APPENDIX
J11
R

Appendix

(103
8813 A
10V

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Annual Washington City Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce, at its annual Washington City dinner last Tuesday evening, honored me with a citation. I ask unanimous consent that my reply to the remarks by Mr. H. B. Bartlett, vice president of the State chamber, in awarding this citation, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT DINNER OF PENNSYLVANIA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, APRIL 29, 1958

Mr. Chairman and my fellow Americans, I cannot tell you how much I appreciate the honor you have conferred upon me tonight.

I cannot find words adequate to express the feeling in my heart at this moment.

Let me assure you that I feel proud and humble. I am overwhelmed by your kindness and profoundly grateful.

To each of you, thank you so very much.

I want to say, in all sincerity, that the greatest privilege I have enjoyed in a long lifetime has been the opportunity to serve the people of Pennsylvania.

For more than half a century I have been entrusted by my fellow citizens with many responsibilities in military and civilian capacities.

Now that I am approaching the end of my public career I can only hope that in some small way my service has been useful and constructive.

It may be appropriate on this occasion to discuss briefly the philosophy of government which has guided my course through the years.

It is a philosophy of government based on the fundamental principles which made our country great and strong.

I believe that the private enterprise system is the foundation of our economic strength and progress.

It is a system which gives encouragement and incentive to initiative, self-reliance, courage, and personal responsibility.

The philosophy of government in which I believe would strive for a sound currency and would protect the value of the dollar against the destructive force of inflation.

It would operate, as far as possible, on pay-as-you-go basis, avoiding excessive taxation and the crushing burden of an ever-increasing national debt.

It would restrict the activities of the Central Government within the limit of the powers granted by the Constitution.

It would prevent Federal encroachment upon functions which are properly the exclusive responsibility of the State and local levels of government.

It would keep government out of all forms of competition with private enterprise.

It would strike down every attempt to replace Americanism with a socialistic system to direct, control, and regiment the lives of the people.

I believe that many of the dangers that confront the United States today have been brought upon us because we have departed from those fundamental principles of good government.

For nearly a year the Finance Committee of the United States Senate has been conducting an investigation into the fiscal and monetary situation of this Nation.

Extensive hearings have been held, with testimony from the leading authorities on governmental finance.

The preponderance of evidence shows that one of the great dangers is inflation, and the resulting erosion of the dollar.

Another source of danger is the failure of productivity to keep pace with constantly increasing wages.

This has had an inflationary effect on the prices of everything we buy.

It has imposed severe hardship on millions of Americans by cutting in half the value of savings accumulated by years of industry and thrift.

A third danger grows out of the fact that people are demanding more and more from government.

Organized pressure groups demand appropriations for their pet projects, for new and expanded functions of government, for sectional advantage and for every conceivable form of spending.

Some do not hesitate to threaten political reprisals unless their proposals are given immediate and favorable attention.

Let me point out that in this session of Congress bills have been introduced, in the Senate alone, calling for brand new Federal expenditures of about $77 billion over the next 5 fiscal years.

This is in addition to the regular Federal budget, which by itself totals about $74 billion for fiscal 1959.

If any substantial part of these proposals should be enacted it would mean increased taxes or more deficit financing.

The Government has no other way to pay its bills.

The dangers I have outlined assume more alarming proportions in this time of recession and extensive unemployment.

They should serve as a warning against hasty and ill-considered remedies—which may prove more costly in the long run by bringing on more inflation.

They prove conclusively that there is no easy or painless solution to our economic problems.

No action by the Government will bring economic recovery overnight as many seem to think.

Progress in this country depends far more upon what people do for themselves than anything the Government does or can do for them.

The dangers we face today should be the immediate and personal concern of everyone here tonight.

You are the leaders of business and industry in our great Commonwealth.

You are vitally interested in building the economic strength of our State and Nation.

Therefore I urge you to take a more active part in government. I believe no businessman should ignore or neglect that responsibility.

And furthermore, it would avance the cause of good government if more businessmen would interest themselves in politics—not merely from a partisan standpoint, but as a patriotic contribution to the public welfare.

We can curb inflation, we can reduce the excessive cost of government, we can avoid deficit financing, if the determination to do so is strong enough to overcome the pressure for selfish advantage.

The point I want to make most emphatically is that this is no time to abandon sound principles.

In the growth and development of our country there have been many changes. But the principles upon which it was established are fixed and everlasting.

To overcome the dangers which confront us today we must first strive to make every American sturdy, hardy, and self-reliant, with faith in the future of our country, and faith in our form of government.

Water Conservation Is Urgent Problem in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the nature of the Texas water problem may be simply stated: The State's demand for water increases while the overall supply of water decreases.

This is a problem demanding—and it is receiving—the best attention of the people of Texas.

It is a problem whose solution depends in part on such water development projects as those included in the rivers and harbors bill that was recently vetoed by the President.

Every possible approach will be needed, as the Dallas Times Herald recently pointed out in a thoughtful editorial, to keep Texas water supplies adequate to the need.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Times Herald editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVERY APPROACH WILL BE NEEDED TO KEEP TEXAS' WATER ADEQUATE

After a memorable drought most of Texas is again well stocked with water. But unless our people and their leaders prove to be diligent and resourceful, this felicity will vanish. So it was wisely recognized by Texans speaking at the American Water Works Association conference in Dallas.

Many signs point to the urgency of pushing water conservation on all fronts. Among the signs:

That Texas must begin to process more of the raw materials it produces, to compensate its economy for the leveling off of its oil industry on which this State's prosperity has been based to large extent. New manufacturing quickly hikes the demand for water.

That Texas' growth in population is among the swiftest in the Nation and that, for various reasons, per capita consumption of water is mounting yearly.

That, as noted by speakers at the AWWA meeting, Texas has long been tapping its underground water stores faster than they have been replenished.

To summarize, as did Marvin C. Nichols of Fort Worth, chairman of the Texas water development board, Texas' demand for water rises while the overall supply drops. This disparity must be corrected, if Texas is to achieve its full economic potential and recurring, painful water crises are to be averted.

Texans should settle for no less than the assumption that there is no need for one drop of the water that falls upon the State, or flows into it, to waste into the Gulf of Mexico.

Texas' water objectives require adequate local, sectional, and statewide planning. They require bold acceptance of new technology for diverting excess stream flow into the aquifers that underlie our State. They entail sound water-pollution laws, well enforced.

Most of all, the adequate water that is vital to Texas' future requires an informed, aggressive public that is willing to work for and invest in our most precious natural resource. Without such a public the wet cycle that Texas is now enjoying will turn out to be a fool's paradise.

Address Delivered by Mrs. Lammot du Pont Copeland Before the 67th Continental Congress, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Mrs. Lammot du Pont Copeland before the 67th Continental Congress, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, Constitution Hall, on April 18, 1958. Together with this address, I ask permission to include a brief biography of Mrs. Copeland, the author of these remarks.

There being no objection, the address and biographical sketch were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALK GIVEN BEFORE THE 67TH CONGRESS OF THE DAR, CONSTITUTION HALL, APRIL 18, 1958, BY MRS. LAMMOT DU PONT COPELAND, FIRST REGENT, GUNSTON HALL, LORTON, VA.

Many of you here this morning may not realize how much George Mason contributed to our heritage of individual freedom.

He was born in Virginia in 1725 and his greatest influence was felt on the eve of our Revolution. Most of the documents he wrote are unsigned, becaues they were written for legislative bodies. He repeatedly turned down public offices that were offered to him; and he died in 1792, just before the Federal period began. But what he left behind him is of vital importance in the everyday lives of all Americans—past, present, and future.

For it was George Mason who first formed, with glowing phrases, the idea that individual men and women have inherent rights and for the first time in history these rights were admitted by a sovereign state and became a part of written constitutional law.

George Mason wrote the Virginia Declaration of Rights, which was adopted by that State on June 12, 1776. Some of the phrases from it will sound familiar to you:

"That all men are, by nature, equally free and independent and have certain inherent rights which they cannot by any compact deprive or divest their posterity: namely the enjoyment of life and liberty with the means of acquiring and possessing property and the pursuing and obtaining of happiness and safety."

And here are others from this document: "That all power is vested in and consequently derived from the people."

"That the freedom of the press is one of the greatest bulwarks of liberty and can never be restrained but by despotic governments."

"That all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion."

They sound familiar to you because they were incorporated a month later into the Declaration of Independence and 15 years later in the Federal Bill of Rights on December 15, 1791.

We are apt to give to Thomas Jefferson the credit for these phrases, but listen to this letter written by Thomas Jefferson to Judge Woodward and dated Monticello, ———, and I quote: "The fact is unquestionable that the bill of rights and the constitution of Virginia were drawn originally by George Mason, one of our really great men and of the first order of greatness."

Let me tell you something about George Mason himself.

He was the fourth generation of that name in Virginia. Owner of vast plantations on both sides of the Potomac River and of a handsome house that he called Gunston Hall and that can be visited today. When George Mason came of age he took his expected place in the governing bodies in the town of his Colony. His closest friend and neighbor was George Washington, and this was fortunate for us, because their unusual gifts complimented each other. The man of action and the scholar collaborated in many of the events that stir our memories today.

His lively mind was widely respected and it seemed to his contemporaries that no man possessed more ideas about the functions and obligations of government. So, is was inevitable that George Mason would become involved in the struggle between the English King and his Colonies across the sea.

He protested to Fairfax in a letter to a London newspaper as early as 1766 in these words:

"Three million people driven to desperation are not an object of contempt. Does any sensible man think that three or four millions of people, not naturally defective in genius or courage, who have tasted the sweets of liberty, will long submit to oppression?"

Again, in 1769, when the British Parliament placed taxes on the simple necessities of life, he was the first to advocate a boycott and he wrote the nonimportation resolutions, which Washington introduced into the Virginia House of Burgesses.

The Boston Tea Party followed, resulting in the passage by Parliament of the Boston Port bill that closed that port and crippled the city. Far away in Alexandria, Va., Washington called a protest meeting at which George Mason's famous Fairfax Resolves were presented. The right of independence was here first presented. Taxation and representation were declared inseparable. The importation of slaves must stop. The Colonies had a free and natural right to make their own laws.

It was during the next year, 1775, that the American Revolution broke out in Lexington, Mass. We find George Mason writing a plan for the organization of the Fairfax Independent Militia, the first such company in the Colonies. The document begins:

"We come equals into this world and equal shall we go out of it. All men are by nature born equally free and independent." And it ends with these words: "Let us never lose sight of this fundamental maxim—that all power was originally lodged in and consequently is derived from the people, we should wear it as a breastplate and buckle it on as our armor."

In early June of 1776, drafts of the Virginia Declaration of Rights were published in Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Maryland newspapers. The Declaration of Independence was adopted and seven of the young States incorporated Bills of Rights copied from the Virginia one in the new constitution.

And, meanwhile, the ill-armed and untrained colonists were fighting for existence under George Washington's generalship.

Finally, the war was over and the States turned their thoughts toward founding a government to bind them together.

George Mason was a delegate to the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia that labored through the long, hot summer months of 1787. But he was not satisfied with the document that was finally agreed upon and he went home to lead the fight against its ratification by the State of Virginia. His strongest criticism was that the proposed Federal Constitution contained no bill of rights which would protect the individual from the tyranny of government. It was a bitter fight between masters of oratory and debate. George Mason, Patrick Henry, James Monroe, and Benjamin Harrison against ratification, while James Madison, "Light Horse" Harry Lee, Edmund Pendleton, and Edmund Randall were in favor of it.

Finally, the price for acceptance was agreed upon. It was a promise that a set of amendments embodying a bill of rights would be introduced into the First Congress of the United States.

In September of 1789, during the first session of that Congress, James Madison instigated recommendations for adoption by the various States of the first 10 amendments that now constitute our Bill of Rights.

Thus, the line of succession from George Mason's early formulation of the principles of the inherent rights of men was finally drawn into the living law of our country. So, that is why, today, we pay tribute to George Mason of Gunston Hall.

It was Mr. Louis Hertle, of Chicago, who deeded the property to the Commonwealth of Virginia to be maintained upon his death as a memorial to George Mason, because Mr. Hertle felt indebted to him for the opportunity he had to enjoy life and liberty and for the means of acquiring and possessing property.

Mr. and Mrs. Louis Hertle acquired the property of Gunston Hall in 1913 and he deeded it to the Commonwealth of Virginia in 1932; and, at that time, named the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America its custodian. This society, through a board of regents, has raised funds to restore it as it was in George Mason's day and has built the administrative buildings necessary to running it as an historic house museum open daily to the public. The gardens, restored by the Garden Club of Virginia, overlooking the Potomac River, con-

tain the 200-foot boxwood walk planted by George Mason in 1758.

His will contained this sacred charge to his sons: "If either their own inclinations or the necessity of the times should engage them in public affairs, I charge them on a father's blessings, never to let the motives of private interests or ambition induce them to betray; nor the terrors of poverty and disgrace; nor the fear of dangers and of death deter them from asserting the liberty of their country and endeavoring to transmit to their posterity those sacred rights to which they themselves were born."

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF MRS. LAMMOT DU PONT COPELAND, GREENVILLE, DEL.

Mrs. Copeland, a native of Litchfield, Conn., was educated at private schools here and abroad. Presently living in Wilmington, Del., she is a trustee of the Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum; and is chairman of its fellowship committee. She is also a member of the furnishings committee of the Dickinson Mansion, Dover, Del. Besides serving as first regent of the board of regents of Gunston Hall since 1951, Mrs. Copeland is a manager of the Delaware Society of the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America. Mrs. Copeland has served on the exhibition committee of the Wilmington Society of the Fine Arts; and, recently, served as cochairman of the China Trade Show, held in October 1957.

Mrs. Copeland has spoken before several groups in the past few years, including the Antiques Forum, at Williamsburg, in 1956 and 1958; the Present Day Women's Club, of Princeton, N. J., and others.

Virginia M. Wuesthoff, of New Hampshire, Winner of the Elks National Youth Leadership Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, a 17-year-old New Hampshire girl who plans to be a nurse was today named the Nation's outstanding young leader. She shares the honors with an 18-year-old Arizona boy.

Miss Virginia Marie Wuesthoff, of Rochester, N. H., daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Edward N. Wuesthoff, was selected on the basis of her record as a leader in school and community activities, and for her character, good citizenship, perseverance, and resourcefulness. She will receive an award of a $1,000 United States savings bond at the annual convention of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, in New York, in July.

Mr. President, I wish to take this occasion to extend my congratulations to Miss Wuesthoff and to express my pride in the fact that a New Hampshire resident has been chosen to receive this signal honor. Miss Wuesthoff typifies the millions of young people in America whose training and background assure this Nation that its future is bright.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement by Miss Wuesthoff concerning the honor she has won, and a statement on her background and accomplishments.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY VIRGINIA MARIE WUESTHOFF FROM HER ENTRY IN THE ELKS NATIONAL YOUTH LEADERSHIP CONTEST

The youth of today is a versatile molding substance which is easily shaped by circumstances and environment. Realizing this, I have always strived to follow good example and aimed to reach the top, and thus be in a position to encourage in my classmates a willingness to accept responsibility and a satisfaction in doing things well.

One of my principal objectives in participation in music, art, dramatics, and literature is to arouse interest and appreciation in Rochester of the cultural facets of school life. Being president of the student council has given me the opportunity to further the use of parliamentary procedure in assemblies and inspire additional activities in this governmental group for the good of the student body.

When chosen as 1 of 12 New Hampshire delegates to attend the United Nations Pilgrimage for Youth in 1957, I knew the honor was a chance to observe the workings and accomplishments of this great organization and impart to my associates and various city groups a knowledge of the genuine integrity of the U. N.

It is quite widely known that in this age of missiles, only understanding can insure peace in our turbulent world. Thus through promoting a duty to responsibility in the youth of my community, it is my objective to accelerate, in my own small capacity, the arrival of a universal and eternal peace.

WANTS TO BE A NURSE

Miss Wuesthoff is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Edward N. Wuesthoff. She plans a career in nursing and will enter the Mary Hitchcock Memorial Hospital School of Nursing in Hanover, N. H., in the fall, following her graduation from Spaulding High School in June.

A National Honor Society member, Miss Wuesthoff has attained top grades in her school work while pursuing a busy and varied schedule of extra curricular activities. She was her school's delegate to the United Nations Pilgrimage for Youth to New York last year. She is a member of the National Thespian Society, serving as president of her high school chapter in her senior year; and a member of the Future Nurses of America.

An accomplished public speaker, she recorded a speech on the United Nations which has been used in her school's Problems on Democracy classes. She has won numerous awards for participation in music, dramatics, public speaking, science and student government. Long active in community service programs, Miss Wuesthoff is a Junior Red Cross member, has participated in the March of Dimes and other fund drives, and last Christmas directed a CYO choral group caroling at local hospitals and convalescent homes.

Miss Wuesthoff, the youngest of six children and the last remaining at home, lives with her parents on a farm outside Rochester. After school she milks the cows, and lends a hand with the planting, gardening and haying. She has also found time on summer vacations to work as a waitress, and has been employed during after school hours by the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Extension of Unemployment Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, we are now discussing the extension of unemployment benefits. We want to keep this plan of insurance from becoming a dole. Capt. John M. Cummings, a columnist for the Philadelphia Inquirer, recently had some very fine comments on this subject, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In his press conference the other day President Eisenhower heatedly denounced as a dole and nothing else a Democratic plan to ease the effects of the recession by extending unemployment benefits to those whose insurance under State laws has expired. The net effect of cash payments out of the Federal Treasury, he argued, would be to destroy the insurance system.

It now develops that Republican opposition has been fortified by Democratic resistance to the plan. At a meeting of the House Ways and Means Committee southern Democrats joined midwestern Republicans in upholding the President's position.

The use of the word "dole" by the President doesn't exactly fit what supporters of the measure have in mind. The word means "to deal out sparingly," and since the plan calls for an initial appropriation of $1,470,000,000, well, it reminds us:

A week or so ago a man we hadn't seen in a full quarter of a century or more dropped into the office for a visit. Although he gave off no impression he had just been turned out by a Bond Street tailor, he was reasonably well dressed. He was clean shaven and he wore a shirt that was no stranger to a laundry. Yet by his own admission he had been on the bum for years.

We knew something of his background. In his younger days he had studied medicine. For a few years he worked in an upstate hospital, but he never advanced far enough to win the privilege of placing M. D. behind his name. His father was an industrious, hard-working man who was busy at his trade until sickness and finally death took him away.

In time he became a drifter, moving along from city to city. His favorite dodge was to live on the missions. We got the impression he was currently putting up at a Philadelphia mission.

He explained, however, that a mission had a limited welcome. After a specified time you had to move on, generally to another mission. He came to us with an argument, you might call it a plea. He wanted us to expound for the benefit of you and your hard-working taxpaying neighbors the principle that every American should be pensioned off at age 55. He himself, of course, had reached this milestone.

He argued that billions in social-security funds were piling up in Washington. This money, he contended, should be doled out and thus placed in circulation. At 55, he insisted, a man was worked out, washed up, and it was up to you and you and you to keep him in funds for the remainder of his

days. He thought a pension of at least $100 a month would meet the needs of most folks.

We asked if the same pension would be paid to bums, drunks, and the like who never held work in high esteem.

"Sure," said he. "What if a man does blow it in on booze. He puts the dough in circulation and that's what counts. Me? Well, I haven't had a drink in several years. Got a heart condition. And I take garlic to help it."

We told him it wasn't necessary to specify the cure. We knew it the minute he entered the room.

Maybe you think this pension to everyone at a fixed age is something peculiar to this self-confessed bum. Don't be fooled. Others are advocating it. And they're not bums, either.

Maxwell M. Rabb, Secretary to the Cabinet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two documents which testify to the extraordinarily effective job which Maxwell Rabb of Boston has done as the first secretary to the President's Cabinet. The first of these is an exchange of correspondence between the President and Mr. Rabb. The President's letter reveals the high regard which he has had for Mr. Rabb's work.

The second is a very complimentary editorial from last Saturday's Boston Herald, which makes special note of the anonymity with which Mr. Rabb has performed his duties.

There being no objection, the correspondence and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The White House today made public the following exchange of letters between the President and the Honorable Maxwell M. Rabb, secretary to the Cabinet.

The President's letter follows:

APRIL 24, 1958.

DEAR MAX: The prospect of your departure from the White House staff in the near future is one which I accept only because I appreciate how unstintingly you have given of your time and energy to your work for more than 5 years. It has been a truly large service that you have rendered—not only to me but to the members of the Cabinet, your other associates, and the Nation. Now that personal reasons require your return to private life, I must comply with your request to terminate your duties in mid-May.

I share your belief that the strengthening of Cabinet procedures in recent years is a significant step to more efficient conduct of the business of government. As you review in years to come the many complex problems that have almost constantly engaged our attention, your awareness of the role of the Cabinet in solving them should give you a very rewarding feeling. Particularly have the guidance and stimulus that you added to the preparation of matters for Cabinet discussion helped to insure a firm foundation for the policies shaped there.

I am grateful also for your tireless devotion to the cause of better understanding of each other among the many individuals and groups comprising our Nation. Through personal example and encouragement to others, you have made a contribution which I regard as being of the highest type any person can make. In this you will, I trust, find a very real and lasting satisfaction.

A letter of resignation and its acceptance customarily has an air of finality that in this instance is unacceptable. Your willingness to be of assistance in the future is something I shall not fail to remember and put to good use.

My thanks and best wishes go to you, along with my complete confidence that the future will be full and satisfying for you and your good family.

With warm regards.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. Rabb's letter follows:

APRIL 23, 1958.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is with deep regret that, because of personal considerations, I must submit my resignation as secretary to the Cabinet, to be effective, if convenient to you, in mid-May.

I shall always be proud to have had the privilege of serving in the Government of the United States under your inspiring leadership. The more than 5 years that I have had the honor to be associated with you have been memorable years, filled with deep personal pleasure and satisfaction.

It has been impressive to observe at close range your quiet and effective resolution of so many challenging problems, your determination to create in this country a moral climate in which discrimination will have no part, and your affirmation of America's traditional humanitarian concern for the refugee who seeks asylum from oppression and persecution.

Particularly am I grateful, as the first secretary to the Cabinet, that there is growing national recognition of the importance of your pioneering contribution in the area of public administration where you have changed the Cabinet from what was a somewhat haphazard, inconclusive conclave into an effective, vital coordinating body.

If, from time to time in the future, I can be of assistance to you, I hope you will call upon me.

Faithfully yours,

MAXWELL M. RABB,
Secretary to the Cabinet.

[From the Boston Herald of April 26, 1958]

NEARLY ANONYMOUS

Maxwell M. Rabb has held one of the most sensitive posts in the Federal Government for half a decade. Yet he has made few headlines. His single envelope in the Herald morgue is a slim one.

This is because Mr. Rabb has wanted it that way. His job has required him to be inconspicuous. He has inherited the mantle of the anonymous assistants whom F. D. R. introduced into the Government and who have become an increasingly vital part of each succeeding administration.

Mr. Rabb's best known service has been as secretary to the Cabinet, a new post created by the Eisenhower administration for the purpose of bringing more organization and direction to cabinet meetings. Under his expert guidance, the cabinet has perhaps become more of an action agency than it has ever been in the past.

The secretary himself has not had Cabinet status. He has headed no great department of Government, has made none of the ultimate decisions. But by operating in the background as an organizer, a smoother-out, a prodder, and a suggester he has helped the cabinet to realize its highest potential as a coordinating agency.

In addition, Rabb has served as the President's principal adviser on minority affairs, working on everything from Negro integration to Hungarian refugee problems, and has been associate counsel to the President on various legal matters. And in these capacities, too, he has remained discreetly in the shadow, producing results but no publicity.

The decision of this anonymous assistant to leave public service, at least for the time being, must be a cause of genuine regret to the President and to the country. Mr. Eisenhower spoke with obvious feeling when he praised the "truly large service" which the quiet Republican from Massachusetts has performed.

The public service can use more like him.

The Present Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in today's Washington Evening Star is a column by Sylvia Porter, one of the best economic writers, dealing with the present recession. There are some interesting and helpful points brought out in her article. I think it makes good sense. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star of May 1, 1958]

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH

(By Sylvia Porter)

WHERE ARE WE HEADING?

It's May 1—the beginning of the 10th month of the 3d business recession since World War II, assuming you accept the birth date of this downturn as July 1957.

Economically speaking, where have we been, where are we now in the business cycle, where do we appear to be heading?

It's no easy job to dig into the baffiegab which has accompanied this most widely publicized and debated downswing in history. But if you do dig carefully, you'll come up with this consensus of expert answers.

We already have gone through the deepest, fastest downturn of the postwar era.

A key measurement of the decline is the Federal Reserve Board's index of industrial production. In neither the 1953–54 recession nor the 1948–49 drop did industrial production fall more than 10½ percent from the very top to the very bottom.

This time, just since last summer, industrial production has fallen almost 12 percent—with the greatest slumps concentrated, as you are fully aware, in heavy manufacturing industries.

STEEL IS YARDSTICK

Steel output is another key yardstick. It's off 42 percent from the 1957 peak against declines of 36 percent in 1953–54 and 32.3 percent in 1948–49.

New orders in manufacturing are a crucial measurement. They're down 22.6 percent from the 1957 top compared with decreases of 16.9 percent in 1953–54, of 18.8 percent in 1948–49.

And if the slumps in autos and housing are measured from their 1955 peaks instead of from their already depressed levels of 1957, the recession in these industries this

time far exceeds the depth of previous postwar auto and housing downturns.

There's no doubt about it: The 1957–58 recession has the dubious distinction of being the deepest since the thirties.

Now, the pace of the downturn has slowed, there are some important signs that we're probing for the bottom of the decline.

Of course, a cynic might retort, "The pace had to slow; this is spring, the season for improvement. Business couldn't continue deteriorating at the rate of this past winter or we'd be in real trouble."

Nevertheless, the slackening of the rate of drop does emphasize that some sizable adjustments are behind us.

Now housing is perking up—reflecting Government stimulants as well as better weather. And if housing starts in May run at an annual rate of a million—as is quite likely—it will mean a pickup in such allied industries as appliances, furniture, rugs, fixtures, etc.

RETAIL SALES RESPOND

Retail sales are responding to spring and to the buy-now campaigns in cities the country over. There are other persuasive signs of leveling out—which is quite a different thing from decline.

We're likely to sit on the business bottom for some time and a slower rate of downturn doesn't automatically mean the start of upturn.

It's imperative that you realize this. Even the optimists admit they can't see any influence which can produce an immediate swing back up. The forces for a smash recovery just aren't present.

A start of upswing well may come in fall, though, and be clearly apparent by the end of 1958.

The shape of this recession is not going to be a "V." Rather, it's likely to be a saucer, an elongated "U." For the first time since the recession began, there is a basis for writing we're approaching the flat part of the saucer, the bottom part of the "U."

You Can Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include an editorial of Thursday, April 24, from the Carmi Times, Carmi, Ill., which shows the commendable efforts the editor of this paper, Mr. Roy Clippinger, is putting forth to maintain prosperity in that area and to prevent any increase in the present recession.

This is the type of call to action that should be ringing out in every community in America, and if it were, the threat of the recession would be abolished, and prosperity would prevail throughout our land.

The subject of this editorial, which I hope all the Members will read, is You Can Help:

On page 3 of this issue is a voluntary contribution to aid the economy and welfare of individuals and business in White County. It is a message that we sincerely believe, if adopted on a national scale, would tend to immediately knock the recession into a cocked hat and return conditions throughout these United States to a state or normal prosperity.

Who or what is responsible for the momentary slump this rich, healthy Nation is going through? We can't lay it in the lap of John Doe. You and I have our individual responsibility to bear in the present situation and only you and I can help snap us out of it.

Speaking solely for this area, we are proud of the fact that we live in the garden spot of the whole world. We are dependent on the good soil and while our oil industry is undergoing a period of readjustment it is a very important factor in our local economy. Our farmers are progressive and industrious and laxity in farm management has gone the way of the one-horse plow. Our oil people are plagued with the shipment of petroleum products from foreign lands, as well as legislative hurdles that will have to be adjusted.

White County is a rich community, comparatively speaking, and the truth of the matter is that we have grown slightly smug in many of our views. We take our community wealth for granted and but few of us are on our toes. We have gone through an era where business and prosperity were taken in stride. We, along with the rest of the Nation, have been content to sit back and beam our satisfaction rather than show an aggressiveness that would have forestalled the present recession.

Especially is that true in business. You go in some business places and owners and clerks sing the blues to the extent that when you leave you have decided the whole country has gone to Hades. If you walk into a competitor's business across the street the owner will probably tell you that business is good and get out his books to prove it. The mental attitude and aggressiveness of business people play a big part in the mental attitude of people whom they serve.

Just as an example of what we mean. Business at the Carmi Times is good and there has never been a day since the newspaper started that the management and employees of the Times could say anything different. The Times is meeting the present situation with a smile. Within the past few months we have spent quite a few thousand dollars on new machinery. We are in a period of completely redecorating our front office. We have faith in this community and in this Nation and will continue to do more than our part both in leadership and cooperation to keep this a happy and prosperous county and our Nation, by long odds, the leading nation of the world.

Won't you please turn right now to the message brought to you on page 3? Try, truthfully and willingly to do your individual part in battling the recession by following the advice this newspaper so gladly brings you. Wake up each morning with a smile, instead of a frown and a grouch, even if you think your affairs are not altogether as you would like to see them, and determine to fight a little harder to better economic conditions that you and your neighbor face.

This community needs you; you need this community, so let's all have a unity of purpose to bring it back on an even keel—let's buy ourselves out of the recession.

The Town That Killed Hay Fever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. DENNISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. DENNISON. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and constituent, Floyd Bixler, of Hiram, Ohio, has called my attention to the following article entitled "The Town That Killed Hay Fever," by Dwight E. Stevenson. This modern parable, which appeared in the Christian Evangelist for April 21, 1958, should be read by everyone. I commend it to the Members of the House.

THE TOWN THAT KILLED HAY FEVER

(By Dwight E. Stevenson, the College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky.)

Once upon a time there was a town in which every inhabitant was afflicted annually with hay fever.

Year after year, generation after generation, during the months of July and August the people went about with watery eyes and running noses and without being able to say their N's, their M's, and their NG's properly.

Then one year a bright high-school senior who had been studying botany after school hours discovered that the hay fever was caused by ragweed growing in Farmer Brown's cow pasture. So the senior told his parents and friends what he had discovered.

"An interesting theory," they said, but they did nothing. After he had told everybody he met and had talked at length with people of watery eyes and running noses—and without being able to articulate his N's, M's, and his NG's properly—the senior became disgusted because nobody would believe him or do anything.

So early one morning while the dew was still heavy, he borrowed his father's scythe and stole quietly out to Farmer Brown's cow pasture. There, with violent sneezes punctuating his labors, he mowed steadly until he had destroyed every ragweed. And then in the late afternoon he made a fire and burned the withering plants which he had slain. Then at sundown, with a throbbing head the size of a rainbarrel, he struggled back to his home and dropped wearily into bed.

The next day all over town eyes stopped watering, noses ceased dripping, and all the people suddenly found that they could say their N's, their M's and their NG's properly. The senior tried to tell his friends that this was because he had destroyed the ragweed.

Most of them laughed in his face and some of them even coined for him the nickname of "Ragweed Willie." But a few believed him and with the help of these few he kept the ragweed down all that summer, and the next, and the next. In fact, the town fathers joined him before many summers passed and the annual slaying of the ragweed was turned into a community festival.

In time Ragweed Willie died, and a grateful community laid him to rest with a huge funeral and even dedicated a school building to his memory. Every year on R-Day the town sallied forth to the old cow pasture which had since become a town park, and slew ragweed to the accompaniment of band music, picnic lunches, and games.

Since by now, three generations had passed and no one living had ever actually seen a ragweed, the ritual of R-Day had become a quaint folk custom, and a sharp divi... arose concerning it. Some defended it stoutly as the most important single day in the whole year, and emphatically affirmed that the rituals of that day had deep cultural—not to say mystical and even religious—significance.

Others disagreed, but in order not to be disagreeable they simply stayed away from the festival; on R-Day they climbed into their automobiles and went to the mountains and the lakes while an ever-diminishing number of their fellow citizens carried on the empty rituals.

Thus it came about that the park grew neglected and R-day was forgotten. Ragweeds, unknown for a generation, began to reappear; and during the months of July and August the people who had known of hay fever only from what they read in their history books began to go around with

watery eyes, running noses, and without being able to say their N's, their M's, and their NG's properly.

Finally, the malady became so bad that the mayor called a public meeting in the assembly hall of the Ragweed Willie High School. The mayor made a speech—without his N's, his M's, and his NG's, and many others—amid the encouraging response of coughs and sniffles—added their contribution to the patriotic occasion. Some said one thing, some another.

"The icecap at the North Pole is melting. That's the cause of it," said one. "Think back and you'll see that the winters are milder than they used to be and the summers are hotter."

But the speech that all of them liked best and the one they applauded the longest went something like this: "Fellow-citizens and proud sons of the Ragweed Willie tradition. This is no ordinary crisis. We have elected representatives in Congress. They are supposed to look out for our interests. But what are they doing for us? I demand that our Government use some of our tax money to look after our interests. I pay my taxes every year, and what do I get for them? Hay fever. Why doesn't somebody in Washington do something?"

After that, somebody made a motion and a petition was drawn up. Everybody signed it. Then they all went home thinking what great things had been accomplished. It was now up to Washington to do something.

On the way home, one sufferer who seemed to be a little worse off than the others, was heard to complain. "Hay fever. What did I ever do to bring this upon me? You know that I never bothered anybody or stuck my nose—achew—into other people's business. What did I ever do to deserve this?" And there were many that spoke the same sentiments.

Meanwhile, outside the town, in the abandoned park that long, long ago had been Farmer Brown's cow pasture, tall ragweed groves flourished and waved gently in the evening breeze.

"All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing." (Edmund Burke.)

Representative Green of Oregon Reports on Russian Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in recent months, many Americans have become very interested in the comparative standing and programs of our schools, particularly in relation to those of Russia and other European countries. The Soviet successes in sending their large satellites into space have had the salutary effect of disturbing our customary complacency and awakening a healthy curiosity about the society that accomplished this technological success, and particularly about its educational system.

As part of the effort to obtain more first-hand information and impressions on these subjects, the able and energetic Representative of the Third Oregon Congressional District, in which I live, Mrs. EDITH GREEN, of Portland, Oreg., visited the Soviet Union during the congressional Easter recess. As a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, Representative GREEN has a particularly direct and well-qualified concern for the comparative educational progress of their country and ours. The manner in which this visit brought to life for her the statistics and other dry facts about that vast and alien society, with which we must compete, was vividly described in an article reporting her journey, in the Oregonian of April 21, 1958. I ask that this article, reviewing Mrs. GREEN's impressions upon her return from the U. S. S. R., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MRS. GREEN IMPRESSED BY EXTENT, INTENSITY OF SOVIET EDUCATION

WASHINGTON.—Representative EDITH GREEN Democrat, of Oregon, returned Sunday from a week's inspection of Russian schools favorably impressed with the quality, intensity and extent of the Soviet education program.

"They are making a tremendous investment in education," said Mrs. GREEN, "and it is not all in the sciences, as we sometimes think. There is great stress on music and art."

Mrs. GREEN flew to Moscow for the House Education Committee of which she is a member. The committee is studying various forms of Federal aid to education.

PUPILS SPEAK ENGLISH

Last Monday the former Oregon schoolteacher spent the morning visiting a Moscow school which had grades from 1 to 10. She heard second graders speaking elementary English, and 10th graders stand and speak extemporaneously for 15 minutes in English. A student discussed the writings of Jack London, in terms of "the fight against imperialists—but it was beautiful English."

She said Russia has been experimenting for 9 years with the idea of starting youngsters on French and English in the second grade. The size of the classes in English is limited to 12 to 15 students. Classes in other subjects run from 35 to 45.

"After listening to those Russian students recite in English, I told them if I had closed my eyes I wouldn't have known I wasn't in an American school," she said.

SPECIAL ATTENTION GIVEN

Gifted scholars get special attention in what is called the House of Pioneers.

As for intensity, students attend classes six days a week. They start at 9 in the morning and go until 2:30 in the afternoon, when they have lunch, which costs 15 cents. After that they go into what are called circles, which allow for specialization in fields in which they are gifted.

She said the student who can compete scholastically after 8 grades, continues on to the 10th. Those who can compete at that point, go on to the university. Cost is no factor, only that they qualify scholastically. Those that fail, go into trade schools or the labor force.

BIOLOGY TAUGHT EARLY

As for the science curriculum, Mrs. GREEN said they start biology in 5th grade and take it through the 9th grade. Physics begins in the 6th grade, goes through 10th, chemistry starts in 7th, goes through 10th.

At Moscow University, she found "a magnificent institution" equipped with 22,000 rooms for a total enrollment of 24,000, 6,000 of which were enrolled in the humanities. She said there were 16,000 full-time students, 8,000 part-time and night students.

Total enrollment in Soviet universities and institutes is 2 million, she said.

A 10th grade student takes mathematics, astronomy, physics, chemistry, history of Russia, and possibly the language of one of the provinces. All schools have the same curriculum, she said.

SOVIET SCHOOLS UNIFORM

To get these facts and impressions, Mrs. GREEN visited kindergartens, schools, and universities in Moscow and Kiev. When she realized, after double checking with American officials, that the schools were uniform throughout the Soviet Union, she dropped plans for visiting Siberia and other outlying areas.

Led by a Russian woman guide, she also visited inside the Kremlin, whose red walls were just across the way from her hotel in Moscow. The weather was cloudy but not cold. She said the Russians were getting set for the Communists' traditional May Day celebrations—"rehearsing the civilians for spontaneous demonstrations."

She spent considerable time talking with American correspondents assigned to Moscow. No one prevented her from taking pictures wherever she went, even inside the Kremlin.

Her guide was unhappy only over the fact that Mrs. GREEN wanted to visit so many churches during Easter services. She attended four services in Greek Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Baptist.

"Every church was packed," declared Mrs. GREEN. "At midnight Easter services at a Greek Orthodox church there were thousands standing in the street outside."

A ballet she found to be excellent artistically but pure Communist propaganda substantively. Originally called the Red Poppy but later changed to the Red Flower at the request of the Chinese, the ballet depicted struggle between the classes.

CLIBURN'S CONCERT HEARD

And it is true what Khrushchev and the others in Moscow were saying about that curly-headed Texas pianist, Van Cliburn, observed Mrs. GREEN. She heard him play at the conservatory in Moscow just before her departure and thought him a great artist. He was also a good showman, which the Russians also appreciated. She also watched him perform on TV from the apartment of an American correspondent.

One thing more which would appeal to the heart of any ex-teacher and parent in this era of the American teen-ager. She said:

"There was no tomfoolery in the Russian schools. No whispering, no giggling, very strict discipline. And when students were called on to recite they stood erect."

Mrs. GREEN said she favors greater exchange of students.

"I don't think any youngster could go over and not come back convinced anew of the superiority of our form of government," she declared.

Describing the old women she saw in the manual labor force, repairing streets and sidewalks, she said:

"Along with their advances in education, there is a grimness of life that is very depressing."

Hon. Thomas J. O'Brien

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, it is a real privilege to join my colleagues in paying tribute today to the distinguished

dean of the Illinois congressional delegation, Hon. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, on his 80th birthday.

TOM, as he is affectionately known to his multitude of friends—a host of whom live in my district—has served the people of Illinois and particularly Cook County faithfully and with real devotion to duty during his long career of public service. He is truly a great American.

I know that the people of his district join with his many friends in this Congress in wishing him the very best and many years abundant in good health and happiness.

Ideas and Ideals as Weapons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of the prime battles in the struggle between freedom and communism has been termed the "war of words," descriptive of the effort to communicate information, ideas and ideals to the peoples of the world.

I hold in my hand a letter to the editor of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Sunday, April 6, 1958, written by Goodhue Livingston, Jr., chairman of the policy committee of the Committee for Collective Security, detailing constructive suggestions as to how we may more effectively act in the war of words. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter to the editor was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTERS FROM THE PEOPLE
TO WIN THE COLD WAR

To the EDITOR OF THE POST-DISPATCH:

Soviet Russia is confident that by mustering overwhelming superiority in the war of words and ideas it can achieve its ultimate aim of world domination without turning the cold war into a hot one.

We therefore must mobilize our political power while we develop military weapons and expand our foreign-aid program. Military might does not provide total defense. We must also develop psychological strength to win the hearts and minds of men to the democratic principle of liberty and justice for all.

Peoples throughout the world want just and lasting peace. We should assume the lead in seeking to secure it to offset the Communist effort to appear the champions of freedom and progress for colonial peoples and underdeveloped lands.

While emphasizing human rights and fundamental freedoms, we must understand that the uncommitted peoples are more interested in the economic and social advantages of democracy than its political aspects and believe colonialism a greater evil than communism.

We must: (1) Emphasize economic and social cooperation as well as military cooperation with the other peoples of the free world and the uncommitted peoples. (2) Make clear that we respect their independence even as we prize our own. (3) Stress that under our democratic form of government living standards have been raised to a greater height than that of any other people and provide us with greater economic security and social equality.

To effectively prosecute the war of words and ideas we urge:

1. Creation of a joint congressional committee on the United States Information Agency to establish and maintain liaison between the executive and the legislative branches.

2. Sustained congressional support for a vastly expanded long-range information program maintained by whatever appropriations are necessary to assure maximum effectiveness.

3. Recognition by both the executive and legislative branches of the vital importance of the war of words and ideas, demanding complete cooperation between them.

Unless we win the war of words, unless we wage peace successfully, we will be compelled to fight a war of weapons which we cannot win, for its only result would be the destruction of civilization.

GOODHUE LIVINGSTON, Jr.,
Chairman, Policy Committee, Committee for Collective Security.
NEW YORK.

Labor's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the following article that appeared in the Southtown Economist, an outstanding community newspaper in Chicago, on Sunday, April 27:

LABOR'S DAY

Members of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers have just won a pay boost of 25 cents an hour. Starting June 1 they will receive $3.90 an hour.

Older members of the union recall that the new hourly wage was the total daily wage about 30 years ago. Quite obviously, labor has come a long way since.

Factories now find it necessary to provide huge parking lots for the cars of their employees. Until labor came into its own, only the head of the company came to work in an automobile.

Much of the credit for labor's prosperity is due the late Henry Ford. During the days when workingmen were being paid $3 a day, Ford, without any prompting, established a minimum wage of $5 a day for his thousands of mechanics. He proved that high wages is good business, and before long other large employers adopted his philosophy.

As always, however, the so-called white collar worker has been left behind in the current trend toward fatter paychecks. He is unorganized and he has to take what is offered him, or do without.

As I read this, I could not help but marvel at the progress America has made in raising the living standards of labor in the past 50 years. To pinpoint or personalize this a bit, I wish to mention my father who has been dead 25 years. He pioneered the labor movement in Chicago in the days of Samuel Gompers. For 31 years he was an active member of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 9. I remember my father telling me that his first pay check from the city of Chicago was $60. I am proud of my father's contribution to the labor movement. However, I am relieved that he does not know the dangers confronting the rank and file members of organized labor today in light of the recent revelations of the Senate's Subcommittee on Labor Racketeering. The conduct of certain of the unscrupulous leaders coupled with actions exemplifying greed and avarice, most assuredly endanger and jeopardize the many benefits labor has fought for and won during the last few decades.

I have been receiving letters and other communications from my constituents urging that the unworthy labor leaders be penalized and removed from their high positions in the unions. Some letters express concern on the part of the rank and file union members and state that they are embarrassed and humiliated over the leadership in some of the unions. They state that as mere rank and file they can do nothing but look to Congress to act for them by putting across legislation which will clean up certain unions and provide machinery which will deter and prohibit dishonesty and coercion.

It is truly a precipitous period in labor's history. Congress should take positive steps to remove the threat to the some of the millions of labor members whose future and economic welfare are in danger because certain leaders have not kept their faith and confidence but have badly abused and misused their office.

In such dangerous times, it is essential that no legislation is enacted which is going to be detrimental to labor so therefore, very thorough and careful consideration must be given to the needs of labor. The labor movement has contributed a great deal to America's progress, security, and economic welfare. We want to help them, not hurt them. This matter is not one in which hasty action can be taken which will prove unwise and completely detrimental to labor.

Involuntary Reconversion Tax Liabilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, recently I received a resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Wichita Falls, Tex., relating to section 1033 of the 1954 Internal Revenue Code.

The resolution points to the plight of people who are forced to sell property under condemnation proceedings and who subsequently must pay Federal income tax on the amount in excess of the original purchase price or reinvest that amount in other property similar to that taken by condemnation. As is stated in the resolution, Mr. President, there are many cases in which aged

people of relatively small financial resources are forced to sell their homes and then pay this additional tax or seek a home which may be far removed from the area of their friends and relatives and church ties.

Mr. President, I commend this resolution to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Wichita Falls, Tex., and a letter from Mr. H. A. Thomason, city manager of the city of Wichita Falls, Tex.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 324

Whereas under section 1033 of the United States 1954 Internal Revenue Code, if land is taken under condemnation proceedings by any governmental agency, the taking thereof is held to be an involuntary conversion, and, if the amount received by the landowner exceeds the amount the land costs him, the excess is held to be income; and

Whereas this excess brought about by involuntary conversion is subject to Federal income tax if the landowner does not, within 1 year, invest the proceeds of the forced sale in land of similar or related use; and

Whereas under the present contemplated program of the various governmental agencies, many large reservoirs of water will be created under condemnation proceedings and tens of thousands of acres of land will be flooded and thus taken out of use for agriculture and grazing; and

Whereas also many thousands of acres of land as well as other property will be condemned for highway right-of-way purposes in the consummation of the current Federal interstate highway program; and

Whereas a considerable portion of the land taken by condemnation will be valuable property, including that along river and creek courses, and will generally flood the arable and best grazing land, and leave the ridge land (the least valuable) to the landowners; and in many cases will totally disrupt a practical and profitable business operation; and

Whereas under the section of the income tax law referred to hereinbefore, landowners will have to invest the proceeds of the condemnation sales in other property similar to that taken from them by involuntary conversion, or pay income tax as stated hereinbefore; and

Whereas this condemnation of large acreages of good arable and grazing lands will greatly reduce the amount of such land, and at the same time increase the number of people trying to purchase such lands, and thereby stimulate the operation of the law of supply and demand, thus causing the price asked for such similar land or property to be increased considerably for such land or property as may be offered for sale; and

Whereas in many cases aged people of relatively small financial resources will be forced to pay the income tax or seek a home in distant parts of the State, or other States, where similar property may be for sale, and, if they succeed in finding such property for sale and do purchase same, they will have to leave the communities where their relatives and longtime friends live and where their church and other civic ties have long been established, and begin life among strangers; and

Whereas these landowners annually pay Federal income taxes as other citizens do, and yet by this discriminatory provision of the present Internal Revenue Code, they are unjustly required to pay an additional income tax; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Wichita Falls, Tex., That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to repeal the provision requiring the owners of land or property taken by condemnation to pay income tax on the excess of such sales and permit the owners, without paying income tax on same, to invest the proceeds in any kind of property they may desire; and be it further

Resolved, That official copies of this resolution be sent to the 2 United States Senators from Texas, to the Honorable FRANK IKARD, United States Congressman from the 13th Congressional District of Texas, and to Representative WILBER D. MILLS, of California, who is the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, as well as the Joint House and Senate Committee on Internal Revenue.

Passed and approved this 14th day of April A. D. 1958.

K. C. SPELL, *Mayor.*

Attest:

GEO. T. HENDERSON,
City Clerk.

The Trinity River Controversy: Straight and to the Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, a great controversy is raging over the Trinity River project in northwestern California, and how this highly desirable project is to be constructed and operated. My bill providing for the joint development of the waterpower resources of the Trinity River has had lengthy hearings, which were completed nearly 3 months ago by the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. No action has been taken yet, although the preponderance of evidence was most convincing in favor of the partnership proposal.

It seems to me to be in the best interests of the Nation to call for speedy action on this matter. In a talk before a recent meeting of California's Commonwealth Club in San Francisco, Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton gave an excellent summation of the true nature of this controversy over the Trinity River project. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial from the April 24 issue of the Petaluma Argus-Courier, which discusses this controversy:

STRAIGHT AND TO THE POINT

Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton, in his recent talk before California's Commonwealth Club on the proposed partnership development of the Trinity River project, answered in detail objections raised to the proposal by Congressman CLAIR ENGLE before the same forum. Then he pushed tangled statistics aside to say something that, we feel, has needed saying:

"If the opponents of teamwork are willing to sacrifice $175 million in the Central Valley project account plus $83 million in Federal taxes, plus municipal and State taxes, merely to try to prove that only the Federal Government can do a job right, let them say so plainly.

"If the opponents of teamwork are unalterably opposed to anything but all-Federal development—and its inevitable corollary, Federal monopoly—let them say so and plainly. If the opponents of teamwork believe that now is the time to start California on the road toward a valley authority, let them say so and plainly."

There, through all the theorizing in the foggy pens of socialism, stand clear the plain facts to be considered in the interests of the people of California.

Proposed Railroad Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated April 23, 1958, written to the able junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] by the presidents of Wabash Railroad Co., and Missouri Pacific Railroad Co.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 23, 1958.

Hon. STUART SYMINGTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SYMINGTON: We are disappointed that the program of railroad legislation proposed in behalf of the administration by Secretary Weeks in his letter of April 22, 1958, addressed to Senator SMATHERS, was so limited in its scope.

In our opinion, there is no excuse to withhold approval of repeal of the excise tax to await development of a general tax-revision program. In its conception, this tax on freight and passenger traffic was not primarily a revenue measure. Its revenue potential is not great and it was justified during the war as a deterrent to civilian use of common carrier facilities, badly needed to carry war supplies and personnel. The trouble now is that it continues to deter use of railroad facilities by the public when the industry is in desperate need for freight and passengers. Unlike most other excise taxes, this tax applies to only a small percentage of the Nation's transportation. Much of the water traffic and a major part of highway traffic is either free of the tax or avoids it. It is this fact that makes the issue so serious to the railroads who are taxed on 100 percent of their traffic.

The construction reserve proposal is another important part of the program which would result in substantial improvement to railroad facilities and equipment. It would bring about an early return of many furloughed railroad workers to their jobs. It would use railroad revenues rather than borrowed money to finance the projects and would be a great stimulus to the general economy.

The program developed by the railroads before the Senate subcommittee was a well-rounded one. It was supported by extensive and we believe thoroughly documented testimony by leaders in the industry. It was in

most particulars supported by spokesmen for competing forms of transportation.

A look at the past will show quite clearly how serious it is to let a basic industry like that of the railroads be brought to its knees because it must carry on its operations in a straitjacket of antiquated repressive rules and regulations. Once down, it is hard to get the giant up.

We want to urge you to press upon your associates in the United States Senate the importance of enacting a balanced program now to save our industry. We believe that not only the railroads but our whole economy will get a great lift by such farsighted action.

Sincerely yours,

WABASH RAILROAD CO.,
By A. K. ATKINSON, *President.*
MISSOURI PACIFIC RAILROAD CO.,
By RUSSELL L. DEARMONT,
President.

Surplus Food Stamps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Consumer Study of the House Committee on Agriculture recently completed public hearings on the feasibility of a surplus food stamp plan to benefit America's needy and unemployed.

As a member of the Agriculture Committee, I have watched these hearings with great interest and am anxious that our food surpluses be used as benficially as possible.

Among the witnesses appearing before Congressman ANFUSO's committee was a fellow Californian, Mr. George McLain, president of the National Institute of Social Welfare.

In order that the views of Mr. McLain may be readily available to Members, I include his statement in the Appendix to the RECORD at this point:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is George McLain. I am president of the National Institute of Social Welfare, located at 200 C Street SE., Washington, D. C., with main headquarters at 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

By way of explanation. The National Institute of Social Welfare is a nonprofit corporation. We are specifically set up to represent the aged, the blind, physically handicapped and dependent children on the local, State, and national level. It has been our job, through the past 17 years, to work in behalf of America's needy citizens, most of whom depend entirely upon the public-assistance program for their existence.

As your committee is limited in time allotted to the hearings on surplus-food stamps, this presentation will be brief. Herewith are major points prepared for inclusion in the record.

First, I want to commend Congressman ANFUSO, chairman of this subcommittee, author of H. R. 11162, and Congressman HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, for making these hearings on surplus-food stamps possible. Of course, my deepest appreciation to two gracious ladies, the Honorable LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, and the Honorable MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, who have worked tirelessly to create surplus-food stamps to benefit America's hungry.

I'm delighted that Congress is giving serious consideration to the distribution of surplus food stamps as embodied in H. R. 11162. However, its effectiveness will be seriously impaired unless certain protections are established. We call your attention particularly to section 2, item 1, in this bill which states:

"In carrying out such program, the Secretary shall distribute surplus food made available by the Secretary for distribution under this program only where requested to do so by a State or political subdivision thereof."

This should be stricken from the bill. A provision should be included requiring States to participate and conform to certain standards established by Congress. Among such provisions should be:

1. That the program be administered uniformly in every political subdivision of the State.

2. No residence requirement shall be imposed on any applicant or recipient of surplus food stamps.

3. Domestic requirements and distribution shall take precedence over any and all foreign allotments and distribution.

4. Provisions be made for emergency cases, where the applicant does not have the means to purchase surplus food stamps.

1. ASSURE DISTRIBUTION

My objection to the permissive legislation under consideration is based on the belief that if it is intended for Congress to make surplus food available to needy people by appropriations, such distribution must be directed by Congress. It is my understanding that under this bill, the Federal Government would bear the entire cost of the program. Therefore, I can see no conflict whatever with States and/or local authority. It would seem grossly unfair that Congress should pass a bill which would assist the needy in some parts of the country, whose local lawmakers may be more humanitarian, while the needy in other sections would be deprived of this Federal program, simply because of an antagonistic or capricious policy of local politicians.

Generally speaking, I understand why certain provisions of H. R. 11162 is limited in scope and why overall discretionary powers are given the Secretary of Agriculture, who is called upon to establish and administer this surplus food-stamp plan. Nevertheless, Congress has its responsibility to the people. It has the power by law to bypass whatever opposition exists against a surplus food-stamp program.

2. RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS

I strongly recommend that Congress specifically forbid States and local subdivisions from imposing a residence requirement. Most States require a certain length of residence before they will grant any aid to needy citizens under the public-assistance section of our Social Security Act. These requirements vary in length from 1 year to the maximum of 5 years allowable under Federal law, and have created great hardships on many of our aged and needy.

It is the thousands of stateless citizens who desperately need surplus food stamps. I have included in my prepared statement, which you have before you, two examples of the heartlessness inherent in present State residence requirements.

3. DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION

Considerable effort has been expended under Public Law 480 to dispose of our surplus food commodities in foreign countries, either as a gift, sale, or trade. This generosity involves a great loss to the American taxpayer. I am greatly sympathetic to the needs of those abroad. Yet, I firmly believe we cannot successfully help others until we have solved the problem of hunger and need here at home.

4. EMERGENCY CASES

Most of the detailed surplus-food stamp plans or food-allotment proposals which have been offered to Congress are based upon the theory that beneficiaries will purchase a certain number of stamps, representing their average expenditure for food, and will be given an allotment of free stamps as a supplement. I approve of this basic theory to increase consumption without decreasing consumer expenditures. At the same time we will raise the dietary standards of the low-income groups. However, in establishing this purpose, we must be aware that many of our people have no money income at all.

Obviously, if a breadwinner had no money with which to purchase food stamps, he would be unable to receive any free stamps, unless provision is specifically made for emergency aid. We hear daily of cases from all over the country describing that plight of the unemployed who are not covered by unemployment compensation, and who are ineligible under local regulations for any of the public assistance or relief programs. Certainly they, of all people, should not be denied surplus-food stamps because they have no money with which to purchase food in the first place.

ECONOMIC REALITIES

Yes, I could go on and on in moral justification of eradicating hunger and want here amidst us in this land of plenty. Yet I believe we must consider equally important the economic realities involved. Yes, we have definite and indisputable statistics that can well be understood by anyone to support the desperate need for surplus food stamps.

I have included in my prepared statement excerpts from a report by the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, startling facts regarding the inadequacy of present public assistance grants. This indicates a very great need for surplus food to supplement the meager allowances. I am extremely pleased that a provision in H. R. 11162 specifically forbids any reduction in public assistance grants through acceptance of surplus food stamps.

EFFECTS OF INFLATION

One of our affiliates, the California Institute of Social Welfare, of which I am chairman, undertook a comprehensive cost-of-living survey last fall. We sought specific information on the effects of inflation on California old-age pensioners, particularly in relation to food and adequate diets. A report on this has just been issued and I should like to ask that it be inserted in the RECORD immediately following my statement, so that the committee may have access to the information compiled.

UNEMPLOYMENT CRISIS

I have already mentioned benefits which would accrue to victims of the current unemployment crisis. Certainly, with 5 million breadwinners unemployed, and the number steadily rising, we must all be concerned with this national emergency. Again, we must look at it from the moral conviction that none of our people should be hungry in the midst of vast food surpluses. Hand in hand with our moral obligation, go the hard, economic facts.

When we consider that 7.3 percent of insured workers were unemployed in mid-February (highest percentage since the system began back in 1938) and that the percentage was much higher in some States, reaching all the way up to the frightening level of 14.4 percent in Montana, we can readily see the absolute necessity of putting into immediate effect a surplus food stamp program.

CONCLUSION

The cold economic facts and figures demand that a surplus food stamp program is vitally necessary. And in the face of moral

justice, I feel certain your decision will be a unanimous approval of these amendments which I propose to H. R. 11162.

In my written presentation I have gone into greater detail of the vital and immediate need for a surplus food stamp program and I will be happy to answer any questions the committee members may have.

Thank you.

REA Interest Rate Raise Unjustified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, an article by the distinguished newsman, Roscoe Fleming, in the April 22 issue of the Christian Science Monitor, presents interesting information on the two proposals to hike the interest rate on REA loans.

Mr. Fleming's article discusses an analysis of the REA program made for the Illinois REA Association, and in regard to this pertinent study he states:

The rural electrification program was a social one as well as an economic one; and as a condition of getting Federal funds, the REA's had to pledge coverage on an area basis. That is, they had to extend service to every farm in the area for which they were licensed, no matter how remote. This is contrary to the private utilities' custom of picking out clumps of customers so situated that the cost of serving them are greatly lessened.

In other words, the REA service often costs more—it is more expensive to serve a thousand farms scattered over hundreds of square miles, than to serve the same number of suburban or city families within a few square miles, or within a few dozen cities.

Mr. President, the Christian Science Monitor is a newspaper with a well-deserved reputation for factual unsensational reportorial analysis and objectivity. I think that the article by Roscoe Fleming in the April 22 issue discusses, in a most factual and objective manner, the important reasons why an increase in REA interest rates is uncalled for, and I highly recommend this article to my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the article entitled "REA Hits Loan Bill Due To Boost Costs," by Roscoe Fleming, which appeared in the April 22, 1958, issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REA HITS LOAN BILLS DUE TO BOOST COSTS

(By Roscoe Fleming)

DENVER.—"They shall not pass," seems to be the sentiments of most officials and members of Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives, as to two bills in Congress favored by the Eisenhower administration.

One would require the cooperatives hereafter to pay whatever rate of interest on their loans the Government has to pay. They now pay a flat 2 percent.

The other bill would set up a system under which the cooperatives under certain circumstances might seek loans from private lenders, rather than from the Government. The latter would insure the loans to reassure the private lenders—the cooperatives would pay the cost of this insurance—and the Government would transfer to the private lender the first lien it now holds on cooperative property.

This bill is the more heartily opposed by the REA's—though both are unpopular—as discussion made clear at the annual meeting of Colorado REA cooperatives here.

The Colorado cooperators follow the pattern of opinion established nationwide, and evidenced at the annual convention of the National Rural Cooperative Electrical Association at Dallas last winter.

VITAL HIRED HAND

Electricity has become the indispensable hired hand on millions of farms. (The REAs call their symbol of service Willy Wired-Hand.) About 95 percent of American farms now have central-station current, compared with 10 percent in 1935, freeing the farm wife from the washboard, and her husband from much of his arduous toil around the barn, increasing the efficiency of the farm simultaneously with providing more leisure for its operators.

About 1,100 separate REA cooperatives were established in the big program that was instituted by Congress in the mid-1930's after private utilities had turned down the Government's offer of low-cost, long-term loans to them if they would extend their lines throughout the countryside. About 80 cooperatives have fully repaid the Government.

Somewhat less than a thousand still owe it money, and have repaid about $500 million plus interest, or some $800 million in all, out of $3.6 billion loaned. They, as a group, are $117 million ahead in paying off their debt, and the delinquency of a few is infinitesimal—about $100,000 in all.

But the program so far has provided only a minimum service by modern standards for most of the 4 million farm families now served. The latter are going to demand more current for heavier jobs. David Hamil of Colorado, REA administrator, told the Colorado group that up to a billion dollars a year in new financing may be needed eventually.

REA PROTEST EXPLAINED

The REA attitude is that while the Government may have to pay more than 2 percent for money from now on, it piled up a surplus of some $50 million "made" from REA loans in earlier years when it wasn't paying that much. So, the REA officials say, if they are going to be charged the full cost of interest from now on, they first should get a credit of this $50 million.

They are much more hostile to the second bill. They say it produces an opportunity for private utilities, or their financiers, to get hold of one REA after another; and they claim that the private utility goal is, as always, to put REA out of business.

The REA administrators say that under either measure they probably would have to increase rates, perhaps to a point where farm families, hit from the other side by diminishing farm income, no longer could afford electricity.

Mr. Hamil, in effect, warned them, however, that the REA's sooner or later would have to provide more of their own financing if not all of it. But he then tempered his warning by saying:

"However, utilities generally figure that they must have a net worth of 45 to 50 percent, to be on a sound basis. The comparative figure for the REA system nationwide is 13 percent. So it cannot, as of today, go on a wholly self-financing basis. The cooperatives are not yet strong enough."

COSTLY OPERATION

This would seem to put off for some years, perhaps many, the day when the cooperatives will feel they are strong enough.

In an analysis presented to the convention and made for the Illinois REA Association, one of the strongest in the Nation, the following points also were made:

The rural electrification program was a social one as well as an economic one; and as a condition of getting Federal funds, the REA's had to pledge coverage on an area basis. That is, they had to extend service to every farm in the area for which they were licensed, no matter how remote. This is contrary to the private utilities' custom of picking out clumps of customers so situated that the costs of serving them are greatly lessened.

In other words, the REA service often costs more—it is more expensive to serve a thousand farms scattered over hundreds of square miles, than to serve the same number of suburban or city families within a few square miles, or within a few dozen city blocks.

CUSTOMERS FAR APART

The Illinois study shows that REA customers average only three to a mile there. In many less closely populated States they are even farther apart.

Secondly, of 151,000 farmsteads originally on Illinois REA lines, 11,000 no longer exist as separate "services." They have been abandoned or consolidated into other farms. The capital cost of building lines to serve those farms was more than $7 million. The remaining 140,000 farmsteads and REA members must now pick up this load.

Thirdly, every item of cost has increased, and wholesale power rates that the cooperatives must pay still are going up. Costs are increasing both because of inflation and because of the need of replacing old facilities with new and sturdier construction to take today's increasing loads. Debt-service payments—which under REA repayment schedules increase year by year—will within a decade reach a statewide maximum of $3,700,000. Net margin of the Illinois cooperatives, corresponding to the net profit of private utilities, was $2,208,000 in 1956, which means they must find $1,500,000 more yearly within the decade, just to service the debt.

The authors of the Illinois study say that any steep increase in interest on new loans, say, from 2 to 4 percent, will be just too much for some of the weaker cooperatives, and they may go to the wall or have to sell out.

Bright Spots in the Recession Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, during this time of constant talk of depression here in Washington and on the floors of both Houses of Congress regarding the economic condition of the country, it might be well to listen to what is being said regarding the same problem elsewhere in the Nation. Reports from my district in California, as reflected in the newspapers, take a more optimistic view, and from a statistical standpoint give good indication that conditions may not be as bad as the gloom propagandists depict. For instance, earlier this month

the San Rafael Independent Journal in Marin County reported that—

The total value of Marin's agricultural production in 1957 was up a healthy $2 million from 1956, and surpassed all years in the past decade except 1952.

Marin County Agricultural Commissioner Thomas W. Peryam noted this growth was in spite of some unusual weather and market conditions, and concluded that—

Marin agriculture is still in a healthy condition.

A few days later, Carroll Snyker, manager of the Marin Development Foundation, reported that building permits issued during the month of March in the county rose to the highest total value since July 1955. This certainly is healthy, and refutes the claims of the gloom prophets that a horrible drop in construction activity has the entire Nation in its grips.

In a related industry, the Crescent City American, located in the midst of northwestern California's timber region, noted early this month that the plywood market was holding steady, and that a mill employing 140 men was reopening. The mill had closed earlier because of poor market conditions. Several other mills in the Crescent City area, which had been closed because of market conditions, were again in operation and employing several hundred men.

Earlier in the year, reports from many areas in the First District in California showed the number of applications for unemployment insurance benefits on the decline, and retail sales rising again after a period of low turnover. While total unemployment is above the same time last year, the total working force is still close to its all-time high.

In Napa County, the Napa Register reported taxable sales in the last quarter of 1957 were more than 15 percent above the previous year. And the entire year 1957 was 13 percent higher than 1956.

When considering the true impact of the recession on the Nation's economy, it is well to consider the whole picture. I would like to include in the RECORD, with leave to extend my remarks, an editorial from the Novato Advance of April 9, which is indicative of the other side of the gloom picture:

THE BRIGHT SIDE

Things may look gloomy to a lot of people right now—those unemployed, storekeepers who see business down, and others who feel that they might be in line to feel the recession ax knifing their necks by taking away their livelihood or putting them on reduced subsistence.

There is gloom on us right now, for many legitimate reasons; and the gloom talkers are having a real holiday. With gloom around, the gloom talkers are compounding the present situation to the point we not only have gloom surrounding us but a positive nightmare.

Actually things are not so bad. It is only every tenth person that is actually affected by the gloom and recession. And things can be made a lot gloomier by just talking about it and getting steeped mentally and psychologically in the atmosphere.

Actually there is a brighter side to the whole picture. Take present business conditions, for instance. Certainly not the best ever. In fact, every third person you talk to on the street is in agreement that we're in a full-scale recession.

But when every third person tells another person how stinking things are, the more it stinks.

Let's stop worrying long enough to consider what the first two people had to say, before you get to the third guy with consternation written all over his face.

Gloom is darned contagious. But with a little effort you can catch a couple of more pleasant diseases known as optimism and cheer almost as easily.

Let's make the effort of looking on the bright side a community one.

There is more building going on or just about to go on, as soon as the weather clears, than has been exhibited for the past 2 years. At Loma Verde they fully expect 340 homes to go up this year and there are plans for plenty more homes here in Novato.

Despite layoffs, the loss of income has been partially offset, for merchants at least, by an increase of 600 in personnel at Hamilton Air Force Base.

Local bankers tell us that personal savings are at an alltime high.

The local dairy industry at the moment is reportedly prospering better than ever—no recession there.

The new four-lane highway and bridge now going up from 101 to Sears Point will bring income, jobs, residents, and travel convenience to North Marin.

There have been more inquiries by small industrial firms concerning suitable locations in the North Marin area than ever before in the history of the local chamber of commerce here, chamber officials report to us.

A number of small-business concerns, operated part-time from homes, have recently moved into the area, adding potential growth and income to the area.

Public construction continues here with schools and other public projects both in Novato and in the county slated.

We can be more optimistic than ever about this community's chances for the planned 4-year State college with the two Cotati sites being ruled out.

With one golf course now operating, and another million dollar golf course to be ready this year, Novato will become known as the recreational headquarters of the bay area

Actually, a check of retail advertising in the Advance shows it is up 8 percent over last year, a good index as to how merchants feel about the local market.

Also merchants report that business is no worse than last year, admittedly not as good as the two previous years. Some of the stores report an increase over last year.

At Hamilton a 510 housing project is to be built this year which will also help boost the local construction industry out of the doldrums in addition to providing homes for Air Force families.

Meanwhile, let's all try to look on the bright side. Let's help our community in every way possible.

All of us who live in and love the Novato Valley might stop and consider how quickly we could change the local recession by our combined buying power.

The exchange current generated would soon burn out the real and often rumor-made gloom.

Don't let the gloom talkers get you down.

A Bill To Get the Government Out of the Milk Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. BROWN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which I sincerely hope will be part of any omnibus farm legislation that might come before the Congress this session.

It is a dairy bill written in fact, if not in words, by the dairy farmers of southwest Missouri, after many give-and-take meetings at the grassroots last fall.

This is a bill to get the Government out of the milk business, to encourage milk producers themselves to formulate their own self-financing programs for dealing with their own problems, and to enable producers to formulate those programs, without interference from Government, processors, or distributors.

This is a dairy program of the dairy farmers, by the dairy farmers, and for the dairy farmers—a bill to restore free enterprise to the enterprisers, subject only to the public interest.

We have had some 20 years experience with Government agricultural programs, written in Washington, administered from Washington, in the name of the Federal Government. In all fairness, much has been accomplished. Farmers have learned to work together for their common good. They've seen what happens when they overproduce an economic market. They've learned the value of stabilization. But changing conditions in agriculture and controversial administrative policies in recent years have either reduced the effectiveness of the Government programs or revealed their inherent weaknesses.

Yet, when the Congress sits down to revise or update the programs, we are beset on all sides with confusing advice from divided and divergent sources. The feuding farm associations seldom, if ever, agree.

One farm group tells us to do one thing, another tells us to do another, and still another group differs with the first two. The food processors have their pet suggestions. The consumer groups want their interests provided for. The Congress becomes a referee, not a policy-making body.

And where is the farmer? He is back home milking cows, trying to make a living.

The political arena in Washington is no place to devise a sound and practical program for dairy farmers. Members of Congress are to represent the public interest—the interest of all the people. We cannot dissolve ourselves into a board of directors to formulate policies and prices for dairy producers. The

dairy producers must do it themselves, outside of Washington.

Let us say to the people who produce the milk for the Nation's ever-increasing population: Milk is your business, not ours. You know more about it than the Congress, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the President of the United States. You are fully capable of handling your own business; and we want you to take full charge of your own destiny. Formulate your own programs. Determine your own prices. All we ask is that you provide us with an adequate, orderly, and stabilized flow of milk and dairy products at fair and equitable prices. Therein lies the public interest. And, just as Government has commissions to doublecheck public utility firms to make sure that they operate in the public interest at fair and reasonable rates, we are creating a Federal Milk Commission to doublecheck milk prices. It will be a quasi-judicial body, as nonpolitical as human beings can be, and certainly free of any obligation to pursue any particular political philosophy of any political party in power.

With these tools, and within this framework, the Congress will be saying to milk producers—write your own program. Put your own price tags on your products, and prove to the Federal Milk Commission that your prices are fair and equitable. Go to it with the blessings and good wishes of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this is what the milk producers of southwest Missouri—speaking through me, their elected Representative—are trying to say in this dairy bill.

We ask the Congress to do these things:

First. Divest the Secretary of Agriculture of any legislative authority to fix prices on milk and dairy products.

Second. Direct the Secretary of Agriculture to hold a national referendum whereby bona fide dairy producers vote on whether or not they want to get together in regional conventions, and subsequently a national convention, to formulate their own programs.

Third. Provide the means by which bona fide dairy producers can elect their own delegates to such conventions and formulate their own programs.

Fourth. Authorize dairy producers, through their own duly elected officials, to impose upon themselves any stabilization fees or assessments or quotas they vote on themselves to assure the success of any program they might devise.

Fifth. Assure them that any accumulated surpluses in the Commodity Credit Corporation will not be dumped on the domestic market to jeopardize the success of their new programs.

Sixth. Loan them enough working capital, during the first 2 years of operation only, to give them a running chance at success.

Seventh. Create a Federal Milk Commission to review any price schedules established by the elected officials of the dairy producers to make sure that such prices are fair and equitable, based on cost of production plus reasonable profit.

The Federal Government, under this bill, is not asked to purchase any temporary surplus production of milk and dairy products. The dairy producers want to handle it themselves. Let us give them a chance to do it.

There is no parity price support program in this bill. Dairy producers feel that they can devise better methods of computing fair and equitable prices. Let us give them a chance to try it.

There is no Government price fixing in this bill. Dairy producers are fed up with having their prices fixed in Washington by the Secretary of Agriculture. They think they will be happier and better off if they determine their own prices, and submit them to a Federal Milk Commission for approval. Let us give them a chance to try it.

This is Government's chance to get out of the milk business; and, if Government inventories of dried milk and butter are the expensive and aggravating problem that the Secretary of Agriculture says they are, we should jump at the chance to give dairy producers the chance they deserve to formulate their own programs, without Government dictation or interference, except in the legitimate public interest.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Congress to read this bill. It is simple. It is based on historic principles of self-determination by democratic processes. It is a foundation upon which can be built a new, sound, and workable program for 1½ million disillusioned people—the dairy producers of America. I urge each Member to give the bill, its purposes, and its methods thoughtful consideration.

The language of the bill is as follows:

A bill to divest the Secretary of Agriculture of any legisaltive authority to fix prices on milk and dairy products; to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to call a National Dairy Producers' Constitutional Convention whereby bona fide dairy producers may formulate their own self-financing programs for stabilizing milk prices at fair and equitable levels; and to create a regulatory commission to protect the public interest in the production and marketing of milk

Be it enacted, etc.—

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Milk and Dairy Products Act of 1958."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this act, the term—

(1) "Dairy producer" means a person or corporation who produces milk in a State and makes sales of such milk throughout the year which are sales in interstate or foreign commerce or which directly burden, obstruct, or affect interstate or foreign commerce.

(2) "Milk products" means cheese, butter, and nonfat dry milk.

(3) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(4) "Commission" means the Federal Milk Commission established by section 9.

NATIONAL REFERENDUM

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary shall arrange for a referendum in which bona fide dairy producers shall (1) vote on whether they favor or oppose the holding of a national convention of dairy producers as authorized in this act, and (2) vote to determine which of the individuals who have been proposed for consideration as provided in subsection (d) are to be delegates to the regional conventions held preliminary to the national convention. Each county in the United States shall have at least one polling place for the referendum.

(b) Each dairy producer shall be entitled to one vote in the referendum conducted under this section.

(c) There shall be 1 delegate to the regional convention for each 500 dairy producers in a county, except that in any event each county where there are more than 50 dairy producers shall have 1 delegate.

(d) To be eligible for consideration as a delegate to a regional convention a person must be a bona fide dairy producer and must be proposed for consideration by a petition to the Secretary signed by at least 50 dairy producers or by at least one-third of the dairy producers in a county in the case of counties in which there are fewer than 100 dairy producers.

REGIONAL CONVENTIONS

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary shall divide the United States into 15 regions each of which shall have approximately equal milk productions. The Secretary shall provide for holding a regional convention in each such region. He shall provide that at each such convention the delegates shall—

(1) divide into committees and study groups to formulate resolutions for consideration at the national convention;

(2) adopt such resolutions as they desire to propose before the national convention; and

(3) elect, from among their number, 15 persons to be delegates to the national convention.

(b) The Secretary shall pay the compensation, in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, of such attorneys, accountants, and other experts as he determines may be necessary at each regional convention. Each delegate to a regional convention shall receive compensation at the rate of $12 per diem for each day they serve at the regional convention and each such delegate shall receive his travel and subsistence pay in conformity with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations.

NATIONAL CONVENTION

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary shall provide for holding a national convention in the city of Chicago, Ill. The delegates at such convention shall be the persons elected at the regional conventions pursuant to section 4.

(b) At the national convention the delegates shall—

(1) study the various problems confronting the dairy industry in the United States,

(2) formulate and adopt a constitution whereby dairy producers shall elect their own officials and operate their own self-financing stabilization programs to provide the Nation with an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products at fair, equitable, and stabilized prices.

(c) The constitution and the program formulated at the national convention shall be submitted to a referendum of dairy producers who voted in the referendum conducted under section 3. If, in such referendum, a majority of the dairy producers voting indicates that they wish the constitution and the program to become effective, such constitution and such program shall become effective.

(d) The Secretary shall pay the compensation, in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, of such attorneys, accountants, and other experts as he determines may be necessary at the national convention. Each delegate to the national convention shall receive compensation at the rate of $12 per diem for each day they serve at the national convention and each such delegate shall receive his travel and subsistence pay in conformity with the standardized Government travel regulations.

AUTHORITY OF DAIRY PRODUCERS

SEC. 6. (a) If, in carrying out any program which has become effective under section 5, it shall be necessary for dairy producers through their duly elected officials to have

authority to impose on all producers marketing assessments or fees for the purpose of enabling the producers to stabilize prices of milk and milk products, such fees or assessments are hereby authorized and shall be deducted by milk handlers from payments made to the dairy producers.

(b) No program shall become effective which provides for marketing allotments or controls unless and until the terms and conditions of such allotments or controls are explicitly approved by a majority of dairy producers in a national referendum.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

SEC. 7. (a) While a program adopted under this act is in effect, the Commodity Credit Corporation, notwithstanding section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, may not support the price of whole milk, butterfat, or the products of such commodities.

(b) During each of the first 2 fiscal years in which a program adopted under this act is in effect, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall loan to the dairy producers such sums, not in excess of $200 million in each year, as the elected officials of the dairy producers estimate will be needed for working capital. The sums so loaned shall be repaid, with interest at a rate to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture but not less than the cost of money to the Commodity Credit Corporation for a comparable period.

(c) During the time a program adopted under this act is in effect, the Commodity Credit Corporation, notwithstanding section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, may not sell any milk products in its stocks within the United States.

LAWFUL PRICES

SEC. 8. In the event a program adopted under this act provides for establishing price levels paid to dairy producers for their milk, the prices shall be considered lawful if they do not exceed levels which will result in an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and milk products to the market at fair, equitable, and stabilized prices, determined as provided in section 12.

FEDERAL MILK COMMISSION

SEC. 9. (a) There is hereby established as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government an agency to be known as the Federal Milk Commission which shall be composed of five members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall designate one of the members to act as chairman. Not more than three members of the Commission shall be members of the same political party.

(b) The terms of office of members of the Commission shall be 5 years, except that—

(1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and

(2) the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, one at the end of 1 year, one at the end of 2 years, one at the end of 3 years, and one at the end of 4 years, after the date of their appointment.

Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

(c) Each member of the Commission (other than the chairman) shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum; and the chairman shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,500 per annum.

(d) The principal office of the Commission shall be in the District of Columbia, but the Commission or any duly authorized representative may exercise any or all of its powers in any place. The Commission shall hold such meetings, conduct such hearings, and receive such reports as may be necessary to enable it to carry out the provisions of this act. Three members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum thereof.

(e) The Commission shall have authority, subject to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as are necessary in the exercise of its functions.

PRICE SCHEDULES

SEC. 10. (a) Under such rules and regulations as the Commission shall prescribe, the elected officials of the dairy producers shall file with the Commission, within such time and in such form as the Commission may designate, and shall keep open for public inspection, schedules showing the lawful prices at which milk and milk products are to be established under the program adopted under this act.

(b) Unless the Commission otherwise orders, no change shall be made by the dairy producers in the level at which the price of milk or any milk product is to be established, except after 30 days' notice to the Commission and to the public. Such notice shall be given by filing with the Commission and keeping open for public inspection new schedules plainly stating such new prices. The Commission, for good cause shown, may allow such changes to take effect without requiring the 30 days' notice herein provided for by an order specifying the changes to be made and the time when they shall take effect.

(c) Whenever any such schedules of new prices is filed, the Commission shall have authority, without formal pleading, but upon reasonable notice, to enter upon a hearing concerning the lawfulness of such prices; and, pending such hearing and decision thereon, the Commission may suspend, but not for a longer period than 5 months beyond the time when the new schedule would otherwise go into effect; and after full hearings, either completed before or after the new price has gone into effect, the Commission may make such orders with reference thereto as would be proper in a proceeding initiated after it had become effective.

(d) At any hearing involving an increase in prices, the burden of proof to show that the higher prices are not unlawful shall be upon the elected officials of the dairy producers.

UNLAWFUL PRICES

SEC. 11. Whenever the Commission, after a hearing had upon its own motion, finds that the price therefore established and in effect is unlawful, the Commission shall determine the highest level of price which would be lawful and shall establish the same by order.

DETERMINATION OF LAWFUL PRICES

SEC. 12. (a) In determining whether a price is lawful, the Commission shall ascertain the price which will return the cost-of-production, determined as provided in subsection (b), plus a reasonable profit.

(b) The cost of production shall be determined on the basis of an audited cost-accounting survey of the actual production costs of at least 100 dairy herds in each region established by the Secretary under section 4, selected according to accepted statistical methods to represent a reasonably adequate sample of class I and non-class I producers. In determining such costs—

(1) all costs of production on the farm shall be considered which are properly assignable to milk production;

(2) farm-grown feed shall be assigned a cost of not less than 85 percent of the wholesale market price of such feed in the area; and

(3) hired and family labor shall be assigned a cost computed on the basis of wage rates for comparable work in milk manufacturing and processing plants in the area.

(c) The reasonable profit referred to in subsection (a) shall be a return to dairy producers on invested capital equal to the average return on the net worth earned by milk manufacturers and handlers during the preceding fiscal year.

(d) The Commission is further authorized to make audited cost-accounting surveys of production costs experienced by colleges and universities in handling test herds in each of the regions established by the Secretary under section 4, such surveys to make due allowances for per-cow production of test herds compared to national per-cow production averages.

INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMISSION

SEC. 13. (a) The Commission may investigate any facts, conditions, practices, or matters which it may find necessary or proper in order to enable it to carry out its duties under this act.

(b) For the purpose of any investigation or any other proceeding under this act, any member of the Commission, or any officer designated by it, is empowered to administer oaths and affirmations, subpena witnesses, compel their attendance, take evidence, and require the production of any books, papers, correspondence, memoranda, contracts, agreements, or other records which the Commission finds relevant or material to the inquiry. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of any such records may be required from any place in the United States or at any designated place of hearing. Witnesses summoned by the Commission to appear before it shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States.

(c) In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena issued to, any person, the Commission may invoke the aid of any court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which such investigation or proceeding is carried on, or where such person resides or carries on business in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, papers, correspondence, memoranda, contracts, agreements, and other records. Such court may issue an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission or member or officer designated by the Commission, there to produce records, if so ordered, or to give testimony touching the matter under investigation or in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. All process in any such case may be served in the judicial district whereof such person is an inhabitant or wherever he may be found or may be doing business. Any person who willfully shall fail or refuse to attend and testify or to answer any lawful inquiry or to produce books, papers, correspondence, memoranda, contracts, agreements, or other records, if in his or its power so to do, in obedience to the subpena of the Commission, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000 or to imprisonment for a term of not more than 1 year, or both.

(d) The testimony of any witness may be taken at the instance of a party, in any proceeding or investigation pending before the Commission, by deposition at any time after the proceeding is at issue. The Commission may also order testimony to be taken by deposition in any proceeding or investigation. Such depositions may be taken before any person authorized to administer oaths not being of counsel or attorney to either of the parties, nor interested in the proceeding or investigation. Any person may be compelled to appear and depose, and to produce documentary evidence, in the same manner as witnesses may be compelled to appear and testify and produce documentary evidence before the Commission, as hereinbefore provided. Such testimony shall be reduced to writing by the person taking deposition, or under his direction, and shall, after it has been reduced to writing, be subscribed by the deponent.

(e) Witnesses whose depositions are taken as authorized by this act, and the person or officer taking the same, shall be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

RULES OF PROCEDURE

SEC. 14. All hearings, investigations, and proceedings under this act shall be governed by rules of practice and procedure to be adopted by the Commission, and in the conduct thereof the technical rules of evidence need not be applied. No informality in any hearing, investigation, or proceeding or in the manner of taking testimony shall invalidate any order, decision, rule, or regulation issued under the authority of this act.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 15. Any person affected by an order issued by the Commission in a proceeding under this act may obtain a review of such order in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia by filing in such court, within 60 days after the order of the Commission, a written petition praying that the order of the Commission be modified or set aside in whole or in part. A copy of such petition shall forthwith be served upon any member of the Commission and thereupon the Commission shall certify and file with the court a transcript of the record upon which the order complained of was entered. Upon the filing of such transcript such court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to affirm, modify, or set aside such order in whole or in part. No objection to the order of the Commission shall be considered by the court unless such objection shall have been urged before the Commission in the application for rehearing unless there is reasonable ground for failure so to do. The finding of the Commission as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive. If any party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for failure to adduce such evidence in the proceedings before the Commission, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Commission and to be adduced upon the hearing in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as to the court may seem proper. The Commission may modify its findings as to the facts by reason of the additional evidence so taken, and it shall file with the court such modified or new findings, which if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, and its recommendation, if any, for the modification or setting aside of the original order. The judgment and decree of the court, affirming, modifying, or setting aside, in whole or in part, any such order of the Commission, shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of the United States Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 28, secs. 346 and 347).

SEC. 16. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, not to exceed $5,000,000.

Hawaii Deserves To Go First Class

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Rock Hill Herald, Rock Hill, S. C., of April 28, 1958:

HAWAII DESERVES TO GO FIRST CLASS

Each year the proposition comes up in Congress, and each year it is put aside. The issue is statehood for the Territory of Hawaii.

Many arguments are put forth against granting statehood for this American territory that lies in the Pacific, 2,000 miles off the shores of California.

Most are excuses against action: Hawaii does not actually border on the United States; the number of elected representatives in the United States House and the United States Senate would be affected; the power of one major political party or the other would be reduced; it would be giving the Communists a pipeline into the Federal Government because communism is strong in Hawaii.

This last argument is one of the most distorted and misunderstood reasons against statehood for Hawaii. The people of Hawaii have consistently rejected Communists. The Communist menace has been under more careful study in Hawaii than in any State in the Union. The number and influence of Communist labor leaders has decreased in recent years.

Hawaii has shown itself to be a loyal American territory. On a percentage basis, the Territory of Hawaii lost more than four times as many soldiers in the Korean war as did any State in the Union. And there wasn't a single case of desertion by an Hawaiian serviceman—and not a single case of a prisoner refusing to return to his homeland, as some American servicemen did.

The Territory of Hawaii, growing in economic strength, is proving itself to be a loyal American outpost. It's time the people of Hawaii were given first-class American citizenship.

President's Pentagon Reorganization Plan Gains Popular Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to study the nationwide comments regarding President Eisenhower's program for reorganizing the military. Many of the fears expressed in Washington are not found elsewhere in the Nation, and it is my belief that many of these fears are without foundation. Many public-spirited citizens around the Nation have spoken out in favor of the President's plan, and the philosophy behind it. With permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a sample of this public support for the reorganization plan, in the form of an editorial from the April 18 issue of the Petaluma Argus-Courier:

IKE CONTENDS DEFENSE PLAN PROVIDES SOLVENCY, SAFETY

President Eisenhower opened the fight for his defense reorganization plan yesterday with a nationwide radio and TV talk. "The purpose of the plan," he said, "is clear. It is safety with solvency. The country is entitled to both."

As presented to Congress, the defense reorganization plan largely fulfills the requirements for true reorganization. This was hoped for, but was not achieved, when the Defense Department was created. The plan is designed to assure maximum military efficiency and economy. It provides the means for eliminating rivalry, conflicts, duplication and waste which could cost the Nation its future in an era of missles. It opens the way for the development of coordinated roles and missions adapted to new weapons.

But the plan has also stirred the all-out opposition of the defenders of the status quo. Even before the proposals were known, the plan was greeted with such terms as "blockbuster," and "revolutionary." Since its presentation to Congress it has been denounced as a militaristic proposal that could lead to a Prussian-type supreme high command or a military man on horseback running the country.

The President scoffed at such criticisms, and said that the fears of critics are "at the lease misconceptions and at the most misrepresentations. I repeat, there will be no single chief of staff; no Prussian staff; no czar; no $40 billion blank check; no swallowing up of the traditional services; no undermining of the constitutional powers of Congress."

Here are the major points in the President's program:

Reorganize our combat forces into unified operational commands under the direct control of the Secretary of Defense.

Require that strategic planning be unified and concentrated in the Joint Chiefs of Staff and their immediate staff.

Permit the Joint Chiefs to delegate to their vice chiefs most of their administrative responsibilities as operating heads of the three services.

Continue the three military departments as support agencies for the combat forces.

Place all research and development activities under one man, who would report directly to the Secretary of Defense, and appropriate all funds for such activities to the Secretary of Defense, instead of to the services.

Otherwise strengthen the authority of the Secretary of Defense by giving him greater flexibility in use of appropriated funds; eliminating the requirement that the services be separately administered; eliminating the prohibition on transfer, assignment, abolition, or consolidation of functions; tightening his supervision of public affairs activities of the three services.

The President has spoken out in unmistakable terms. He has put his case on strong grounds. His position is that we are not getting enough return for what we spend in terms of security. He has spoken not only as President, but also as a soldier. And here he is on firm ground. If anyone wants expert testimony on what needs to be done to get a more effective Defense Establishment, here is an expert whose qualifications cannot be challenged.

In taking his case to the people he is not attempting to ride roughshod over Congress. He is not attempting to dictate but to lead. Some reorganization is imperative, and the President is trying to make that reorganization effective. He deserves our support.

Fourscore and a Terrific Score

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, today, Wednesday, April 30, the sun peeks out of the heavens to wink at us, for there are sweet, soft complimentary murmurings about the halls of the Capitol and

everyone is whispering about the happy event—for this day, Mr. THOMAS O'BRIEN, of Illinois, the dean of the Illinois delegation, and the natural leader, celebrates his 80th birthday.

His colleagues of the House respect and venerate this humble man, gentle by disposition and fiery by nature. In his long career—25 years—in this House, he has never forsaken a friend and always kept his word. The sagacity of his mind being trained by experiences among those men who ever struggled against the raw problems of a tough life, both economically and socially, had prepared him for his important work here. As a true leader, he always gives the other fellow a friendly word of advice, a pat on the back, the strength of his support. Mr. O'BRIEN fights for one out in the open. He is unafraid. He values the rules of friendship. He never lets one down. The many friends here testify to this, indomitable leaders' complete acceptance as a great man, true American and loyal leader. Mr. O'BRIEN champions the cause of the little fellow, the person who needs a friend. He has great love and respect for the distinguished Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, and the versatile, brilliant majority leader, JOHN MCCORMACK. There is not a Member of the House of Representatives that Mr. THOMAS O'BRIEN need ask a second time for anything—for services he has given to others over the years need not be repeated for him.

His early career started 52 years ago, serving in the Illinois Assembly, as Sheriff of Cook County and as a Congressman. His training on the West Side gave him a keen sense of "knowing a man when he saw one"—and to evaluate character. Mr. O'BRIEN never crossed a person in his life. And, further, he has never mislead anyone at any time. He does not mince words about what he thinks, and is forthright about any position that he takes on a question, whether you like it or not. He tells you to your face—you get it straight from him.

He does not hedge or squirm about hurting your feelings if it is the truth you must know. He served under the fine leadership of a great Democrat, Honorable Patrick Nash, and all his life being taught that a man who can give an order can take an order. This philosophy of life is to accord to another the fair treatment that you would expect to receive yourself. His practical knowledge of men and things is tremendous. He is trustworthy and reliable—a man of few words; but when he talks he really says something and means it—no double talk from our friend who is affectionately called the sheriff.

In my personal tribute to him, may I thank him for the many kind acts of friendship shown to me, as well as the invaluable aid, advice and guidance received through his good offices. It is a privilege to have enjoyed this degree of intimacy through years of my life, beginning with our service in the Illinois Assembly in 1931. He has always been at my side, for which I am ever grateful.

Mr. O'BRIEN, on this day sacred to your memory, we, the Members of the House of Representatives salute you and your popular mate, Mrs. O'Brien, who is revered by everyone throughout the Washington area, especially the working girls, clerks, and waitresses for her many kindnesses. It is for your help, patience and powerful leadership that we join you and your wife in this happy celebration, asking God's blessing.

Jefferson and Lincoln Gave Advice Which Might Help With Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following editorial, which appeared in the April 24 issue of the Muskingum Valley News-Magazine, a small weekly newspaper in Dresden, Ohio. To my way of thinking, it represents one of the finest pieces of editorial writing that it has been my privilege to read for a long, long time, and I commend it to the attention of every Member of the Congress. It is an incisive commentary on the all-pervading problem of big government, and it expresses in no uncertain terms the fear of a socialized America if present trends continue—a fear which I have shared with the author for a good many years.

As we gather here each day to consider new and even more grandiose Federal spending programs, it might be well if we paused occasionally and gave serious thought to the sentiments expressed in this article. If we do not soon call a halt to the growth of big government, we are in grave danger of forfeiting those precious rights for which the giants of the past—men of great vision and foresight like Lincoln and Jefferson—worked so unceasingly to acquire and preserve for us.

To the editor of this paper, Mr. D. F. Anguish, I wish to publicly express my appreciation for an excellent, thought-provoking piece of journalism. I only hope that, in the noisy din of "spend, spend, spend" which echoes and rechoes through these Halls each day, this voice, from the heartland of America, is not lost.

JEFFERSON AND LINCOLN GAVE ADVICE WHICH MIGHT HELP WITH RECESSION

As we listen to newscasts and watch releases in the daily press it becomes rather evident that we are kicking up an economic storm. The well-bandied-about phrase is recession.

Of course the great minds of all time have bent to this problem—often without too much concrete accomplishment. In the thirties we came up with some grand experimentation which dragged us to the brink of socialism and pretty well sapped our personal liberty. Sad thing is that, despite a change in administration, we're still eddying in the same socialistic direction.

Certainly this country editor doesn't purport to know the answer to the problem, but we can't help thinking. We've come up with a few generations on the subject that are a little alarming.

It won't be popular to point it out, but turning our backs upon the advice of men like Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln hasn't helped. Jefferson said, "That government which governs least governs best." Lincoln said in essence that no government should be trying to do things for people at the local level which they could do for themselves. For years, it seems to us, our Government has been doing just the opposite.

For example, in 1928 our national budget was less than $4 billion. Today the $275 billion debt ceiling has finally been broken through and we talk in national budget figures up to $85 billion. As we used to say back during World War II, "Is this trip really necessary" Good question.

No nation in history has ever started the black walk down the road to socialism and turned back. It is probably silly to hope we can. Our processes of government have become so complex, and so burdensome, and so costly—bureaucrats by the tens of thousands have so completely honeycombed our society—that the hope of ever unshackling the Nation is remote indeed. People who talk of individual initiative, and Federal economy are now but voices crying in the wilderness.

The Eisenhower administration, before and in the early days of its present term, talked a lot about economy. The overwhelming pressure of the socialistic tidal wave—the back-home pork-barrel projects of Congressmen—and the fact that people have become so accustomed to Federal handouts as to feel they cannot live without them—now seems to have ground-swelled whatever feeble economy effort there may have been.

There are many interesting parallels in this picture. While the Chamber of Commerce on the National and State level issues brochures on Federal spending—points out how millions can be saved—members of this organization at the local level put on the congressional heat for spending on pet local projects. The Dillon Dam in this area is but one prime example.

Jefferson, Lincoln, and a great many of our greatest have pointed the way of dignity, freedom, and individual initiative but there is every indication we have lost this spark which might possibly solve our problem. It seems we must seek surcease in a Federal bureaucracy, which must take away before it can dole it back—and in the process dissipate the lion's share.

Maybe that's why Jefferson warned, as he did, "That government which governs least, governs best."

The Fund for Adult Education, an Adjunct of the Ford Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I take pleasure including a resolution adopted by the AMVETS Post of Atlantic, Iowa.

The resolution follows:

AMVETS, THE AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II AND KOREA

Subject: The Fund for Adult Education (FAE), an adjunct of the Ford Foundation.

Whereas certain forces dedicated to the overthrow of our form of republican government under the Constitution of the United States of America, are disseminating propaganda to agitate and confuse Americans by obscuring the truths of American history,

American domestic affairs, and international political affairs; and

Whereas the aim of such propaganda is to implant ideas of a collectivistic world government and to incite action leading thereto through biased information contained in political activity known as adult education discussion groups sponsored by the American Library Association (ALA), various universities and colleges through liberal arts discussions released through university extensions, the American Foundation for Political Education (AFPE), and the Foreign Policy Association (FPA); and

Whereas the discussion group activities sponsored by the above listed organizations are supported by funds received from the Fund for Adult Education whose aggregate funds, amounting to many millions of dollars, are exempted from taxation by privilege extended by citizens of the United States of America; and

Whereas at this time there is no need or desirability for politically biased curricula to be implanted in the educational system of the United States of America in the form of prepackaged collectivistic material published by Ford Foundation's FAE, or the latter's subgrantees: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, in view of the disclosures regarding the FAE, That we, the members of Atlantic AMVETS Post No. 1, meeting in a regular and duly authorized session this 23d day of April 1958, in Atlantic, Iowa, do hereby alert our membership to:

1. Continue followup and study of the ever-changing tactics of the FAE to infiltrate and to propagandize the educational system of the United States of America.

2. Urge the investigating committees of Congress to make thorough investigation and to report to the American public findings concerning FAE activities.

3. Urge that the internal revenue officials make thorough investigation of FAE's propaganda activities which, under the Internal Revenue Code, disqualifies FAE for tax exemption, and, finally, to revoke FAE's tax exemption; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution and this alert be brought before the next meeting of the ninth district AMVETS, and also brought to the attention of the Iowa Department of AMVETS and the National AMVETS headquarters in Washington, D. C., for a complete study and analysis of the Fund for Adult Education (FAE) at the earliest possible time; finally, it is hereby

Resolved, That all elements of AMVETS, the American Veterans of World War II and Korea, at the State and local levels, will have no truck with the Fund for Adult Education (FAE) enterprises. If AMVETS posts and departments (State organizations) are offered financial aid or invitation by the Ford Foundation's FAE adjunct, or its subgrantees, in carrying out the FAE programs, it is sincerely hoped that they will decline.

CARROLL W. HAYES,
Commander, Atlantic, Iowa.
CHARLES V. BLAKE,
Adjutant, Atlantic, Iowa.

APRIL 1958.

Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday Senator KARL MUNDT, Chairman of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission, submitteed the final report of the Commission. I feel Senator MUNDT's introductory statement and a part of the report should appear in the RECORD as follows:

INTRODUCTION

There is no question but that the program of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission was a success. Quietly and without undo fanfare it succeeded in its prime objective—making the achievements and great contributions of Alexander Hamilton better and more favorably known to all America and at the same time bringing about, in some measure, a reawakening of American belief in and understanding of the sound principles upon which our Nation was established.

From the outset the Commission sought to achieve its aim through lasting accomplishments—the stimulation and publication of new books on Hamilton and his times, the editing and publication of a truly definitive edition of Hamilton's papers and through more complete understanding of Hamilton and the formative period of the Nation in the schools and colleges. As the Commission's report shows, these hopes were turned into realities.

Because of its small staff and limited funds it was clear from the beginning that that Commission's function must be to plan and to stimulate others to carry out the plans. As a result of this decision, successful efforts were made to enlist the active support of men and women in many fields, of whom a considerable number served as members of the Commission's several advisory committees.

The Commission takes special pride in several of its accomplishments. It brought about the publication and subsequent widespread distribution of the Basic Ideas of Alexander Hamilton, edited by Dr. Richard B. Morris of Columbia University and published by Pocket Books, Inc. This 451-page volume, selling at 35 cents, for the first time made available a wide selection of Hamilton's writings at a price within the reach of all Americans.

Establishment of the Commission, without question, had much to do with the decision of the Rockefeller Foundation and Time, Inc., to provide funds for Columbia University to undertake the editing for publication of a definitive edition of Hamilton's papers, a work now in progress. The Commission cooperated in this work to the greatest possible extent, its "Treasure Trove" search for Hamiltonia bringing to light many documents vital to the work.

Another achievement for which the Commission takes modest credit was its Alexander Hamilton Exhibition which was set up, with the cooperation of the Treasury Department, in the Treasury Building in Washington. This exhibition which contained the finest and largest collection of Hamiltonia ever assembled was viewed by more than 70,000 visitors. The Commission is deeply grateful to the many individuals and institutions whose loans of material made the exhibition possible.

The Commission is pleased to report that in spite of the fact that the total of $200,000 it received in appropriated funds during its lifetime was less than was needed to do a complete job that it nevertheless was able to return to the Treasury a part of this sum, even though small, in keeping with its determination to conduct the Hamilton Bicentennial on a strict economy basis as Hamilton would have wished.

It is fair to point out that the Government of the United States actually profited substantially because of the Commission. The Post Office Department has estimated that it earned a net profit of upwards of $800,000 through sales to collectors of the highly successful Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial commemorative 3-cent stamp, sales for which no postal service was rendered. This net profit accrued to the general fund of the Treasury.

The Commission's scholarship program in which more than 200,000 high-school students actively participated did much to refocus attention on Hamilton and his era, the formative period of the Nation. Added to this were the many lectures in colleges on Hamilton and his times inspired by the Commission's activities and the added emphasis given the man and the period in countless courses of instruction.

Special thanks on the part of the Commission are due the Government agencies which cooperated in making the bicentennial year a success, especially to the Department of State, the Treasury Department, the Department of Defense, the Department of the Interior and the United States Information Agency. The Commission also expresses its appreciation for the cooperation of the many governors, mayors, and other public officials who gave assistance to the program and to the thousands of individuals and organizations who took part.

It is the belief of many Americans that a permanent memorial to the work of Alexander Hamilton should be erected in the National Capital. In support of this belief the executive committee of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission at its final meeting in Washington on April 24, 1958, adopted unanimously a resolution recommending such a proposal to the Congress. The resolution read:

"*Resolved,* That the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission recommend to the Congress the design and erection in the District of Columbia of a suitable memorial to the work of Alexander Hamilton in the founding of the United States, the memorial to be in keeping with the weight and measure of his accomplishments, for these reasons among others, that—

"1. No man did more to establish the United States than did Alexander Hamilton in bringing on the Constitutional Convention, in perfecting the Constitution of the United States through clarifying the problem, in obtaining ratification of the Constitution, and in establishing the Federal Government thereunder—and that without Hamilton, had the United States been formed at all, the Union formed would have been considerably different from what it is and might well have fallen apart for the lack of adequate strength in the Federal Government;

"2. The Federalist, by Hamilton, with help from Madison and Jay, is the greatest commentary on the Constitution and its underlying principles, a commentary that articulated and balanced the American political system so well that it became the basis of constitutional interpretation by the Supreme Court for the first century and a half of the Republic;

"3. A fitting physical memorial to the work of this great man would establish a strong and enduring link between the beginning of this Nation and its institutions and its posterity."

I could not bring this personal statement to a close without expressing my warm appreciation to my fellow Commissioners for their contributions toward making the bicentennial a success and to the members of the Commission's staff who worked tirelessly to the same end.

KARL E. MUNDT,
Chairman, United States Senator from South Dakota.

The Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission was established by Senate Joint Resolution 140, passed by the 83d Congress and approved by President Eisenhower on August 20, 1954, as Public Law 601, chapter 770.

The joint resolution, as adopted, read as follows:

"*Resolved, etc.*, That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the "Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") which shall be composed of 19 Commissioners as follows: The President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, all ex officio; and eight persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, four Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and four Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Commission to prepare plans and a program for signalizing the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton. In preparing such plans and program the Commission shall give due consideration to any plan or plans which may be submitted to it, and to take such steps as may be necessary to coordinate and correlate its plans with those prepared by State or civic bodies. If the participation of other nations in the commemoration is deemed advisable, the Commission may communicate to that end with the governments of such nations.

"SEC. 3. The Commission shall select a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members, and may employ, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, such employees as may be necessary in carrying out its functions.

"SEC. 4. The Commissioners shall serve without compensation, but may be reimbursed for expenses incurred by them in carrying out the duties of the Commission.

"SEC. 5. When the Commission has approved a plan of celebration it shall submit it, insofar as it relates to the fine arts, to the Commission of Fine Arts for its approval.

"SEC. 6. The Commission shall, on or before March 1, 1955 make a report to the Congress in order that further enabling legislation may be enacted.

"SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

"SEC. 8. The Commission shall expire upon the completion of its duties, but in no event later than January 11, 1958."

In its report to the Senate, filed with the joint resolution, the Senate Judiciary Committee said in part:

"Alexander Hamilton was born on the island of Nevis in the British West Indies on January 11, 1757. It was in the American Revolution that Alexander Hamilton stood with Washington and Franklin in developing the basis of what is today our great Federal Republic. Hamilton was the fertile mind and organizing genius of President Washington's administrations. For this great work he has been described as the architect of the American Union. Hamilton represented the conservative mind in its most brilliant and useful form. His devotion to the free press, to free speech, and to the institutions of freemen is too little appreciated. The finest monument that could be erected to Hamilton would be an adequate edition of his writings. Such an edition would not be merely a monument to Hamilton—it would be a genuine and enduring contribution to the Nation which he labored so ardently to create. The committee is of the opinion that the works of Hamilton would be particularly appropriate in this era of world history, when many countries throughout the world are struggling with the problem of self-government or trying to find a proper formula to use in adopting for themselves the self-government best suited to their environment, capabilities and abilities, and the making available to those people the complete works of Alexander Hamilton will serve not only this Republic, but the world. The committee believes that this resolution is meritorious and therefore recommends favorable consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 140."

Pursuant to the law the Speaker of the House of Representatives, on August 21, 1954, appointed the following Representatives as members of the Commission:

Hon. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, Jr., of New York.

Hon. THOMAS E. MARTIN, of Iowa.

Hon. PETER W. RODINO, Jr., of New Jersey.

Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY, of New York.

Mr. MARTIN was elected to the United States Senate in the November 1954 election. The Honorable CARROLL REECE, of Tennessee, was named to replace him by the Speaker of the House of Representatives early in the first session of the 84th Congress.

The President of the Senate, on November 17, 1954, appointed the following Senators to be members of the Commission:

Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia.

Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, of Missouri.

Hon. IRVING M. IVES, of New York.

Hon. KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota.

The President of the United States, on January 11, 1955, the 198th anniversary of Hamilton's birth, appointed the following persons as members of the Commission:

Lt. Gen. Milton G. Baker, of Pennsylvania.

Edward R. Burke, of Maryland.

Mrs. Marie Brown Coffin, of the District of Columbia.

George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury.

Laurens M. Hamilton, of Virginia.

John A. Krout, of New York.

Clark Haynes Minor, of New York.

Mrs. Robert P. Patterson, of New York.

On February 1, 1955, at the call of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission met in the Secretary's office in the main Treasury Building in Washington for the purpose of organization. Senator KARL E. MUNDT was elected Chairman, and Representative FREDERIC R. COUDERT, Jr., was elected Vice Chairman pursuant to the terms of the law. Mr. W. Randolph Burgess, Under Secretary of the Treasury, was named Secretary of the Commission, and Mr. Robert A. Dilion, of the Treasury Department, was named Assistant Secretary.

An executive committee of five members was established, consisting of the chairman, the vice chairman, and three to be appointed by the chairman. Mr. Burgess was made an exofficio member. The chairman named Mr. Burke, Mr. Hamilton and Representative Rooney to serve with him and the vice chairman of this committee.

The executive committee of the Commission met on February 7, 1955, in the office of Senator MUNDT and appointed J. Harvie Williams, of the District of Columbia, Director of the Commission, and Dr. Frank Monaghan, also of the District of Columbia, historian of the Commission. They were directed to prepare a report for the Commission on plans and a program for signalizing the bicentennial of Alexander Hamilton in the year starting January 11, 1957, in accordance with the law creating the Commission.

The next few months were devoted to developing and outlining a program for the year-long bicentennary. On September 12, 1955, the Commission formally recommended to the Congress that the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton be signalized as follows:

A. By memorial meetings and exercises throughout the year 1957, beginning on January 11:

1. A joint session of the Congress.

2. Proclamations by governors and joint sessions of State legislatures.

3. Appropriate public ceremonies in cities and communities especially concerned with the public achievements of Alexander Hamilton and with the important events of his life in the struggle for the establishment of the Republic.

4. Appropriate ceremonies on the anniversaries of particular events such as the Battle of Yorktown; the Annapolis Convention; the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia; the New York Convention at Poughkeepsie; appointment as Secretary of the Treasury; his reports on the mint on manufacturers, and on the establishment of a Bank of the United States; the Whisky Rebellion; appointment as major general of the Army; the duel with Burr, etc.

B. By publications:

1. An authoritative and comprehensive edition of Hamilton's papers.

2. Stimulate the reissues by publishers of out-of-print works on Hamilton and his contemporaries.

3. Encourage the publication by established publishing houses of a popular biography of Hamilton and of a volume of selected Hamilton writings. These two volumes should be designed for widest possible distribution—both for libraries and schools, and for the general public in a less expensive pocketbook edition.

4. Preparation and stimulation of special articles in historical journals, popular magazines, etc.

C. By activities in the field of education and public affairs:

1. The institution of a national essay contest in the schools, colleges, and universities of the Nation.

2. Oratorical contests in educational institutions and elsewhere.

3. Encourage the adoption of Hamilton as a special topic for nationally established discussion groups.

4. Special lectures on Hamilton and his times in colleges and universities having endowments or available facilities for such lectures.

D. By commemorative exhibitions of Hamilton portraits, manuscrips, documents, and other memorabilia, at the Library of Congress, the National Archives, the Treasury of the United States, public art galleries, museums, public libraries, and elsewhere.

E. By special exhibits and displays under the auspices of local historical societies and other historical, learned, civic, and patriotic societies, and professional and business associations.

F. By stamps and coins: Appropriate special coins, stamps, medals, etc., should be issued on January 11, 1957, and the appropriate other occasions in connection with the Hamilton bicentennial.

This program was in accord with the Commission's decision to devote its efforts to the stimulating of many activities by others, rather than to undertake directly their organization. This policy served to economize funds appropriated by the Congress and was in keeping with the well-known views of Alexander Hamilton.

It is gratifying to report that with few exceptions the Commission's objectives were achieved, as explained elsewhere in this report.

The Commission's small staff worked steadily and effectively to perfect plans for the bicentennial celebration, in close cooperation with the Commission's executive committee.

Advisory committees, 17 in all, were set up to aid the Commission in the many fields in which activities were planned. These advisory committees were: Armed Forces and Coast Guard; Banking and Finance; Commerce and Industry; Constitution and Law; Contests and Awards; Education; Exhibits and Displays; Historians; Libraries and Museums; Medicine and Public Health; Patriotic Societies; Political Economy; Public Relations; Rhetoric and Public Address; Special Events, Symbols, Medals, Stamps, and Coins;

and Veterans Organizations. Leaders in the many fields accepted membership on these advisory committees. A full list of committee members will be found at the end of this section of the report.

In addition, the Commission established a special Committee on Birthplace and Boyhood Home, headed by Commissioner Laurens M. Hamilton, to coordinate bicentennial observances in the Leeward and the Virgin Islands. Other members of this committee were Richard Parkhurst, president, Mystic Terminal Co., Boston, Mass.; Hon. Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior, and Hon. Walter A. Gordon, Governor of the Virgin Islands, both members ex-officio; Capt. Henry Balsley, USN retired, St. Thomas, V. I.; Mrs. Douglas Armstrong, St. Croix, V. I.; J. Robertson Ward, Antigua, British West Indies; Dorr E. Newton, St. Croix, V. I.; Cyrus F. Judson, Jr., Alcoa Steamship Co., New York, N. Y., (deceased); Mrs. Cyrus F. Judson, Jr., New York, N. Y.; Mrs. Lee Karwick, Caribbean Tourist Association, New York, N. Y.; and Erwin Balluder, Pan American World Airways, New York, N. Y.

One of the first tasks of the Commission staff was to enlist the cooperation of national, State, and local organizations in many fields to assure widespread participation in the bicentennial celebration. Because of the highly economical basis on which the Commission was operated throughout its lifetime, the efforts of its staff were directed toward the stimulation of activities by others rather than actually organizing and sponsoring them itself.

As a result of this necessary policy the Commission was never able to keep an accurate check on the many and varied types of Hamilton observances conducted throughout the United States. However, enough information was obtained to indicate clearly that Hamilton observances, in one form or another, were held in hundreds of communities from coast to coast; that many magazines and newspapers carried special articles on Hamilton and the bicentennial observance; that there were a substantial number of television and radio programs having to do with Hamilton; and that thousands of public schools and several hundred colleges and universities gave special attention to the bicentennial. In addition, exhibitions of Hamiltonia and Americana of the Hamilton period were held in many cities and communities throughout the United States under the auspices of local groups.

A substantial number of these historical exhibitions were stimulated by the Commission through the American Association for State and Local History and the Manuscript Society. These 2 organizations, numbering upward of 3,700 historical societies, museums, libraries, and private collectors of historical material, were among the first to pledge support to the Commission. Each of them set up a special committee to cooperate in the bicentennial.

Columbia University, the successor to Kings College, Hamilton's alma mater, quite naturally took a leading part in bicentennial observances throughout the year. The Association of the Alumni of Columbia College named a special Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Committee headed by James Madison Blackwell, New York attorney. This committee planned and carried through arrangements for the 11th annual Hamilton dinner held on May 1, 1957. At this dinner Dr. Grayson Kirk, president of the university, received Columbia's Alexander Hamilton Medal for Distinguished Service.

In addition to Mr. Blackwell, the special committee included Elliott V. Bell, Douglas M. Black, Benjamin J. Buttenweiser, Bennett Cerf, Clifton Fadiman, Oscar Hammerstein 2d, Roscoe C. Ingalls, John A. Krout, Ward Melville, Edmund A. Prentis, Arthur Hays Sulzberger, William T. Taylor, and Richmond B. Williams.

Through correspondence and personal visits, the Commission enlisted the support of many National, State, and local organizations in varied fields. Cooperation with the Commission was pledged by such outstanding groups as the American Bankers Association, the American Bar Association, the American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, American Historical Society, Manuscript Society, National Education Association, the League of Business and Professional Women, the American Society for State and Local History, the American Legion, and Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Among others are American Booksellers Association, American Farm Bureau Federation, American Hotel Association, American Institute of Architects, American Library Association, American Municipal Association, American Pharmaceutical Association, American Political Science Association, American Association of University Professors, Boy Scouts of America, the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church, Kiwanis International, League of Women Voters, Loyal Order of Moose, National Association and Council of Business Schools, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Savings and Loan League, and Rotary International.

Others included the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Society of the Cincinnati, the Sons of the Revolution, the Sons of the American Revolution, the National Federation of Republican Women, the National Newman Club Federation, the American Legion Auxiliary, the National 40 and 8, the Chicago Coin Club, and the Milwaukee Numismatic Society, along with a substantial number of State bankers' associations and State bar associations. In addition, many educational groups cooperated and worked with the Commission.

The national organizations cooperated closely with the Commission in the setting up of the various advisory committees, recommending names of outstanding individuals for appointment.

Letters were sent to each of the 3,700 members of the American Association for State and Local History and the Manuscript Society asking cooperation with all phases of the work of the Commission, including sponsorship of local celebrations and exhibitions—many such were held—and especially in the Commission's treasure trove search for Hamiltonia (described elsewhere in the report). The Commission letters enclosed covering letters from the special committees set up by each organization to work with the Commission.

The Department of State cooperated closely with the Commission both during the planning period and during the year of the bicentennial celebration. At the request of Senator MUNDT, the State Department early advised all embassies and major consulates of the impending celebration and, a short time later, requested them to confer with the governments to which they were accredited in an effort to find in archives and other depositories any Hamilton materials in connection with the Commission's treasure trove search. As a result, a substantial number of documents and other memorabilia were brought to light and forwarded to the Commission. Especially beneficial results were obtained in France, Great Britain, the Netherlands, and Denmark.

Plans for close cooperation between the Department of Defense and the Commission were worked out some months before the bicentennial year began. Members of the Commission staff met at the Pentagon with public relations officials and officers of all branches of the armed services, plus the Coast Guard, and outlined the aims of the Commission. Promises of assistance were given by the Pentagon, promises which were more than carried out in performance during the bicentennial year.

On January 11, 1957, the opening day of the bicentenary, President Eisenhower's proclamation was read at formations in every United States Military Establishment around the world. It was posted on all bulletin boards and was broadcast, along with data on the bicentennial, over the worldwide network of the armed services radio. Throughout the year notable events of the bicentennial were thus brought to the attention of armed services personnel.

In addition, frequent reference to the bicentennial was made in the various publications of the armed services. The United States Army brought D Battery of the 5th Field Artillery, the unit Hamilton organized in 1776, to New York for the opening day ceremonies there. Bands, color guards, and military units were provided at various times throughout the year for ceremonies in Washington, New York, Chicago, Nevis, St. Croix, and other cities and communities where special observances were held.

The stimulation of lectures on Hamilton's contributions to the establishment of the Nation, and suggestions that special library exhibits be set up, that courses of reading be established, and that Hamilton's work be emphasized in classes in history, economics, political science and public speaking were recommended to colleges and universities by the Commission's Advisory Committee on Education. This Committee, which was headed by Dr. Henry M. Wriston, president emeritus of Brown University, included a distinguished group of college and university presidents in its membership.

As its first step in this phase of activity, every college and university in the United States and its Territories and colonial possessions was asked for information as to endowed lectures under its control which might be used for special Hamilton addresses. This inquiry showed that upwards of 900 such lectures were in existence.

Following up on this information, Dr. Wriston wrote all institutions of higher learning with such lectures urging them to arrange for special addresses on Hamilton and his times in the course of the bicentennial year, set up Hamilton exhibits in their libraries, and emphasize Hamilton's work in appropriate classrooms. A large number of these institutions followed these suggestions.

One of the earliest activities to be set in motion by the Commission was preparation for its scholarship program, described in full elsewhere in this report. Outstanding educators, especially in the public speaking field, were enlisted to work out, in cooperation with the Commission staff, detailed plans for this program. Educators in every State took part in this activity, which took substantially more than a year of preparation.

Stimulation of the writing and publication of books and magazine articles, newspaper editorials, etc., called for a substantial amount of effort on the part of the Commission's staff. (These activities are described elsewhere.) In addition, through the cooperation of the Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, information on the plans for the bicentennial was sent to every television and radio station in the United States. Similar information was sent newspapers and major magazines. Members of the Commission's advisory committee on public relations were most helpful to the staff in carrying out the public relations phase of the preliminary program.

In the course of the period of preparation the Commission built up an extensive mailing list. Most of those on this list, which included all advisory committee members, received copies of the various reports which the Commission submitted to the Congress,

as well as news releases and other material of special interest.

Following is the membership of the Commission's advisory committees:

Advisory Committee on Armed Forces and Coast Guard: Gen. Mark W. Clark, Charleston, S. C.; Gen. J. Lawton Collins, United States of America, retired, Washington, D. C.; Adm. Louis Denfeld, United States Navy, retired, Washington, D. C.; Adm. William F. Halsey, United States Navy, retired, New York, N. Y.; Rear Adm. John B. Heffernan, Washington, D. C.; Gen. George C. Marshall, Leesburg, Va.; Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy, retired, Berkeley, Calif.; Adm. Merlin O'Neill, United States Coast Guard, retired, Coster, Md.; Gen. Lemuel Shepherd, United States Marine Corps, retired, Washington, D. C.; Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer, United States Army, Boyds, Md.

Advisory Committee on Banking and Finance: Mr. Claude L. Benner, Wilmington, Del.; Mr. Victor M. Birely, Washington, D. C.; Mr. C. Francis Cocke, Roanoke, Va.; Mr. H. Frederick Hagemann, Jr., Boston, Mass.; Dr. Devereux C. Josephs, New York, N. Y.; Mr. James S. Kemper, Chicago, Ill.; Mr. Laurence F. Lee, Raleigh, N. C.; Mr. William A. McDonnell, St. Louis, Mo.; Mr. F. Raymond Peterson, Paterson, N. J.; Mr. Albert C. Simmonds, Jr., New York, N. Y.; Mr. John J. Sullivan, Denver, Colo.; and Mr. Dean Witter, San Francisco, Calif.

Commerce and Industry: Hiland G. Batcheller, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Fred C. Crawford, Cleveland, Ohio; Stephen M. Dubrul, Detroit, Mich.; Benjamin F. Fairless, New York, N. Y.; Hon. James A. Farley, New York, N. Y.; Robert M. Gaylord, Rockford, Ill.; Hon. Ed Gossett, Dallas, Tex.; Howard Hall, Cedar Rapids, Iowa; F. O. Prior, Chicago, Ill.; Henry G. Riter, III, West Orange, N. J.; Ernest G. Swigert, Portland, Oreg.; Hon. Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce; and James C. Worthy, Chicago, Ill.

Advisory Committee on Constitution and Law: Hon. Walter M. Bastian, United States Court of Appeals, District of Columbia Circuit; Mr. Thomas M. Burgess, Colorado Springs, Colo.; Mr. George A. Finch (deceased), Washington, D. C.; Mr. E Smythe Gambrell, Atlanta, Ga.; Mr. Allen T. Klots, New York, N. Y.; Mr. Cloyd Laporte, New York, N. Y.; Mr. William Logan Martin, Birmingham, Ala.; Mr. David F. Maxwell, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mr. Herbert G. Nilles, Fargo, N. Dak.; Mr. Alfred J. Schweppe, Seattle, Wash.; Mr. J. Cleo Thompson, Dallas, Tex.; Mr. Charles H. Woods, Tucson, Ariz.; Mr. Lloyd Wright, Los Angeles, Calif.

Contests and Awards: Dr. Bower Aly, chairman, University of Missouri; Prof. A. Craig Baird, State University of Iowa; Dr. F. Kenneth Brasted, president, University of Dallas; Hon. Samuel M. Brownell, superintendent of public schools, Detroit, Mich.; Dr. Thorrel B. Fest, University of Colorado; Prof. Annabel Dunham Hagood, University of Alabama; Prof. Bruno E. Jacob, National Forensic League; Mr. Rodney Kidd, director, the University of Texas; Dr. George McCarty, College of William and Mary; Prof. Richard B. Morris, Columbia University; Prof. Theodore F. Nelson, St. Olaf College; Mr. Robert Schacht, University of Wisconsin; and Dr. Lloyd Schram, University of Washington.

Advisory Committee on Education: Dr. Henry M. Wriston, president emeritus of Brown University; Dr. Margaret Clapp, president, Wellesley College; Dr. Arthur Coons, president, Occidental College; Dr. Donald J. Cowling, president emeritus of Carleton College; Dr. Theodore A. Distler, executive director, Association of American Colleges; Dr. Elmer Ellis, president, University of Missouri; Dr. Daniel Z. Gibson, president, Washington College; Dr. Rufus C. Harris, president, Tulane University; the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, president, University of Notre Dame; Dr. Grayson Kirk, president, Columbia University; Dr. Katherine McBride, President, Bryn Mawr College; The Reverend E. J. O'Donnell, S. J., president, Marquette University; and Dr. J. E. Wallace Sterling, president, Stanford University.

Advisory Committee on Exhibits and Displays: Mr. Herbert J. Sanborn, Library of Congress; Mr. King Rich, Albert Frank-Guenther Law, Inc., New York, N. Y.; and Leonard C. Rennie, Washington, D. C.

Advisory Committee on Historians: Prof. Leland D. Baldwin, University of Pittsburgh; Prof. Gerald Capers, Tulane University; Dr. Thomas C. Cochran, University of Pennsylvania; Prof. Albert B. Corey, State historian, Albany, N. Y.; Prof. Louis Gottschalk, The University of Chicago; Prof. Wood Gray, George Washington University; Dr. Louis M. Hacker, Columbia University; Dr. Bernhard Knollenberg, Chester, Connecticut; Prof. Gilbert L. Lycan, Stetson University; Mr. David Mearns, chief of manuscripts, Library of Congress; Prof. John C. Miller, Stanford University; Prof. Broadus Mitchell, Rutgers University; Prof. Richard B. Morris, Columbia University; Mr. Vrest Orton, Weston, Vermont; Prof. E. P. Panagopoulos, San Jose State College; Dr. Boyd C. Shafer, executive director, American Historical Association; Dr. S. K. Stevens, executive director, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission; and Mr. Milton Halsey Thomas, Columbia University.

Libraries and museums: Mr. Paul M. Angle, Chicago Historical Society; Mr. James T. Babb, librarian, Yale University Library; Dr. Paul H. Buck, director of libraries, Harvard University; Mr. Jack Dalton, librarian, Alderman Library, University of Virginia; Mr. Edward G. Freehafer, director, New York Public Library; Mr. Clifford C. Gregg, director, Chicago Natural History Museum; Mr. Richard Logsdon, director of libraries, Columbia University; Mr. Stewart Mitchell, director, Massachusetts Historical Society; Mr. James J. Rorimer, director, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Ralph R. Shaw, Graduate School of Library Service, Rutgers University; Mr. John Walker, director, National Gallery of Art; and Mr. Hermann Warner Williams, Jr., director, the Corcoran Gallery of Art.

Advisory Committee on Medicine and Public Health: Dr. E. Vincent Askey, Los Angeles, Calif.; Dr. Luis H. Bauer, New York, N. Y.; Dr. John W. Cline, San Francisco, Calif.; Dr. Edwin S. Hamilton, Kankakee, Ill.; Dr. Elmer Hess, Erie, Pa.; Dr. George F. Lull, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. Walter B. Martin, Norfolk, Va.; Dr. E. J. McCormick, Toledo, Ohio; Dr. Dwight H. Murray, president, American Medical Association; Dr. Torald Sollman, Cleveland, Ohio.

Advisory Committee on Patriotic Societies: Miss Gertrude S. Carraway, honorary president general, Daughters of the American Revolution; Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant 3d, United States Army, retired, Washington, D. C.; Col. Catesby ap Catesby Jones, Richmond, Va.; Mrs. Carroll D. Kearns, president, National Federation of Republican Women.

Advisory Committee on Political Economy: Dr. James Washington Bell, chairman, secretary of the American Economic Association; Hon. Lewis W. Douglas, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Ferdinand A. Hermens, Notre Dame University; Mr. Evron M. Kirkpatrick, American Political Science Association; Dr. Harold Metz, Washington, D. C.; Dr. Ralph Robey, Dalzell, South Carolina; Dr. O. Glenn Saxon, Yale University; Mr. Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., Princeton, N. J.; Dr. Arnold J. Zurcher, professor of political science, New York University.

Advisory Committee on Public Relations: Mr. Howard W. Calkins, New York, N. Y.; Mr. Julian Goodman, National Broadcasting Co.; Mr. Robert F. Hurleigh, Mutual Broadcasting System; Mr. Garth P. James, Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas, Virgin Islands; Mr. Edward M. Kirby, Washington, D. C.; Mr. Theodore F. Koop, Columbia Broadcasting System; Miss Llewellyn Miller, New York, N. Y.; Miss Ann Scott Morningstar, New York, N. Y.; Mr. Bryson B. Rash, Washington, D. C.; Mr. Donald Robinson, New York, N. Y.; Mr. G. W. Johnstone, National Association of Manufacturers.

Advisory Committee on Rhetoric and Public Address: Prof. W. Norwood Brigance, chairman, Wabash College; Prof. A. Craig Baird, State University of Iowa; Prof. Donald L. Clark, Columbia University; Prof. Marie K. Hochmuth, University of Illinois; Prof. Wilbur S. Howell, Princeton University.

Advisory Committee on Special Events: Rev. Alexander Van Cortlandt Hamilton, Norwalk, Conn.; Mr. Conrad L. Wirth, Director, National Park Service.

Advisory Committee on Symbols, Medals, Stamps, and Coins—Philatelic Matters: Mr. H. L. Lindquist, chairman, National Federation of Stamp Clubs; Mr. Richard S. Bohn, president, Association for Stamp Exhibitions, Inc., New York, N. Y.; Mr. Claude Cartier, New York, N. Y.; Mrs. Louise Boyd Dale, chairman, the Philatelic Foundation; Mr. Jules Glaenzer, New York, N. Y.; Mr. Robert L. Graham, Jr., attorney, Philatelic Congress; Mr. Peter G. Keller, executive secretary, American Stamp Dealer's Association; Mr. John Steinway, New York, N. Y.; Lt. Gen. Cornelius W. Wickersham, governor, Collector's Club, New York, N. Y.

Advisory Committee on Symbols, Medals, Stamps and Coins—Numismatic Matters: Mr. Harold S. Bareford, New York, N. Y.; Mr. Earl B. Barnes, president of the Society of Medallists, Indianapolis, Ind.; Mr. Vernon L. Brown, the Chase Manhattan Bank; Mr. Louis Eliasberg, Baltimore, Md.; Mr. Sawyer McA. Mosser, secretary, the American Numismatic Society; Mr. Leonel C. Panosh, president, American Numismatic Association; Dr. Louis C. West, president, the American Numismatic Society.

Advisory Committee on Veterans Organizations: Mr. Clyde A. Lewis, Plattsburgh, N. Y.; Mr. Lyall T. Beggs, Madison, Wis.; Hon. Louis A. Johnson, Washington, D. C.; Hon. Raymond J. Kelly, Chicago, Ill.; Mr. John R. Quinn, Los Angeles, Calif.; Mrs. Laurence J. Murphy, Union, N. J.; Mr. Louis E. Starr, Portland, Oreg.

Khrushchev Utterances Serve To Spur Rise in Anti-Jewish Tendencies in Soviet Union

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of Members of Congress the important information contained in a release sent me by the Institute for the Study of the U. S. S. R., New York office.

This shows us what the Jews in the Soviet Union and its satellites are suffering, the state of terror in which they exist, their privations, and the denials of religious liberty inflicted upon them. This is another striking example of the failure of the Soviet Union to grant that very equality of freedom and opportunity upon which the Communist ideology is based, to a large segment of its own population, as well as in its satellite countries. The article follows:

(By Nadezhda Teodorovich, of the Institute for the Study of the U. S. S. R., a body of former Soviet scholars with headquarters in Munich, whose aim is to furnish reliable information on trends and developments inside the Soviet Union)

MUNICH.—Nikita Khrushchev's chronic bitterness toward Soviet Jewry was made dramatically clear by the recent publication in a leading Paris newspaper of an interview in which the Soviet dictator confirmed reports that the Kremlin's 30-year effort to build an autonomous Jewish Republic in the Far East as a buffer to Chinese expansion had failed.

Le Figaro had quoted Khrushchev as having stated that the Soviet's nationality policy was correct and magnanimous. The U. S. S. R., he declared, was the first state to decide to aid the Jews as a people by a decision to resettle them in Birobidzhan, an autonomous region in eastern Siberia. But, he added, this wonderful gift had been rejected by the Jews, who refused to resettle there and only a very small number of Jews remained in Birobidzhan at present.

Khrushchev placed the entire blame for the Birobidzhan failure on the Jews themselves. "Jews," he explained, "prefer to be artisans: you do not often find them working on building sites or in metallurgical plants. Jews do not like collective work and collective discipline. They prefer to be scattered. They are individualists."

In this description of Jewish characteristics, Khrushchev drew attention to those qualtities in the Jews returning from Birobidzhan which were not in accord with the traditional Marxist-Leninist concept of class. His statement was clearly aimed at stamping Jews as inferior in the eyes of the Communist leadership.

During the last decade, there has been a considerable increase in anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. A number of measures, all supported by the Central Committee of the Communist Party, have been taken to prejudice the interests of the Jewish people.

Such measures become more understandable when it is recalled that the Communist Party has frequently declared that it does not recognize the Jews as a nation; that it refuses to acknowledge the community of interest of the Jewish race; that it does not consider it a compact ethnic unit despite the existence of the State of Israel; that it regards the Jewish people as the remnants of an ancient people which has slowly been assimilated by various societies and that it denies the viability of Hebrew as a separate language.

According to V. I. Lenin, "Jewish national culture is nothing more than the slogan of rabbis and the bourgeosie, the slogan of our enemies." In accordance with this view, the Communist Party has attempted to encourage the assimilation of Jews into Soviet society and, while condemning expressions of Jewish separatism, has brutally uprooted the national and particularly the religious traditions of the Jewish people.

In the years 1920, 1930, 1936, and 1939–40, Zionist organizations were dissolved in the Soviet Union and Jewish rabbis, teachers, writers, artists, and actors were killed or sent to labor camps. Synagogues and other religious schools, including secular cultural institutions, were closed and the study of Hebrew was forbidden. These measures were in retaliation for the fact that the Jews had shown evidence of disagreement with Communist ideals and had striven to maintain their patriarchal, religious way of life as well as their aspirations for political independence in Palestine.

During World War II, the Soviet high command did not bother to organize in time the evacuation of Jews from frontline districts, and as a result they were massacred by the Nazis. The Soviet lists of victims of the Nazis during World War II do not contain the names of Jews. Further details of this Soviet perfidy can be found in Solomon Schwarz' authoritative study: Jews in the Soviet Union.

The establishment of the tiny State of Israel in 1948 stimulated the desire of many Soviet Jews to emigrate. In order to discourage such a move, the Soviet Government made accusations against Israel and its policies and against international Zionism. This was done at the show trial in Prague of Rudolf Slansky. This trial and the ensuing sentence terrorized Jews not only in the Soviet Union but throughout the satellites.

Since that time Jews have been gradually removed from responsible positions in the Soviet Union. Jewish students at Soviet universities have been subjected to persecution. In 1953 the trial of Jewish doctors took place and many Jewish cultural leaders were deported. Of the 15 synagogues formerly in Moscow, only 1 remains. On important holidays it is overflowed with thousands of worshippers. Here they have been able to share their feeling of community, praying in the same synagogue together with members of the Israeli diplomatic mission. For propaganda purposes, in 1957 the Soviets opened a religious school in Moscow which has, however, only 12 students. It is known that there is a synagogue in Kiev, but no information is available on other centers of Jewish religious life. As with all other religious communities, the Soviets demand that party policy be supported publicly my members of the Jewish community as reported by Radio Moscow on November 24, 1956.

In 1957 Communist leaders stated that the lack of national cultural life among the Jews could be explained by the Jewish striving for complete assimilation. According to the Communists, the Jews were not interested in speaking their own language or having their own schools and theaters. Yet in 1956, when the American Jewish opera singer, Jan Peerce, sang in the Moscow synagogue in ancient Hebrew, his appearance touched off a remarkable demonstration by Moscow's Jews.

The police regime in the Soviet Union, the imprisonment of the Jewish people within the ideological and political frontiers of a country where they are not at home; the complete lack of any prospects for improvement in their life in the Soviet Union and their constant fears for the future have produced among Jews in the Soviet Union a state of mental depression which robs them of initiative and the will to work.

Khrushchev would have been more correct if, in trying to explain the reason for the failures of Birobidzhan and comparing them with the successes of the young Jewish State of Israel, he had sought out these failures in the very nature of the political system and philosophy imposed by force in the U. S. S. R.

Address of Hon. Oren Harris, Chairman, House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, our colleague, Hon. OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, delivered the principal address to the annual meeting of the administrative law section of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia.

His remarks were well received by those in attendance who comprised one of the largest groups to attend an annual meeting of the administrative law section.

It gives me a special pleasure to include his address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today, under leave to extend:

It is a pleasure to be here this evening at the invitation of the administrative law section of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia to meet with you who are practitioners in the field of administrative law.

As chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has initiated the legislation creating a majority of the independent regulatory agencies as well as other agencies having delegated legislative powers to promulgate rules and judicial powers to determine rights or privileges of persons under law, I, naturally, have an equal interest in the administrative processes.

Further, as chairman of this committee's Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight, I, obviously, during the past year more specifically have been seeking, as you have been, to arrive at a fair judgment evaluation of these administrative processes and of the execution of laws by these administrative agencies. In such connection I am aware of the various proposals which have emanated from the administrative-law sections of the different bar associations to meet some of the problems with which our Legislative Oversight Subcommittee has been concerned, and, indeed, am appreciative of the helpful comments and suggestions which have been made to us by such of your officers as Chairman Valentine Deale and past chairmen Smith Brookhart and Donald Beelar.

It is in view of your interest in the subject, and more particularly in view of my strong belief that you who practice before these administrative agencies have responsibility, as do those of us who created them, to see that they faithfully execute the law, that I am prompted to say some things to you tonight that I think should be said and to discuss with you tonight the origin and purpose of our Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight, what it has done, and what it expects to do.

I am glad to have this opportunity not only to discuss this problem but to express some personal viewpoints on the subject as I see it. As a matter of fact, in my own opinion, this speech is 1 year late.

I should like to make it perfectly clear that I do not claim to know all the answers or that I am capable of solving all the problems. Furthermore, I do not believe that because of the far-reaching importance to the public welfare that there is any place for self-centered egotistical viewpoints, or for a half-truths technique.

I should like to make it perfectly clear that I have no intention of destroying or discrediting the independent regulatory agencies necessary for the American people. We want to make them stronger—not weaker. I have no intention of character assassination or of pursuing any course other than with justice and fair dealing.

I feel strongly on the subject of compliance with the law and the public disclosure of any corruption or maladministration or wrongdoing. From my experience I think I know something about investigations and in this instance the committee will continue to determine the policies of the work and no dubious methods will be used in developing information as has occurred in the past—which I have deplored.

The action of the committee since its reorganization is well known. The alleged misconduct of commissioners in one agency has been thoroughly developed and you, of course, know the result of the investigation of the channel 10 case in Miami, Fla. Contrary to some public claims, the committee had very little in its files on other matters pertinent to the investigation, and that mostly consisted of information from other committees of the Congress and newspaper clippings, information which long since had been made public.

I am encouraged and glad to report that the staff is working hard in developing information toward carrying out the purposes of the investigation. We feel we have an excellent staff with Bob Lishman as our counsel and I have no doubt as to the final results.

ORIGIN OF SUBCOMMITTEE

Under the rules of the House of Representatives, all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to certain specified subjects are referred to a standing committee. The subject matter under the jurisdiction of such standing committee is specifically spelled out in the rules. In addition to this legislative duty, however, under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and the rules of each body, each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives is given the added responsibility of exercising continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee. This direction and responsibility is set forth under section 136 of that act under the caption, "Legislative Oversight by Standing Committees."

This Legislative Reorganization Act of some 12 years ago, however, contains certain provisions applicable to the standing committees of the Senate which do not apply to the standing committees of the House. It has been customary, therefore, at the start of each Congress, commencing in 1947, for each standing committee of the House to introduce a resolution which, when passed by the House, gives the standing committee the necessary authorization, power, and funds to carry out these legislative and investigatory responsibilities.

During the discussion on February 5, 1957, at the time the House was considering this routine resolution concerning the activities of our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which bears the number 99 in the 85th Congress, Speaker RAYBURN took the floor to say:

"I trust that the gentleman will set up a subcommittee * * * to see whether or not the law, as we intended it, is being carried out or whether a great many of these laws are being repealed or revamped by those who administer them."

To this, I replied that this matter had been discussed within the full committee and it was recognized that under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 the committee must exercise watchfulness over the administration and execution of any law by any agency within the jurisdiction of the committee.

On March 6, 1957, I appointed the special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight consisting of 11 members.

On March 11, at the unanimous direction of the full committee, I introduced House Resolution 191 asking for an appropriation of $250,000, for the purpose of carrying out this responsibility. On April 11, the resolution passed and the subcommittee undertook its organization.

PURPOSE OF SUBCOMMITTEE

The purpose of the subcommittee has been expressed in very succinct language with which I am sure you are familiar:

"To examine the execution of the laws by the administrative agencies, administering laws within the legislative jurisdiction of the committee, to see whether or not the law as the Congress intended in its enactment has been and is being carried out or whether it has been and is being repealed or revamped by those who administer it."

Inherent in this statement of purpose is a dual approach: (1) Whether the law has been and is being faithfully executed by the agency in the public interest or whether it is being repealed by the agency through lack of enforcement; and (2) whether the agency is revamping the law through interpretation by rule or internal procedures to enlarge the area of regulation beyond that intended or to administer the law through procedures not intended by the Congress.

I assume from study of your bar association's proposals that it is the latter approach with which you have been more concerned, but our subcommittee necessarily is as much interested in any inadequacies of administration as in overzealous or onerous administration.

In making such examination our studies devolved around eight major heads as follows:

1. Review and analysis of the laws and amendments, and intent of the Congress when enacted;

2. Area of the field regulated by each law, changing circumstances and growth of the field since enactment;

3. Consideration of the legislative standards in the law to determine whether they can be drafted in more precise terms with the view of reducing administrative discretion;

4. Consideration of rules and regulations issued by the agency under the discretionary delegations, reconciliation with statutory standards and legislative intent, manner in which rules have been applied in practice;

5. Administrative interpretations and practices apart from formal rules and regulations, public notice of such interpretations and practices, extent to which in fact administration is by internal interpretations as distinct from published rules;

6. Judicial decisions on the administration of the law by the agency, the statutory standards, rules and regulations, and administrative interpretation; enlargement of area of regulation supported by the decisions;

7. Enforcement of statute, rules, and regulations;

8. Organization of agency with especial attention to its independence.

ACTIVITY TO DATE

With the determination of these purposes and avenues of exploration for achieving these purposes, the subcommittee proceeded to the acquisition of personnel, which, following the adjournment of the Congress, was engaged in doing the necessary staff work. Owing to the limited funds appropriated and to the limits of time in achieving a substantial portion of this tremendous objective, this work initially was and so far has been confined to six regulatory agencies administering laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of our committee.

When we returned to the second session of this Congress and prepared to hold hearings on what had been developed by the staff, we discovered that its work had been confined chiefly to activities of the Federal Communications Commissioners, concerning whom it made certain charges of misconduct. Owing to the circumstances surrounding the staff release of these charges as well as the nature of the charges, and the clamor of the press and the communications industry, the subcommittee felt that there should be no delay in providing an opportunity for those whose record or conduct was involved to challenge the accuracy of such charges in hearings at an early date.

Accordingly, on February 3 the subcommittee initiated hearings on the Miami Channel 10 case, which continued through March and into April. All aspects of this case and charges of misconduct were gone into thoroughly, and everything that had been developed by the staff and was left in the files after their famous midnight ride, was presented. A report on this phase of the subcommittee's study was issued on April 4.

These hearings on the conduct of members of the Federal Communications Commission revealed that over the years a pattern had developed of questionable conduct on the part of some of the members of the Commission and on the part of some members of industry and industry organizations who are subject to Commission regulation. The questionable propriety of some of this conduct, in the subcommittee's opinion, has seriously undermined public confidence in the Commission and thus affected adversely the administration of law by the Commission. To whatever extent such public confidence has been shaken, it must be restored.

In the restoration of such confidence, the Commissioners may help themselves greatly, if they will. In the restoration of this confidence, the industry which has gone far beyond what it should have done, can do much, if it will. So too, do you who practice before these Commissions have a responsibility in maintaining of public confidence, as do we on this subcommittee. We already have made certain recommendations for remedial legislation—and I am sure there will be more. I have introduced a bill covering these recommendations which will be considered in the near future.

These recommendations go farther than just to some of the questions of Commission conduct, and enter into the problems of pressures and undue influences upon the Commissioners.

The present Communications Act prohibits ex parte contacts on the part of any person who has participated in the presentation or preparation for presentation of adjudicatory cases before hearing examiners. It is clearly evident from the record on the Miami channel 10 case that several ex parte contacts on behalf of two principal contenders for the license were made or attempted to be made, by persons who had participated in the case before the examiner. This, with all other such matters, has been referred by the committee to the Department of Justice for appropriate action.

The Communications Act, however, does not cover ex parte contacts with the Commissioners or Commission staff by persons other than those who participated in the presentation before the hearing examiner. The Miami channel 10 hearings indicated that there were such persons who made ex parte contacts. It is important that the Commission, as well as competing parties, be protected by law from any attempt at off-the-record influencing of the Commission decision in such cases, and the bill I have introduced would cover this situation.

In passing, it may be appropriate to note that our committee files now contain indication that such ex parte contacts have been made in a number of other comparative television cases. Since such contacts are prohibited by law, even though the Commission itself may have taken no action with respect to the parties making them, it is interesting to conjecture what may be the legal status of the licenses which were granted in such instances. The law, of course, has been made by the Congress. It is understood by the Commission and should not be winked at by it or any enforcement agency.

PROGRAM AHEAD

I am sure that you appreciate that the subcommittee feels that, unfortunately, its complete attention seems to have been concentrated upon only one aspect of the study that was originally contemplated. It is important, of course, that this aspect be fully considered and the situation which gives rise to the possibility of improper conduct should be cleaned up by legislation and otherwise. Nevertheless, in the long-term future, the larger aspects of the subcommittee's investigation cannot be ignored. Indeed, it is just as appropriate today as it was a year ago to consider whether the laws themselves properly are being administered; whether times have changed and the laws need amendment; whether the laws themselves can be more explicit with less discretionary power to the Commissions in issuance of rules and regulations; whether, and the extent to which, the Commissions have enlarged the area of regulation; and so on.

We are proceeding to develop these other items of study to the end of meeting the purposes of our examination of these agencies, though perhaps not by the same route as we originally had planned. Having recently flown from Washington to Tokyo via Copenhagen and the North Pole over a route not much longer than that via our west coast; and having returned from New Zealand, after flying over the South Pole, via Honolulu and our west coast to Washington, although in the future I visualize a competing route which will go from here via South America and Antarctica to New Zealand, I cannot but be especially aware of the fact that goals may be achieved through different routes.

We are carefully studying the extent to which agencies arrogate unto themselves policymaking authority by extending the field of regulation. For example, it is obvious that certain communications devices and certain types of securities have come into existence which were not conceived of at the time of the enactment of the laws. It is also obvious that certain laws were silent as to such matters as rate or security regulation, but certain jurisdiction over these fields has been indirectly exercised through other statutory provisions relating to issuing of certificates or approval of contracts and agreements. It is also obvious that certain agencies in the issuing of certificates or the granting of exemptions, have changed their rules or interpretations so greatly that they are today in exact reverse position from that held a few years ago.

Such administrative interpretations, generally supported, sometimes rejected, by the courts, may reflect to great degree changing circumstances and conditions from those existing at the time the statues were enacted. Whether this extension or revision of the field of authority, however, should be arrived at unilaterally by the agencies, with the help of the courts, or be the result of congressional action, is a matter with which we are concerned.

We are also studying the enlargement of the agencies' jurisdiction by the courts, even in instances where this has been done against the agencies' wishes, as well as upon their urging. There are many individual examples which leap to mind, but the far-reaching effect of the so-called Pittsburgh decision, in which the regulatory agencies are told to consider the implications of the antitrust statutes as well as the statutes under which the agencies have been established is not fully apparent.

We are studying whether legislative standards cannot now be written into the law or be drafted in more precise terms than in existing law to cover such standards as the agency may use in its processing of cases before it. Certainly it would appear that from the experience gained over the years this might be a feasible objective. To determine whether such statutory standards now can be drafted means a study of whether an agency by rule has set up standards for the processing of cases and how it actually has been processing such cases in the light of these standards. This means a study of some decisions which have been rendered.

Parenthetically, I might observe that this does not mean a review of the cases themselves but a study of the cases only to determine whether patterns may exist. I make such parenthetical observation because, contrary to some impression that may have been given you last fall by members of the staff, it has not been and is not now our intent to review individual cases as to whether or not the proper decision itself was made. There are proper procedures in each statute by which applicants can pursue their rights if they feel they have been violated in the agency decision. Our review is for the purposes of determining what legislative correction, modification, expansion, or other amendment such studies show should be made in the public interest and of determining whether present law is being properly administered. Of course, in the study of the cases there well may be certain matters coming to the fore that will require specific attention.

Another case study for purposes of determining whether clearer legislative standards may be written is that having to do with exemptions from regulations in contradistinction to that having to do with the processing of applications for cases within the regulatory field. It is just as clear that administrative practices here and the experience of the years should lead to the establishment of standards by the agency if not in the statute.

At the same time, of course, we are continuing with our consideration of the independence of the agencies. In the hearings so far, there has been some attention to the identification of the regulatory agency with those whom it regulates. The question of independence is broader than this, of course, and encompasses the freedom from restrictive action by the executive department as well as by Members of the Congress. In such connection we are studying the effect of the Reorganization Acts of 1950 which concentrated more power in the Chairman of the many Commissions and provided for his designation by the President. There are collateral questions of the extent to which the agency budget or personnel should come within the purview of the Bureau of the Budget or the Civil Service Commission.

Finally, I cannot refrain from briefly commenting upon the bar proposals which provide generally for more formal procedures and greater uniformity of procedure among the various agencies regardless of the subject matter within their jurisdiction. At this juncture I can see no gain in creating new standing committees in the Congress or a new overriding executive agency having dominance in this field. I believe there is a grave question whether too much formalizing of procedures and insulation of the Commissioners from their staffs through making a commissionership in effect a judgeship is in the public interest. The theory, of course, of the independent regulatory agency is that the Commissioners there are acting in the public interest, on behalf of the public, and for the protection of the public. A recent trend to have them sit as judges on a record in which the applicant is represented by counsel and the public by the staff of the Commission seems to me to do violence to the very principles and purposes under which the Commissions were created. The Commissioners, not the staffs, are charged with administering the law in the public interest.

With the general proposal to overhaul the Administrative Procedures Act, however, I am in full agreement, although I am not certain that my solution would be the same as that proposed by your legislative committees. Our hearings to date already have indicated the need for changes in administrative procedures as they apply to one agency. I assume that the same consideration will apply to others.

Of course, in the evaluation of any recommendations for modifications of administrative procedures, the major question is whether the proposed modification is in the public interest. One of the great difficulties, of course, in streamlining procedures, in expediting cases, in the securing of early decisions, is that to some degree such accomplishments perforce may diminish the workload on you who specialize in practice before these agencies. I am sure, however, that it is your desire as well as ours that there be improvement in these procedures wherever examination shows that this is desired.

I believe in this connection I can best close by quoting the words of your past chairman, Donald C. Beelar, in a recent Federal Bar Journal article in which he refers to the preamble to the Canons of Professional Ethics, which reads:

"In America, where the stability of courts and all departments of Government rests upon the approval of the people, it is peculiarly essential that the system for establishing and dispensing justice be developed to a high point of efficiency and so maintained that the public shall have absolute confidence in the integrity and impartiality of its administration."

And Mr. Beelar says:

"No difference should exist between those in private practice or in government practice on the above quoted objective of achieving a high integrity in agency processes in better service to the public."

Finally, I cannot refrain from briefly commenting upon the bar proposals which provide generally for more formal procedures and greater uniformity of procedure among the various agencies regardless of the subject matter within their jurisdiction. At this juncture I can see no gain in creating new standing committees in the Congress or a new overriding executive agency having dominance in this field. I believe there is a grave question whether too much formalizing of procedures and insulation of the Commissioners from their staffs through making a commissionership in effect a judgeship is in the public interest. The theory, of course, of the independent regulatory agency is that the Commissioners there are acting in the public interest, on behalf of the public, and for the protection of the public. A recent trend to have them sit as judges on a record in which the applicant is represented by counsel and the public by the staff of the Commission seems to me to do violence to the very principles and purposes under which the Commissions were created. The Commissioners, not the staffs, are charged with administering the law in the public interest.

With the general proposal to overhaul the Administrative Procedures Act, however, I am in full agreement although I am not certain that my solution would be the same as that proposed by your legislative committees. Our hearings to date already have indicated the need for changes in administrative procedures as they apply to one agency. I assume that the same consideration will apply to others.

Of course, in the evaluation of any recommendations for modifications of administrative procedures, the major question is whether the proposed modification is in the public interest. One of the great difficulties, of course, in streamlining procedures, in expediting cases, in the securing of early decisions, is that to some degree such accomplishments perforce may diminish the workload on you who specialize in practice

before these agencies. I am sure, however, that it is your desire as well as ours that there be improvement in these procedures wherever examination shows that this is desired.

I believe in this connection I can best close by quoting the words of your past chairman, Donald C. Beelar, in a recent Federal Bar Journal article in which he refers to the preamble to the Canons of Professional Ethics, which reads:

"In America, where the stability of courts and all departments of Government rests upon the approval of the people, it is peculiarly essential that the system for establishing and dispensing Justice be developed to a high point of efficiency and so maintained that the public shall have absolute confidence in the integrity and impartiality of its administration."

And Mr. Beelar says:

"No difference should exist between those in private practice or in government practice on the above quoted objective of achieving a high integrity in agency processes in better service to the public."

I have appreciated being with you tonight before an understanding—yes, even a tolerant—audience because there are none who have a greater duty and obligation to stand in the role of protectors of the public interest than do you who have day-to-day contacts with the administrative agencies through your practice before them. I am certain that as you attorneys and members of the bar faithfully perform this role and as we in the Congress adequately discharge our legislative responsibilities, we shall have, and continue to have, administrative agencies that properly and fully execute the laws that have been entrusted to them for administration in the public interest.

Proposal by Senator Monroney To Establish International Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we have been hearing a great deal over the past several months about the proposal of the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] relative to his idea of a world bank. As one of those who think there is a great deal of merit in his proposal, and one which I would hope the administration would consider seriously, in view of the continuation of the foreign aid program on a long term basis, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Montpelier (Vt.) Argus of March 25, 1958, and an article from the Las Vegas Sun of March 23, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Montpelier (Vt.) Argus of March 25, 1958]

WORTH LOOKING INTO

In the never-ending search for expanded world markets it is only logical to look to the underdeveloped nations as a prospective source of new trade and commerce. Russia is already doing so, and is wooing such nations with low-interest loans to pump new life into their economies. The Soviet quite likely is expecting a substantial return in psychological value as well as fresh avenues of trade.

It behooves the free world to examine not only the possibilities presented by such a course of action but the consequences that might result if the democracies falter. In the war of democracy versus communism, democracy needs all the friends she can find.

This is substantially what Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, a Democrat, had in mind when he offered the idea of creating an International Development Association.

As we under stand the proposal, the Association would be affiliated with the World Bank and be authorized to make mixed-currency, low-interest loans to spur economic development of the underdeveloped countries. The international agency would be able to make loans that the World Bank cannot make.

In other words, the loans made by the international agency would be subject to more risk than World Bank loans and could be taken without a government guaranty.

The United States, of course, would play an important role in any such scheme, taking 30 percent of the billion-dollar stock proposed by MONRONEY. The rest of the stock would be taken by the other World Bank members—59 of them.

The semi-isolationists will undoubtedly look on the proposal as another of those fool plans to give away American money. But before they holler too loudly they might be reminded that no less a personage than Eugene R. Black, president of the World Bank, thinks the plan at least merits close examination.

And Mr. Black, the conservatives among us can rest assured, is a pretty sound banker who isn't accustomed to giving money away—or even loaning it without some substantial reason.

In addition to the good politics and good business of such a plan—as measured in terms of international affairs—there are also the humanitarian aspects of assisting underdeveloped nations to the best of our abilities.

No such economic assistance can any longer be measured entirely in terms of dollars and cents. There is an investment in humanity attached, and, as in foreign aid, an investment in security and freedom.

Those who want proof of the business need don't have to look beyond a comparison of United States imports and exports. In 1957, for example, the country exported nearly $22 billion in commerce and imported at a rate of only $13 billion. What are we going to do to lessen this gap?

Undoubtedly the Monroney plan is not ideal. But as Mr. Black says, it should be examined.

[From the Las Vegas Sun of March 23, 1958]

SENATOR MONRONEY'S BANK IDEA GOOD

A proposal by Senator MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma to establish an international bank which would lend money at lower rates and with less security than the present World Bank is deserving of serious consideration.

It would be linked to the World Bank and its purpose would be to make loans in mixed currencies (dollars and other national currencies). The loans would be repayable in the currencies of the borrowers instead of dollars or other hard currencies (i. e., currencies readily exchangeable for gold or dollars).

Loans would be under control of an international, multilateral group. Presumably they would be free from what some people have regarded as a sort of dollar veto which arises from the World Bank's rule that loans can be made only where there is prospect of repayment in hard currency.

Senator MONRONEY'S suggestion makes good sense. Whether it is beyond criticism in all details is beside the point. It is a serious and intelligent attack on a weakness in Western competition with Russia. With every ruble Krushchev spends in his stepped-up economic offensive this competition becomes keener.

In connection with this, the plan would clear as economically feasible loans the Kremlin is perfectly ready to make but which do not meet the requirements of the World Bank, Western governments or most private investors in western countries.

Any realistic plan to shift the emphasis in our own approach to foreign aid deserves careful consideration.

For too long now, the United States has been pouring millions and billions into foreign countries and all we have received in return is vicious propaganda depicting us as Uncle Sugar and Uncle Shylock.

The MONRONEY bank plan is a statesmanly approach to solving the economic ills of countries friendly to the United States, plus the added value of winning friends instead of economically intimidating people.

Aid of Young Nations Through International Banking Machinery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Oklahoma City Oklahoman of March 19, 1958, entitled "MONRONEY'S New Look," which represents an advocacy of an international banking machinery to aid young nations.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oklahoma City Oklahoman of March 19, 1958]

MONRONEY'S NEW LOOK

Senator MONRONEY thinks the once young and vigorous foreign-aid program bequeathed by President Truman is now old, tired, weary, haggard, and worn out.

He's convinced that we need to take a new look at foreign aid. The Senator has been doing his own looking and is suggesting a fresh approach to the International Finance Subcommittee this week.

MONRONEY embodies his fresh approach in a Senate resolution he describes as "an effort to facilitate economic development of young nations through international banking machinery instead of through United States loans and grants."

In the circles where foreign aid is usually accepted as a more or less permanent way of life the Senator's plan elicits a great deal of polite applause. Its details remain to be worked out but broadly it envisages a companion agency to the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development (World Bank) to make loans in mixtures of hard and soft currencies on terms more favorable than the World Bank can advance. Senator MONRONEY points out that the World Bank can't make project loans which may be good but impossible of repayment in dollars or other hard currencies over the 20-year required term. He thinks that therein lies our opportunity.

As a starter, Senator MONRONEY's proposed International Development Association would need an original capital of a billion dollars in hard currencies of which the United States would put up 30 percent, or $300 million. By mixing local currencies with hard currencies MONRONEY feels $1 could be made to do the work of many dollars now being spent. He says that would help us to put to work the vast amount of local currencies we have received and will receive from sales of our agricultural surpluses abroad.

The Senator plainly regards his program as a replacement for the economic development loans provided in the existing foreign-aid program. In order to qualify as a fresh approach, his plan would have to eliminate some existing phase of the foreign-aid program and not simply become a further accretion to it. The Senator would substitute his program for the additional $625 million that Secretary Dulles is asking for development loans in the new foreign-aid budget.

In view of parliamentary and political red-tape the Senator isn't likely to get his project going this year even if the Senate acts favorably. In the meantime the existing economic-aid programs will presumably be continued. It is only important to note that the Senator's proposed $1 billion of capitalization is represented as a starter. By his own estimate the Senator's suggested TVA-type joint watershed development loan to India and Pakistan would require $400 million alone. As it turned out the original Marshall plan was only a starter. It and succeeding foreign-aid schemes have now cost the American taxpayers about $60 billion.

It is evident that the United States can't continue to export at a rate nearly twice its import rate. It is also evident that in the interim between now and the perfection of the intercontinental ballistic missile the United States will need foreign bases and foreign friends. Presumably also it will continue to have embarrassing farm surpluses to trade for embarrassing surpluses of foreign soft currencies.

But instead of a fresh approach through refinancing maybe the present need is a fresh definition of the motivations behind the various far-reaching activities loosely lumped together as foreign aid. With the perfection of the ICBM and the missile-carrying submarine fleet the present military justification could quickly recede. Would foreign aid then serve principally to finance surplus crop dumping or factory exports?

It is true that the program bequeathed by President Truman is now tired, weary, and haggard. It ought to be tired. It has outlived by 6 years the 4-year envisaged life of the original Marshall plan. The birth of MONRONEY's new plan is worth a 31-gun salute only if it is accompanied by the long overdue death of unilateral foreign economic aid.

Publicity for Income Sources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one sure way to create public confidence in Government is to eliminate conflict-of-interest situations in decision-making. One way to eliminate conflict-of-interest is to make public the sources of income of decision-makers. This point is underscored in an excellent editorial in Labor, a national weekly newspaper published by 16 railroad labor organizations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Goldfish Bowl?" which appeared in the April 26 issue of Labor.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

NO GOLDFISH BOWL?

President Eisenhower last week rejected the idea that Members of Congress should make public all their outside sources of income. As for high administration officials and members of Federal regulatory commissions doing so, Ike said, "I have never thought about it, and so at this moment I certainly wouldn't express a conviction."

The President was questioned on the subject at his news conference. The idea of requiring high officials to reveal their private incomes has been revived recently because of scandals in the Federal Communications Commission.

Actually, however, the idea is an old one. Back in 1951, President Truman asked Congress to require all Members of Congress and all Federal officials and military officers paid over $10,000 a year to reveal their private sources of income.

In the same year a Senate subcommittee investigating corruption, headed by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, urged the same thing. More recently Senators MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat of Montana, and WAYNE MORSE, Democrat of Oregon, and some other legislators have also sought such a measure.

Nothing has come of any of these efforts, and President Eisenhower's opposition seemed to kill any chance of uncovering the full network of private personal interests held by high Washington officials.

Quite a few Members of Congress have proposed legislation requiring union leaders to disclose all their sources of income. If the idea is good for labor, why not for the lawmakers and Federal officials, too?

William Manger, Assistant Secretary General of Organization of American States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the May issue of Americas magazine, entitled "Right Hand Man, William Manger, OAS Assistant Secretary General."

Dr. Manger has without question made a great contribution in furtherance of the objectives of the Organization of American States. He will retire on May 18 of this year. I know that the services which he has rendered will be appreciated by all of us in the United States, as well as those in every country of Latin America. His leadership has done a great deal toward promoting and cementing the ties of friendship between the United States and our Latin American neighbors.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIGHT-HAND MAN WILLIAM MANGER OAS ASSISTANT SECRETARY GENERAL

(By Harry W. Frantz)

"I have always said that I am a very fortunate man. One of my greatest fortunes is the opportunity that I have had to know and to be associated with representative men not only of 1 country but of 21 countries." These were OAS Assistant Secretary General William Manger's opening words when he went before the Council last November 14 to announce his "determination to retire" when his term expires May 18. As farewells are said, Washington observers will perceive that one of the ablest craftsmen of the inter-American diplomatic structure will be taking his leave. He is esteemed much like a university professor about to become emeritus.

For 43 years "Doctor" Manger—as he is known to all, though he refers to himself simply as "Mister"—has been an integral part of the Pan American Union, no less familiar to the OAS staff and the Washington diplomatic corps than the Aztec fountain, the brightly colored macaws in the patio, or the white-trunked sycamores on the beautiful grounds. The marble exterior of the original building, built in 1910, has yellowed a little and the stone steps have worn smooth since Manger, as a boy of 16, came here to work in April 1915.

In recent years Dr. Manger has occupied a second-floor office in the southeast corner of the old building with a splendid view of the Mall and the Washington monument. The door is always open—to diplomats, government officials, reporters, visitors, OAS employees, in short, anyone who has need of his knowledge or his counsel. On the walls are the portraits of four men who inspired him in his youth: Andrew Carnegie, who largely financed the construction of the main building; Esteban Gil Borges, the celebrated Venezuelan diplomat; Leo S. Rowe, Director General of the Union for 25 years; and Francisco Javier Yanes, Assistant Director from 1910 to 1924.

When Dr. Manger completed 40 years of service in 1955, the OAS Council met in his honor. Ambassadors vied in expressions of tribute and appreciation, but he has always thought of himself as only "an inter-American civil servant." He would be the last to claim any personal credit for the transformation of an institution that in 1915 was little more than an international commercial bureau into the most powerful political, economic, and cultural regional system in the world—the Organization of American States.

William Manger was born in Richmond, Va., on September 22, 1899, the son of George and Helena (Lenz) Manger. In 1915 he was attending a private school in Washington, contemplating a business career. The Pan American Union was looking for a file clerk, and young Manger took the job. His supervisor, Mrs. William J. Kavanaugh, who soon recognized his unusual talent and diligence, urged him to continue his education and to specialize in Latin American history and inter-American affairs.

By dint of hard work and self-sacrifice, Manger rose from one position to another. After office hours he attended Georgetown University, where he received his bachelor of laws degree in 1921, his master of science in 1923, and his doctor of philosophy in 1926. His doctoral thesis was on the protection of foreign investments, then as now a key topic in inter-American affairs. In July 1923 he became the chief of the PAU financial section, and for the next 9 years he worked unstintingly at preparing a number of valuable annual publications, assembling documentary material and drawing up preliminary

nary agenda and regulations for inter-American conferences, and guiding the Union's first efforts in the public-relations field. During this time Dr. Manger did a great deal of the complex preparatory work that led to the permanent establishment of Pan American Day. The formal proposal, which was made by Brazilian Ambassador S. Gurgel do Amaral to the PAU governing board, was adopted in 1930, and the first official celebration of the day was held the following year.

In February 1934 Dr. Manger became counselor of the Union, and continued to devote much of his time to the behind-the-scenes but nonetheless essential and highly technical activities involved in preparing for inter-American conferences and in putting into effect the resolutions that came out of these meetings.

Eleven years ago, on July 2, 1947, Dr. Manger was unanimously elected assistant director of the Union by the governing board, a position he has held ever since, though the name was officially changed with the signing of the charter at Bogotá in 1948. From that time he has been Assistant Secretary General of the Organization of American States. The governing board, incidentally, became the OAS council.

Even Dr. Manger's personal life has been closely identified with the Pan American Union. On June 30, 1923, he married Anna Kleiser, secretary to PAU counselor Franklin Adams. They have 2 sons, William Franklin and John Edwin, and 3 charming grandchildren. For same years the Mangers lived in a small house (now the offices of Americas) on the Union grounds, and Dr. Manger was willingly on call 24 hours a day. Now their home is in northwest Washington close by Rock Creek Park, where he still enjoys an occasional hike. His out-of-office interests have always been his family and, in recent years, his garden. At one time he shared Dr. Rowe's enthusiasm for tennis, and he smokes a pipe and Habana cigars—his closest friends can recall nothing more sensational about him.

Dr. Manger has quietly served as right-hand man and expert informant to six chiefs of the Pan American Union: John Barrett, Leo S. Rowe, Pedro de Alba (acting director for some months after Dr. Rowe's death), Alberto Lleras Camargo, Carlos Dávila, and José A. Mora. Besides handling multiple routine tasks in Washington, he has been attending international conferences all over this hemisphere since 1923. The first was the Santiago Conference that year, concerned primarily with disarmament in the Americas; then the Habana Conference in 1928, which adopted Pan American codes of public and private international law; the Montevideo Conference in 1933, which approved the nonintervention declaration; the Lima Conference in 1938, which established the principle of inter-American consultation; the Bogotá Conference in 1948, which approved the Charter of the OAS; and the Caracas Conference in 1954, which adopted measures to discourage communism in the Western Hemisphere. He has also participated, in a technical capacity, in the four Meetings of Consultation of the Foreign Ministers of the American Republics; at Panama in 1939, Havana in 1940, Rio de Janeiro in 1942, and Washington in 1951. Dr. Manger was secretary general of the fourth meeting. He attended the Chapultepec Conference in Mexico City in 1945, which charted the course for preservation of the inter-American regional system within the projected United Nations Charter. Apart from actual attendance, Dr. Manger has helped with the preparatory and administrative work on so many technical and special-purpose inter-American conferences that only he himself could now give all the dates and places.

Of particular importance to Western Hemisphere newspapermen was the First Pan American Congress of Journalists, held in Washington, April 7–13, 1926. In point of distinguished attendance, broad achievements, and valuable documentation, this Congress is still remembered as the most significant press meeting ever held in this hemisphere. Dr. Manger served as secretary general of the Congress and, as I have mentioned, in those days was personally conducting the Pan American Union's press relations.

At all these historic assemblies, Dr. Manger's principal function was to apply the Pan American Union facilities to the preparation, smooth organization, and post-conference fulfillment of resolutions. As a result, he became acquainted with an extraordinary number of American statesmen and foreign-office and embassy officials on all levels. Among his many unreserved admirers was Senator Arthur Vandenberg, the architect of the Rio de Janeiro mutual-security treaty.

Add to this imposing list of duties and accomplishments Dr. Manger's efforts to establish close cooperation between the Pan American Union and women's organizations, schools and universities, chambers of commerce, libraries and other institutions, and his personal influence on inter-American relations becomes even more evident. Yet despite his multiple services—and many of them on dramatic occasions—Dr. Manger has rarely emerged from his willingly accepted—indeed, preferred—behind-the-scenes role. Countless reporters have called at his office, only to return to their typewriters to chronicle the plans and achievements of others. As he retires, newsmen will give Dr. Manger their accolade for that most esteemed public service: the cheerful acceptance of urgent telephone calls at home and at any hour.

The key to Dr. Manger's success, long-time colleagues suggest, is an extraordinary capacity both for writing and using official documents. The contents of his many bookcases are almost entirely the records, proceedings, and annals of the inter-American system. A reporter entering his office unannounced would probably find him working at his desk, but whenever a question called for a precise answer, Dr. Manger would quickly turn to an appropriate reference volume. Then, with the visitor, he would sit down at a large round mahogany table to find the exact information.

This punctiliousness has over the years earned Dr. Manger a well-deserved reputation for encyclopedic knowledge of Pan American affairs. The hundreds of articles, pamphlets, and background documents he has written are the backbone of diplomatic documentation in this field.

Rarely has he written in a personal, nonofficial vein. One exception was an article for the Pan American Union Bulletin in 1937: A Rendezvous with Life—A Voyage to South America. Speculating about his ship companions, he wrote: "Here we have a real cross section of the life of a continent. * * * Traveling on a ship of this character * * * is in itself a liberal education that gives one an insight into what the people of other parts of the continent are thinking and what they are doing. Contact with them is an admirable introduction to the countries one is planning to visit."

For the past 25 years Dr. Manger has been lecturing at Georgetown University, and after he leaves the Union he plans to continue in an academic career. He will give courses at the Georgetown School of Foreign Service on Latin American history and will conduct a seminar in the graduate school on politics and governments of Latin America. He will also continue to write on international affairs in the Western Hemisphere. Incidentally, his best-known publications in this field, written for the Pan American Union, are The Basic Principles of the Inter-American System and Pan American Postwar Organization. The latter was published in 1944 and was an invaluable guide to government officials and diplomats who were anticipating the international readjustments certain to follow the war.

Many people will remember Dr. Manger as a gracious but unostentatious host at countless functions in the Hall of the Americas and at open-air concerts on moonlit nights in the Aztec garden. Others will picture him as he swiftly delivered documents to conference tables and whispered information or advice. There was always something quiet and deft about such minor transactions that seemed to inspire confidence. Swift recall and a tremendous accumulation of facts made him an ideal conference aid.

Diplomats and students of inter-American affairs are keenly aware that William Manger's tireless efforts, his "know-how," and his constant purpose have made a real and lasting contribution to friendship and cooperation among the American nations. He has helped to give the regional system an internal sense of tradition and to foster its day-by-day technical efficiency. In decades to come, there will be thousands of such civil servants. But Dr. Manger will always be remembered as the pioneer.

Statement of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson Before the House Committee on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement made by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson to the Committee on Agriculture:

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE EZRA TAFT BENSON BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, MAY 1, 1958

I am pleased to discuss with you the dairy situation, and particularly the various dairy stabilization bills introduced by Members of of House of Representatives with a view to helping dairy producers.

It is most appropriate for this committee to consider the problems of the dairy industry and possible solutions. From the standpoint of numbers of farmers engaged in selling dairy products and the income derived therefrom, dairying is one of the important segments of agriculture. The dairy enterprise ranks second as a source of income to farmers, being exceeded only by beef cattle.

The importance of the industry has long been recognized by the Department and much constructive action has been taken to assist dairy farmers. We recognize, of course, that numerous problems remain to be solved, even though in 1957 cash receipts to farmers from sales of dairy products totaled $4,643,000,000, the highest on record.

ACTIONS TAKEN TO ASSIST DAIRY PRODUCERS

The Department of Agriculture is helping the dairy industry to achieve more efficient production and marketing through research and education and through promotion and merchandising programs.

For years the Department has made great efforts to achieve increased efficiency in milk production through improved breeding, better feeding, and other desirable farm practices. We have sought ways and means of producing and marketing at lower costs.

We have helped to develop and encourage new and expanded outlets for dairy products.

We recommended and the Congress enacted in 1954 the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, Public Law 480, to move surpluses into constructive use. Under this law we have moved a very large quantity of dairy products. This program has not only been of benefit to the dairy industry; it has also won much good will for this country.

Under title I of this law we have programed the export movement of dairy products equal to about 1.4 billion pounds milk equivalent, with a value of $71.8 million. We are using a substantial amount of foreign currency to develop markets abroad for our dairy products.

We should note that unless action is soon taken to extend Public Law 480, dairy producers will lose some of the benefits which otherwise would be derived from extension of title I of Public Law 480.

Under title II of this law we have programed for donation to various governments a total of $76.5 million of butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk. These donations have been made for famine and emergency relief as provided by the law.

Under title III we have also donated very large quantities of dairy products to private and other eligible welfare agencies. A small quantity has been moved through barter. We have donated under title III a total of around 1.6 million pounds of nonfat dry milk, 337 million pounds of butter and butter oil, and 516 million pounds of cheese.

We are improving the nutrition of many schoolchildren under the special milk program. This program, now in its 4th year, is currently being undertaken under legislative authority for the use of $75 million of CCC funds. It is operating in all the 48 States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, and Hawaii. A total of 1.8 billion half pints of milk were consumed by children under the program last year. The program has made it possible for many more children to drink more adequate quantities of milk. It has also contributed substantially to the effective operation of the dairy price support program.

We are also donating large quantities of dairy products for distribution to schools under the national school lunch program, to eligible institutions, and to needy persons in this country.

During the past fiscal year: 46 million pounds of butter, 32 million pounds of cheese, and 24 million pounds of nonfat dry milk were donated to the national school-lunch program; 9 million pounds of butter, almost 16 million pounds of cheese, and 16 million pounds of nonfat dry milk were donated to eligible institutions; 12½ million pounds of butter, 72 million pounds of cheese, and 83 million pounds of nonfat dry milk were donated to needy persons in the United States.

We have also made large quantities of surplus butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk available for increased use by veterans' hospital patients and military personnel. A total of 23 million pounds of butter and nearly 2 million pounds of cheese have been transferred to the military agencies during the past 5 years. These transfers increased consumption of dairy products by military personnel and veterans' hospital patients over and above their normal use.

Under another special program, for which the Department pays part of the cost, the United States Armed Forces have more than doubled their consumption of fluid milk. In 1957 the military personnel used about 560 million pints of milk more than they would otherwise have consumed. This program comes under provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1954 which not only authorizes purchase of fluid milk in carrying out the mandatory dairy price support operations, but also provides that CCC stocks of dairy products may be transferred for increased use by the Armed Forces.

Consumption of milk by veterans' hospital patients also has been increased.

We have made excellent progress during the past year under the accelerated brucellosis program. At the present time approximately one-third of all of the counties in the United States, including all of 11 States and Puerto Rico, have qualified as modified-certified areas. This means that the incidence of the disease does not exceed 1 percent of the cattle and 5 percent of the herds. If the program is continued at the present rate, it is expected that around 90 percent of the States will be certified by 1960.

Major efforts in our current dairy production research involve: (1) the national cooperative dairy herd improvement and sire proving program; and (2) breeding, nutrition, herd management, and physiological research. In our current utilization research program we are emphasizing: (1) Research into preparation of improved dry whole milk, particularly as to keeping qualities, improvements in flavor, reconstitutability and reduction in bulk; (2) fundamental research on cheese to obtain better quality and reduced costs of production; and (3) developing new and expanded uses of other dairy products.

Our research on marketing problems of the dairy industry is being directed particularly at market expansion for dairy products. We are studying market potentials and seeking more effective methods of presenting dairy products for purchase by consumers. We are surveying consumer buying habits, preferences and other factors affecting purchases.

We are also studying factors bearing on costs and efficiency of marketing dairy products. These range from simple measurements of the farm-to-retail price spreads on a number of products to detailed engineering studies of various processing and marketing operations. New developments such as the shift from handling milk on farms in cans to handling it in bulk tanks may necessitate changes in the structure of the industry. Some of the Department's research is aimed at helping the dairy industry adapt its structure to such new developments.

In summary we are taking all the sound and constructive steps available to increase the use of dairy products. We are continuing to cooperate closely with the dairy industry in promotion and merchandising programs. We have urged the continuation of the Public Law 480 programs and also the programs designed to increase the consumption of fluid milk by children and military personnel. We are carrying out research and field education efforts to make more efficient the handling and marketing of milk and other dairy products. Butter, cheese, and dry milk continue to be donated to the school lunch program, to charitable institutions, and to needy persons not only for the purpose of reducing surpluses, but also as a means of developing and strengthening markets. Dairy products will be exported in increased volume when this can appropriately be done. Efforts will be continued to encourage the development and expansion of domestic and foreign markets for dairy products for the long-time benefit of our dairy farmers.

PROVISIONS OF THE DAIRY STABILIZATION BILLS

Self-help efforts, as distinct from government programs, are to be encouraged and aided. Self-help is in the American tradition—and a far more healthy, progressive, prosperous agriculture flows from individual planning, self-reliance, and self-help than can ever be achieved through dependence on Government.

The self-help principle in its broad sense is a most desirable objective for the dairy industry. Yet I find it necessary to recommend against the enactment of legislation such as embodied in H. R. 10043, H. R. 9743, H. R. 10060, and other bills which have been presented as self-help measures. Much as I regret the need for this decision, there are compelling reasons.

The reasons lie in the principal provisions of the bills. They are not truly self-help measures.

1. These bills would create in the Department of Agriculture, as an independent agency and instrumentality of the United States, a Federal Dairy Stabilization Board. The Board would consist of 15 milk producers or officers of dairy cooperatives appointed by the President from nominees selected on a regional basis by milk producers. The Secretary of Agriculture would be an ex officio member without vote. The Board could use employees and services of any Federal agency. Or it could set up its own staff outside the civil-service system.

2. These bills would require the Secretary of Agriculture to appoint a Federal Dairy Advisory Committee of 12 members. They would represent manufacturers, processors, handlers, and distributors of milk and its products, consumers, other agricultural commodities or programs, and other interests directly concerned with the operation of the act. The committee would confer with and advise the Board concerning the dairy stabilization program.

3. These bills would give to the Board almost unlimited authority to acquire facilities and to acquire, process, store, sell, donate, advertise, and otherwise handle milk and dairy products.

4. These bills would authorize and direct the Board to stabilize prices of milk and butterfat to producers and to determine and announce price support levels. The Board would take into consideration such factors as the declared policy of the act, the importance of milk and dairy products to the health and general welfare of the Nation, and the estimated supply and demand situation for milk and its products. Other factors would be the support level for feeds; the cost of producing, processing, and marketing milk and dairy products; relative prices of other foods; hourly returns for labor; and the need for and reasonable relationship between the prices that farmers receive and pay.

5. These bills would authorize and direct the Board to carry out price support through purchases of milk, butterfat, or other dairy products. They would give to the Board the same broad authority that CCC now has to sell, donate, or barter any dairy products acquired by it, in domestic and foreign outlets, and for use by the armed services, in school lunches, and for welfare uses.

6. The Board could transfer to CCC, or dispose of for CCC account, quantities of dairy products equal to imports of dairy products and the increased production of milk and butterfat resulting from diversion from production of other commodities under control programs. CCC would be required to pay to the Board the full cost of such products. United States Government agencies would be required to cooperate with the Board in the disposal of dairy products acquired by the Board by barter, exchange for foreign assets or currencies, and in the use of foreign currencies in connection with relief distribution, or procurement activities.

7. Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determined, after public hearing, that the Board's operations had resulted, or would result, in unreasonably high prices to producers, he must prescribe a support level and recommend action by the Board. If the Board did not take such action, the Secretary could petition the United States Court of Appeals for a decree directing the Board to take such action or to cease and desist from other action.

8. The Board could borrow money from anyone, pledging dairy products as collateral

or without security. CCC would be required to loan to the Board, without security, amounts requested by the Board up to $350 million outstanding at any one time.

9. The Board would be required to determine marketing assessments to cover cost of price supports, except costs due to imports and crop diversions. Whenever marketing allotments were in effect, the Board could establish different assessment rates for producers' sales within allotments and sales in excess of allotments. The first buyers of milk and butterfat from producers would withhold the assessments from prices paid producers and would pay the assessments to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. There would be appropriated, for use by the Board, sums equal to the assessments collected. Marketing assessments also would be collected on imports of dairy products, for use by the Board.

10. These bills would require the Board to put into effect a marketing allotment program for any marketing year when the marketing assessment would exceed a given figure, such as 25 cents per hundredweight of milk. The Board would allocate bases to individual producers, taking into consideration historical production, trends, and other factors. It would allocate the available markets to producers annually and would issue marketing certificates to producers covering their marketing allocations.

11. A referendum would be held to determine whether dairy farmers favor a dairy stabilization program as provided in these bills or a price support program as provided by the Agricultural Act of 1949. If producers approved the dairy stabilization program the Board would be required to support prices to producers for milk and butterfat for the marketing year beginning April 1, 1959, at 90 percent of parity. The marketing assessment would be 25 cents per hundredweight of milk or milk equivalent. In computing the support level for manufacturing milk, the Board would be required to use the July 1946–December 1948 average ratio instead of the lower last 10-year average ratio of manufacturing milk price to all milk price. Thereafter the Board would set the support levels and the assessment rates. The Board's stabilization program would be subject to subsequent referendum to determine whether it should be continued or discontinued, if 10 percent of the producers petitioned for such referendum.

12. The Board's operations would be exempt from taxes, antitrust actions, and other laws applicable to Government contracts.

13. These bills would suspend dairy price support operations by the Secretary during the Board's operations.

SERIOUS QUESTIONS INVOLVED

These bills represent an effort by representatives of dairy producers to develop a self-help program under which a large part of the cost of dairy price support operations would be transferred from the Federal Government to the producers. Self-help objectives, I repeat, are meritorious and warrant careful consideration. However, there are several provisions in these bills which raise important questions regarding delegation of authority and responsibility, the lack of limits on price support level, and administrative feasibility.

Broad authority with respect to dairy price support operations would be vested in an independent board of producer representatives. If producers initially voted in favor of the stabilization program, the Board would determine the level of support and the amounts of assessments on producers' sales of milk and butterfat after the first year. Producers would have further opportunity to approve or disapprove the Board's actions only if 10 percent of the producers petitioned for another referendum.

The Board could act without the approval of either the Secretary of Agriculture or the President. Moreover, the guiding standards in these bills are very broad. Except for the first year, they do not specify any maximum or minimum limit on support level. It appears advisable for the Congress to continue to determine the criteria and maximum support levels for agricultural commodities.

A second question is whether the authority and responsibility for agricultural price supports should be divided. The Secretary of Agriculture now has the responsibility for operating a consistent and balanced agricultural program. These bills would give an independent board authority to conduct programs for dairy products. It is believed that the coordination of the farm program as a whole would be best accomplished by continuing a unified authority and responsibility for price support operations for all commodities.

The provision for review, recommendation, and petition by the Secretary of Agriculture for court action—to require the Board to take the recommended action or to cease and desist from other actions—would be impracticable. The time involved in hearings and court procedures would be excessive. An unsatisfactory relationship might develop between the Secretary and the Board with respect to authority and responsibility for price support operations.

Furthermore, it is not advisable that questions between Federal administrative agencies and officials regarding administration of Federal laws and programs be taken to and resolved in the courts.

The stabilization program would go into effect if a majority of the producers voting in the referendum favored it. Under some of these bills the Secretary would be directed to consider the vote of any cooperative association of milk producers bona fide engaged in marketing milk, butterfat, or dairy products for producers as the vote of the producers in such cooperative. Other self-help dairy bills do not provide for such method of voting but require individual voting.

If producers voted in favor of the stabilization program, the support level for the first year would be 90 percent of the parity price for butterfat and 90 percent of the parity equivalent price for manufacturing milk. The base period would be the 30-month (July 1946-December 1948) average ratio of 88 percent between the price of manufacturing milk and the price of all milk, instead of the last 10-year average ratio now used, which for 1958 is 81.2 percent. Based on the March 1958 price of all milk, different percentages of the parity equivalent price of manufacturing milk as computed by the present method and the proposed method are as follows:

	Present method (basis 10-year average)	Proposed method (basis July 1946–December 1948 average)
Parity price of all milk at wholesale per hundredweight	$5.02	$5.02
Ratio of manufacturing milk to all milk prices (percent)	81.2	88.0
Parity equivalent of manufacturing milk per hundredweight:		
100 percent	$4.08	$4.42
90 percent	$3.67	$3.98
75 percent	$3.06	$3.31

Butterfat parity is not altered by the proposals. Based on March 1958 parity data, 90 percent of the parity price of butterfat would be 67.9 cents per pound as compared with the support price of 56.6 cents per pound announced for the current marketing year.

Thus, if producers voted in favor of the program, the following increases would be required over the 1957–58 support level:

Manufacturing milk: 73 cents per hundredweight, or 22 percent.

Butterfat: 9.3 cents per pound, or 16 percent. After deduction of the prescribed 25-cent assessment for the first year, the net support level would still be above the 1957–58 support level by 48 cents a hundredweight, or 15 percent, for manufacturing milk, and a somewhat lower percent for butterfat (depending upon how the butterfat assessment rates were computed). The effect of the increased support level would be to further encourage milk production. The higher support level would result in approximately corresponding relative increases in prices to consumers for milk and its products. This would decrease consumption.

It is apparent, therefore, that with similar production and marketing conditions a substantial increase in purchases of dairy products would be necessary to make the higher support level effective. This could result again in the accumulation of large stocks of dairy products, since the Board, operating as a Federal agency, would be confronted with the same problems of international trade and relationship as would be encountered under the present type of program.

The present method—computing the parity equivalent of the price of manufacturing milk by administrative determination—is preferable to fixing by law a method that requires the use of a relationship that existed 10 years or more ago. Moreover, the present method of using the latest 10-year average relationship allows for trends and is consistent with the modernized parity provisions of existing legislation.

It appears preferable for Congress to continue to leave to administrative determination the actual level of support within prescribed ranges rather than to prescribe specific levels of support for specific years.

The bills would require marketing allotments on sales of milk and butterfat by individual producers if the marketing assessment would exceed 25 cents per hundredweight of milk. The apparent purpose of such allotments is to make it possible to establish relatively high assessment rates on overquota sales. The objective is to tax the surplus out of existence. This provision warrants careful consideration.

Much study has been given to the feasibility of a dairy allotment program by the Department of Agriculture, the dairy industry, and farm organizations. Very difficult administration problems would be involved. These are associated with seasonal variation in milk production and seasonal distribution of individual producer's allotments. Such allotments would be necessary in order that first buyers of milk and butterfat would know, when they paid for such milk and butterfat, the quantities on which they must deduct the differential assessment on overallotment milk and butterfat. These sums must be remitted monthly to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Because the experience with crop allotments has not been highly satisfactory, we are sure that such controls on dairy producers would be even less acceptable and successful in controlling output of dairy products. The Department questions the advisability of legislation that would require milk and butterfat allotments.

The bills would, in effect, exempt producers of milk and butterfat from self-financing dairy support operations attributable to imports of dairy products and to diversions from the production of other ag-

ricultural commodities resulting from such Federal production control measures as acreage allotments.

With respect to imports, section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, provides authority to restrict imports of dairy products to prevent their interference with the dairy price support program. With respect to diversion, there is no satisfactory basis for measuring the effects of crop acreage allotments, quota, and related programs on the production of milk. There are too many offsetting and immeasurable influences.

Milk production is influenced by numerous factors. These include the relative farm prices of milk, butterfat, and other commodities (including those subject to acreage allotments or marketing quotas), feed prices, supplies and quantities under loans, and technological developments in both crop and livestock production. It would be virtually impossible to determine with reasonable accuracy what part of the total milk production, or of the price-support purchases, should be attributed to each factor.

The self-help principle in its broad sense is a desirable objective for all agriculture. Reaching this goal calls for a better adjustment between production and consumption, more efficient production and marketing, more freedom from Government regulations and interference, and less dependence upon Government price supports and related programs.

It would appear, however, that several major policy considerations must be resolved before a definitive position can be taken with respect to this type of legislation. Such questions which the Congress should decide include:

1. The desirability of giving very broad authority on price support and related operations to a commodity board not directly subject to control by the legislative and executive branches.

2. The desirability of providing similar authority to other commodity groups. If so, there would be the need to set up a superboard to coordinate the decisions of the various independent commodity boards.

3. Since the granting of broad authority to agricultural commodity boards to fix minimum prices would be a reversal of the policies agriculture had advocated for over half a century on certain nonagricultural services, what should our position be with respect to these other controls? These include costs of services farmers buy, such as freight rates, truck transportation rates, electricity, etc.

4. What should be our policy with respect to providing adequate protection to the general public under the commodity board setup?

5. If a dairy board is set up, should the Secretary of Agriculture have veto power over its actions? In evaluating this policy consideration should be given to the following:

a. Which actions should be subject to veto?

b. Who would reconcile differences between the Secretary and the board?

c. Who would have responsibility for the decisions made?

d. To what extent would divided authority affect efficient operations?

e. To what extent would veto authority permit the Secretary to reconcile the price-support actions of the various commodity boards?

f. To what extent would a double review of every major action result in duplication of personnel?

6. How will the plans be financed to the extent the assessment does not cover costs? This question arises because while the various plans claim to be self-financing all call for the borrowing of large sums, such as $350 million from CCC with no provisions for repayment. If the plan is not successful and builds up a substantial deficit so that farmers vote to return to the present price support method in order to avoid paying high assessments, what happens to the unpaid obligations to CCC?

7. Because a single commodity board is not subject to the same overall commodity responsibility with respect to international relations as a Government agency, this commodity board approach on disposal operations could undo in the international field much of the good being done through other efforts.

CONCLUSION

The dairy industry already is using the self-help principle.

Many dairy farmers are helping themselves by producing milk more efficiently through better breeding, better feeding, culling, quality improvement, and other pratcices. They are also striving to improve the marketing of their milk and butterfat through cooperative actions. A major feature of the current revolution in the dairy industry is the establishment of modern, efficient processing plants, and the development of dairy products in packages more appealing to consumers. More effective merchandising by individual distributors is being supplemented by group advertising and promition of milk and its products. This is financed by farmers through voluntary deductions from the prices they receive for milk and butterfat.

Emphasis on increasing consumption of milk and its products in the regular commercial market channels offers the best solution to the dairy problem. It is estimated that if all households that are low on calcium were to raise their consumption to the recommended level, milk consumption would go up about 9 percent. This is roughly double our current annual purchases of dairy products for support purposes. Not only would it wipe out the surplus—it would call for a substantial increase in production.

Mr. Chairman, I shall be very happy to respond to such questions as you may have.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, people of Polish ancestry throughout the world will observe the 167th anniversary of the enactment of the famous Polish Constitution of 1791. At this time, I believe it is fitting that we pause to reflect upon the sacrifices made by the people of Poland in an effort to maintain the principles embodied in that historical document.

Although Poland has been subjugated many times since the adoption of her constitution, her people have maintained their patriotism and moral resistance. The events of October 1956 and the Poznan revolt clearly illustrate the resistance of the Polish people to Soviet control and their aversion to communism. They realize that Communist concepts of economy and industrial planning have brought them to the brink of disaster. Their desire for liberty is strong and will eventually lead them to victory over their oppressors.

I wish to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the noble people of Poland, who, by reason of their fortitude and love of freedom, are a source of inspiration to oppressed people everywhere. I look forward to the day when Poland will have obtained complete independence.

The Pearl Harbor Complex

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Mr. Walter Lippmann is one of the most penetrating and enlightening commentators in America. In an article appearing in today's papers, Mr. Lippmann points out how tremendously important it is for America to get over her Pearl Harbor complex. Mr. Lippmann writes eloquently that our military and economic policies are paralyzed by an hypnotic infatuation with the possibility of a nuclear knockout blow. He says that after we take all the necessary precautions to protect our retaliatory power, we should forget our Pearl Harbor complex and address ourselves with all our initiative and energy to the fact that we are pressed by the competition of a new, extraordinary powerful social order.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEARL HARBOR COMPLEX

(By Walter Lippmann)

At the U. N. on Tuesday, Mr. Hammarskjold said that the basic reason why no progress is being made on disarmament is that there as a "crisis of trust from which all mankind is suffering at the present juncture." It is reflected, he went on to say, "in an unwillingness to take any moves in a positive direction at their face value * * * because of a fear of being misled."

This surely is the heart of the matter, and we may take it that our Arctic bomber flights, which Mr. Hammerskjold referred to a "the present state of extreme preparedness," reflect an absolute mistrust in the intentions of the Soviet Union. Mr. Lodge in the same debate spelled out this mistrust, which actuates our military policy, by saying that "the awesome destructive power of modern armaments makes it at least theoretically possible to wipe out the military capacity of a state—even one of the great powers—in a single attack. But such an attack must come without warning if it is to succeed.

The proposal for international inspection in the Arctic Zone are based on the theory that the inspectors could detect the preparation for a super attack and could, therefore, nullify the danger of an all-out and absolute Pearl Harbor. Our remedy, in short, for the mistrust we have of Soviet intentions is to put a great deal of trust in an inspection system.

If I read Mr. Hammerskjold's remarks correctly, he thinks that if the Soviet Union and the United States would make an agree-

ment to set up an Arctic inspection system, this would reflect a state of mind in which other agreements might then be reached. Certainly inspection as such, which would be as the saying goes, "foolproof," is not in the cards. If the will exists and the means exists to deliver the absolute knockout, no system of inspectors can prevent it.

The real guaranty against the super-Pearl Harbor is that the means do not exist, and therefore the will to attempt it cannot exist. It is not necessary in this situation to trust Russian intentions. It is necessary only to have trust in Russian sanity. In Mr. Lodge's remarks, which I have already quoted, the key words are that it is "theoretically possible" to strike a knockout blow.

But is it even theoretically possible to do that now? Not according to the Director of Central Inelligence, Mr. Allen Dulles, who said in an address this week that "as I see it, under its present policies, the U. S. S. R. does not intend to use its military power in such a way as to risk general war." Why not? Because "they have a healthy respect for our retaliatory capability."

We have a right to believe that Mr. Dulles does not believe that it is now even theoretically possible to knock out our retaliatory capacity. For, as he said in the next paragraph, we must be ever watchful of military developments, "in order to anticipate any attempts at a breakthrough which would change the balance of military power." Until and unless there is such a technological breakthrough, there exists a balance of military power which is a true deterrent to a Pearl Harbor.

In the last analysis, a more flexible policy on our part does not depend upon putting trust in the intentions of the Soviet Union. It depends upon our putting trust in their ability to read correctly the balance of power.

The rest of Mr. Allen Dulles' address reinforces this view. He dwelt at length and in rich detail upon the spectacular success of the Soviet Union in promoting its own industrial development, and with the prospect that in the course of a generation the Soviet industrial capacity may catch up with our own. Is it likely that with such prospects, the Kremlin will risk everything on the very theoretical possibility that it could knock out the United States?

The moral of this argument is that, having taken all the necessary precautions to protect our retaliatory power, we should resolve our Pearl Harbor complex. It paralyzes our military thinking and it stultifies most of our diplomacy. We should instead, conscious of our own security, address ourselves to the great fact of our era that in almost every field of human endeavor we are pressed by the competition of a new and extraordinarily powerful social order.

Secretary Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Stanley High, appearing in the current edition of Reader's Digest, entitled "The Unshakable Mr. Dulles":

THE UNSHAKABLE MR. DULLES

(By Stanley High)

However history rates John Foster Dulles as United States Secretary of State, it will almost certainly record that, in a spot more exposed than any other in our Government to the ill wind of criticism at home and abroad, he has had more and sharper censure than any of his recent predecessors. It may well record too that few Secretaries of State survived their critics for so long with less loss to themselves or greater gain to their country.

"It is ironic," writes Marguerite Higgins, Washington correspondent of the New York Herald Tribune, "that the loudest calls for Mr. Dulles' scalp should have been made over policies that history is already showing to have been among his wisest."

Only once in his nearly 5½ years in office has Dulles' continuance as Secretary been in genuine doubt. On November 3, 1956, he was rushed to Walter Reed Hospital in Washington for a critical operation. With the State Department boss incapacitated for a prolonged period as, at 68, he seemed bound to be, the urgent Washington question was: Who now for Secretary?

Within 48 hours the Secretary, with 2 telephones installed by his hospital bed, was supplying his own answer: Dulles. Soon a story was going the rounds which Dulles himself hugely enjoyed. It seems that a high State Department official was expressing some doubt as to the Secretary's post-hospital future. He was rebuked by a colleague: "Only the Lord could pry John Foster Dulles out of his job, and He tried and failed."

"There is a difference," Dulles recently declared, "between being respected and being liked. We do not run the foreign policy of the United States with a view to winning a popularity contest. We have to do some things which we know are not going to be popular. But we have not done, in my opinion, anything for which we are not respected."

No other issue visited upon Dulles such an outpouring of vilification as Suez. Following Israel's invasion of Egypt and the British and French attack on the Suez Canal Zone on October 31, 1956, the survival of those principles of peaceful settlement and of law and order which the United States and the United Nations were sworn to uphold was in the balance. Sure that free world nations would never muster sufficient courage and unity for decisive action, the Communists were set to move in on the Middle East and Africa for an unprecedented propaganda killing.

Late in the evening of November 1, Dulles appeared before the U. N. General Assembly. There, in open disagreement with our two oldest and most powerful allies, he opposed this resort to force and called on the U. N. for action that would make it apparent to the world, not only for the benefit of ourselves but of all posterity, that there is here the beginning of a world of order.

This refusal to compromise or even momentarily to suspend his principles put the Dulles must-go critics, particularly in Britain and France, in full cry. But, moved by Dulles' appeal, the U. N. rose to the challenge. On its demand, the fighting stopped and a U. N. police force took over. Both Suez and the Gaza Strip were liquidated as immediate trouble spots. And the Communists were robbed of an issue they would have turned to sure-fire account.

When, in January 1953, Dulles moved into the Secretary of State's paneled, heavily carpeted office, the peace-at-all-costs line then coming from Moscow had lulled the West into unconcern and its leaders into inaction. Dulles had been too long and too deeply involved with events, often as part-time adviser to the State Department, to require any briefing. He waited 6 days and then, in a startlingly, undiplomatic TV roundup, gave a chapter-and-verse review of what the Communists, behind their pretenses, were up to and what the United States proposed to do about it.

He spoke first to the United States: "We have enemies who are plotting our destruction. Those enemies are the Russian Communists and their allies in other countries."

Then he turned to a Western Europe whose leaders had stalled effective measures for a common defense. Thirty billion dollars of United States funds, he said, had already been poured into Western Europe on the theory that there could be unity there. If, now, such effective unity, with West Germany included, did not take rapid shape, it would be necessary to give a little rethinking to the American policy of European aid.

Widely applauded in the United States, this speech, in Europe, was bitterly attacked as a veiled threat, and the new Secretary was assailed as insensitive, inflexible. As for the Communists, the violence of their reaction indicated that, in their estimate, Mr. Dulles had already begun to move into the position he now occupies as world communism's public enemy No. 1.

Today, even the hardiest of Dulles' die-hard critics make little effort to obscure the fact that, preaching, pressing, and negotiating, in Congress and in 470,000 miles of globe-circling travel, he has had an often decisive hand in clearing up threatening trouble spots, shoring up the free world's defenses, advancing the free world's unity and strength, and slowing to a halt communism's geographical aggressions.

Six months after he took office, the United States made it clear that resumption by the Communists of hostilities in Korea would lead to immediate action that might not be confined to North Korean objectives. A month later, in a stinging propaganda defeat, the Communists accepted the United States principle that no prisoners of war should be returned to Communist subjugation against their will and, ending negotiations they had stalled through 2 years, signed the Korean truce.

A like policy of boldness at the time of the French setback in Indochina saved south Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia from the expected Red sweep in southeast Asia.

Austria, from having been a Communist base, has been liberated by peace treaty.

The dispute between Italy and Yugoslavia over the port of Trieste has been resolved.

A crash program of United States technical and economic assistance helped bring Iran back from the brink of Communist disaster and aline that country with the free world.

West Germany has been admitted to equal defense partnership with the nations of West Europe.

Confounding the critics, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has not disintegrated, but is growing in effectiveness. At its latest meeting last December—a meeting the critics foredoomed—Dulles' objective, wrote Cyrus Sulzberger, foreign editor of the New York Times, was "to secure Allied agreement for installation in Europe of intermediate-range missile bases and nuclear warhead stockpiles. In this he succeeded brilliantly; and he paid no price."

The principles of joint defense, exemplified in the Organization of American States and in NATO, has now been extended through the Baghdad Pact, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) and the Formosa Resolution, by which Congress authorized the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States to prevent Communist aggression against Free China. Thus the free world's defenses have been extended from western into eastern Europe and across the Middle East and Asia to Japan.

Dulles' part in these momentous achievements reflects his strong conviction that moral, essentially Christian principles are not only right, but provide a sound basis for ordering international relationships. He strikingly set forth this conviction when, in 1950, President Truman appointed him to negotiate a peace treaty with Japan.

"We want the kind of peace that has a good chance of making Japan and the United States close associates in the future," Dulles said. "It cannot be done without the free will of the conquered. It must be a peace of reconciliation."

Negotiated in the unprecedentedly short span of 1 year, the Japanese peace treaty "translated," as Time magazine said, "the Dulles word into the Dulles deed."

If Dulles' capacity to translate word into deed has diminished the vociferousness of his free-world critics, it has served, conversely, to confirm the Communists' worst fears. That he is now, more than ever, communism's public enemy No. 1 was revealed by no less than Soviet Premier Nikolai Bulganin in a letter dated February 1 to President Eisenhower. Arguing for a summit conference between heads of state, Bulganin referred to the President's earlier suggestion that the success of such a meeting would be likelier if the way were prepared by meetings between the foreign ministers of the nations involved. Wrote the Soviet Premier: "It is hardly necessary to explain why we would like to avoid this. * * * Considering the biased position of certain possible participants in a ministerial conference, we cannot be confident that talks on this level would not create additional obstacles to the organization of a summit conference."

James Reston of the New York Times stated that this back-handed tribute to our Secretary of State "cemented Dulles in his job for good." By this declaration Bulganin acknowledged that Secretary Dulles, in a period overshadowed by Communist menace, has proved to be the free world's toughest, most experienced, least easily fooled negotiator. Beyond anyone else, he has shown the capacity to "create additional obstacles" in the way of the Communists' unchangingly agressive purposes. Throughout, of course, he has been the target for some of the Communists' choicest epithets: "slave-owner," "imperialist," "pillager of the people" and so on. In view of the record he finds these attacks not too hard to bear.

"I recall," he said recently, "that the Communists in an editorial in Izvestia on January 1, 1950, gloatingly listed the various satellite states—'the camp of democracy and socialism'—and went on to boast that 'the forces in this camp are multiplying daily.' Since then the Communists have made important material, scientific, and military advances. But they have made no important territorial gains.

"Meanwhile, such events as the East German revolts of June 1953, the Polish outbreaks of June 1956, and the Hungarian uprising of October-November 1956 reveal that the satellite states, from being a source of Communist strength, are becoming a source of weakness."

No one is more aware than Secretary Dulles how far short these encouraging facts are from proving that the Soviet threat is now decisively diminished. But, "we should not let hatred, prejudice, or past misadventures," he wrote recently, "lead us to refuse all association with the Communists and to have no agreements with their governments. Nor should we refuse to do what is sound merely because the Communists want it. We must keep on trying, again and again, to make them realize that a world of 'peaceful coexistence,' which they profess to desire, requires that international engagements be honored."

Then, as in his first address as Secretary, he spoke to America:

"In a struggle where freedom is the issue, the only adequate exponents of freedom are free people. Only individuals can have a personal faith and can demonstrate freedom. Such faith and works are what we need today. They are more important than material things. And they can be provided only by individuals, not by government."

The record shows clearly that the United States and the free world have gained greatly because of the "demonstration of freedom" which has resulted from the "faith and works" of John Foster Dulles.

Movies and Television Shows Which Flaunt Indecency and Applaud Lawlessness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, recently there have appeared motion pictures and television shows which flaunt indecency and applaud lawlessness. One such recent picture is Baby Face Nelson which, in addition to the above contains wanton killings, sadism, and immorality.

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who is well qualified to detail the effect of such productions on the Nation's terrifying crime wave, has written an article on this subject dated May 1, 1958, which apears in the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin. I recommend this article to my colleagues:

To All Law Enforcement Officials:

As a law enforcement officer and as an American citizen, I feel dutybound to speak out against a dangerous trend which is manifesting itself in the field of film and television entertainment. In the face of the Nation's terrifying juvenile crime wave, we are threatened with a flood of movies and television presentations which flaunt indecency and applaud lawlessness. Not since the days when thousands filed past the bier of the infamous John Dillinger and made his home a virtual shrine have we witnessed such a brazen affront to our national conscience.

As an illustration, two brothers, aged 10 and 12, who a few weeks ago terrorized a town in Oklahoma in a shooting spree that left one man dead and two others founded, told the police they got the idea from watching television and movie crime stories.

There are, of course, many responsible leaders in the motion picture and television industries who dedicate their efforts to producing wholesome entertainment and to upholding the worthwhile principles of established production codes of ethics. Again and again, they serve the best interests of law enforcement and the public welfare by genuine portrayals of criminals in their true light—wretched, unglamorous leeches who bring nothing but degradation to themselves and human suffering to their fellow men.

Regrettably, however, there are some unscrupulous individuals who value money above morals, and whose actions should be exposed in the searching klieg light of public opinion. In their lust for bigger and bigger profits, they glorify violence, glamorize corruption, and picture criminals as heroes for youth to idolize.

One movie code official recently declared that the number of murders in a film is not particularly important—only the reason why the criminal committed a murder is of concern. He said he would not permit a wanton killing to be depicted but indicated that the killer first had to be wronged. What kind of double moral standard is this? This same official, in describing a film, said there were only 12 murders—not an excessive number according to his interpretation of the production code. What kind of rationalization is this?

I deplore censorship—and certainly law enforcement officials have no right to dictate what should or should not be shown on the rectangular screens. They do have, however, the obligation to insist on the observance of the moral law which binds men in all matters. They also have the right to speak out when law enforcement is held up to ridicule and the criminal is elevated to heroic proportions.

No standard of decency or code of operations can justify portraying vile gangsters as modern-day Robin Hoods. Film trash mills, which persist in exalting violence and immorality, spew out celluloid poison which is destroying the impressionable minds of youth. In commenting on a current blood-drenched screenplay, one reviewer wrote, "If you enjoy turning over rocks to see what crawls out, you'll have a gay time. * * *"

Parental supervision over the entertainment fare of children, discretion on the part of movie and television viewers, fulfillment of community responsibility by film exhibitors and television station executives, and citizen protests to producers of offensive shows can solve this problem.

Unless the leaders in the television and motion picture industries take the initiative to correct this ominous trend of crime glorification, they may be assured it can be accomplished by the strong pressure of public opinion. Time after time, the voice of the citizen has brought action, and it can be done again.

Very truly yours,
JOHN EDGAR HOOVER,
Director.

The Monroney World Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Green Bay Gazette has earned an excellent reputation for the lucidity and persuasiveness of its editorials.

Recently it carried an editorial eloquently supporting the second World Bank proposal of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

This editorial emphasizes the solid commonsense wisdom of the Monroney proposal—a program that would put to work idle, tragically unemployed, blocked balances, including our soft-currency holdings. It would cost American taxpayers little. It would benefit the free world immensely.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Green Bay (Wis.) Gazette of March 4, 1958]

THE MONRONEY WORLD BANK

The matter of foreign aid is one of the knottiest problems which confronts Congress again this year.

The President's dire warning that, unless his request for about $4 billion is granted, a much larger sum will have to buy armaments in the future is difficult to evaluate. It stems from the puerile point of view that, without foreign aid in great sums, we must fight a war. Obviously any thinking American would rather have a higher tax at present than wage a nuclear war tomorrow. The doubts raised come from the lack of confidence in the way in which the money is spent, disgust with some of our allies, charges of gross waste and foolishness in spending, and questioning of the philosophy that we can buy friends who will really stand up to the Russians. Those doubts are hard to allay and, on the other hand, it is difficult for the administration to prove good results from past foreign aid.

Senator MIKE MONRONEY has proposed that another international agency, similar to the World Bank, be created to make long-term loans at a low percentage to underdeveloped countries. This proposal seems to have two advantages. First, it can make loans with less security than the present World Bank and at a comparable rate of interest to that offered by Russia. Secondly, it is international in scope rather than being merely from the United States. Again it is hard to evaluate this point, but our handouts no longer seems to make firm friends and no one loves a creditor. The initial United States contribution to this new agency, as envisioned by Senator MONRONEY, would be $300 million, a long way from $4 billion.

An extension of such an agency would also tend to do away with some of the complaints about our present methods of foreign aid. Pakistan representatives charge, and with reason, that the nations which threaten to turn to Russia get more money than those which are firmly in the Western camp. A lot of Americans would have preferred that the money spent on bombs which the French used to kill Tunisian children had bought missile research in the United States. The Wisconsin teacher who is now organizing and administering a physical-education program for the Kingdom of Laos may be winning friends, but should American tax dollars be used to train Asian track teams?

Miss Barbara Ward, a British author and economist, calls for a "fully thought out, fully sustained, and accepted strategy for worldwide economic growth" from the Western Powers and paints a gloomy canvas of country after country falling under the Communist sickle otherwise. It may be, and we must acknowledge that, while we seem no closer to peace than before we started a foreign-aid program of such huge proportions, neither are we in a shooting war.

But it is extremely doubtful that our foreign-aid program has paid sufficient dividends in goodwill to warrant such a tremendous investment as demanded by the administration. Senator MONRONEY's proposal, or one similar to it and perhaps on a much larger scale, would seem to be a lot closer to a continuing program of assistance impossible on the year-to-year basis which we must maintain.

Has My Church Left Me?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, recently an article was called to my attention. This article appeared in the DAR magazine. I am sure everyone knows of the high ideals and high purposes of this fine patriotic organization.

This article to some may be unjust in the ideas expressed. Some of us are aware that in many organizations and groups—the idea of patriotism is a bit old fashioned to many of our so-called progressive social welfare organizations. In fact many have been so bold to state openly that patriotism and national sovereignty is dangerous to the continued well-being of the United States. They further point out the concept of a world government is the more modern concept, and must be adopted to guarantee a peaceful world. Patriots are often pointed out as persons callous for the welfare of the world's downtrodden people.

It is true that our churches have been a great force in the developing of our modern American ideals. It is not sufficient to merely want to help our fellow man. But the basic issue is how to do it. Many of us believe that self-help, self-interest, and self-determination are all powerful ideals.

This article is most worthy of consideration. It asks some questions that a lot of people must answer:

HAS MY CHURCH LEFT ME?

There are two subjects which are difficult to discuss in an uncomplimentary manner with a good conscientious woman—her child and her church.

A mother who assumes the attitude of "He is right because he is my child," usually ends up in juvenile court. Any woman who feels that "It is right because it is my church," becomes a target for all destructive forces without and within its confines.

A wise mother sits down and finds out what is wrong with her child. She believes in him as far as his conduct will possibly allow her. Then she expresses her rebuke for his misconduct and administers the degree of punishment she feels the act warrants.

During the last few years, many people have said, "I am leaving the Methodist Church, I can no longer stand the socialism, liberalism, and communism, in its teachings." Others have said, "I teach Sunday school classes, but I don't use the literature. I just don't say anything about it."

If it is not too late, and I pray it isn't, shouldn't we, as loyal Methodists and true Americans, sit down with some of the leaders of our church and find out what is wrong—then like the mother with her child, discipline them accordingly? We cannot improve the situation by leaving the church, nor by building up resentment in other members. We should have righteous indignition and attack with the fury Christ showed the moneychangers in the temple.

Nothing would be more pleasing to "the pink fringe" element of our church than for all of us who see them in their true light to quietly slip out and leave them to brainwash the youth and the unsuspecting members.

Many of us suffer with nostalgia when we think of the experiences in the Methodist Church of our childhood. We did not know then that it was frustrating to children to meet in general assembly with the adults. There we read the lesson, which was from the Bible rather than one on economics. We heard a petition sent up to God in prayer by an older member, asking for our guidance and future life. We went to our classes and there we learned the Golden Text, the names of Christ's disciples, and were taught the profound truth of the Scriptures. This built up a reservoir of faith from which we have drawn in the trials of life. We were taught to respect all that was good and holy.

Today when we enter the beautiful piles of brick and stone which we call churches, Christians are aghast at what they find—Mother Goose Rhymes on the walls of the primary department. This serves to confuse the inquiring mind of the child. Was Jesus another make-believe character? The house of God is no different from the schoolroom.

Many fine youthful teachers are not aware of the subtle force which recommends such decorations and settings for their teaching. Another example: A few years ago we studied in the circles of our Women's Society for Christian Service, a book called Symbols of the Church. A fine young mother reading a chapter from this book to our study group commented, "The American flag is not recommended for the sanctuary, for after all, it is one God and Father of us all."

In our local church, the American flag and Christian flag had been put out of sight for they had become soiled and worn, and no one had taken the time and effort to see that new ones were placed there. The shocking paragraph from the above study group was presented by this writer to the next official board meeting. Result—new flags were purchased and put in their proper place, in which they have been and will continue to be, for now we have had the warning.

We move from the classrooms to our modern church to find that the education building is the main feature and the place of worship the smaller building. Do you ever wonder what we are educating toward and what for? A few years ago I came in contact with a young lady who was supposed to be a well-trained youth leader. She admitted that she couldn't lead a devotional. She told me that the church she had just left had the most beautiful pool table she ever saw. Then with an air of flippancy, she asked, "You don't approve of that, do you?" I replied, "My only comment is, 'God have mercy on the First Methodist Church when it tries to outworld the world.'" This young lady soon left that church because she was promoted to a larger field of church activity.

It is this writer's firm conviction that our young people do not want their church to compete with the world. When they want to play pool, they have tables in their own recreation rooms at home, or they find them in the recreational centers of the community. When they want to dance, there is a better orchestra at the club. This is a conclusion I have reached after many years of church work and as a teacher in public schools.

For 5 years Col. George Smoot and I conducted a Sunday morning boys' club. We soon found that the boys didn't come for the handicraft period, nor did they come for the breakfast we served as most of them worked and had their own money. They came for the Bible study, the morning devotionals and entered into the spiritual part of the program.

Colonel Smoot, who represented everything to those boys that was Christian and American, was called back into active service. Seven of the boys enlisted in the Armed Forces for that was during the Korean police action.

One morning, John, who was one of the most faithful members of our club came to my home. He was home on leave, and he knew that when he returned to his post he would be sent to Korea. He was not hunting a ping-pong table or a music box where he could dance. He was seeking something that was real and vital, that would strengthen his faith for the task ahead. He wore the expression of a frightened little boy, for he had never been away from home until he joined the Army, and now he was going to a strange land. After some conversation he said, "I'll never forget the Bible lessons we had, that is why I am in this uniform. I made up my mind I would do something to deserve the blessings I have had in this country."

That morning when John left armed with a New Testament and his head held high,

I felt that no godless war lord could change his attitude toward his God and his country. He returned safely, and he, his wife and two little boys, go to Sunday school each Sunday.

We have a foster son who spent 8 years in the Navy, and he saw much fighting in the Second World War. However, this was not as hard on him emotionally as fighting his way through the modernism and socialism of one of our biggest seminaries to become a Methodist minister.

Now we are faced with the problem of finding a school for our 19-year-old son, who is in his second year in a small Methodist school. He, too, is to become a minister. He is younger and has had less experience than the one who had been through the war and had learned the practical meaning of Christianity. Shall we send him to a school where they permit old-fashioned liquor glasses with the blue-devil on one side and the cross on the other to be sold for souvenirs? Must we send him to a school where they will tell him that all he has learned at home is outmoded? That it is all right for his parents to believe in the physical resurrection of Christ, or His virgin birth, or that we need a spiritual rebirth, but that he must be more enlightened?

My question is "Has my church left me?" Do I have to have a higher class in political science, learn more economics, and be able to admire Eugene V. Debs in order to enter into the discussion of a Sunday school class, or be trusted with the minds of our young people?

Have we grown so big that we have turned into big business? God has never counted upon the multitudes for His work. Using some examples, which the modernists would have us believe are only legends, God only started with two people; he could only bring one man and his family through the flood; he could only save one man in Sodom and Gomorrah. He sent His only Son into the world, and Christ selected just 12 apostles. Never did He expect to hold the multitudes in loyalty to Him. He knew that they would spread palm branches in His path and proclaim Him King, then would shout "Crucify Him," a few days later.

Thank God we have many fine loyal Christian Americans in our pulpits today. In too many cases, they are afraid to cry out against a few leaders, to warn the laymen. They have seen examples of a few men who have, and they became labeled, crackpots, or alarmists. Isn't it time that we, as laymen, stop repeating like parrots the things we are told to say and start thinking about who is telling us to say it?

Today we attended the worship service in our church. It was a delayed laymen's day program. Last Sunday we had visited in another State and their worship service was laymen's day. Although it was a different speaker, and a different State and church, the talk was the same. It happened to be a subject that would bring approval from anyone present, My Father's Business. The point is that each speaker gave the same words, the same examples, and thoughts. This should remind us of how very regimented we are in being a puppet for those who do the thinking for us.

Can we awaken our loyal churchmembers before we lose every trace of the stewardship God gave us in this great church? By the help of our Creator I will continue to fight for my belief and the doctrine that is so much a part of my life that I cannot separate it from the very atmosphere I breathe.

Once I accepted our church literature as I accepted the Bible. Today as I read the comments on the lesson, I turn to the front of the publication to see where the gentleman who wrote it was educated. That explains much of his thinking. Can't we clean up our church schools? We all know that this is the source of much of our brief today.

I implore you to ask the question, "Has my church left me?"—"Am I being swept on with the devastating tide and doing nothing about it?" If the answer is Yes, speak out and object to the modernism, and be unafraid for He has said, "Lo, I am with you always." But we must elect to be with Him first. May He bless us in our efforts to save our beloved Methodist Church.

The North Dakota Theodore Roosevelt Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO KRUEGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, within recent weeks, many Members have received in their offices material highlighting the forthcoming Theodore Roosevelt Centennial observance. Since last October 27, North Dakotans have been observing the centennial occasion in many ways. In the weeks ahead, many special events are planned in North Dakota, where the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park—this country's only national memorial park—is located. It is the hope of all North Dakotans that as many Members of Congress as possible will attend some of these events, which are well described in the following article by Gov. John E. Davis, which appears in the April issue of State Government:

THE NORTH DAKOTA THEODORE ROOSEVELT CENTENNIAL

(By John E. Davis, Governor of North Dakota)

(North Dakota this year—from last October 27 through the same date next autumn—is conducting statewide and diverse events and programs to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt. It is doing so with special pride because of the large place his experience in the State had in T. R.'s life. In the following account Gov. John E. Davis tells of the formation of the North Dakota Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission, summarizes the theme the celevration has taken and points up its outstanding features.)

In keeping with the progressive thinking of North Dakota people, the 35th Legislative Assembly approved House bill 547, March 11, 1957, which established a commission for the commemoration of the 100th anniversay of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt and made an appropriation of $10,000 to carry out the purpose of the act.

The North Dakota Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission is composed of 19 members plus the Governor (chairman), the president of the senate, and the speaker of the house.

At its first organizational meeting, the commission hired an executive director and developed broad policies for conducting a Statewide observance. One month later, the newly hired director, whose office is in the State Capitol, presented a suggested program and committee asignments for each category of activity.

Theodore Roosevelt is immortalized as the 26th President of the United States. He was one of the world's greatest teachers of the philosophy of free government and developed the basic program of conservation of natural resources.

T. R. AND CITIZENSHIP

The theme of the centennial—October 27, 1957 to October 27, 1958—has been declared "Responsible citizenship," and the centennial's major pupose is to make Roosevelt's teachings and principles a driving force to strengthen and inspire the American people. "Responsible citizenship" is obtained through self-discipline combined with a devotion to the public good.

Roosevelt himself said, "In the long run, success or failure will be conditioned upon the way in which the average man, the average woman, does his or her duty, first in the ordinary, everyday affairs of life, and next in those great occasional crises which call for the heroic virtues. The average citizen must be a good citizen if our republics are to succeed."

The Theodore Roosevelt Centennial offers an oportunity for the American people to realize and appreciate the ideal of greatness that was ever before Theodore Roosevelt—the greatness that is built on personal character, faith in God and man—responsibility, brotherhood and the fire of high purpose in the heart.

Theodore Roosevelt publicly stated, "I never would have been President if it had not been for my experience in North Dakota," and we in North Dakota are justifiably proud. He is the only United States President who has ever lived in our State.

T. R. undoubtedly never thought while living and ranching in the Badlands of North Dakota in the 1880's that a national memorial park would be established more than 50 years later as a memorial to his enduring contributions to the conservation of the country's natural resources for public benefit. However, Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park was established by act of Congress, April 25, 1947, thereby giving North Dakota the first national memorial park in the United States. Today, it is still the only national memorial park in the Nation.

CENTENNIAL FEATURES

Although the centennial observance is rapidly developing along many avenues, the major ones are: Education, speaker's bureau, club activities, and a gala pageant, "Theodore Roosevelt, great American."

Committees are actively working on every level of education in the State, from grade school to university and college. The Young Citizens League (students mostly from rural and village schools) has adopted the centennial theme as its league theme and project for the 1957–58 school year. A suggestion that the University of North Dakota and the North Dakota Agricultural College consider granting an honorary degree to worthy recipients in a field of endeavor closely related to a comparable Theodore Roosevelt field has been well received.

Through the cooperation of the North Dakota Bar Association, a statewide speakers bureau has been established, with subcommitteemen in every county of the State. This group is well versed in the history of Theodore Roosevelt, and all civic, service, social and fraternal organizations in North Dakota will be contacted for program engagements before the end of the Centennial year.

Plans are progressing nicely for active participation in the centennial observance by Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, 4–H Clubs, Camp Fire Girls, YCL (Young Citizens League), and many other organizations of young people.

SUMMER EVENTS

July 3, 4, 5, and 6 have been designated as Theodore Roosevelt, Great American, pageant days. In conjunction, there will also be a world championship rodeo, designed to attract the best known names in rodeo circles. The rodeo will run 3 days, July 4, 5, and 6.

The pageant is to be professionally staged, with a nationally known director and author in charge. Present plans call for a pageant costing between $35,000 and $50,000. It will

be free to all visitors. Nationwide publicity will be helped by the National Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission.

Finally, the Dickinson State Teachers College is advancing rapidly with plans to present a free-to-the-public symposium of nationally known speakers. Lectures will be held at the college throughout the summer months. Three national figures have been scheduled to date, including Dr. Hermann Hagedorn, National Centennial Commission Director, and one of the world's greatest authorities on Theodore Roosevelt.

The eyes of the Nation will be on the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial observance this summer. North Dakota, to the best of my knowledge, has the most active program planned of any State in the Union.

Rhode Island Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, again on May 4, Rhode Island will again be celebrating the anniversary of its freedom. It was 182 years ago today that the brave people of Rhode Island declared their independence from their mother country, Great Britain.

With the passage of time, many events are overlooked or failed to be recorded and personal sufferings are not related. But, these brave people endured such inequities with a strong determination and the taste of freedom in their mouths. True to the tradition of democracy the people imposed their will upon the legislators to act, and speedily, to rid themselves of the rule of a tyrannical ancestor. It was on the 4th of May 1776 that the Rhode Island Assembly adopted the resolution renouncing allegiance to the British King. This act was the initial spark of freedom that fired the Congress of the United States to take similar action 2 months later.

Rhode Islanders have always been noted for their individual initiative and independence. The people of the State have stood together when they thought their cause was just. Rhode Island was the first of the 13 colonies to declare complete independence of Great Britain, and the last to ratify the Federal Constitution, refraining until it felt that certain injustices had been corrected.

Colonial resentment found expression in a series of incidents, many of which occurred in Rhode Island. As early as 1764 Newporters climaxed a riot with crewmen of the British schooner *St. John* by firing upon the vessel with cannons. The following year a Newport mob, angered by impressment of American seamen, seized and burned the British vessel *Maidstone*. Most famous of these incidents to Rhode Islanders was the burning of the British revenue schooner *Gaspee*.

The colonial spirit of independence was the rock on which Britain's North American empire was finally wrecked. Accustomed for more than a generation to little or no taxation, and to almost complete freedom in the management of their internal affairs, the colonists were disposed to resent every British attempt to strengthen colonial administration.

As in the past Rhode Island will celebrate its Third Annual Heritage Week featuring pageants, ceremonies, and exhibits honoring our historic inheritance. The Heritage of Rhode Island is a continuing thing, a patrimony passed on from generation to generation. New honors, new accomplishments, new discoveries—all are based upon that devotion to liberty and integrity that was implicit in the founding of our State. The many industries that make Rhode Island renowned today had their beginnings in the humble crafts of our early settlers. The culture of Rhode Island is the contribution of those made welcome by this State's tradition of freedom and conscience.

Many illustrious names are woven into the fabric of Rhode Island history, from Roger Williams to the ancestors of our beloved Senator THEODORE F. GREEN. These and many more have helped to make our Nation strong and secure and have contributed to its economy and culture.

We are proud of our State.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Advocated by American Bankers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the American Bankers Association formally advocated a 5-year extension of the reciprocal trade agreements program as "an important contribution to the economic well-being both of the United States and of the entire free world." I believe that the position of this distinguished group of American leaders in the banking field merits the careful consideration of the Congress. I concur entirely with the warning of the bankers association:

> In view of the mounting economic and military challenge of the Communist nations, it would be extremely unfortunate if we were to allow domestic economic difficulties of a transitory nature to turn our foreign economic policy back toward economic isolation.

We all remember the disastrous consequences of the extreme economic nationalism of the post World War I period—a period which saw the choking of international trade by the mistaken tariff policies of the nations of the world.

I urge my colleagues to read the following resolution of the executive council of the American Bankers Association which was adopted on April 22, 1958, and offered to Chairman WILBUR MILLS, of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, by President Joseph C. Welman yesterday:

RESOLUTION ON FOREIGN TRADE POLICY ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION, APRIL 22, 1958

Over the past several months, the economic decline in this country has emphasized the pervasive interdependence of the economies of the free world. If long continued, the recession here would pose a serious threat to the economic stability of friendly nations abroad, because our foreign investment outlays and our imports and exports exert an important influence on the level of economic activity of these countries. In turn, if economic conditions abroad were to become unfavorable, this would intensify our own distress by reducing demand for the products of our export industries.

Over the past 25 years much has been achieved in the way of developing a foreign economic policy that is truly in the national interest. Our efforts to reduce restrictive and discriminatory barriers to the expansion of world trade, our mutual security program, our economic and technical assistance programs, and our encouragement of American private investment abroad have strengthened our own Nation economically and politically and have enhanced the economic stability and military security of the nations of the free world. Indeed, the present strength of the free world can be attributed in large part to our foreign economic policy since World War II.

In view of the mounting economic and military challenge of the Communist nations, it would be extremely unfortunate if we were to allow domestic economic difficulties of a transitory nature to turn our foreign economic policy back toward economic isolationism. From the point of view of our own industrial recovery, it is important that American private investment abroad continue to expand, for such investment increases the dollar purchasing power of foreign nations, thereby raising demand for the products of American industries. Broadening the market for American exports also requires that we continue to negotiate for the reduction of barriers to the international movement of goods and currencies.

It would be fallacious and dangerous for us to try to stimulate economic recovery in the United States by placing greater restrictions on the entry of products from abroad. Such restrictions would serve to increase the impact of the current recession on other nations of the free world and to depress further the demand for products of our own export industries. By broadening the market for our own products and stimulating world trade in general, we can make an important contribution to the economic well-being both of the United States and of the entire free world.

In view of the foregoing considerations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the executive council of the American Bankers Association go on record as approving the 5-year extension of the reciprocal trade agreements program, and the related legislation necessary to its effective implementation.

For a Free Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, no American who prides himself on his dedication to the patriotism embodied in our Declaration of Independence can remain insensible to the high principles contained in the Polish Constitution as enacted in 1791. For 167 years free people everywhere have paused to pay their tribute to those staunch patriots whose action is

commemorated each year on May 3 as Poland's Constitution Day.

The brutal arrogance with which the Communist dictators have undertaken to trample underfoot the rights of this free people has met with unwavering resistance from within the Polish Republic as well as the strongest condemnation from without. And the belligerent attitude of the masters in the Kremlin toward any movement to slacken the chains on this gallant people has shown how utterly insincere is their protestation that they stand for peace.

Happily, there are increasing signs that Poland is moving forward step-by-step to the realization of her rights as a sovereign state and it is most gratifying that the United States has shown a readiness to assist such movements. In addition we shall continue to make available substantial evidences of our concern for Polish economic stability and the right to work out their destiny without interference from neighboring aggressors.

The Real Enemies of Union Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, in view of all that was said in the other body last week in regard to labor legislation, it is rather significant that 1,800 miles from Washington, D. C., a country editor would write an editorial that exactly expresses the issues involved—namely, freedom to the man who labors—from his arrogant labor racketeering bosses.

Power always corrupts. Many wars have been fought for freedom. It seems tragic that so many men who labor—are now confronted with a new menace more deadly and more arrogant and more domineering than in olden days before labor unions were all powerful.

I commend this editorial:

THE REAL ENEMIES OF UNION LABOR

There is nothing wrong with union labor that a dose of freedom tonic wouldn't cure. The racketeers and the Communist inclined who are riding the movement now would automatically come under control if there were no captive membership to suck for wealth and power.

Actually, it is the union members who should be working to rid their unions of the stench that arises every time unionism is investigated. There is absolutely no reason why our wage earners cannot have unions which proudly conform to the American creeds of justice, decency, honesty, fair play and freedom. All that is necessary is to let the membership swing both ways.

Union labor leaders have shown themselves past masters at using double talk to make the ridiculous sound sensible and many of the membership have been brainwashed into believing that it is right that unions should have governmental power in forcing citizens to join, pay dues and toe the unions political line. But now the doubletalk artists are in trouble.

Kansans are going to vote on a constitutional amendment next November and the amendment reads, "Guaranteed freedom to join or not to join a labor organization." The old Right to Work phrase, which was rather meaningless, has been dropped and the issue defined more exactly for what it is.

Even gifted double tongues will get into trouble trying to explain why Kansas people should vote against freedom. And that is exactly what labor leaders are forced to attempt; either that or give up the fight.

Freedom to join or not to join is the only way there can be any freedom. Management once fought viciously to prevent employees from joining unions and this violated freedom because the freedom not to join became meaningless when freedom to join was denied by force. Turn it around and it reads exactly the same way. Freedom is destroyed when unions use force, either legalistic or terroristic to suspend the workers' right not to join.

Every freedom-loving citizen in Kansas, both in and out of union labor, should join the fight to put across the guaranteed freedom amendment. The power-maddened union leaders, who are trying to destroy freedom through compulsory membership are the ones who are threatening to destroy the labor movement, and all that is good and great about America in the process.

Freedom is the issue. Everyone who truly understands and truly cares—for the good that unions can do, for the American way, for freedom—these are the ones who must work and fight to see that the guaranteed freedoms amendment not only wins in Kansas, but wins by an overwhelming majority.

Ambassador Par Excellence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it is seldom indeed that the completion of a tour of duty of a diplomat on the Washington scene brings universal regret at the thought of his forthcoming departure. However, this is the existing situation whenever reference is made to the return to his homeland of India's Ambassador to the United States, the Honorable G. L. Mehta.

Mr. Speaker, the Indian Ambassador to the United States during his 6 years' stay in this country has understood and appreciated American policies and their motives, and has successfully explained them to his Government. In addition, he is largely responsible for a better understanding in this country of India's policies in international affairs. Consequently, he deserves a great deal of the credit for the existing improved relations between our respective nations.

Testimony of his outstanding services to the cause of better human relations is evidenced in the recent editorial in the Washington Post and Times Herald in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks, under unanimous consent, I include this article in the RECORD following these brief words:

AMBASSADOR PAR EXCELLENCE

It is a rare ambassador who has the satisfaction of seeing a marked improvement in his country's foreign relations as the direct result of his own efforts. But it is no exaggeration to say that the recent growth of understanding between India and the United States has been very largely initiated by G. L. Mehta, India's Ambassador in Washington who will be honored at a national dinner tonight before bidding farewell next week.

When Ambassador Mehta arrived in 1952 there was much mutual mistrust between this country and India. The prevailing American attitude seemed to hold that India was a nation of Hindu mystics who enjoyed poverty and that Prime Minister Nehru was oriented toward, if not a secret ally, of the Communists. In India there was a tendency to look upon the United States as a chauvinistic country of materials which had a soft-drink culture and insisted on forcing its beliefs on everyone else as a condition of friendship.

Happily, there is much more maturity today. Many Americans have come to respect India as the strongest exponent of democratic government and free institutions in Asia and to recognize that India's success will have a great deal to do with the future of these institutions. Indian neutrality is understood if not applauded; and the ties of freedom have become more important than disagreements over particular policies. Mr. Nehru, for his part, has shown warm appreciation of the help this country has given India, and has evidenced his confidence in American motives and idealism. Thousands of exchange visitors—students, teachers, businessmen, journalists—have buttressed this understanding with personal experience.

Mr. Mehta, along with some able American Ambassadors in New Delhi, has been a prime architect of the improved climate. He had done far more than interpret India to the United States; in his travels and speeches over much of this country he has grasped the meaning of American life and aspirations and has interpreted them to India. He has had somewhat the same sort of influence as Benjamin Franklin had in France 180 years ago. His voice has been listened to in the evolution of Indian policy; the success of Mr. Nehru's visit in 1956, for example, reflected his patient background labors. He has been an amicable critic of American shortcomings; but, following Cromwell's advice to the painter, he has never let the defects obscure the whole.

This gentle, witty nonprofessional diplomat has been hard minded in advancing his credo that similarities are more important than differences and that the choice of means has much to do with the worth of ends. A truly civilized man, Ambassador Mehta has won an enormous gratitude as he leaves. Americans, no less than their Indian counterparts, are vastly in his debt.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, the Polish national holiday, the anniversary of Polish Constitution Day of 167 years ago, will be celebrated. Although the Government of Poland is under the iron heel of communism, the hearts and minds of the Polish people are governed by their belief in God and their burning will to be free. It will be just a question of time before Poland will rise again, as it has in the past, to throw off the yoke of the oppressor. Let us

fervently pray that when this is done their freedom will be everlasting and eternal. Mere hope and talk on our part is not sufficient. We Americans must indicate by our every thought, word, and deed in whatever way possible, that we will render whatever assistance is necessary to the Polish people to enable them to regain their rightful heritage.

Indelible in the hearts and minds of the American people are the glorious deeds of those great Polish freedom fighters, Pulaski and Kosciusko, and others who in our own struggle for freedom fought side by side with our ancestors.

We salute our Polish brethren, the great Americans of Polish descent and their brethren in the homeland at this time, and we join with them in the prayer that before long we shall see a rededication of Poland's Constitution Day, this time under a free government.

To Restore Employment to Those Who Are Now Out of Work and To Guarantee Permanency of Existing Jobs

---

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill which will:

First. Create jobs for American working men and women now unemployed.

Second. Add stability to and improve existing jobs.

Third. Stimulate business with resultant expansion of the national economy in the years to come.

Certainly, there are no more important tasks facing this session of the Congress.

BILL IS OF VITAL IMPORTANCE TO EVERY MAN, WOMAN, AND CHILD IN THE UNITED STATES

Because of the extreme importance of the subject matter of this bill to every citizen of the United States, I urge sincerely that Members of Congress study very carefully provisions of the bill, and my statement thereon in relation to the depreciation schedules set up in bulletin F.

IMMEDIATE ACTION BY THE CONGRESS IS URGENT

Once Members of Congress have had the opportunity to study this matter, Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the appropriate committees will find it possible to hold immediate hearings so that the bill may be considered thoroughly and passed without undue delay.

Our Nation, its workers and its businesses need this legislation. I am convinced that no other measure here proposed or under committee consideration will do the all-important job of creating jobs as quickly, as surely, and as soundly as will this bill.

WHAT THE BILL DOES

Mr. Speaker, briefly the bill does simply this. It proposes to reduce substantially the periods during which capital investments may be depreciated for tax purposes if they are made or contracted for over a specified period of 18 months.

For the accelerated depreciation to apply, it would not be necessary that the projected capital investment become a finished reality in the 18-month period.

The depreciation benefit would accrue if the contract for such an investment was made during that period even though the normal completion or delivery date should fall thereafter.

THE BILL IS RETROACTIVE TO JANUARY 1, 1958

It is proposed likewise that the provisions of the bill be made retroactive to cover capital investments made or contracted for since January 1, 1958.

The reasons for the retroactive feature are obvious. As long as the bill is retroactive in its application, anticipated capital investment will not be delayed pending the final approval of the bill.

WHAT IS SCHEDULE F?

This schedule contains tables of the numbers of years of useful life of capital investments as now computed by the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Members of Congress should keep these figures before them constantly in considering this legislation and study them in relation to my statement on the bill and the bill itself.

THE BILL COVERS ALL CAPITAL INVESTMENTS

The Internal Revenue schedule to which I have referred, sets up depreciation periods for capital investments based on the estimated life of the product of the investment, be it buildings, machine tools, farm equipment, or any of the hundreds of other items covered by the broad term of capital assets.

This bill would apply to all of them so that its advantages would accrue to all on exactly the same basis.

TEN MILLION JOB SOURCES

The provisions of this bill would be applicable to farmers and to small and big business alike.

It has been estimated that there are some 6 million farmers in the United States.

There are some 4 million businesses of every size and description.

Thus, when we pass this bill we will be making it possible for these 10 million business units to put more poeple to work almost at once.

SPECIFIC PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The bill, Mr. Speaker, proposes these changes in the depreciation schedule for capital investments made or contracted for in the specified 18 months' period:

First, the depreciation period for any capital investment now based on up to and including a 15-year estimated useful life would be reduced by one-half.

Second, that portion of the estimated life on any capital asset exceeding 15 years would be reduced by two-thirds.

THE IMMEDIATE EFFECT OF THIS BILL

Let us see what this bill would do.

First. It would encourage the 10 million job-producing units in this country to do now what they may have anticipated for the future and open up financing to enable them to do it.

Second. It will create now hundreds of thousands of jobs for people who do not have jobs.

Third. It will act as a guarantee of greater security and improvement in existing jobs.

WHO WOULD BE THE MOST ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT THIS BILL?

It is perfectly obvious that the most enthusiastic supporters of this bill would be the men and women who want and need jobs, and the men and women who run the 10 million business units which could provide those jobs.

Their enthusiasm would be shared, too, by the men and women who now have jobs because they would benefit through improvement in and greater stability of the work they are now doing.

All American taxpayers should support this bill because here is a way to cure the present recession and expand the national economy without costing the taxpayers a single penny.

EXAMPLES OF HOW DEPRECIATION WOULD BE FIGURED UNDER THIS BILL

For a farmer: A new tractor could be depreciated within 5 years instead of 10 years; a threshing machine would be depreciated within 7½ years instead of 15 years; a corncrib could be depreciated within 12½ years instead of 30 years.

For the small factory owner: Tools and dies could be depreciated in 1½ to 2 years instead of 3 to 4 years; heavier machinery and tools could be depreciated in 7½ to 9 years instead of 15 to 20 years.

For heavy industry: A new plant of average construction could be depreciated in 16 years instead of 40 years.

For rental housing: Homes, apartment buildings, and office buildings of average construction could be depreciated within 16 years instead of 40 years.

For transportation systems: The beneficial effect of this bill on our dilemma-ridden railroad system would be tremendous. Because they could depreciate it more rapidly, it is my best judgment that the railroads would immediately acquire hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of new equipment. Of course, the bill would also be applicable to other forms of transportation.

For wholesale and retail establishments: This bill would provide an incentive for wholesale and retail stores to carry out now the renovation programs—new store fronts, new fixtures, and so forth—that they may need and have been anticipating in the future.

WHY THIS IS THE BEST LEGISLATION THE CONGRESS COULD PASS TO PUT PEOPLE BACK TO WORK TODAY

This legislation has many advantages over public-works programs.

Public-works programs are selective The people they would employ would, at best, be only a fraction of those who need jobs.

Public-works projects would help in only certain scattered areas. Generally speaking, they would take a long time to get underway.

In addition, under this bill workers would be more likely to get jobs in their own communities rather than having to move to an area in which a public-works

project is planned because this bill will put 10 million business units in the United States in a position to act the very hour the legislation is passed using their own capital instead of taxpayers' money.

THE ADMINISTRATION HAS TAKEN SOUND STEPS

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has moved with admirable courage and speed to take those steps it has been possible to take up to this time to cure our economic ills. They have been constructive steps, and I am sure that all of us have approved of the motives behind them.

But here is a new, an additional, and a wholly businesslike approach that will complement the program that is already underway. And again, I repeat, this bill would not cost the taxpayers a penny.

PERMANENT JOBS CREATE NEW TAX SOURCES

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that this bill would have the effect of postponing some tax revenues.

But, at the same time, it is altogether possible—yes, even probable—that the end result of stepped-up capital investments would, over the long pull, create even greater tax revenues in the future.

I believe that this would be the case.

There is every reason to believe that this would be the case because these, Mr. Speaker, would be lasting and permanent jobs growing out of the creation of new, permanent, and lasting capital assets to add to the wealth of the Nation and to expand our economy over the years to come.

This, then, Mr. Speaker, is the best way to create jobs.

It is the best way to add stability to existing jobs.

It is the private-enterprise way.

It lets America's 10 million business units solve the problems of our economy without costing the taxpayer a penny.

Because this is the best way, let us get the job done just as quickly as the legislative process can be completed.

Hon. Thomas J. O'Brien

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I want to take this opportunity to salute and congratulate my colleague and warm personal friend, TOM O'BRIEN of Illinois, on his 80th birthday. Because of his fine character, genial and friendly disposition, he counts his friends by his acquaintances, and knows no enemies.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the pleasure of knowing him for many years, as many Members of the House have, and have found him always a gentleman of the highest type, always willing to be helpful if one's cause is worthy, and a man whose word, when given, is always as good as the soundest bond.

Educated in business law and and accounting, for years he was associated in the accounting business with John S. Weisbach & Co., Chicago, and for a time served as State bank examiner under auditors Brady, Russel & Nelson. Before coming to Congress, he served as a State representative in the 45th, 46th, and 57th General Assemblies of Illinois. He was first elected to the 73d Congress; reelected to the 74th, and 75th Congresses; elected sheriff of Cook County for the term 1938 to 1942. Was afterward elected to the 78th, the 80th, 81st, 82d, 83d, 84th, and 85th Congresses, and for many years has been a member of the great Committee on Ways and Means.

His many friends wish him continued good health, happiness, and service in this body.

American Water Works Association Endorses New Water Development Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted last week to learn that the American Water Works Association, through its board of directors, at the association's annual meeting held in Dallas, Tex., adopted a resolution endorsing H. R. 11544, the bill, which I introduced, setting out the basis for Federal cooperation in the construction of multiple-purpose water projects by States or local agencies, primarily for the development of domestic and industrial water.

The American Water Works Association is a national association of agencies interested in water development, and is the first national organization to endorse this legislation, although it has had the support and endorsement of numerous California water agencies.

I attach a copy of the resolution for the information of Members:

Whereas domestic and industrial water supply is of growing importance and must be coordinated in the planning and development of drainage basins for their most economic use—by construction of multiple purpose water projects; and

Whereas domestic and industrial water supplies have historically paid their own way as the responsibility of local agencies, and have not been aided by Federal or State subsidies, and it is important to the general Federal taxpayer that such policies be continued; and

Whereas under existing laws there is little opportunity for the financing and construction of multiple purpose water projects other than by the United States; and

Whereas H. R. 11544, introduced by the Honorable CLAIR ENGLE, chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, sets forth a means of much-needed Federal cooperation with States and local agencies, and under this bill, where domestic and industrial water supplies are the principal purposes, State and local agencies may construct multiple purpose water projects with the Federal Government contributing the cost of navigation, flood control, fish and wildlife as would be nonreimbursable under existing law, if built by Federal agencies, and loaning the cost of irrigation allocations without interest where compliance is had with the 160-acre limitation of reclamation law, and with interest for excess lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the American Water Works Association, assembled at Dallas, Tex., on April 25, 1958, hereby endorses in behalf of the association such general principles of Federal cooperation with State and local agencies as set forth in said bill H. R 11544.

Tweedt Watches, Takes Part in Dramatic Farm Changes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include an article which appeared on Tuesday, April 22, 1958, in the Ames Daily Tribune, Ames, Iowa:

TWEEDT WATCHES, TAKES PART IN DRAMATIC FARM CHANGES

In 1911, Burney Tweedt started farming for himself 1.5 miles southeast of Huxley.

Then 21 years old, he had a pair of purebred Hamiltonian trotting horses, a team of big bays, some milk cows, and the privilege of renting the 80-acre place from his father for his start.

Now 68 years old, he is planting his 47th crop at this place and can look back, sometimes nostalgically, on intervening years in which he had witnessed dramatic changes in the world as a whole, in the world of agriculture, and in his own personal world.

EASIER NOW

He admits that farming is much easier now with tractors and more equipment but doubts if it is as much fun as it used to be.

"I was slow to change," he recalls. "I didn't even buy a tractor until 1947."

Actually Tweedt kept a team of horses until just 2 years ago. He used them for planting corn and a few other jobs.

"It's hard to get used to being without them. I kinda feel like I still don't have the chores done without feeding some horses," he mused.

Horses were to the young man of 1911 what a snappy automobile is to the 21-year-old of today.

Tweedt recalled how beautiful his purebred Hamiltonian trotting horses looked when he hitched them to the top buggy and went to court his future wife. He called them Harp and Leroy. His work horses were Polly and Prince.

It was in 1914 that Tweedt married. This was the year after he purchased the farm from his father in 1913.

"Young fellows nowadays wouldn't start up farming on an 80; they would think it was just a garden spot. But we've always made a good living here," Tweedt recalled.

He talked briefly of the days when farmers harvested their grain by threshing. There were days of going out on the threshing rig. Hard work, but fun, he recalled. Tweedt ran a threshing machine for about 7 or 8 years.

LARGE FAMILY

The fertile 80-acre place, some of which was virgin land when Tweedt bought it nearly a half century ago, has not only made a nice home and provided a good living for its owner and his wife, but they have been able to raise a family of 10 children there.

The Tweedts' children are scattered all over the country now, "and only one lives on a farm," exclaimed the father.

Tweedt feels that he doesn't need Government assistance with his farming. He's not in the farm program now and has not participated in it in the past more than was absolutely necessary.

"I'm glad as long as I can run my own farm. The Government doesn't owe me anything except a free country to live in," he declared.

He's against any trend to bigger farms and believes no man should be allowed over 160 acres.

He also dislikes the trend for farmers to work their place and hold down a job in town. There are plenty of things on the farm that need attending to, he opined.

Tweedt loves the farm life.

"All my life I've been my own boss," he said. "If I want to take a day off, I don't have to ask anyone."

Tweedt said that with 10 children he has of course had his difficult times. He always had had a cash income from milk cows, however. From the time he started until just 2 years ago he has milked. He has always kept about eight brood sows for spring pigs.

QUIT MILKING

"I quit milking to cut down on the work a little. I still have the hogs and am raising seven Holstein heifers," he told. He has 150 pullets.

Tweedt actually came to the farm one-half mile east of U. S. 69 on Highway 210 in 1902 when his parents, Mr. and Mrs. S. K. Tweedt, moved there from Estherville. He started running the place for his father in 1907.

Tweedt was confirmed and has been a longtime member of the Palestine Lutheran Church just a short way east of his place. All of the 10 children were confirmed there, too.

Tweedt doesn't look 68 because he is slim, tanned and healthy looking. In this, his 47th year of farming, he still gets a tremendous amount of zest out of turning over the black soil, planting the crops and watching them grow.

His wife has had a heart condition for the past several years and though she can do her own housework, leaves the chicken chores, etc., to him.

"She keeps telling me I ought to go have a checkup," said Tweedt. "But I say to her what would I tell the doctor. I feel fine."

The Tweedts' children are: Silas and Burnie, Jr., both of Houston, Tex., and both in the insurance business; Donald, El Paso, in the Army; Norman, Oakland, Calif., heavy machinery serviceman; Clare, student in an electrical engineering technical school at Kansas City; (Gladys) Mrs. H. M. Barnes, Cole Comp, Mo., and the only 1 of the 10 now on a farm; (Beulah) Mrs. Ray Allen, Ames; (Mildred) Mrs. Richard Brown, Ames; (Wilma) Mrs. Ray Shiery, Ames; and (Frances) Mrs. Ray Olson, Des Moines.

Hon. Thomas J. O'Brien

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to associate myself with those who are congratulating our colleague, Congressman TOM O'BRIEN, on the occasion of his 80th birthday. I have known Mr. O'BRIEN since the first day I came to the Congress, and over the years I have grown to respect him most highly and to place great confidence in his judgment.

He is a good American who fills his position, not only to the satisfaction of his constituents, but to the country generally. Not all of us are permitted to live out a life as full and complete as his has been. It is, therefore, fitting that we express our unusual interest in his age attainment and wish for him a continuation of his good health and activity.

The School on Beacon Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article on the Suffolk University in Boston, which maintains high-scholarship standards under the leadership of President Robert J. Munce:

THE SCHOOL ON BEACON HILL
(By Floyd Lee Bell)

(Suffolk University, which now includes a college of liberal arts, journalism, business administration, as well as original school of law, has today a total enrollment of more than 1,500 students in day and evening classes. Maintains high-scholarship standards under the leadership of President Robert J. Munce.)

It's the University on Beacon Hill—the great downtown university—it's the university from which more law students have been graduated into high places on the courts of Greater Boston and of the Commonwealth than from any other school or college. In brief, it's Suffolk University, whose blue and gold colors are those of the Commonwealth itself, whose alumni are from every State in the Union and who swear by their alma mater as the greatest.

Suffolk University is unique in this area of colleges and universities. Since its location is directly at the rear of the State house and with almost a puddle jump leap an ambitious student may skim the distance between classroom and legislative and judicial, as well as executive, offices of the government; and many of them have made the leap to attain high prominence in governmental affairs.

Suffolk is a school beloved by its students and its graduates—of whom there are now literally thousands. It is a university which grew from a law school—and that latter remains a very important division of the big university itself. It is the last university to offer low-tuition rates so that the boy or girl seeking an education and a degree may not be prevented by sky-high rates from achieving his or her ambition.

At the helm of Suffolk University sits a most humane gentleman, President Robert J. Munce, whose door is literally always open. Any student may drop in to chat with and to discuss problems at any moment of the college day. Bob Munce is a man with a record—a splendid one—having been on the faculty of various other colleges and universities including the University of Pittsburgh, Washington University in St. Louis, and Washington and Jefferson. He believes that every student has potential success stamped upon his brow and that he needs only encouragement to become a leader. That is why President Munce devotes many, many hours to intimate chats and coaching of students, many of whom have gone forth prepared to swear that their future success was because of those talks with the dean (for he was dean for a number of years) or the president. He is a topmost educator but above all else he is human, he is understanding and his kindly attitude does much to make Suffolk so highly regarded among schools and colleges of this territory.

Suffolk probably presents more opportunity for the young man or woman desirous of working through college, or at least to do part-time work, than do most institutions of higher learning.

Its classrooms are spacious and well lighted, its laboratories and lounging rooms are likewise. Although emphasizing scholastic attainment, Suffolk provides plenty of recreation and entertainment for its student body, realizing that many extracurricular activities are necessary if school spirit is to be maintained at a high level.

Many businessmen seek Suffolk graduates because of the unusual training given in business administration just as law offices are happy to receive for further training or as associates those who have been graduated from Suffolk.

One of the points of interest at Suffolk is the magnificent office and reception room on the third floor occupied by President Munce, but actually used almost as much by the students and members of the faculty as by the tall, handsome and gregarious president. In the very center of this room is a long table some 30 feet in length, perhaps as handsome a "directors" or "trustees" table as one ever could find.

The Suffolk Journal is the school publication and is a newsy, well-written journal of news and notes, edited entirely by students of the university, printed on "slick" paper and affording a wonderful chance for budding journalists to practice their arts.

The location of Suffolk makes it accessible from MTA or from any of the three railroads entering Boston; it likewise affords students an unparalleled opportunity to visit the historical shrines of a great part of Boston, many of which are within walking distance. The great metropolitan shopping centers are also just a few blocks from the university. Only several blocks distant is the Boston Public Library, one of the finest in America, and the Museum of Fine Arts is a 10-minute subway ride. On the historic Charles River, a view of which may be seen from the upper stories of the university building, there is a chance for the athletic prowess on water to be worked out.

No school, college, or university in the Nation presents greater opportunities for its students to achieve scholastic distinction and none has a board of trustees of higher caliber. This board is made up of some of the leading professional and businessmen of the Commonwealth and is headed by Hon. George B. Rowell, former Assistant Attorney General, as chairman.

In Suffolk University auditorium, which seats some 1,800 persons, many celebrities of the political, civic, stage, screen, and television worlds have appeared; and Suffolk is proud of the fact that Miss Jane Wyman, who was later to be granted an "Oscar" by the Motion Picture Academy Awards Committee as leading screen actress of 1949, was before that granted the Suffolk award for being, in the judgment of the students, the greatest screen actress of the era. The late Miss Gertrude Lawrence was another who was granted an award in Suffolk auditorium. Leaders in political thought and action, in religion, and in education have appeared as guests and speakers in this auditorium.

Suffolk, although primarily a day institution, was the first college in New England at which a student might earn a bachelor-of-arts degree through evening study.

Suffolk is a member of the New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The college departments are approved by the board of collegiate authority, department of education, and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The law college is approved by the American Bar Association. The judicial, supreme, superior, probate, land, and municipal courts are next door to the university.

As of now, Suffolk University includes Colleges of Liberal Arts, Journalism, Business Administration, and Law. It has a total enrollment of more than 1,500 students in day and night classes and its standards of scholarship are regarded as ranking as high as those of any university in the Nation.

Annually for several years past, the commencement exercises, at which degrees are granted to more than 200 each year and to some 8 or 10 recipients of honorary degrees, have been held in the old Boston Opera House, a tradition of years in this area—but with the razing of that famed building this year the exercises will be held in Mechanics Building.

Donald Goodrich is dean of the colleges other than law, and Frederick McDermott is dean of the Law College. The attorney general of Massachusetts, and at least eight judges of the higher courts are members of the Suffolk Law School Alumni Association of which Judge Frank J. Donahue, one of the best known judicial minds in the East, has long been president. Judge Donahue brings each year to the annual midwinter and fall meetings of this alumni association some of the topnotch legal minds of the Nation as speakers and as guests of honor.

Suffolk University, under the skilled guidance of Charles Law as coach, has noteworthy athletic teams in baseball, basketball, soccer, and hockey. The blue and gold teams have won many honors for the university.

The library at Suffolk is one of the largest and most comprehensive in the New England region and recently Richard J. Sullivan, of Lawrence, longtime city librarian at Lawrence, was named librarian at Suffolk. He has held many important posts in library circles and is recognized as one of the leaders in this branch of education.

The true measure of any university or college is reflected in the record of its graduates. Early in its history Suffolk gained recognition for the high quality of its faculty and the success of its graduates. Judges, lawyers, bankers, business leaders, educators, and statesmen have emerged from its hall of learning. Their advancement, they cheerfully admit has been due to the training they received at Suffolk University.

It's a truly great school, this "downtown" university, this Suffolk University which has fitted so many young men and women for useful careers.

Law Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, today, May 1, 1958, has been proclaimed Law Day by the President of the United States. As a Georgia lawyer and as the son and grandson of Georgia lawyers, I was taught from birth a reverence for the law and the Bill of Rights.

As a former active participant in the work of the Georgia Bar Association, it was my privilege to observe among the members of the legal profession many of the most able and scholarly men it has been my privilege to know. It is, therefore, my sincere hope that those Americans who will today express their respect for the codes, the standards and the traditions of our legal system will simultaneously acknowledge the capabilities of the members of our legal profession who so conscientiously and tirelessly administer that system, and who have so consistently contributed to the stability and the progress of our country.

Had this Nation discarded the English common law when it declared and fought for its independence in the 18th century, it might well have lost its freedom before the end of the 19th century.

If, today, the American people decide that they should discard the traditional judicial interpretations of the United States Constitution and embark on an untried course of judicial legislation and depart from the doctrine of judicial precedent, they might well lose their freedom before the end of the 20th century.

It is my hope and belief that the American people are becoming more and more aware of those standards and those traditions of the law that elevated their Nation to greatness.

It is my hope that today, Law Day, when we honor our system of jurisprudence, we shall remember that it is a system which has been tried and proved to be the best in the history of the world.

Pay TV or Free TV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, Congress is being asked to consider the question of pay television, and to determine whether the long-range interests of the public at large are best served by permitting or denying permission for large-scale undertakings in this area.

Anything that might affect television as basically as subscription television is of intimate concern to the American public. Current reports of the A. C. Nielsen research organization show that there are 42,500,000 homes in the United States with television sets—84 percent of all homes in the Nation. Recent reports of the Television Bureau of Advertising show the average home watching television about 6 hours per day, so that the television set works a 42-hour week in these days of a 40-hour workweek economy. Watching television is the most popular waking activity of the American family. It is appropriate, therefore, that we examine closely any proposal that would drastically affect that medium.

On February 19, 1958, Donald H. McGannon, president of the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., Inc., in an address before the San Francisco Advertising Club, examined the subject of subscription television in terms that I feel bear our close examination. Mr. McGannon expressed fears for the future of public service broadcasting, if pay television comes. Public service broadcasting, by definition, is that area of programing not basically classified as entertainment, but designed to inform, educate and enlighten the audience. In his talk, Mr. McGannon also expressed concern over the danger that pay television may hold for our national economy. Partial text of Mr. McGannon's address follows, and will prove interesting reading:

We cannot, however, overlook certain obvious causes which may have an effect upon the prosperity of broadcasting in the future. This is especially true in the case of the visual medium when we consider the effect of the various plans of subscription broadcasting. Too many of us in free television are inclined to accept the soporific that pay television "can't happen here." We base this on the conclusions that the public will resist any idea of paying for home entertainment which they now have largely free; the Government will not permit such a system; the investors will not be attracted to the economic considerations of pay television; or simply that the system will not work.

Too many people regard subscription television as somebody else's problem—as something that will have no effect on them beyond the decision whether or not to pay for one of the things in their home. Pay television, ladies and gentlemen, is the problem of every person in this country, whether or not he subscribes; in fact, whether or not he watches free commercial television.

We cannot wish away by subjective thinking the fact that pay television is technically and economically possible and we should approach it as openmindedly as possible, bearing in mind three major premises:

1. If this system of subscription television will weaken our free system of television by reducing the potential audience, this could correspondingly weaken our economic program and would run contrary to the conviction that the growing consumer population requires enlarged avenues for selling in order that production could be maintained.

2. The services that radio and television can render in the informational field are made possible directly or indirectly by advertising revenues. These services, such as news, special events, and supporting of great national causes and public-service programing, in general would suffer radically or be nonexistent in the cash-and-carry atmosphere of subscription television.

3. A system of television that must depend upon popular subscription for revenue would tend to stultify creative efforts in the field of programing, which efforts represent the future of our industry and the potential of the medium. Even the proponents have stated that they plan to rely upon existing program formats to bulk out their schedule—such as motion pictures, sporting events, spectacular programs, theatrical productions, and the like.

One of the aspects of this problem that disturbs me the most is the tendency of the proponents of pay television to derogate advertising in their efforts to establish what they seem to believe to be a new art form, or the variation on existing themes. On numerous occasions I know you, too, have

seen them depict broadcasting advertising as generally distasteful and, specifically, costly to the consumer.

Our task, therefore, is to maintain the integrity of our present system of free broadcasting and encourage its growth, to tell the positive story of advertising as well as of the mediums. Our long-range thinking should be turned to improving our own mediums in advertising itself and perhaps give more energy to that task than to simply worrying about the potential intrusion of the various subscription schemes and the promoters behind them. It is fair to state that people have become accustomed to and even like advertising when presented in a balanced and creative form. I believe they even rely upon it as a service and understand the contribution that it makes to the control of costs in a mass economy.

I cite you specifically the classic example of Ivory soap—its unit cost has increased very little in 75 years, although production and material costs have risen sharply, demonstrating the efficacy of advertising in a competitive and dynamic production economy.

As Thomas D'Arcy Brophy, chairman of the board of Kenyon & Eckhardt, recently said, "Advertising is not expendable. It is not a garnishment of business * * * it is an essential ingredient of our economy * * * it is to selling what the machine is to production. Advertising mass produces customers for a mass production economy."

Broadcasting is not alone an industry of buying and selling, producing and using. We are an industry interested in the welfare and betterment of the people we serve, and determined to contribute to the peaceful progress of our Nation which we genuinely feel possesses, by circumstances of history, a large responsibility in the affairs of today's world. The task to retain the God-given liberties of the free world and to resist the Communists' slavery-recruiting program is one in which free people cannot fail.

Their success, however, is predicated upon being informed. The responsibility, therefore, of people employed by free media, such as ours, to fully and intelligently inform is a massive thing. We feel that this responsibility to society far transcends the labors to which we turn our hands each day, and must be predicated upon ingredients that are as inherent in broadcasting as they are in government and law, journalism and industry, labor and elsewhere—these are responsibility and leadership.

It is not enough to say that we will serve the American public on the basis of a formula comprised of program ratings, but must exercise ingenuity and courage in programing efforts that achieve increasingly higher plateaus of success. It is not sufficient in the interest of public service to ask for blood or money for the indigent, or that we encourage the purchase of bonds as a hedge against inflation, or the hiring of the handicapped, or urge safety on the highways.

These are worthy badges to wear, but beyond this we, too, must deal in ideas. We must contribute in an editorial sense to the people's understanding of the issues of the day—the facts and conditions that surround the cold war, the differences in ideologies between the Communist and free worlds, the reasons that create a need for NATO, and the purpose and effectiveness of the United Nations.

In a government-operated system of broadcasting, leadership, such as it is, is preordained and, unfortunately limited in most instances to the party in power. Ours suffers no such limitations for we are the custodians of an instrument for enlightenment—forever charged with the responsibility to achieve its greatest potential. We cannot let broadcasting become a mere appliance in the home which becomes for the mind what the refrigerator is for the stomach—a storehouse of staples to satisfy an appetite. Our efforts must be far greater, and serve as a source of inspiration and enlightenment to which each of our people may turn to fulfill their ideals and aspirations.

The broadcasters of America, and certainly those engaged at the Westinghouse stations, are of the sound conviction that we will be free only so long as we are respected, and we shall be respected only so long as we are principled, ingenious and courageous, and ever aware of the responsibilities we assume in dealing with the minds of men.

Why I Like To Live in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an address by Mr. Reid Brazell, president of the Leonard Refineries, Alma, Mich., at the 12th annual testimonial dinner given by the Association Executives of Michigan for Michigan Members of Congress at the Hotel Statler in Washington on April 29, and entitled "Why I Like To Live in Michigan":

Needless to say, I appreciate the opportunity and feel honored to have the privilege of speaking to you on this auspicious occasion—an occasion when busy folks take time to come here to Washington, to talk to, to break bread with, and to honor their representatives in the Congress of the United States.

When Bill Palmer called and asked me to talk to this group, my first reaction was, "What do I have to say that would be of interest to such a meeting?" I asked Bill, "What do you want me to talk about?" His reply was, "Why you like Michigan." That was easy. I like Michigan because I believe in Michigan, and because I believe in Michigan I suggest to you and to the people of Michigan that we establish as an objective, as a goal, the job of putting real meaning and truth into the three words, "Michigan means business." The achievement of this goal should not be too difficult for the people of Michigan if past performance is any indication of what they can and will do if such a challenge is accepted.

Let's take a look at our State, its history, and more importantly its people; also a look at the present, and look to the future.

First, as personal reference, I should like to mention that it was by no accident of birth that Michigan is the State in which I make my home; in which I raise my family and in which I earn my daily bread. I was born in Oklahoma and lived there and elsewhere for 30 years before adopting Michigan. Notwithstanding my love for Oklahoma, my native State, and my pride in it, I adopted Michigan for my home. I chose it for reasons that are reflected in its history, its geography, its climate, and above all, in its people. I chose it because I believed in Michigan, its people and its future. That faith of mine has become stronger each of the years that I have lived here. I truly believe in Michigan.

Perhaps from the vantage point of the past we can more clearly perceive why confidence in the future of our Michigan is justified—and come to a better understanding of why we all of us should believe in Michigan.

Consider for a moment: What sort of a State is Michigan? What are Michigan people like? There is no simple answer to those questions. Michigan is unlike any ohter State lying between the two oceans. Michigan people and the development of the State reflect circumstances most unlike those that exist elsewhere in this world.

Senators MCNAMARA and POTTER must find it a great challenge as well as great honor and responsibility to wear the mantle of United States Senator for Michigan.

If we start at Monroe in Congressman MEADER'S district and go westward to the western boundaries of Congressman HOFFMAN'S district, we find fertile lands where Michigan farmers plow soil as rich as can be found in our whole country.

Moving northward, we find the busy Saginaw Valley district so ably represented by my own Congressman ALVIN BENTLEY, to the east we find the great Thumb area represented by Congressman MCINTOSH, moving farther north into the districts represented by Congressmen GRIFFIN, CEDERBERG, and KNOX; a vast region of generally sparse soil where a few short years ago stood our vast treasures of pine and hardwood. Some people thought these treasures inexhaustible, but the trees were felled and by 1890, they were largely gone. In every frontier country there are heedless people who despoil without thought for the future. So it was with Michigan's forests. But others come to heal the wounds. Thus today, happily, there stands in that region row upon row of growing pines and hardwoods which will bless future generations.[1] At the upper part of Congressman KNOX' district are the Straits of Mackinac which so long divided Michigan, but now spanned by the world's great new bridge, to unite the people of the upper and lower peninsulas and open new horizons for us. The eastern end of the upper peninsula, also in Congressman KNOX'S district, was another land of hardwood and pines which, once despoiled, is again emerging as a land of bounty. Traveling westward toward the Wisconsin border, in Congressman BENNETT'S district, rock ridges emerge from the soil and there are found the iron and copper riches that for so many years sustained large segments of our population.[2 3]

I believe in Michigan because of its great natural opportunities. Michigan is a State apart. Its uniqueness lies in the varieties of its geography, climate and terrain and particularly in the uniqueness of its peoples. Its uniqueness is perhaps best exemplified by the fact that Michigan is dotted by more than 11,000 inland lakes, is traversed by 20,000 miles of streams and is framed by waters as blue as those of the Mediterranean. It has a shoreline of over 3,200 miles. Michigan is bounded by 4 of the 5 Great Lakes. There is Lake Superior, with its cold and mighty breakers smashing the rocky shores of the upper peninsula—Lake Michigan, beating at the sand dunes to the west; Lake Huron, gently touching the eastern side of Congressman MCINTOSH'S district; and Lake Erie, lazily lapping the Monroe marshes.[4 5]

Michigan's climate is also unique. Our State is air conditioned by the waters of the Great Lakes. The lake waters absorb heat from air warmer than themselves and warm the colder winds. The Great Lakes regions are frequently a meeting point for high and low pressure areas, with the result that we have frequent changes of weather. Our climate is a seasonal climate. Each year we enjoy spring's rebirth of nature, summer's warmth tempered by the cooling lakes,

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

autumn's brilliance unexcelled in beauty in any place else in the whole world, and winter's quiet snows.

Our uncommon geography and climate have produced an uncommon people. Our people vary as to types and ancestry, and because of what Michigan people have done with the land that they found, our State never developed into any common type of State.

Little more than a hundred years ago Michigan was wilderness. Its chief industry was the fur trade. As late as 1814 history records Indian massacres in Michigan. It was not until 1842 that the Indians ceded the last Michigan lands. In the space of little more than a hundred years this State was created from a wilderness land of trappers and fur traders to its present greatness. Into its development went incredible extremes of vision and stupidity and greed and generosity.

Our State was born of bloodshed and dissensions so often common to frontier lands. It was born of the calamities of Indian massacres, pestilences, destructive fires, wars and unprecedented waste and greed and wisdom and folly and cupidity and integrity. Truly Michigan has had a tempestuous past.

The Michigan wilderness did not come to the forefathers easily. They fought for it. First they fought the French, then the British and then the British again, and all the while they fought the Indians. When peace came many of these frontiersmen entered upon an orgy of exploitation of the Michigan land and the treasures beneath the surface unprecedented in history. It is, however, of some comfort to recall that the pines of Michigan housed much of the Nation and produced values equal to 3 times the gold that California's earth gave up and 10 times the gold from Alaska. Many houses built of Michigan pine still stand today. And much of the money derived from this so-called rape of the woods found its way into our colleges and our hospitals. It might be well to consider that had these pinelands not been cut away we would not have our great and growing State and national forests that are so important to our beloved Michigan outdoors.[6]

During roughly the same period that Michigan trees were producing their fortunes, Michigan produced half the copper mined in the United States—more than 9 billion pounds of it—and millions of tons of iron ore. Into this land came Welshmen, Lithuanians, Austrians, and Finns to fell the trees and tend the mines, joining the earlier migrations of Germans, Dutch, Irish, and Polish peoples, who had come to mingle with the original French and English settlers. Thus came our complex and uncommon people.

When the last great native pines came crashing down in the Michigan forest and when our iron and copper ore became much less bountiful, there were heart-breaking times in many parts of our State. The lumberjacks and the ore workers took up farming. We see today in many sections of our State tragic reminders of their vain efforts and of their dreams of establishing farms in soil inhospitable to farming. A lonely chimney against the evening sky. A rotting door stoop. A dilapidated barn. We must not assume that all of our State is thus inhospitable. Today much of that soil once unsuccessfully tilled is producing fruits, cereals, and meats in great abundance. These developments have come about because Michigan men who failed once were willing to try again and try ever once again. They have come about also because, just as there were those who despoiled our land, there were in greater number those who made efforts to enrich it and to insure its future bounty. In 1857 our legislature had the wisdom to found our great Michigan State University, the first agricultural college in the entire Nation to open its doors. That institution and our great conservation department are fulfilling their destiny in securing to us the utmost bounty of our soil and the riches beneath.

I believe in Michigan because our State has been well endowed with many resources. There are the great salt deposits in the State which have placed Michigan ahead of all other States in salt production. Lest we think salt a common sort of product for table use only, we should remember that salt and derivatives from it are used in more than 14,000 different products.

Petroleum, too, is found in Michigan—enough so that in 1938 Michigan was second in the producing States east of the Mississippi. While production has been declining, it is still an important product to many of us.

In the era before the automobile, other great industries came to Michigan—furniture in Congressman FORD's district; wagons and carriages in Congressman CHAMBERLIN's district; the great paper and pharmaceutical industries in Congressman JOHANSEN'S district, and the great and growing pharmaceutical industry in Detroit. There came also a wide variety of small factories which depended upon the hardwood of the region, dotting areas to the north.

Michigan is bounded by waters that were bountifully filled with fish. Thus it became a land of fishermen. It became also a land of sailors. Our great fishing industry has declined, but with the development of the St. Lawrence seaway, our State promises to provide ports for the shipping of all the world. Michigan woods have always abounded with game. Thus we are a land of hunters and outdoorsmen.

Up until now we have considered for the most part those people of Michigan that depended upon the soil, the forests, and the treasures beneath the soil for a livelihood.

There was, and is, the Detroit industrial complex so ably represented by Congressmen MACHROWICZ, DIGGS, RABAUT, DINGELL, LESINSKI, GRIFFITHS, and BROOMFIELD. First established as Fort Pontchartrain by Cadillac in 1700, Detroit and its environs had a population of only 1,442 people in 1820 and only 21,000 people by 1850. As late as 1900 Detroit's population was only approximately 300,000 people. Today its population exceeds 2 million, and it has become one of the largest cities in the United States.[7 8]

In 1900 Detroit was a city of stability. It was a self-satisfied city. True, there had developed in Detroit the successful manufacture of stoves, drugs, machinery and railroad equipment, which continue to be successful. But at the turn of this century the most extravagant prediction as to Detroit's future would have paled into insignificance when compared with the actual events that followed. Ford, Chalmers, Olds, Joy, Durant, Nash, Willys, Chapin were pioneers of another sort than the trappers, fur traders, and timber men who penetrated the Michigan wilderness, but they pursued their dreams with the same tireless energy and zeal and at the same hectic pace. By 1910 the population of Detroit had grown to almost half a million people and Detroit had become the ninth largest city in the United States.[9]

Detroit did not invent or create the automobile, but Detroit did create and perfect the art of making tens of millions of them through assembly line techniques and industrial practices that revolutionized not only Detroit but the world; techniques and practices which may revolutionize society itself before their influence is fully spent. Into the crucible of Detroit came armies of unlike men. From Michigan itself came the grandsons of the fur trappers, the sons of the lumberjacks and timber cruisers, the unsuccessful farmers and the sons and grandsons of the copper and iron miners. But Michigan was an insufficient reservoir of manpower to supply the virtually insatiable appetite of the assembly lines. From the Appalachians and from the deep South came other armies of men. When World War I ended, other nations poured their unneeded and unwanted sons into Detroit. These were a most uncommon people.

These diverse and unlike peoples from all parts of the world have been assimilated in the State of Michigan. The melding of their diverse skills, cultures and backgrounds has given us a citizenship unique among the States, but with many common characteristics.

Michigan peoples have many common traits. Among those common characteristics are ambition, industry, bravery, skill and a love of their State and Nation. We should not forget that Michigan gave us many supremely brave and self-sacrificing men—673,000 of them who served our Nation in World War II. Most of our peoples who were not in active service, hundreds of thousands of others, gave their skills to produce the munitions of war—more than $20 billion worth by the end of World War II—far more than the production of any other State, to make Detroit and Michigan the "arsenal of democracy" in World War II.

Until now I have spoken most of material things. I have said little of Michigan's inanimate treasures. True, we are a people who have devoted much of our lives and resources to material things—but there is another side equally or more important. In 1817 our forebears established a great university—the University of Michigan—one of the 4 or 5 great universities in the world. At almost each crossroad we established a church and in hamlets a college, so today there are more than 20 colleges and universities. In 1785 a land ordinance was adopted setting aside section 16 in every township to be used for educational purposes. Thus today the son of a Finnish immigrant writes our Nation's songs, the son of a Polish immigrant is a judge or a Congressman. A most uncommon people we are.[10 11]

Detroit made automobiles available to even the poorest of our country's citizens. More than 7 million of them in a single year. That availability has been largely responsible for the second greatest industry that our State now enjoys, the tourist industry. Thus there is a close kinship between Detroit and the outer regions of our State.

Our 11,000 lakes, our shorelines bathed by the waters of the Great Lakes, our thousands of miles of trout streams and our tens of thousands of reforested acres beckon to the weary to come at all seasons and enjoy peace and beauty and to return to their homes and jobs refreshed. The automobile has provided the means for them to come. And how they have come. From an occasional visitor a few years ago seeking relief perhaps from hay fever, we now have a flood of visitors who come from all parts of the world and at all seasons of the year to visit with us and to spend with us more than $600 million annually.

With Etienne Brule crossed the Straits and landed at Sault Sainte Marie in 1618 he could not imagine that a few short years hence, as history goes, a span of steel and stone more than 5 miles long would bridge the rushing waters of the Straits. Cadillac and his small band of men and women manned the ramparts of Fort Pontchartrain on the shore of the Detroit River in 1700, and met with equal fortitude the vicissitudes of Indian attack, destructive fire, cholera, and near starvation. I doubt Cadillac could envision that towering edifices of steel and stone would 1 short day stand on the site of and near the old fort.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

The timber cruiser who as late as the 1880's stood in the hushed silence of a grove of towering pines would never have believed that hundreds of thousands of people would come to these woods and lakes and streams of Michigan each year to find renewed vigor and contentment. I suspect that as Brule, Cadillac, and the timber cruiser would have been unable to prophesy the future of Michigan, we now cannot successfully prophesy that future.

We do know one thing well, however, that this great State of ours, and its magnificent institutions and its people, have developed, been preserved, grown and flourished in a climate of personal, political, and economic freedom. It is the hallowed function of you gentlemen whom we honor tonight, to help to continue to preserve those institutions of freedom.

It is not my purpose or province to advise you as to how you shall insure that freedom endures. There comes to my mind, however, the words of two great and honored Michigan statesmen who described their creeds when dealing with critical political problems of their day. First, there was Senator Lewis Cass, who as a Senator in 1850 enjoyed the dubious help of being required by custom to vote in accordance with instructions of the Michigan Legislature, which appointed him. Differing with the instructions received from the legislature, he had this to say, "When the time comes and I am required to vote upon this measure, I shall know how to reconcile my duty to the legislature with my duty to myself by surrendering a trust I can no longer fill." Friend and foe alike proclaimed him for his courage and ultimately the instructions from the legislature were withdrawn and Senator Cass not only retained his integrity and independence, but he has been forever honored by his people.

More recently the late Senator Vandenberg, having changed the views he had previously held on matters of the greatest national interest, reported to the shocked constituents who had elected him and said, "What happens to me politically is of no moment to me or to the State, but what happens to the country is of vital moment to all."

What can we predict for the future of Michigan? I am reluctant to predict as to its physical characteristics, its modes of transportation or even as to the form and nature of its industry. It has been predicted by scientists that in the next 25 years worldwide transportation may become as rapid as communication is now; that nuclear developments may make energy almost as cheap as air and that climate control will permit us to have alternatively a tropical garden or an ice age. In the light of these predictions it would be presumptuous for me to try to predict the rate of growth of our State or the precise forms that growth shall take.

I believe that Michigan has the greatest growth potential of any State in the Union. It has great natural resources, particularly the greatest bodies of fresh water in the world; the geography and terrain that make it an outdoor paradise for its residents and tourists; and, above all, the most important resource, people of indomitable spirit.

How can we put action, truth into the words, "Michigan means business"? First, we, you, each person in Michigan, should recognize it is a job for us to do ourselves. Stop expecting Washington and our Federal Congress to do the job for us. We should ask far and expect to receive the cooperation of the Federal Government in those areas where joint State and Federal action is required.

Second, advise our State officials and our State legislative bodies that in the development of our land of plenty, it will be necessary to invest money, now and in the future, in many projects, such as roads, educational institutions, health institutions, harbor projects, recreational facilities, to name only a few—projects that will permit the rapid development of our Michigan, and, incidentally, a rapid return of the money invested, through taxes that would be paid. We should expect the legislature to provide the funds necessary.

Third, the organization of groups whose efforts can be directed toward the many community projects that should be undertaken, projects that will help to put action and truth into the words, "Michigan means business."

---

[1] 1857: Michigan State University was the first agricultural college in the Nation to open.

[2] Michigan is the second State in production of iron ore; first in salt; second in sand, gravel, magnesium compounds, and peat.

[3] 1919: The Soo Canal was completed and it became and remains the busiest in the world.

[4] 1887: The Nation's first game warden was appointed at Grand Rapids.

[5] 1891: The Nation's first ski club was established at Ishpeming.

[6] 1881: The first forestry school in the Nation was established at the University of Michigan.

[7] 1868: First refrigerator box car was patented in Detroit.

[8] 1875: First ice cream soda developed at Sanders in Detroit.

[9] 1893: The first policewoman was appointed in Detroit.

[10] 1867: Michigan was the first State to support a university by direct property tax (University of Michigan).

[11] 1874: First school for underprivileged children in the world opened at Coldwater, Mich.

Hon. William J. Lindsay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that the citizens of the metropolitan area of Chicago, and the State of Illinois, learned of the recent death of the Honorable William J. Lindsay, 79, former judge of the superior court of Cook County for 30 years, retired since 1953.

He was born in Aurora, Ill. He attended the East Aurora High School and Grinnell College, Iowa, where he captained the baseball and football teams. After his graduation he taught mathematics and athletics at Iron Mountain, Mich., and at Englewood High School in Chicago. He attended Chicago Kent College of Law and, after graduation, taught law there from 1917 to 1927.

He was a stanch and active Democrat and was selected as the Democratic candidate for State's attorney in 1928. He was recognized as one of the greatest jurists of his time. And numbered among his many students are the outstanding lawyers at the bar today.

Judge Lindsay will be remembered for the many celebrated trials over which he presided. He was a brilliant and considerate jurist. He was rigid and strict in court decorum, fair in his applications of the principles of law, and thorough in his knowledge of procedures and evidence.

Entering his courtroom, the citizen knew that the dignity of the law and its honest application would be upheld. He instilled in everyone great respect for the judiciary and confidence in its institutions. His great contribution to the people of Cook County in the high service that he rendered to his fellow man will never be forgotten.

He tempered justice with mercy and, in his fairness, made one feel proud of having known him. Those who came before him respected his high qualities as a judge and his humane understanding as an honest man.

It is with deep feeling that the Congressmen of Illinois extend to his widow, Teresa, and his daughter by a previous marriage, Mrs. Mary McCormick, and his three grandchildren, their heartfelt condolences.

Russia Faces Food Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, you will recall that in February Lawrence Sullivan, coordinator of information, House of Representatives, made an interesting summary of a study by Prof. G. Warren Nutter, of the University of Virginia, which showed that in every basic industry Russia today is 25 to 100 years behind the United States, as measured in per capita production. I was happy to insert this study in the RECORD of February 10, 1958, and it is found on page A1243.

Mr. Sullivan recently completed a study of the Communist food crisis. His documentation from testimony before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, plus several studies by the Foreign Agricultural Service and the National Industrial Conference Board shows that the Communist world in both Eruope and Asia faces an explosive food situation.

Believing it will be of great interest to all my colleagues, I have asked unanimous consent that this study, entitled "Russia Faces Food Crisis," be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

RUSSIA FACES FOOD CRISIS

(By Lawrence Sullivan, Coordinator of Information, U. S. House of Representatives)

Why is Moscow so frantic for an immediate summit conference? Chiefly because the Communist food crisis is critical. A gaudy conference with top leaders from the lands of plenty is demanded urgently to restore the sagging prestige of the Kremlin masterplanners in the eyes of their own people.

Unless Moscow can do something spectacular before winter to improve Russian nutritional standards, an explosive food situation will confront the entire Communist world, in both Europe and Asia.

Diplomats currently are watching the Communist food supply more closely than at any time since the Bolshevik revolution of 1917.

Communist agriculture has failed for 40 years to keep abreast of Russian population growth.

In Russian money today, the average Soviet factory hand must work 3 hours to earn 1 dozen eggs.

Translated into American wages, this means that eggs in Moscow are selling at $6.30 a dozen, New York equivalent.

Slovenly tailored woolen suits in Moscow sell for 350 hours of labor at current Russian wages. Translated into American wages, the shoddy woolen suit in Moscow cost $735, New York equivalent.

A pair of shoes in Moscow requires 62 hours of factory wages, which is the same as shoes at $130.20 a pair in Chicago.

One pound of butter costs the Moscow worker 3 hours and 11 minutes wages—equal to $6.65 a pound, New York. By the same calculation, milk is $1.20 a quart in Moscow.

These examples, from a United States Department of Agriculture study published in November 1957, on the 40th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution, epitomize today's acute crisis in Russian farm production.

Upon his return from a Russian tour last November, Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, of Louisiana, reported: "Many Russian people today have only black bread, cabbage, potatoes, beets, and a pot of tea."

Reporting on his 10 years in Russian slave labor camps, a returned American prisoner, John Noble, reported: "The Soviet Union is a land of shortages and hungers."

"The country is insufficient in all respects, in food and industry. There simply isn't enough of anything to go around."

"Prisoners in the Arctic slave labor camps have denuded the countryside even of its dog population," Noble reported.

"Dog meat, I found, has a taste all its own, but if anything it is softer and tastier than beef. In all, the doctor and I ate up two dogs. The pieces, kept hidden in the snow, fed us for months."

Noble reported between 25 million to 28 million men and women in the Russian slave camps as of mid-1954.

The average weight of some 100,000 slaves in the infamous Vorkuta camp ranged 75 to 115 pounds per man. (Normal Europeans would average 175 pounds.)

"Our teeth rotted from lack of vitamins."

The Department of Agriculture's World Food Survey for January 1958 estimated food production per capita this year in the free world at 4 percent greater than the 1935–39 average, but the Communist nations are still 8 percent below their per capita prewar averages.

"Per capita production in Communist countries as a whole is still significantly below prewar, whereas per capita production in the rest of the world is slightly above prewar" (Foreign Agriculture, January 1958, p. 28). Thus, failure to feed a steadily expanding population continues as the first challenge to world communism.

"With population growing rapidly and nutritional standards low, a stagnant agriculture," reports Gregory Grossman of the University of California, "unquestionably threatens the very basis of a country's existence" (World Economic Growth, p. 32).

The National Industrial Conference Board confirms this picture with its own conclusion from a recent Russian tour, that "the emphasis given to heavy industry has left the bulk of the population of Russia with living standards that are woefully inadequate."

Steadily mounting pressures for better living standards, both within Russia and all the satellite states, raise grave doubts concerning the survival of communism (p. 45).

Before the Communist revolution, Russia was a principal world exporter of wheat, but in 1956 the Soviets imported 15 million bushels of wheat from Canada and additional tonnages from Argentina and Australia.

Our own Department of Agriculture emphasizes that all the temperate zones in Russia already are under collectivist cultivation. There are no new lands available for corn and feed grains, as basis for more meat and dairy products.

Russia is also totally lacking in quality breeding stock.

"There is also a great shortage and backwardness in refrigeration and processing equipment." Transportation is inadequate everywhere.

Russia's hunger crisis would have developed 10 years ago, save for millions of tons of lend-lease shipments of food, farm machinery, and fertilizers during the war years.

After the war, direct food shipments from UNNRA sustained Russian nutritional standards at the bare subsistance level through 1948.

For the years 1952–53 Russia, on her own for the first time since 1942, produced annually only 86 percent of her 1935–39 average farm yield, as measured on a per capita consumption basis.

By 1957 this per capita food production had been advanced slightly to 92 percent of the prewar average.

Harry Schwartz, Soviet affairs specialist for the New York Times, attributed the Polish and Hungarian uprisings of 1956 primarily to food shortages.

"There also has been the smaller scale, but still interesting, armed revolt in northern Vietnam," he told the Congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report (p. 37). "All of these are primitive expressions of the resentment of the people at the sacrifices they have been forced to undergo."

The urgency of the food crisis inside Russia was again underscored by Khruschev's order last October abandoning the old Stalinist collectivist tractor stations, in favor of direct ownership of tractors by the state farms.

In his address before the Supreme Soviet accepting the premiership, on March 27 of this year, Khrushchev devoted more than two hours of his 3-hour speech to agricultural production and food distribution.

But even here, communism still was unable to grasp the core of the problem—lack of incentive under collectivism.

All the world sees clearly that the solution of Russia's chronic food crisis lies in a return to private ownership of land and production machinery, with production-for-profit as the powerful incentive to expansion.

But that solution, of course, would entail complete abandonment and repudiation of all communism.

Even Khrushchev now admits that communism cannot deliver the goods.

But nobody in the Kremlin yet has suggested a practical solution within the terms of doctrinaire Communist theory. Hence a current political and economic crisis of the first magnitude. Gnawing stomachs do not wait on refinements of Marxist theory. Despite the sputniks, all the Communist world still queries, "When do we eat?"

Moscow's successive 5-year plans always have emphasized industrial development at the expense of agriculture. Many city populations have multiplied by 10 since the 1917 revolution, but often supporting farm acreage around the mushrooming cities has scarcely doubled.

Baku had 150,000 population in 1917 and 1 million in 1957. Novosibirsk had 60,000 in 1917 and 800,000 in 1957. Omsk had 160,000 in 1939 and 560,000 in 1957. Kuibyshev had 360,000 in 1939 and 800,000 in 1957.

In part, these new city masses have been supported since the war by commandeered crops from the satellites of eastern Europe. The great Danube Valley, for centuries the breadbasket of central Europe, is today a land of rigorously collectivized hunger and want.

As Harry Schwartz told the Economic Joint Committee of Congress in December 1956: "The chief characteristic of economic management this past decade in Poland has been that men sent to run a particular field knew nothing about that field. This was particularly true in agriculture.

"The second reason is, of course, that the peasantry of eastern Europe has, by and large, been opposed to collectivism. * * * The peasant's only possible resistance has been passive resistance. He simply did not do his job as well as he might have. So the really fundamental answer to what has happened to the great Danube granery is that the ills of Communist management have so deprived peasants of incentive, and have so mismanaged agricultural affairs in eastern Europe, that the countries like Rumania, Hungary, and Poland are today countries which badly need imported grain to feed their own people" (p. 50).

On the other side of the world the same tragic story is told in China.

"It is abundantly clear that the Chinese peasants hate the very idea of collectivization," the United States Department of Agriculture reported in December 1957. "They showed their contempt by such measures as slaughtering their livestock before they were taken away at ridiculously low prices, or were confiscated outright. The very few who could, have fled to other countries. The hundreds of million who remain know that if they produce more the state will take more; that it is dangerous to have wealth and safer, if not more comfortable, to be poor. For a country with limited agricultural resources, negligible surplus stocks, and a rapidly growing population of 600 million, this could have the most serious implications.

"Moreover, floods and droughts occur frequently, so with a population already living near the brink of famine, mismanagement of resources might bring about unparalleled disaster. Regardless, the Chinese Communists are determined to build industry, and they intend to make the peasants pay the bill" (p. 18).

The population of Red China is increasing at roundly 15 million a year. But total food production is shrinking every harvest, because the insistent back-country resistance to collective farming is driving millions to the cities.

Between 1949 and 1956 the strictly urban population of Communist China jumped by 32 million.

In 1949 Red China had only 5 cities of more than 1 million population. But by 1957 it had 13 cities of a million or more.

These surging seas of hungry unemployed, driven from the land by iron-fisted collectivist agriculture programs, soon must bring the breaking point for Chinese communism.

Nor does Khrushchev blink at the disaster now confronting the whole Communist world.

J. Edgar Hoover reports in Masters of Deceit, published in March 1958, that Khrushchev remarked flamboyantly at a Moscow diplomatic fete late in 1957:

"Those who expect us to abandon communism will have to wait until a shrimp learns to whistle."

In an earlier epoch of cataclysmic catastrophe in Europe this sentiment was rendered: "After me, the deluge."

Communists and Bombings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following article by David Lawrence, which appeared in the Washington Star of April 30, is most worthy of the attention of this Congress and of every patriotic American:

COMMUNISTS AND BOMBINGS—REDS BELIEVED INSTIGATORS OF BLASTS AT NEGRO AND JEWISH BUILDINGS

Is Communist money back of the bombing of a Negro school and a Jewish church building in Jacksonville, Fla.? Have the same tactics—but with a different group of persons—been employed to intensify interracial feeling there as a grand jury charged were used in 1954 when a Negro moved into a house in a white neighborhood in Louisville, Ky., that was damaged a month later by a bomb?

The Communist issue was raised in the Louisville case because of suspicious circumstances. The warnings given at Jacksonville sound like Communist-inspired utterances. They came over the telephone from persons who made reference to a "Confederate underground." This is the language of the dedicated Communist, who is familiar with "undergrounds." In the South, moreover, there is less anti-Semitism than anywhere else in the United States. Prominent Jewish lawyers are active in the crusade of Southerners to retain "separate but equal" school facilities for whites and Negroes as sustained for 58 years by the Supreme Court of the United States. The effort to provoke anti-Semitism is a Communist tactic that has emerged in other countries recently, especially in West Germany where interracial feeling had been dying down since Hitler's day.

The incidents at Jacksonville are to some extent reminiscent of an episode 4 years ago in Louisville. A Negro had been trying unsuccessfully to buy a house in a white neighborhood. In May 1954 a white man alleged to have Communist affiliations bought it—not for himself—and transferred it immediately to the Negro. Trouble began at once. Shots were fired. A rally, supposedly of the Ku Klux Klan, burned a fiery cross. Feeling began to run high. Then, on June 27, came the bombing. No one was injured. Though it occurred at 12:30 a. m., the residents of the house were outside on the porch or away from the rooms bombed.

"It is very significant to this grand jury," said the formal report of the Jefferson County grand jury which investigated the bombing, "that this case seems to follow the pattern used by the Communist Party to create trouble between the respective races in this country, and that one of the specific methods of doing this is by the purchase of property for Negroes in areas which normally are occupied by white persons," and then causing incidents such as this. * * *

"It is the opinion of this grand jury that it would have been impossible for the explosive to have been placed under the house as it was by anyone from the outside. * * * In other words, it is our opinion that the charge was placed and was discharged by someone having ready access to the home.

"It is significant to this grand jury that a portable, battery-type radio, identified as having belonged to a white man who took up actual full-time residence at the home shortly before the explosion, was found underneath the house in damaged condition. * * * This person refuses to state, on the grounds that it would incriminate him, whether or not he was the owner of the radio involved, and whether or not he ever had been under the house. He thereafter * * * refused to state whether or not he is a member of the Communist Party for the reason that the answer to that question would incriminate him."

The grand jury indicted five persons on charges of banding together to "commit, aid, or counsel" the bombing.

The first person tried, though not accused of the actual bombing was charged with stirring up racial friction in violation of a State sedition law. At the trial two former undercover agents for the Federal Bureau of Investigation testified that Communist Party members were taught to incite racial violence. The accused man denied he was or ever had been a member of the Communist Party. A woman undercover agent for the FBI testified, however, that he was a member, that she attended a Communist Party meeting at his home, that she had paid party dues to him, and that his wife was also a member of the Communist Party. The jury voted for conviction, and the sentence was 15 years in prison and a fine of $15,000.

But the high court in Kentucky felt bound by a new decision of the Supreme Court of the United States that States couldn't enforce antisedition laws and that this was a Federal matter. Hence, the accused was released. Further trials were abandoned as useless.

In October 1957, A. Scott Hamilton, commonwealth attorney at Louisville, told the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee the story of the part played by the Communists in the Louisville affair and how his efforts at prosecution were frustrated by the rulings of the Supreme Court of the United States.

In Praise of the Congressional Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, readers of that great Washington daily, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, will surely be interested in an understanding editorial from the Boston Herald of April 28, 1958, entitled "For the Record."

Under unanimous consent, I include it as part of my remarks, as follows:

Senator NEUBERGER, of Oregon, is an earnest young man who has little regard for stuffy traditions. Even his first-term status has not prevented him from unsettling the dust in the upper Chamber with daring proposals for reform.

In an article for the New York Times magazine he leveled his pen at one of the most hallowed senatorial and congressional practices, revision of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And by and large he makes an excellent case.

A record, says the Senator severely, should be a record. Yet by custom the Nation's lawmakers are permitted completely to rewrite what they say "for the RECORD" before it appears in the official "proceeding and debates" of the Congress. They are permitted to delete whole sections of what they have said or to introduce lengthy speeches which were never delivered.

This, Mr. NEUBERGER feels, is a fraud on the very large readership—mostly nonpaying—of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and a dangerous perversion of history. He advocates a change in the rules so as to permit the editing of grammar only, not substance, and a much stricter limitation on insertions in the Appendix.

From the point of view of economy alone there is much to be said for this reform. The Government now shells out about $1,700,000 a year to publish 43,000 copies of the RECORD. And perhaps a third of that goes to the printing of recipes or the prize-winning essays of local high-school seniors. There is certainly a tremendous amount of padding and waste.

But can the useless material be eliminated without cutting into the real values which the RECORD gives us? If some Senators and Congressmen fill out their remarks with rhetorical flourishes and long-winded digressions, others insert material of the utmost pertinency and value. How distinguish between them?

It is bad to distort the debate on an issue after the fact. But a too literal transcription of extemporaneous comments may also create misconceptions. We might lose as much as we gain by stopping revisions of the RECORD.

We hate to admit, particularly to a man like Senator NEUBERGER, that we are in any way tradition bound. But we have gotten rather used to the RECORD the way it is. And we hope Congress won't jump too quickly to change it.

What New Yorker magazine flippantly refers to as "Wind on Capitol Hill" still has the capacity to refresh, when taken in moderation. Let Mr. NEUBERGER not blow too hot too soon.

Clean Laundry Locals Form New Council in AFL–CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, since the new AFL–CIO Laundry and Dry Cleaning Trades International Union will hold its first convention here in Washington on May 12, 1958, a brief recital of the history of this new organization is appropriate at this time.

The story of the new Laundry and Dry Cleaning Trades Union is a tribute to the clean, courageous, responsible leaders and rank and file members of American labor who have worked and are working ceaselessly and dedicatedly to build the foundations for a better labor movement.

I am particularly interested in this new laundry workers' union because it was in my own city of Milwaukee that the Laundry and Dry Cleaning Trades International Council was formed earlier this year, and because a Milwaukee union leader, Arno Schulz, whom I know and respect, has played an extremely important part in the new union's creation and subsequent operation. Mr. Schulz is serving as provisional secretary-treasurer of the new International Union, as well as president of local 3008 in Milwaukee.

The following article from the AFL–CIO News of February 1, 1958, describes the new union's creation:

CLEAN LAUNDRY LOCALS FORM NEW COUNCIL IN AFL–CIO

(By Eugene A. Kelley)

MILWAUKEE.—A new clean Laundry and Cleaning Trades International Council was formed here by delegates representing locals with approximately half the membership of the discredited Laundry Workers International Union, expelled by the AFL–CIO convention.

The appointment of President Arno Schulz of directly affiliated local 3008 in this city as provisional secretary-treasurer of the LCTC was announced following the founding convention by Peter M. McGavin, assistant to AFL–CIO President George Meany, who presided at the sessions.

The headquarters of the council will be located in Milwaukee where several LWIU locals made the first break with their union and received direct AFL–CIO charters.

Four unions from widely separated sections of the country made applications for charters during the convention and delegates from a number of other locals said they would make application in the very near future following meetings to take this action.

The vote to establish the council was unanimous as was the vote to have McGavin designate provisional officers until another meeting of the council can be held. McGavin indicated that this would probably be set within 90 days.

He, said 17 former LWIU locals have seceded and been chartered by the AFL–CIO to form the nucleus of the new council.

No council charters, he made plain, will be given to any but former locals of LWIU. "There will be no charters for racketeers, hoodlums, or characters of dubious reputation," McGavin said.

McGavin called the council the forerunner of a new international union and told the delegates they faced the choice of remaining with a union corruptly dominated or reaffiliating with the AFL–CIO and building a union dedicated to legitimate principles and advancement of workers in the industry.

Mr. Speaker, formation of the new union came soon after the AFL–CIO, at its Atlantic City convention last December, expelled the Laundry Workers International Union, LWIU, on charges of domination by corrupt influences. The following article from the Milwaukee Journal of December 17, 1957, tells what happened:

LAUNDRY WORKERS OUSTED, WISCONSIN LOCAL WILL BOLT

(By John D. Pomfret)

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.—The AFL–CIO Thursday expelled the 72,000-member Laundry Workers International Union (LWIU) on charges of domination by corrupt influences.

A spokesman for about 2,300 Wisconsin laundry workers immediately announced that his group was bolting the international union and would remain in the federation.

Arno Schulz, of Milwaukee, president of LWIU, local 174, said he has asked the AFL–CIO for a charter as a directly affiliated AFL–CIO Federal labor union. An AFL–CIO spokesman said that the charter would be issued.

Thus, local 174 will become the first unit of an outcast union to seek and be granted a charter to remain an AFL–CIO affiliate.

Local 174 has nearly 2,000 members in the laundry and dry cleaning industry in Milwaukee, 75 in Racine, 225 in Madison, and 13 in Oshkosh.

* * * * *

Schulz said that the membership of his union already had authorized him to take whatever steps were necessary to remain in the AFL–CIO.

Schulz's move to leave the union was the climax of a longstanding dispute between his local and the international.

Schulz, with the aid of Milwaukee laundry owners and the backing of the Wisconsin State Insurance Department, has waged a long and successful fight to take the welfare program of his local out of the hands of the international union's social security department.

Schulz, 45, was born in Sheboygan and brought to Milwaukee by his family at the age of 1. The son of poor parents, he quit school after the sixth grade to go to work.

He entered a laundry as a washman in 1932 and sold kitchen equipment at night. He was appointed business agent of local 174 on October 15, 1937. He later became secretary-treasurer and in 1940 was elected president.

He served as a vice president of the international union for 3 years during the 1940's. He is vice president of joint council No. 13 of the union, which covers Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we will watch with interest the continuing progress of the new AFL–CIO Laundry and Dry Cleaning Trades International Union in the forefront of our clean and responsible American labor movement. Steps taken to date give us confidence for the future, and are a credit to labor, to Milwaukee, to Wisconsin, and to the entire United States.

Sermon by Mrs. Neil M. Lieblich, President of Sisterhood Shaari Zedek, at Sisterhood Sabbath Services at Congregation Shaari Zedek, of Brooklyn, on Friday, March 7, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is an unusual event for a woman to occupy the pulpit on a Sabbath, but this great honor was recently conferred on my good friend, Mrs. Sarah Lieblich, a gracious lady, loved and respected by all in our community. The occasion commemorated the festive holiday of Purim.

This holiday is an annual observance of the biblical festival as recounted in the Book of Esther which is reread on the eve of the day of the festival and is also dedicated to the memory of a woman, Queen Esther, a Jewess, who turned a day of weeping into a day of happiness.

Queen Esther was successful in convincing King Ahasverus to rescind a decree issued by the king empowering his deputy, Haman, to wreak his vengeance on the Jews in his empire extending from India even to the borders of Ethiopia.

The queen fortified with proof, beauty, and charm assured King Ahasverus that the Jews were loyal subjects of his kingdom but rather that Haman was plotting and planning against the king and his household. Haman and his followers were executed on the very gallows that he, Haman, built to execute the Jews.

Thus a woman, Queen Esther, turned a day of sadness and sorrow into a day of rejoicing.

Worthy rabbi, cantor, officers, members, friends of Shaari Zedek, many stories have been told of the creation of man, and this allegory is one of them.

Since God created man in His own image, He decided: "What better way to do this—than to just chip off pieces of His precious self and send them earthward?" That he did.

Some of these precious bits fell on pure white sand; some fell on yellow sand; some were immersed in black earth; and others fell on brown sod. They then began to take on the outward appearances of the land in which they were born—and they continued to fulfill their destiny on earth until they once again were called unto Him on judgment day.

What do you think was the basis upon which each was judged? Was it the material goods he had accumulated during his sojourn on earth? Was it anything related to the outer appearances of man? You know the answer: God sought out in each of His children that which He had originally sent down to earth. How unblemished was this precious item He had instilled in each human being? How much of the original soul and spirit remained? Those are His criteria.

What are our own criteria for judging man? What makes someone a good or a bad neighbor? It is for the purpose of clarifying our thinking about our fellow man that I want you to go with me—not behind the Iron Curtain, nor into Asia, Africa, or other farflung places where historians of great note have taken us—but into our neighboring community, better known as Bedford Stuyvesant.

Who are these people? What are they like? What makes them what they are—and, of course, what is our responsibility to our brethren elsewhere?

Let us first look into the history, if you will, of this neighborhood roughly bounded by Myrtle Avenue, Reid-Utica Avenues, Fulton Street, and Franklin Avenue. The houses in this section are predominantly brownstone—1-, 2-, and 3-family dwellings. Scattered here and there still are five-story walkup tenements and a few elevator apartment houses.

This was the paradise to which the people on the lower East Side had emigrated at the beginning of the century. Trees are plentiful, even several small parks dot this area, and wherever the eye turns, a house of worship is evident.

Who came across the East River? You and I know well these people. Many of us are descendents of the Jews who came to this land of opportunity at the close of the 19th century. Then there were also Italians and Germans who had fled famine in Europe and came to these shores to settle here.

These people worked hard—in factories—better known in those days as sweatshops—or set themselves up in small businesses. They labored so that their children could have greater educational and cultural opportunities than they had had—and in a large measure, they were successful in achieving their goals.

They made the grade—and immediately sought to better themselves physically as well as culturally; and so the exodus began.

Examine with me these families—their interests and aspirations. It's easy to tell about them—for it's almost biographical. Papa worked from early morn till late at night. Mamma was in her house all day—cooking, cleaning, sewing, baking—and ready to serve each member of the family as he

returned from his daily chores. She was always able to meet the changing circumstances of a given day. If it rained all day, we found rare dishes native to her home on the table that night to imbibe, and to exclaim about.

What else, said she, was there for her to do—except to cook or bake something special? She listened to her programs on the radio while she worked and the psychology she learned and the psychiatric analyses she heard—she immediately put to use on her family.

Mamma was never too tired to listen to the gripes and grumblings of her children. "All," said she, "so that when Papa comes home everything must be calm and peaceful so he can eat and enjoy his meal in peace." After his dinner, then the family confabs or pow-wows started. Each one made his demands upon Papa—and slowly—and not always to everyone's liking—all problems were resolved, and the family made ready for a peaceful night's sleep to be alert for the day to come.

Recreation? Of course. So the children went to an occasional movie or vaudeville show—and as they grew older, to a neighborhood stock company performance. The folks went to a benefit show now and then and occasionally the whole family had to attend a union or political rally or even a concert. This was the family working, striving, and enjoying life together, and trying to get the most out of life for all, for it was truly all for one—one for all.

Then, one by one the children went on to higher learning or professional pursuits or became wage earners and soon the family became restless and made ready for the exodus.

These people left Bedford Stuyvesant many years ago—but the houses in which they lived still stand—and there are people living in them—who have that selfsame precious bit in them as did the people who came before them. Who now occupies these old, dilapidated houses—some without central heat or hot water? Primarily, the Negro who came into this area because he, too, was trying to better himself physically and culturally. The wage earner in these families took the places of the former workers in the sweatshops—now known as 40- or 44-hour factories—or bought small businesses, some of which are still open 7 days a week and 14 hours a day.

The cycle has started. Let us not for 1 moment minimize these people who came into Bedford Stuyvesant and are still coming into the area—be it an influx of Negroes or as is now the case—Puerto Ricans.

These families move here because they hope for a far better life than they've ever had. They, too, have aspirations for their children and themselves. They, too, wanted to improve their surroundings and also want to improve their financial and social status.

You remember the stories told by our parents and grandparents of the relatives who came from their native land and who stayed with them for months, and some for years; until they could send for their families and set up households of their own. I remember Jonah who lived with my family even before my time—and then brought his own family here and settled in Liberty, N. Y. I got to know Jonah because he was an integral part of my family. And every time that he came to New York City, he stayed with us. Our family was his family until his own family came to these shores. These ties bound us together until death did us part. This was the essence of brotherhood in practice.

Today the same pattern is followed. The wage earner comes up from the South or from Puerto Rico; settles with a relative or friend; tries to find work, and then is caught in the maelstrom of 20th century living; no, not living, existing. He stays with a relative or friend—but not a family—for there's no family life to speak of. The 1958 concept of a family is far different than the one held by our predecessors at the beginning of the century. Blame this change on the present day tensions that are within all of us; blame it on the spiralling cost of living that necessitates more than one wage earner per family; blame it on antiquated, inadequate, and overpriced housing; blame it on society in general. We who permit our governments—city, State, and Federal—to lag a generation or two behind the needs of the people in housing, education, medicine, mental hygiene, and every conceivable area that answers man's needs. And you know what's happening: it's often too little that comes too late.

Oh, it's so easy to throw up your hands and even utter a few not such nice words when you get into your car for a relaxing drive—and make no headway on the streets—or can't find a place to park once you've gotten to your destination. Isn't there something wrong with our present day civilization when you are given the opportunity to achieve but can't make proper use of your achievements that you've gotten by dint of hard work?

We're all full of frustrations. But those, who are struggling to make material ends meet, have—you'll have to admit—far greater problems. Whereas a good percentage—yes, the greater number of us, no matter how great the pressures from without, can solve our problems within the confines of the law—there is always a group in our society that takes the easy way out—hurting others as they seek refuge from their problems in drink, dope, and other forms of social behavior.

What shall we do with Raymond who at 8 years of age brings an iron wrench to school ("My uncle gave it to me," he said), and hits another child with it. Fortunately no one was badly hurt. But Raymond's father deserted him—but lives close enough to tear this child asunder from his mother wherever he gets the urge to see him or buy him a new outfit, or give him 25 cents spending money. So last week, Raymond's mother decided to go out to work to earn some extra money for her spring outfit, and she told Raymond, "Go to your father this week and let him take care of you." She didn't desert him. At least so she thought—but Raymond felt differently and he showed how hurt he was. Now Raymond is suspended until his parents are brought to trial. Who is to blame? Who should be brought to trial?

Then there's Robert, 12 years old, native born, and can't read a single word—yet intelligent. His mother is in heaven, he hopes, after bringing 4 children into the world, each having a different father. Grandmother is caring for these children as she cares for 4 other children of her own. These children have daily prayer services at home (one of grandmother's tenants is a preacher). But this 12-year-old cuddles up to you as an infant does, wanting a kind word and a smile, feeling the world has deprived him of his own family, of his own place in the sun—and we have.

I could go on and on, but what does it all add up to? Are we to close our eyes, close our doors, not venture out from our homes in the hope that a miracle will happen?

Shall we be part of the exodus and say, "Let them solve their problems as we did."

It's not that easy. They can't solve them alone because we, society, have placed too heavy a burden upon their shoulders. Their earnings are meager, their children ill-fed or not fed at all, their homes are squalid, their family is scattered as their souls are splintered and their spirits broken.

They tell us and we are well aware that the world is getting smaller. Billions of dollars go up in smoke when a Vanguard fails, and more billions are wasted as our supposed defense mechanisms become obsolete before they're ever used. No, we can't feel smug here in our beautiful Temple, nor in our well appointed homes, without at least raising our voices in defense of our fellow man who cries out for help, but whom we permit to drown in a sea of despair and hopelessness.

Let us, therefore, as we go forth tonight—each in his own way—lift a finger, raise a hand, yes, even help to raise another's hand, so he, too, can reach out for a better life.

And then, with Arthur Guiterman, the poet, we can repeat:

"No printed word or spoken plea,
Can teach young hearts what men should be;
Not all the books on all the shelves,
But what we, the people are ourselves."

A Great Contribution to International Understanding: Thirty-three Thousand Fulbright Scholars in 10 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, of all the programs engaged in by the United States to advance international understanding and to promote good will between our citizens and the peoples of other nations of the world, none has been more effective or more successful than the program of scholarships which bears the name of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, the Honorable J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT.

It was just 10 years ago that the first Fulbright scholarships were awarded. The program since then has proven its worth many times over, and our investment in it will continue to be repaid with dividends of knowledge and friendship for many years. Of course, the Fulbright scholarship program will be continued, and I hope it will be extended soon to include participation by all nations.

I submit for the RECORD an editorial tribute to Senator FULBRIGHT and the scholarship program from the Milwaukee Journal of April 29, 1958:

THIRTY-THREE THOUSAND FULBRIGHT SCHOLARS

When the first Fulbright scholarships were awarded just 10 years ago, they went to 65 Americans and 36 foreigners. It was a modest beginning for a program that since has led to the largest international educational exchange in history.

The program was founded August 1, 1946, when the 79th Congress passed Public Law 584, originated by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, for the promotion of international understanding. Two years of patient spadework followed before the program started to roll.

By the fall of 1947, the first two educational exchange agreements had been signed. The Fulbright Act, as it came to be known, authorized the sale of American military surplus goods to foreign governments for their own currencies, with the understanding that part of the funds would be set aside to finance educational exchanges. The program later was augmented by Congress with further financial support.

As of this year, approximately 33,000 people have received Fulbright grants, including some 4,000 in 1958. They include Americans for whom the program has financed graduate study, advanced research, university lecturing, or teaching abroad, and foreign citizens for whom it has provided travel funds so that they could come to the United States to study, teach, and train.

Fulbright scholarships this year are being exchanged between the United States and 31 other countries. Since the program's inception, 39 different countries have participated. Senator FULBRIGHT said recently that he hoped there eventually would be Fulbright scholars in the Soviet Union and that Russian scholars would come here under the program.

Extending the program to Russia would be in keeping with the stated purpose of the act: "To promote a better understanding of the United States in other countries and to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries."

In just one decade the Fulbright Act has done much to widen the range of international contacts between scholars and teachers. In its second decade it could become a potent force for understanding between the United States and Russia.

The 39th Annual Convention of the United States Army Ambulance Service Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, this year the United States Army Ambulance Service Association will celebrate the 40th anniversary of the return home from World War I of the thousands of young Americans who formed the United States Army Ambulance Corps during World War I and served with heroic devotion as an integral part of the American, French, and Italian Armies during that conflict. The year 1958 also marks the 42d anniversary of the opening of Camp Crane, Allentown, Pa., which was the training site of the United States Army Ambulance Service.

Organized in Paris, France, in 1918 to perpetuate the friendships formed in the ambulance service during World War I, the United States Army Ambulance Service Association will meet this year in Boston, Mass., for the 39th annual convention.

In connection with the activities of the United States Army Ambulance Service Association and its plans for observing the 40th anniversary of returning home from World War I and the 42d anniversary of the opening of Camp Crane, as well as the convening of the 39th annual convention, Past National Commander Albert E. Herrmann has prepared the following article in commemoration of the three events which, at this point, I include in my remarks:

COMMEMORATING USAAC'S 40TH ANNIVERSARY

In May 1917, in Philadelphia and all parts of Pennsylvania, young men joined the United States Army Ambulance Corps, as an integral part of the Medical Department of the United States Army, to serve with the American, French and Italian armies, in June the groups from different sections of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania entrained to Allentown, Pa., and at the fair grounds, Camp Crane was opened.

Many colleges and universities of Pennsylvania sent groups to the USAAC's at Allentown, Pa., and representatives were from University of Pennsylvania, State College, Lafayette College, Temple University, Susquehanna University, and Bucknell College. Community groups came from Philadelphia, Allentown, Wilkes-Barre, Reading, Pottsville, Pittsburgh, Scranton, Johnstown, Susquehanna, the United States Rubber Co., and the Packard Motors of Philadelphia sent sections for training.

In 1917 the first group of USAAC's left for overseas to serve with the French army, later with the Italian army, and then with the American AEF when they went into the front line service.

In Paris, France, in 1918, the organization now known as the United States Army Ambulance Service Association was formed, by Lt. Col. A. Piatt Andrew, who served with the French army, later with the USAAC's, and who served as a member of the 67th Congress, to which he was elected September 27, 1921, to fill unexpired term, and to succeeding Congress, until his death. Lieutenant Colonel Andrews with other representatives of the USAAC's with many Pennsylvanians, held their first annual convention, June 8–10, 1920 at Allentown, Pa., and elected national officers.

The 39th annual convention, will be held this year, July 17, 18, 19, and 20, at Boston, Mass., and the following national officers serving the organization: Commander, Warren S. Ward, of Lewistown, Pa.; senior vice commander, Rudolph L. Wilhelm, of Bloomfield, N. J.; junior vice commander, Robert W. Faulkner, of Elkins Park, Pa.; treasurer, James J. Cummings, of Philadelphia, Pa.; adjutant, Charles L. Winkler, of Philadelphia, Pa.; chaplain, Rev. Guy A. Bensinger, of Dutch Neck, N. J.; editor, USAAC Bulletin, William B. O'Brien of Milton, Mass.; service officer, Frank J. Williams, of Buffalo, N. Y.; and publicity director, Albert E. Herrmann, of Philadelphia, Pa.

National trustees, James M. E. Boes, Philadelphia, Pa.; Les Craigen, of Seattle, Wash.; Ed Heflinger, of Pasadena, Calif.; Al Sommers of Montgomery, Ala.; and Robert W. Rhoades, of Euclid, Ohio.

Regional commanders, North, Fred B. Huebenthal, of Maywood, Ill.; East, Kenneth R. Moore, of Philadelphia, Pa.; West, William D. Sullivan, of Los Angeles, Calif.; and South, G. Wade Earle of Sarasota, Fla.

Post No. 1 of the USAAC's will hold their 40th anniversary banquet on Saturday evening, June 7, in Philadelphia, Pa., national officers of the association, members of the New Jersey, New York, Batavia, Johnstown, Atlantic City, Boston, and Allentown clubs will attend. Comdr. Edward P. Kasten will preside and Senior Vice Commander Clarence E. Keifrider has been appointed chairman. The local committee for distinguished guests will be William J. Raudenbush, Albert E. Herrmann, F. Warren King, Robert W. Faulkner, George E. Wilson, Fullwood P. Hayes, Charles E. Ashford, Gustave Blind, Thomas H. Ellis, Frank E. Olds, James D. Hill, J. Harry Davis, Rev. William F. Wefer, Rev. Guy A. Bensinger, James M. E. Boes, Von H. Byre, I. Edward Cohen, J. J. Cummings, C. J. Winkler, Renato DiLauro, H. E. Dunstan, L. Floro, Col. F. E. Hendler, Ted W. Hissey, C. L. Hoag, H. G. Huf, S. La Noce, P. A. Meglio, K. B. Moore, J. N. Morgan, John O. Parcell, James R. Parris, W. N. Price, H. A. Sattler, and J. H. Hodges.

National Commander Warren S. Ward has pointed Horace Wood of Milton, Mass., as chairman of the national convention committee who will serve with the following members from Boston: William B. O'Brien, Ray Wolloff, Harold Rutledge, Russ Maintain, Dr. Bill Loker, Dr. Bill Baumgartner, Bill Herbits, Bob Allison, Ted Kemp, Jim Collins, Bert Cone, Clint Hannaford, Bill Boyle, Judge George Jones, Matt Arnold, Ed. Simmons, Bill Clifford, Ray Hinds, and Jack Murray. Headquarters will be at the Somerset Hotel.

Statement of David J. McDonald on Current Unemployment Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 28, 1958, David J. McDonald, president of of the United Steelworkers of America, appeared before the House Banking and Currency Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member. Mr. McDonald's testimony was most enlightening and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues, as follows:

STATEMENT OF DAVID J. MCDONALD, PRESIDENT, UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA, ON CURRENT UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS AND NECESSARY CORRECTIVE MEASURES, BEFORE THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, APRIL 28, 1958

My name is David J. McDonald. I am president of the United Steelworkers of America. I wish to thank this committee for affording me an opportunity to present the views of my union concerning the unemployment problems facing steelworkers and labor generally.

It is clear that the state of the national economy is not good. Unemployment has doubled in the short space of 6 months. Industrial production has declined almost 12 percent in the same period. And almost all of the other important economic indicators continue to reflect downward movements.

In many industries the situation is far worse. In basic steel, production in early April has a full 50 percent lower than a year ago and was actually 20 percent lower than production a decade ago in the years 1947 through 1949. From the latter part of 1956, when the steel industry was operating close to capacity, to February 1958, employment declined by 22 percent, a los sof 114,000 jobs. In addition, the length of the average workweek was cut by 6.4 hours, which is the equivalent of an additional loss of 65,000 jobs in the industry. Based on an even lower operating rate in April it is apparent that the loss in employment in basic steel to date by reason of layoffs and reduced workweeks approximates 220,000. As a result, employment of production and maintenance workers in the basic steel industry has declined to about 400,000, or approximately 100,000 less workers than in 1937. This significantly smaller work force, incidentally, is producing steel ingots at an annual rate 19 percent above actual production in 1937.

In the other industries in which the union's members are normally employed—nonferrous metals, iron ore, and metal fabricating—the unemployment rate is almost as high as in the steel industry. Altogether, there are about 250,000 of our members who have been laid off and another 350,000 who are on reduced workweeks in the United States. In other words, half of the United

steelworkers' entire membership is facing serious family economic difficulties.

As the collective bargaining representatives of these workers the union has succeeded in gaining certain benefits which have helped not only those affected by layoffs and reduced workweeks, and their families, but also their neighborhood merchants and in some cases entire communities. I am referring to the supplementary unemployment benefits plans which we negotiated in 1955 and 1956. Under these plans tens of thousands of workers have received, and are receiving, supplementary compensation which, together with woefully inadequate State unemployment compensation benefits, equals about 65 percent of the employee's normal take-home pay. Benefits paid out, or due under these plans to date approximate $26 million and, in numerous communities, have more than proven their worth in terms of relieving serious economic hardship for individual steelworker families as well as others who depend upon their continued ability to buy goods and services. We are proud of this direct contribution which we have been able to make through collective bargaining toward mitigating the human misery caused by unemployment.

Helpful as these supplementary unemployment benefits programs are in so many communities to offset partially the effects of the recession, in some quarters vicious and unthinking attempts still are being made to block them—notably in Ohio and Indiana. In Ohio, for example, the State is preventing the payment of about $6 million in benefits already accrued and held in escrow for unemployed Ohio workers despite the fact that both the common pleas court and the seventh district court of appeals have ruled that their payment is permitted under present Ohio law. In Indiana the State legislature has succeeded in preventing supplementation, thus forcing the supplementary unemployment benefits trust funds to make up for the loss of State unemployment compensation which has been denied to workers receiving supplementary unemployment benefits.

These are two outstanding examples of the inhuman type of action taken to prevent and limit the payment of vitally needed unemployment benefits. These harmful actions are paralleled by equally serious State inaction. There is not one State in which the State unemployment compensation laws are not outmoded or where such laws now serve the purpose for which they were established. State unemployment compensation laws are inadequate throughout the United States with respect to levels of benefits, duration of benefits, and basic coverage. One of the important reasons these laws are so poor is the lack of basic Federal minimum standards. Appeals to the various States for necessary improvements, even when made by the President of the United States, have fallen largely on deaf ears.

The Nation's economic problems have served to highlight the urgent necessity for Federal action. The Kennedy-McCarthy bill (S. 3244, H. R. 10570) which would establish Federal minimum standards for unemployment compensation laws should become law without further delay. It would result in immediately adding to the purchasing power of unemployed workers covered by present State laws as well as additional millions of workers who are not covered by present laws or who already have exhausted their benefits, or who live in States with such backward State administration as those in Ohio and Indiana.

While adequate unemployment compensation is urgently needed to relieve some of the economic difficulties of the unemployed by offsetting a portion of the loss of purchasing power caused by unemployment, such compensation cannot provide the stimulus necessary to return these men and women to gainful employment. This problem obviously requires other actions. Certain positive steps toward stimulating the economy have been taken by the Congress, but much more remains to be done.

It seems to me that the observable tendency of the administration to wait and see, and to hope for the best stems largely from a failure to look objectively at our economy and to determine its needs. The Employment Act of 1946 requires, among other things, that the needed levels of employment, production, and purchasing power consistent with full prosperity for all be set forth clearly for everyone to see—presumably so that needed corrective action can be taken promptly at times such as this. Those mainly responsible for administration of the act have refused to implement the act. As a result, with goals unstated, today's serious economic downturn is passed off as a business readjustment. A rising level of unemployment, instead of resulting in action to reverse the trend, becomes the basis for a discussion of how much unemployment is serious. Production losses amounting to tens of billions of dollars, instead of signalling for all possible steps to halt such a gigantic loss, sets a number of people to figuring that, compared to 5 or 10 or 20 years ago, we are really doing fine.

If we do not pause periodically to take stock of where we are in relation to where we want to be and ought to be, we are inviting trouble. Economic drifting is insidious. If today there are those who refuse to concern themselves about 5 to 6 million unemployed, this will become the floor from which the number of unemployed could rise by several more million without unduly concerning these same people.

Establishing realistic goals for our economy would enable us to see when and where we are lagging and even suggest appropriate actions in support of the unanimous desire to keep our economy expanding and prosperous.

This is a legitimate function of government; one which is, in fact, set forth as the intent of the Congress in the Employment Act of 1946. I recommend that this act be fully implemented and one step in this direction could be the creation of an Advisory Commission by the President of the United States. Such a Commission, composed of appropriate representatives of major industrial companies, of major unions, of agriculture, small business and consumers, could provide vitally needed information, experience and advice which the President and his economic advisers could utilize in carrying out their responsibilities under the act.

For the present it is squarely up to the Congress to provide leadership in the task of helping to turn the economy toward full employment and full production. Many suggestions have been advanced for Federal action. A good many relate to Federal spending and tax policies. As I interpret the pros and cons put forth with respect to increased Federal expenditures and income-tax reduction, there seems to be an area of general agreement that such measures are likely to increase the level of economic activity, production, and employment. But the arguments of those opposed to such corrective measures seem to center about the contentions that a rising price level is our main problem, that increased Federal spending automatically will add impetus to higher prices in some future period and, accordingly, that it is better to let the economy limp along in the hope that this inaction will depress prices.

I am as opposed to inflation as any man who is not deeply in debt. A continuously rising price level hurts many people and interferes with the orderly growth of our economy. But I am unable to understand the blindness and the callousness of those who insist that our first and most important problem is to speculate about a rising price level in the future when month after month prices continue to rise now in the midst of a recession.

I say they are blind because it is clear that the price level continues to move up not because of excessive demand for materials and goods and services, not because of an unbalanced Federal budget, not because of a loose money policy—because none of these exist. Those major industries where prices are administered and where pricing policies have been designed to yield ever-increasing profits and profit margins are responsible for the paradox of a rising price level in a period of falling demand, falling production, and increasing unemployment.

I say those who oppose Federal action are callous because the problems of the millions of unemployed are as nothing to them.

There can be no denying that a Federal tax cut and significantly increased Federal expenditures will result in a temporary deficit. But a deficit of $10 billion or even more is a small price to pay for reversing the economic tide and ending losses of production, profits, dividends, wages, and salaries equal to an estimated $40 billion a year.

With these facts in mind the international executive board of the United Steelworkers of America, meeting in Washington, D. C., on March 17, 1958, formulated the following 9-point program designed to place us on the road to recovery:

1. Cut Federal income taxes for lower-income groups: The tax cut should be concentrated at the lower and middle part of the income scale by increasing the present $600 a year individual exemption and reducing the tax rate of 20 percent on the first $2,000 of taxable income. The tax savings would strengthen consumer demand for many types of consumer goods.

2. Eliminate or reduce most Federal excise taxes: Reduction or elimination of the 10-percent tax on such products and services as automobiles, tires, tubes, luggage, transportation, communication, and others would result in lower prices and, accordingly, would stimulate demand. Most of these taxes were enacted originally to reduce demand. Surely no such purpose is desired today.

3. Enact the Kennedy-McCarthy bill to raise and extend unemployment compensation benefits: Average benefits of about $30 a week are wholly inadequate and must be increased. The duration of benefits must be lengthened and the program extended to many now excluded.

4. Institute a broad program of constructive and much-needed public works. The needs of the country are great. For an extended period there has been a lag in the construction of such necessary public facilities as hospitals, post offices, and other Federal buildings, harbor development, airports, parks, and others. Now, when there is no shortage of materials or labor, is the time to make these necessary improvements which will add to the health and wealth of the Nation and its people, future as well as present.

5. Adopt an expanded Federal housing program: Despite an estimated need for 2 million new homes a year, new housing starts are currently at a rate of less than 1 million.

A Federal housing program is required which will step up slum clearance and public housing, and make available funds for long-term, low-interest mortgages which people with modest incomes can afford.

6. Pass a Federal school-construction bill: In many parts of the country, State, county, and local governments have been unable even to keep up with school-replacement requirements, to say nothing of the educational needs of a growing population. A Federal program of grants and low-interest bearing loans would represent an excellent investment from which dividends will be reaped by many generations of Americans.

7. Provide economic aid for distressed areas: There are numerous areas in the United States which have suffered economic distress for extended periods. The problems of these areas predate the current recession. Without a constructive program and Federal assistance many localities will continue to have serious economic problems even if the condition of the national economy improves.

8. Increase the Federal minimum wage to $1.25 per hour and expand the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act: The present minimum wage of $1 an hour is completely inadequate even to provide a subsistence level of existence. Furthermore, many millions of workers are excluded from coverage of the act. On the basis of simple equity it should be broadened to include as many workers as can be covered by Federal law and its minimum wage requirement raised to $1.25 an hour. Furthermore, substandard wages produce a substandard level of buying and are a drag on the economy.

9. Implement the Employment Act of 1946 by other appropriate Federal action: Although the language of the Employment Act seems perfectly clear, further clarification may be needed to bring administrative performance into line with congressional intent.

This program of action adopted by the international executive board of the United Steelworkers of America we believe is necessary now in order to end the serious economic recession. We also believe that through collective bargaining management and labor can play a constructive role in restoring the economic health of our country by negotiating appropriate wage increases at this time.

There are individuals who, although they understand that the underlying cause of the economic downturn is insufficient demand, nevertheless persist in advocating the freezing of wages. As a means of lifting the level of total demand for goods and services, this would be as effective as tying an anchor to a boat in order to make it go.

The gross national expenditures of the United States last year amounted to $434.4 billion. These expenditures are generally broken down into four major subdivisions: personal consumption expenditures, Government purchases, private domestic investment, and net foreign investment.

Each category of expenditure obviously is important in the total economic picture, but the importance of consumer spending and the purchasing power on which it depends stands forth clearly when these categories are ranked in order of their dollar expenditures. The gross national product of $434.4 billion last year was made up of the following:

Personal consumption expenditures, $280.4 billion (64.6 percent).

Government purchases, $86.4 billion (19.9 percent).

Private domestic investment, $64.4 billion (14.8 percent).

Net foreign investment, $3.2 billion (0.7 percent).

In addition to granting appropriate wage increases, industry should be encouraged to effect price reductions where inflated profit margins have been created by excessive price increases. Such action would contribute greatly to stimulating consumer spending which would be reflected in increased employment and production.

Finally, although there is little doubt that constructive action which will end the recession also will improve, to some degree the economic condition of those particular areas which have come to be known as chronically depressed or distressed areas, additional attention should be paid to this problem.

Before this economic downturn there were, in January 1957, 19 major employment centers and 59 smaller areas with substantial unemployment. Our union represents workers in many of these unfortunate communities. Special legislative action is called for. Several years ago as a member of the Randall Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, I had occasion to examine this problem in relation to hardships which might be caused to particular industries and areas by substantially increased imports. My conclusions were that although economic injury would be quite limited, it was essential that adequate provision be made to ease the impact of the necessary economic adjustments. I recommended that there be provision for technical assistance to companies and communities affected, loan assistance for the purpose of diversification of existing businesses, preference in the placement of Government contracts, special unemployment insurance for displaced workers, and intensive counseling and placement of workers, retraining facilities, and moving allowances where relocation was required. Pending bills H. R. 9505 and H. R. 1105, on the establishment of a trade adjustment program, include provisions consistent with these recommendations. The program embodied in these bills should be enacted.

We also believe that the provisions of H. R. 6215, introduced by Representative BRENT SPENCE, of Kentucky, the chairman of this committee, is a constructive measure designed to redevelop areas suffering from chronic economic distress and our union urges the passage of this bill.

Because of the urgent necessity for action at the earliest possible moment in order to relieve the hardships of the millions of Americans affected by this economic recession, and to end the truly gigantic losses of production which stem from it, the steelworkers earnestly beseech your immediate consideration of the program for economic recovery which we have recommended.

I appreciate very much this opportunity of presenting the views of the members of the United Steelworkers of America with respect to this most important problem which affects the welfare of all of the American people.

H. R. 12065

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of the State of Iowa and his employment security commission have been studying the implications of H. R. 12065 as it relates to the unemployment problem of Iowa, and after apparent complete study they have reached the conclusion that certain sections of this bill are impractical, and I would like to place a telegram from Gov. Herschel Loveless on this subject in the RECORD:

DES MOINES, IOWA, *May 1, 1958.*

Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

After consultation with Iowa Employment Security Commission, I respectfully urge your support of title I, H. R. 12065, for the extension of unemployment compensation. During first quarter 1958, 5,564 covered workers exhausted their benefits in Iowa. For entire year 1957 exhaustions totaled 12,232. Immediate benefits could be provided for these unemployed workers by enactment of title I. Title II, H. R. 12065, would eventually provide desirable benefits for substantial number of unemployed not now eligible but lack of records and information on earnings would pose extremely difficult administrative problems with title II. Am advised by employment security commission that they would encounter little or no difficulty in administering title I, but that title II would require substantial addition to administrative staff and require at least 6 months before any benefits could be paid to workers affected by title II.

HERSCHEL C. LOVELESS,
Governor of Iowa.

The 10th Anniversary of the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion of the 10th anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel I have the great privilege to pay my deep respects to the men and women who have struggled courageously to recreate a Jewish homeland. Today Israel is the 10-year-old fulfillment of a 1,800-year-old dream of the Jewish people. Since the destruction of the second temple in A. D. 70 by the conquering armies of the Roman Emperor, Titus, the Jews have wandered over the earth. The wish to return to their land to reestablish a Jewish commonwealth has ever been present in the hearts of many of the Jewish people. I personally derive a great feeling of satisfaction from the fact that the United States supported the cause of the Jewish people for a homeland after the Second World War. The United States has also continued to promote peace and stability in the Middle East as the only solution for the future welfare of the peoples of the Arab countries as well as of Israel.

The greatest achievement of this first decade has been the immigration of 1 million Jews to Israel and their assimilation into the new country. The first Israeli Parliament, elected in January 1949, enacted the Law of Return which opened the country to all Jews who desire to settle. An unwritten law had been in effect since the beginning of independence and embodies the vision that the new Israeli State would be a haven where any Jewish person might live in freedom and build for the future. Jews arrived from all of the eastern European countries, from Kurdistan, Morocco, Iraq, England, Yemen, and as far away as Shanghai and Bombay during the first decade. In 1948 there were 650,000 Jewish inhabitants, including about 1,800,000 Jews and 214,000 Arabs. No other country has grown so rapidly in an equal span of time. And the immigration has not ceased. Between 1957 and 1962 the Zionist leaders have planned to bring 600,000 immigrants to the Jewish homeland.

The increase in the agricultural and industrial production has been an achievement second only to the popula-

tion expansion. The Biblical landscape, where the "plants are an orchard of pomegranates, with pleasant fruits; spikenard and saffron; calamus and cinnamon; with all trees of frankincense, myrrh and aloes" had long ago disappeared. The countryside, which had reverted to desert land through the centuries, was barren and rocky. Except for the narrow strip along the seacoast, the land could not sustain many people.

Although Israel was under the constant surveillance by the rifles of hostile neighbors, the Israeli Government instituted a vigorous development program to provide land and a place in the national economy for the unending stream of immigrants. Modern agricultural methods, equipment and education have been put to work to increase cultivated areas by nearly 300 percent. A national irrigation program, which will be completed by 1961, has already put 400 percent more land under cultivation. The agricultural effort has been highly successful in increasing the productivity of the land. The yield from the land has been raised threefold and now supplies about 70 percent of the country's food requirement. It is self-sufficient in vegetables, eggs and poultry. Although foodstuffs are the main export commodity, chiefly citrus fruits, which comprise 42 percent of Israel's total exports, industrial production has risen 500 percent to augment the export trade. Among the new industries which have been opened are steel, fertilizers, tires and other rubber goods, paper products, piping, diesel engines, electrical appliances, and the assembly of motorcars and refrigerators. Textiles, plastics, all essential household items and any products are made locally.

It is invigorating to observe how ardently the Israeli Government has attacked the problem of a trade inbalance. There is a noticible determination on the part of the entire people to make the country self-sustaining where possible. Progress has been made; the formidable trade ration of 9 to 1 has been reduced to 4 to 1. This means that Israel is now producing more and buying less, and is on the way to putting its national economy on a firmer foundation. The purchase of defense equipment in foreign markets continues to bite deep into the trade balance. Today Israel exports its products to 80 countries throughout the world. I can say with pride that Israel exports more to the United States than to any other nation, over 22 percent of its total trade. It is evident, therefore, that Israel has an expanding economy, although it will be dependent on foreign assistance for the next decade.

The Government's program for the second decade is bolder and more daring than that of the first decade. It plans to open up and to colonize the southern desert area of the Negev and to establish agricultural and industrial settlements in central and upper Galilee. Exploration and investment in the Negev will open up a rich storehouse of natural resources. The legendary mines of King Solomon with all their wealth have been rediscovered in this area. The Dead Sea contains abundant deposits of potash and other raw materials for a large chemical industry. Already a growing chemical industry contributes 7 percent to the total industrial output. Deposits of phosphates, manganese, copper, iron, feldspar, and mica have been unearthed. Oil strikes have proved that the Negev has reserves of high-grade petroleum—a necessary item in a national economy which has to spend roughly $34 million annually on imported fuel. A domestic source of fuel is important since the Arab nations have levied an embargo on oil to Israel.

Water and labor are necessary, however, to make the country again flow with milk and honey as of old. The Jewish settlers have clearly shown by the results of the last 10 years that they can work and work hard. The country does have enough land to support a larger population, but there is a critical lack of water, as there is through the entire Middle East. More exactly, there is a sufficient amount of water, but it is just not in the right places. The most pressing need at the present time, therefore, is an irrigation program to make the Negev bloom and to generate more electrical power to supply the infant industries.

The future advancement of the country is based on the execution of a national irrigation project. A large part of the nation's irrigation project has already been realized. The real solution to the problem is to pipe water down from the north, where it is available. In 1955 a pipeline was opened from the Yarkon River to the Negev. The project of saving the storm waters of the big Hulah Swamps for all-year agricultural production is more than 50 percent completed. By 1961 it is anticipated that the nationwide irrigation program will have fully exploited all available indigenous sources of water. The project envisions the channeling of the River Jordan and its tributaries, which can supply one-quarter of Israel's annual requirement. But the Jordan River irrigation project is inseparably tied in with the complex question of Arab-Israeli relations and a resolution of this stalemate might open the way for further discussion of regional development and the Arab refugee question.

The completion of the irrigation project is predicated upon an agreement with the neighboring Arab state of Jordan for the harnessing of the Jordan River waters. There is not sufficient water in the Jordan to satisfy the demands of both Israel and the Hashemite kingdom of Jordan. To prevent open conflict it is necessary to draw up a regional approach to the mutual problem of land reclamation. The Johnson Jordan Valley plan of 1953 offered the most equitable distribution to enable Israel and Jordan to derive the maximum benefit from the river water. The plan was accepted by Israel and Jordan but later Syria and Egypt pressured Jordan into withdrawing.

What can the United States do at this time to bring political and economic stability and to stimulate a spirit of mutual cooperation in this area? The administration's policy of vacillation to support first Israel, then the oil-rich Arab countries has contributed immeasurably to the political turbulence of the area. A firm policy always pays off. Our failure to come to grips with the basic realities of the Middle East has opened the door to Soviet penetration.

First. The prerequisite for an enduring solution to the Israeli-Arab animosity is the Arab acceptance of the fact that the State of Israel is a sovereign nation and has become a major factor in the future of the Middle East. The United States has weakly affirmed this fact, but we could stress this basic belief of our Middle East foreign policy by increasing the amount of economic aid to Israel. We could indicate that the United States guarantees the security of Israel by consulting more frequently with the Israeli Government on affairs pertaining to the Middle East.

Second. In view of the disruption of friendly relations between Jordan and the United Arab Republic (Egypt and Syria), the United States might encourage Jordan to cooperate on the Jordan River project.

Third. Peace and stability will never be established in the Middle East until the question of the Palestinian refugee is resolved. The cankerous sore of the refugee camps infects the entire region with hatred and distrust. The receptivity of the refugees to the propaganda of Radios Cairo, Damascus and Baghdad causes a dangerously inflamatory situation. The United States has, from the beginning, contributed a major share of the funds to maintain the refugee camps and has provided proposals for eliminating the refugee problem. The Johnson Jordan River Valley Plan which recognized rightly that an irrigation project and the refugee problem were indivisible, expected and included in its calculations a resettlement of the refugees in the Arab land made fertile by the Jordan River. The United States should use its influence to end the suffering of the Palestinian refugees by repatriation to Israel or resettlement in Jordan with the choice of alternative being given to the individual refugees.

The Israeli experiment has clearly demonstrated that the Arabs and Jews can live together in mutual cooperation. The Israel Government has pursued an enlightened policy toward the indigenous population of 214,000 Arabs. The Arabs in Israel enjoy the same high social, economical, health, and education standards as the Jews. The Israeli Government has never differentiated between Jew and Arab in its policies except in matters of national defense. When Israel was founded, the Arab population numbered about 120,000; since that time about 30,000 Arabs who were living in the neighboring countries have been permitted to rejoin relatives in Israel. An Arab child received free elementary education from the state. There are Arab students in the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. The Arab farmer is not in bondage to an absentee landowner or a money-lender. The Arabs are represented in the Israel Parliament, the Knesset, and are permitted to speak

Arabic in deliberations of the Government.

The State of Israel has become a new force of enlightenment and advancement in the Middle East, and herein, lies the danger of Israel to the feudal society of the Arab countries. The democratic state of Israel springing from the respect of the Hebraic prophets for the inherent dignity of man, has been revolutionary for the Middle East in building a new society with the aid of modern science and technology. The Arab leaders know that if ever the social revolution spread beyond the borders of Israel into the Arab world, the old order of a few landlords standing on the masses of people will come tumbling down. If the Arabs and the Israelis would enter into discussion about mutual problems demanding a regional approach, there is a strong possibility that Israel, possessing a surplus of technicians and scientists, could render valuable assitance for developing the natural potentialities of the Middle East and Africa as it is now doing for the new African nation of Ghana.

I would like to see a more imaginative and more consistent American foreign policy adopted to advance the cause of peace and stability in the Middle East.

Equitable Tax Deductions for Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most extraordinary inconsistencies of the Bureau of Internal Revenue has been its long reluctance to give to the teachers of our Nation the same consideration in regard to deducting expenses that it has granted most other groups. The absurdity of this discrimination is perhaps best indicated by the fact that a movie actor was permitted by income-tax regulations to deduct the cost of ballet lessons on the ground that they were necessary to maintain his physical fitness; whereas, teachers were denied deductions for expenses incurred in attending summer school and summer institutes. Our teachers have been justifiably protesting this injustice, and as we know, there are a number of bills before the Congress to produce this end. In a recent issue of the Tennessee Teacher this legislation was endorsed by the Tennessee Education Association and under unanimous consent I insert the article in question below:

EQUITABLE TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR TEACHERS

The teaching profession has long been in the forefront of the fight for better schools and better education for all American children. This year, the members of the profession have an opportunity to express themselves for their own personal and professional advantage. Individually, and through their State and local associations, teachers have it within their power not only to talk about taxes but to do something for themselves in order to get more equitable treatment.

NEA working in cooperation with the TEA, held organizational meetings in Dyersburg, November 18, and in Knoxville, November 20, in order to lay the groundwork and explain the need for teachers to get a workable definition of necessary business expenses. Chairmen for these meetings were Claude Moore and Miss Mildred Doyle, respectively.

Supporting these attempts by NEA have been the resolutions passed by teacher associations, and letters from individual members of the profession. Similarly, there has been welcome support from many other members of the House of Representatives.

The King-Jenkins bill, H. R. 4662, faces hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee during January or early February. H. R. 4662 seeks to redefine the necessary business expenses of teachers to include the cost of tuition for summer and evening courses, transportation to and from classes, books, and necessary supplies, and the excess cost of living expenses incurred while living away from home and attending school.

H. R. 4662 was introduced by Representative CECIL R. KING, Democrat, California, last February. The same bill was introduced by Representative THOMAS A. JENKINS, Republican, Ohio. In addition, there are more than 2 dozen other bills with a similar purpose.

All these bills seek to provide more equitable tax treatment for all American teachers. If passed, this revision of the Internal Revenue Code will permit those teachers who itemize their expenses on their income tax return to deduct the cost of professional growth from their taxable income. The effect will be a lower Feedral income tax, and a saving which normally may go as high as $150. Technically, H. R. 4662 puts a limit of $600 for these deductible expenses. Because most teachers are in a tax bracket ranging from 20 to 26 percent they may effect a saving up to $150 on their Federal tax bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the teachers and all of those who have been interested in doing justice to them, have welcomed the belated ruling by the Bureau of the Budget which has removed this inconsistency and will bring equality of treatment for the teachers in regard to educational expenses. It has been pointed out that granting the teachers this privilege already enjoyed by other professions, would encourage and stimulate teachers to improve their capabilities. In this connection, it is gratifying to see that there is already evidence of this desirable result. The Nashville Tennessean recently published an interview with Dr. William H. Vaughan, registrar at Peabody College in Nashville, which offers very interesting testimony on this point. Believing that this interview will be of interest to my colleagues and under unanimous consent I am also inserting the report of the interview below.

The report follows:

A BIG BREAK FOR BETTERING TEACHERS

(By Eugene Dietz)

(An interview with Dr. William H. Vaughan, registrar at Peabody College, concerning the recent United States Treasury Department ruling that teachers may deduct certain college expenses from their income-tax payments.)

Question. What effect will this tax break have on enrollment at Peabody and other teacher-training colleges?

Answer. We expect about 400 more students for our summer quarter than we had last year.

Question. On what do you base that estimate and how many students will that give you this summer?

Answer. The heavy increase in applications indicates that we will have more students. I expect around 3,000 this summer. We had 2,600 last summer.

Question. Have applicants told you that the tax deduction made it possible for them to take graduate work?

Answer. Yes. Many. Teachers finally are getting the same break that many other groups have held for years. The Treasury Department ruling, which came after a court test in Virginia, held that a teacher could deduct certain educational expenses, came less than a month ago after an 18-year fight.

Question. Could you identify some of the other groups which you regard as having held the right that teachers now have?

Answer. Yes. Remember the lawyers' convention in London that was attended last year by many American attorneys? Well, their travel expenses were deductible from their income tax. That is one group. There are many others. We hold no grudges. We think they deserve the deductions because the conventions helped improve them professionally. We just wanted the same benefit for teachers.

Question. What part of the cost of attending college is deductible for teachers under this new ruling?

Answer. Well, the regulation, as most other Federal provisions, will be found to be highly technical. Each teacher should consult the Internal Revenue office in his or her home area for specific information. But, generally, here are some of the deductible items: Cost of tuition; cost of books and (for students who come from other areas) their travel expenses and meals and lodging while in attendance.

Question. That seems to amount to a big saving. But just what would it mean in dollars when they file their returns?

Answer. Again, I will have to be general. But most teachers will find that one-fifth of their deuctible expenses will be cut from their income tax payments. If tuition, travel, board and meals cost $600 this summer for a student, he would have around one-fifth of that, or $120, trimmed from his income tax payments when he files early next year.

Question. I understand that teachers may even get refunds for such expenses incurred since 1954. Is that correct?

Answer. Yes. But there is a stipulation that the taxpayer must claim his refund within 3 years. The deadline for seeking a 1954 refund was April 15. But the 1955, 1956, and 1957 costs may be reclaimed.

Question. How do they go about claiming the refund?

Answer. By filling out what the Internal Revenue Department calls form 843. I suggest they contract their Internal Revenue offices about that.

Question. How was the campaign conducted to obtain the tax cut?

Answer. Many educators and Congressmen have been interested in correcting the long-standing wrong. But the National Education Association did the lion's share of the work.

Question. Is there any real benefit to the Nation generally from this tax reduction which is designed to encourage teachers to seek more training?

Answer. Certainly. Our schools will have better teachers. The additional work will provide teachers with more information about the subjects they teach, as well as give them greater knowledge concerning the skills of teaching. All of us, parents, students, and teachers, will gain from this. I think none of us will regret it.

Ghost Town for Two Comes Alive With Tourists, Anglers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the quaintest ghost towns in the West is located at Cornucopia, Oreg., high in the beautiful Cornucopia Mountains in a beautiful forest setting below towering granite cliffs. It is all too fast giving way to the inroads of weather and salvage. Future generations will be poorer when historical landmarks such as this are gone.

Chris Schneider, caretaker, and his wife, Jessie, are the sole inhabitants of Cornucopia. An item appeared in the April 20 issue of the Detroit News which I believe my colleagues will find of interest.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that this article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

GHOST TOWN FOR TWO COMES ALIVE WITH TOURISTS, ANGLERS

CORNUCOPIA, OREG., April 19.—For a couple who are the sole inhabitants of a ghost town, Chris and Jessie Schneider are far from lonesome.

"From April right through the middle of October, we have people here every day," says 72-year-old Chris, who has lived here more than 6 decades.

"Some summer days we see maybe 50 people. You'd think it was New York, the way it gets crowded."

About half the visitors are tourists interested in seeing a "live" ghost town. The other half are eastern Oregonians who come up for the trout fishing in Pine Creek and free camping under the pines.

MASS EXODUS

Overlooking the flowing green meadows of Pine Valley from its perch on the pine-clad hem of the 10,000-foot-high Wallowas Range, Cornucopia is a picturesque page out of the State's mining history.

Half of Oregon's gold came from the Cornucopia's mines, which were worked until October 31, 1941, when the great Union Companion mine closed.

Within 24 hours a mass exodus was underway, town officials pulling out without bothering to resign. In 7 days only Chris Schneider was left. The following year he married Jessie Mires, widow of a Cornucopia miner, and the two settled down to keep the ghosts company.

Chris, who works for the Union Companion owners as caretaker, remembers Cornucopia in its prime, when it boasted 700 persons, 300 of whom were miners.

TERM MAYOR

The town was complete with post office, a 2-room grade school, city hall and jail, 2-story Keller Hotel, two mercantile stores, two taverns, two dancehalls and several sundry establishments, such as barbershop. Elected officials were a constable, mayor and 7 councilmen.

The still jaunty, good-natured Chris knows all about the mayor's job. He served 10 terms, being in office when the town shut down.

"I never wanted the job," he says. "Three, four times I campaigned for my opponent. Once I won by 1 vote. My opponent demanded a recount. I said he was right; he had really won. But when they counted again—shucks. I was still ahead by 1 vote.

"I declined every nomination, but they kept on electing me. Once I 'snuck' around to stuff the ballot box but somebody was guarding it."

SELLS PROPERTY

Life isn't too uncomfortable or boring for the Schneiders. "I never lack for things to do," says Jessie.

The cozy, well-furnished, fresh-painted two-story framehouse, adequately heated by wood, has a piano, a radio, and a telephone. Phone service, vital as it is, is quickly restored after power failures caused by storms.

Caretaker Schneider is kept busy looking after the property and selling machinery, pipes, and company houses. The houses, some infested by pack rats, are sold to a logging contractor, who resells them to Pine Valley farmers.

With spring Chris is putting some of his work aside to act as guide to the curious. He points out the sights and tells how the town was in its boom days.

SHE'LL COME BACK

The main street, a maimed jag of rocky road across Pine Creek, is softened only by a background of cabins in the pines. The crude shops of yesteryear, ravaged by the elements, are eerie landmarks waiting for a banshee wind to claw them to splinters.

The awkward lettering on the clapboard fronts and the rough, frontier style of the sagging structures show plainly that Cornucopia never lacked in earthiness.

When he points to the Union Companion, Chris seems to grow 6 inches taller.

"Someday," he vows, "she'll come back. I know she will. Why, she's hardly been touched." But then his shoulders slouch and he adds wistfully, "but I don't think I'll ever see the time. She'll come back, but I won't be around."

SKIS TO TOWN

After the last tourist and camper depart, Chris puts on a feverish spurt of stocking up for winter.

Once a week, through the long snow months, Chris straps on his skis and glides down to Carson, 6 miles below, to pick up the mail and a few groceries. It takes him 90 minutes to descend, 3 hours to return.

Chris and Jessie are glad to see the first tourists of spring, but when the rush starts—sometimes you can see 10 cars at once in town—the Schneiders lift their eyes toward the high Wallowas, hoping to find a fresh speck of snow on the sky-nestling peaks.

Law Day, U. S. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix about Law Day, U. S. A.

As a lawyer, I am particularly glad to see Law Day, U. S. A., recognized.

One shudders easily to think what, who, or where we would be without our United States Constitution. This truly was a milestone in the evolution of our government by law.

As citizens of responsibility and as duly elected representatives of the people, we must constantly keep before our people the idea that laws are for their protection as individuals and not for their exploitation. Law is our servant and not our master.

As we view the world and conditions throughout this universe, we realize that we must continue to supplant the law of force with the force of law. The world has grown to be dangerous, and we are aware that there would be no survival for us without law.

The United States and Russia have pierced the frontiers of outer space and we are engaged in a race which is comparable to none ever undertaken before. This race imposes a bold task upon the minds and hearts of men and calls for daring and courage. Are we going to extend law to the new frontier? This is truly a great question.

In the years to come, I have full confidence that we all are going to witness great accomplishments on the space frontiers. However, in our accomplishments ahead, I hope earnestly that our contributions will be recognized not only by language but more by the spirit in which we perform these wonders: A spirit of unmistakable adherence to the principles of law and order, recognition of our Creator. These qualities are the things that made us recognized as a government under one God and of the people, by the people, and for the people. These are the things that gave us the position we have today, and the world has looked at us with wonder. The quest must go on, and in it the process of law is an integral part.

Let Us Act Quickly for the Good of Retired Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the two bills (S. 72 and H. R. 607) that provide additional benefits for retired civil-service employees have passed their respective bodies of Congress. A conference on the bills has been asked and the members of the conference committee appointed. It is my hope that these conferees will promptly report out an agreement on which the House and Senate can act and which the President will approve and I have constantly been in touch with some of the conferees on this matter.

I have long endeavored to enact legislation that will bring about cost-of-living relief to these people who have served their Government in many capacities over a long period of years and who have planned for and contributed to a reasonably comfortable community life. I think the provisions being studied in conference are badly needed and, to some extent, provide the additional

income these people so justly deserve. Both in the 84th and 85th Congress I have introduced similar legislation affecting retirees which fully indicates my belief and concern in their welfare. The west coast of Florida is one of the great retirement sections of the United States and many of our fine residents are from the ranks of retired civil employees. The action proposed in these two bills before the conferees is extremely important to the future of these retirees and their retirement communities. I hope that every effort will be made to obtain a conference report at the very earliest opportunity.

I trust that the bill will be reported out soon, that it will provide an amount approximating S. 72 and will provide an increase that will thus adequately compensate for the increased cost of living that so markedly affects the standard of living of these retirees on fixed incomes. This was the intended purpose of my bill and I trust the conferees will consider this factor, of increased cost of living, the principal and motivating element in their deliberations, there being adequate funds in the trust fund to provide an increase in conformity with this principal and still retain the actuarially sound integrity of the fund.

"May Day" Proclaimed "Law Day"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Stroudsburg (Pa.) Daily Record of April 30, 1958:

[From the Stroudsburg (Pa.) Daily Record of April 30, 1958]

"MAY DAY" PROCLAIMED "LAW DAY"

(Series part of observation: President Eisenhower has proclaimed Thursday, May 1, as Law Day and called upon the people to reaffirm their dedication to the rule of the law as the foundation of individual freedom and opportunity for American citizens. As part of the national observance, the Daily Record invited Chester H. Rhodes, of Stroudsburg, president judge of the Pennsylvania Superior Court, to prepare a series of four articles on the judicial system at the National, State, and county levels. The articles by Judge Rhodes are recommended reading for every citizen of the United States—student as well as adult—in these trying days of cold war, nuclear weapons, and space missiles.)

"May Day" is celebrated in the Soviet Union by a display of military strength, power, and force by which the Communist government subjugates its people, terrorizes the countries bordering Russia, and threatens free nations with annihilation.

By contrast, May 1, 1958, has been proclaimed by the President of the United States to be "Law Day."

Our legal system is the antithesis of communism. We have a government under laws created by the representatives of all our citizens, enforced by police who are employees of the people, and administered in courts by impartial and independent judges. It is well at this time to consider the judicial system which administers these laws fundamental to our democracy, and to take note of its historical beginnings and its development.

Our basic law comes from the English common law which at one time was exceedingly harsh. During the reign of George III, there were at least 160 capital offenses including stealing 1 shilling from a pocket or stealing a sheep.

Today the importance of law is not always apparent, and its presence is not always obvious although the rule of law is the foundation of our free society. To appreciate our heritage it is essential to know its origin, its development, and its functioning. The rule of law may take the passive form of our constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of religion, and freedom of assembly, or it may be actively and dramatically demonstrated in a jury's verdict requiring the payment of damages by one who has injured another because of negligent conduct.

It may be found as a statutory enactment of the legislature, as an ordinance passed by a local municipal government, or as the reported decision of a State or local court. Within the last few decades it has been increasingly found in the regulations of governmental administrative agencies. In whatever form the law is found, however, it is meaningless without the individuals who call it into action, the lawyers who advocate its cause, and the courts which ultimately interpret and apply it.

It is significant that judicial functions can be discharged only in that kind of society which is willing to submit its conflicts to adjudication and to subordinate power to reason.

Preliminarily, it is interesting to observe that, prior to the Norman Conquest in the year of 1066, there were no professional lawyers in England. It was in the reign of Edward I, 1272 to 1303, that the profession was first organized.

It is said that the first Pennsylvania court was established in 1642, when we were a Swedish colony, and that the court administered the Swedish law. The Swedes were supplanted by the Dutch in 1655, and the Dutch, in turn, were ousted by the English in 1664. It was then that the common law of England was invoked. The charter granted to William Penn, in 1681, gave him authority to establish a system of courts with final appeal to the Privy Council in England.

At that time lawyers were not required to be learned in the law. It was the act of 1722 that first required lawyers to be learned in the law, but it did not make the same requirement of judges.

The act of April 15, 1851, Public Law 648, provided that judges of the Supreme Court and the president judges of all other courts of record shall be learned in the law. Now all judges in this Commonwealth must be learned in the law, except associate judges.

There is still no requirement that Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States be learned in the law. The chief justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania and the president judge of the Superior Court of Pennsylvania are commissioned as such according to seniority. The Chief Justice of the United States is appointed by the President of the United States, and he may be any one of the Justices of the Court or some other appointee.

Upon the adoption of the first Pennsylvania constitution in 1776, the administration of the common law was continued. The executive jurisdiction of the Pennsylvania courts was ended upon the adoption of the Federal Constitution in 1787 which created the dual system of State and Federal jurisdiction which is sometimes bewildering.

The history of the development of our judicial system is interesting, and very individual should have a knowledge of its functioning. A complete understanding of the many legal systems would require an extensive study of colonial, English, and ancient history, which I shall not undertake to narrate. However, little is known about legal systems prior to early Roman times except that devised by the ancient Babylonians. Their Code of Hammurabi (2250 B. C.), which has been preserved through the ages, recognized some legal concepts which are familiar to us today.

In early Roman history the law and its administration were primitive. During the period of the rise and fall of the Roman Empire, the Christian church became a significant factor, and by the time Emperor Constantine gave it legal status it had become sufficiently organized to have its own ecclesiastical courts. When the Roman Empire fell to Germanic invaders, a tribal system of administering justice prevailed. In administering criminal law the Germanic tribes seldom resorted to a trial. When a man was caught committing a crime he was immediately banished.

Many legal advances which are significant to the English and American systems were developed during the period of the Frankish Empire. The Franks were a Germanic tribe which conquered a great portion of Europe between the fifth and ninth centuries. The Franks continued to administer justice under the tribal system.

It was during the reign of Charles the Great that the Frankish Empire was divided into separate sections into each of which the king sent two of his representatives to hold court. This system of circuit judges was also to appear in England under Henry II. Significantly, the appellate courts of Pennsylvania still travel to various points in the Commonwealth to hear appeals.

The beginning of the jury system may also be attributed to the Franks. When the Frankish Empire collapsed in the ninth century, Europe was again divided into many tribal or national groups, and the judicial advances of the Franks fell into disuse except in the territory of Normandy from which William the Conqueror later invaded England and took with him many of the Frankish legal concepts.

Oregon Indians Await Action on Timberlands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor pinpoints one of the most serious tasks facing the 85th Congress, namely to provide just termination legislation for the Klamath Indian Tribe which will both protect tribal members and preserve the great natural resources found on the reservation. Mr. Malcolm Bauer, special correspondent for the Monitor, deserves high praise for his straightforward presentation of some of the problems which must be faced.

I ask that his article be included in the RECORD.

Oregon Indians Await Action on Timberlands

(By Malcolm Bauer)

PORTLAND, OREG.—Among the important decisions the 85th Congress will make in the next few months is this: Will there be a change in the formula established 4 years ago for the dissolution of the Klamath Indian Tribe and its valuable timbered reservation with a consequent jolt to the lumber economy of the Pacific Northwest and to the Indians themselves?

This is the issue which far transcends the interest of the 2,000 members of the Klamath Tribe, who 94 years ago were confined to a tract of southern Oregon real estate which now happens to be covered by a valuable stand of pine and fir timber. For the justice of the final transaction with the Klamaths may set a pattern for all other similar legislation.

This is one of the first of the termination acts. What makes it so important and so controversial is that the reservation stands in one of the last areas of virgin forest in all of the United States.

SUM NOT ASSURED

A Government survey of reservation property, including the timber, has indicated that the 2,000-plus members of the tribe should expect to receive about $120 million for the real and personal property owned by the tribe. This is a fabulous $58,000 for each man, woman, and child. Some reservation families are, by that standard, worth more than a quarter million dollars.

But there is no assurance that the $58,000 each will be forthcoming. Public Law No. 587 now provides that the reservation will be liquidated and the Indians provided with their equal shares and full citizenship not later than August 13, 1960. If the transaction is conducted with such speed, the return will be much less than $58,000 each, most observers agree, and there will be a flooding of the Northwest timber market such as none ever witnessed.

KLAMATH VOTE ENDED

There is an estimated 4 billion feet of marketable timber on the reservation property, 3 billion feet of which would probably be involved in a forced sale to satisfy the terms of Public Law No. 587. Klamath timber-cutting capacity is approximately one-tenth that amount annually.

Such experts as Earle Wilcox, forester employed by the Management Specialists, in charge of the administration of the liquidation of the Klamath Reservation, and Vincent Bousquet, president of the Klamath Forest Protective Association, feel that to dump the Klamath timber on the market before August 1960, would smash the Northwest timber market and reduce disastrously the financial return to the Indians.

During April members of the Klamath Tribe, many of whom live in States other than Oregon, voted on the key question of withdrawal from Federal wardship. On April 28, the Department of Interior officially reported that 1,641 of a total 2,133 members had elected to withdraw and thus become eligible to receive their equal shares of the proceeds of liquidation of reservation property.

The remaining members of the tribe either abstained from voting or voted against withdrawal. Their share of the reservation will continue to be held in trust by the Federal Government.

This means that, under terms of the Klamath bill now before the Senate Interior Committee, an appropriation of slightly more than $95 million would be required for Federal purchase of the shares of withdrawing members of the tribe.

ACTION CALLED IMPERATIVE

The committee's dilemma is this: Should this sum be appropriated as provided in an administration bill, which has the vigorous support of Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Oregon Democrat? Or should the Klamath Indians and the Northwest lumber economy be left to an unhappy fate?

Senator NEUBERGER met with the Oregon Legislature's Klamath Reservation Interim Committee and others vitally interested in the Klamath problem during the recent Easter recess. "There may be differences of opinion on what we should do, but I am sure that everyone who has any knowledge of the Klamath situation recognizes that we must do something—and that we must do it soon," the Senator said.

And for the first time, Senator NEUBERGER, who has borne the brunt of the struggle to bring justice out of the complex Klamath termination, appeared to hold some hope that the United States Senate would see the necessity of Federal purchase of reservation property—at an estimated $95 million.

The Senate Interior Committee is scheduled to act on the bill soon. The bill must then clear the Senate and the House before adjournment, or the provisions of Public Law 587 will automatically and inexorably take effect: The tribal property of those who choose to withdraw will be liquidated, the withdrawing Klamaths will receive what the market will bear, and the state of the market will be anybody's guess. Northwest lumber interests believe the latter will be sorry indeed.

LOSS ESTIMATED

During his conference on the Klamath question here, Senator NEUBERGER released a letter he had received from Richard E. McArdle, Chief of the United States Forest Service, estimating the possible loss to the Federal Government of the precipitate dissolution of Klamath timber holdings.

"In order to evaluate the impact on national forest operations in terms of losses to the Federal and local governments, it is necessary to assume a period over which the Indian timber might be liquidated. It seems reasonable that such liquidation could be carried out in a 10-year period, beginning in 1960.

"During that period it is estimated, if present trends in national forest sale programs continue, some 4 billion board-feet of saw timber and pulpwood would be reduced to 1.9 billion board-feet of saw timber and pulpwood.

PERSUASIVE ARGUMENT

"Such assumption takes into account allowances for utilization of mill capacity not now being used for installations of some new capacity, and for capacity now normally supplied by Indian timber. Based on these assumptions and present timber values, revenue losses for the 10-year period are estimated as follows:

"Gross loss in Federal receipts—because of dumping necessitated—$49,700,000.

"Loss in 25 percent share for roads and schools of 7 Oregon and 3 California counties, $12,425,000.

"I think this is one of the most persuasive arguments I have heard for the passage of S. 3051 (the administration bill for the purchase of reservation property)," said Senator NEUBERGER. "It has not been explained as fully as it should have been, but I think we can all see that if dumping the Klamath timber on the market in Oregon is going to cause a loss of more than $50 million in Federal timber receipts and road and school funds for Oregon and California, that the $89 (or $90) million we may have to pay to the Klamath Indians is really not out of reason at all."

Under Federal purchase, the timber would be marketed on a sustained yield basis, which means that it could be sold only so fast as its growth replenished the cut. Thus there would be no dumping.

America Should Export More Tobacco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, tobacco farmers in America, the great American tobacco industry, and its employees are being injured by the present foreign trade policy. A 5-year extension of the so-called reciprocal trade agreements could well ruin the American tobacco farmer and the American tobacco industry. The following report from the Department of Agriculture from around the world plainly tells how America is being outtraded by foreign countries in practically every instance. We are losing our tobacco exports. It is time to tell the American tobacco farmers the truth. His acreage is being cut while the foreign tobacco grower plants more and more.

This Congress should vote down the present trade program. We should return to the concepts of the late Cordell Hull and sell more tobacco abroad with bilateral agreements and institute a mutually advantageous foreign trade program.

Mr. Speaker, American tobacco farmers should be represented at foreign trade conferences where the agreements are negotiated. Under the present policy neither the tobacco industry nor the tobacco farmer have been directly represented. We have been represented by the State Department but other countries have been represented directly by their tobacco interests.

The following tells the story. When this story is known the American tobacco farmer and our tobacco industry will rise up and demand that they be represented and that this Congress regain its power to control tariffs and foreign trade:

IMPORT BARRIERS

Argentina

Import licensing: For the past several years, the Central Bank has granted practically no import permits for tobacco of any type. This development has eliminated United States tobacco from the Argentine market. During the period 1947–51, our leaf tobacco exports to Argentina averaged 2.1 million pounds annually, principally flue-cured and burley. There were no exports of any type in 1952, 1953, and through November 1954.

Australia

(a) Preferential tariff: Under terms of a trade agreement in operation since 1941, southern Rhodesian tobacco enjoys a 9 pence (8.4 cents) per pound tariff preference in the Australian market. This places United States leaf at a disadvantage in the Australian market, and encourages the importation of leaf from southern Rhodesia.

(b) Purchase agreement: A purchase agreement is in effect with southern Rhodesia, under the terms of which Australia guarantees to take a minimum quantity or percentage of the southern Rhodesian crop. The present guaranteed quantity is 9.7 million pounds, or 6½ percent of the crop, whichever is smaller. Increasing Australian consumption has lessened the impact of this

on United States exports, although imports from southern Rhodesia rose from a prewar average of 0.1 million pounds to 9.1 in 1953. The United States share in the Australian tobacco import market declined from more than 95 percent in prewar to less than 70 percent during the period 1949–53.

(c) Mixing regulation: This regulation, which has been in effect (with modifications) since 1936, provides for substantial duty concessions on imported tobacco which is to be blended with certain minimum percentages of domestic leaf in the manufacturing process. The concession ranges from 15 pence (14.0 cents) and 18 pence (16.7 cents) per pound, depending upon the classification of the tobacco and end use. Through its influence upon the leaf usage of the larger manufacturers, this regulation has almost certainly maintained demand for Australian leaf at a higher level than might otherwise have been the case.

Austria

Bilateral agreements: For a number of years, Austria, which has a government tobacco monopoly, has maintained a number of bilateral agreements with tobacco-exporting countries, providing for the importation of tobacco of a specified quantity or value. Agreements have been in operation with Bulgaria, Greece, Yugoslavia, India, Brazil, and Indonesia. Most of the tobacco imported from countries listed are not directly competitive with American leaf; however, any quantities imported from them under such trading arrangements do tend to displace leaf from the United States.

Egypt

(a) Premium dollars: According to latest available information, Egypt has for some time permitted no dollars to be used for tobacco purchases at the official rate of exchange. Importers have been required to pay an approximate 10 percent premium to obtain dollars for United States leaf. Exports of United States tobacco to Egypt presumably would have been greater if this premium payment had not been necessary. It has tended to encourage imports of Southern Rhodesian and Indian tobacco.

(b) A trade and payments agreement is in effect between Egypt and Greece. This was recently extended to cover the period September 1, 1954, to August 31, 1955, and tobacco is one of the commodities moving from Greece to Egypt under the terms of the agreement. This encourages the importation of Greek tobaccos, and tends to prejudice the position of the United States tobacco in the Egyptian market.

Finland

Premium dollars: Severely limited dollar allocations for tobacco have forced Finnish importers to resort to "switch" transactions through third countries, in order to obtain dollars for United States leaf tobacco. There have been premium payments involved in these transactions, usually amounting to from 10 to 20 percent. It is probable that if dollars had been freely available, United States tobacco exports to Finland would have been about one-third greater than actual shipments during the past several years.

France

(a) Limited dollar allocations: A system of exchange controls covering dollar purchases for United States leaf has been maintained for several years. This has severely limited imports of United States leaf, apparently without regard for consumer preferences, comparative prices, or the traditional pattern of French tobacco imports from this country. Imports from the United States declined from an average of 21.4 million pounds in 1946–47 to only 6.4 million in 1952–53. In prewar years, the United States supplied about one-third of French tobacco imports. During 1952–53, the United States share was only 9 percent.

(b) Compensation agreements: For a number of years, France has maintained trading arrangements with a number of countries, under the terms of which tobacco has been included as an item to be imported into France. Agreements have been concluded with the following countries: Greece, Turkey, Yugoslavia, Brazil, Argentina, and the Central African Federation. These agreements have been used to implement the French desire to direct trade in tobacco toward countries agreeing to purchase French commodities. They have acted to reduce the French market for United States leaf, particularly dark tobaccos, and to expand imports and usings of oriental tobaccos. In prewar years, an overage of only about 3 million pounds of oriental leaf were imported into France; for 1949–53, the average was 22 million pounds.

Hong Kong

Preferential tariff: A tariff preference of 0.20 Hong Kong dollar (3.5 cents per pound) is in effect on leaf tobacco imports into Hong Kong from British Commonwealth sources. This probably has had no appreciable effect on imports of United States tobacco.

India

Import licensing: An import licensing system is in effect which severely limits imports of tobacco from dollar areas. This acts as a deterrent to exports of United States leaf to India, which fell to only 1.2 million pounds in 1953, compared with an average of 7.5 million during the period 1947–51.

Indonesia

(a) Mixing regulation: The government requires that a minimum percentage of domestic flue-cured leaf be used in the manufacture of certain popular brands of cigarettes. At latest report, the percentage was 10 percent, but indications are that in view of the balance-of-payments situation, the minimum will be increased.

(b) Import licensing: In the fall of 1954, licenses for the purchase of United States leaf were sharply restricted. For 1954–55 (September–August), exchange sufficient for about one-half the 1953–54 purchases will be allowed, and for 1955–56, only about one-quarter. If this regulation is strictly adhered to, imports from the United States will be reduced drastically from the average of about 13 million pounds shipped to Indonesia during the period 1951–53.

Italy

Bilateral agreements: Italy has negotiated bilateral trade agreements with Greece and Turkey. Although tobacco is not specifically mentioned as an item to be imported by Italy, reliable information indicates that such imports are virtually imposed on Italy. These agreements tend to affect Italian imports of tobacco from the United States. Italy has a monopoly which controls all phases of the tobacco industry, and can direct import trade as it sees fit. The monopoly, a government agency, is in a position to implement politico-economic policy toward countries that will accept Italian export commodities in large volume.

New Zealand

Mixing regulation: A regulation has been in effect since January 1, 1941, requiring a tobacco manufacturer to use a specified minimum percentage of domestic leaf tobacco in his total manufacturing operations. The minimum was originally fixed at 20 percent. Under the GATT agreement, New Zealand undertook to guarantee that the minimum percentage requirement, which had been increased on several occasions since 1941, would remain at the then existing level of 30 percent. According to latest information, it has been raised to 32½ percent, as a voluntary move by manufacturers. Because of steadily increasing consumption of tobacco in New Zealand, imports and utilization of United States tobacco have been maintained. It is believed that the volume of imports of leaf from the United States has been below what takings would have been in the absence of the mixing regulation.

Pakistan

(a) Preferential tariff: The tariff regulations provide for customs duties on United States leaf at $2.25 per pound, plus an excise duty. Indian tobacco, because of an agreement made at the time of the partition, is subject to an excise duty only. In effect, Indian tobacco for customs tariff purposes is treated as domestic leaf, and therefore the customs duty is not applicable. The preference is sufficient to encourage the importation of leaf from India in lieu of higher quality tobacco from the United States.

(b) Mixing regulation: There is a sliding-scale excise tariff favoring maximum use of domestic leaf. In other words, the rate of excise declines, as the percentage of domestic tobacco used in a particular product increases. This tends to discourage maximum use of United States tobaccos.

Philippine Republic

Import quotas: Under Republic Act 698, effective May 9, 1952, imports of leaf tobacco (except cigar wrapper) were limited to the following percentages of 1950 imports: 1952—75; 1953—50; 1954—40; and 1955 (and subsequent years)—25. The 1950 imports approximated 28 million pounds. As amended in mid-1954, the law continued the percentage quota restrictions for 1954 and 1955; but provided for such additional imports which, when added to domestic leaf production, would permit the manufacture of tobacco products at a level not less than that of the previous fiscal year. For 1956, and subsequent years, the amendments provided for import quotas at a level which, when added to the domestic crop, will permit manufacturers to produce a quantity of tobacco products equal to the preceding year's. These quota provisions have already restricted imports of United States flue-cured and Burley tobacco, and have promoted uneconomic expansion of the domestic flue-cured crop.

Portugal

(a) Preferential tariff: Light tobacco from Portugese colonial possessions is accorded a preferential duty of 15 percent below the rate applicable to imports from the United States. The object is to encourage tobacco production in those overseas areas.

(b) Bilateral agreement: A basic agreement with Greece, signed in 1949, provides for the exchange of Portugese fishery products for Greek tobacco (oriental) in the amount of $700,000 annually. This has reduced the market for United States leaf in Portugal, although consumers prefer tobacco products containing high percentages of flue-cured and Burley. Imports from Greece increased from 1 million pounds in 1949 to 1.4 million in 1953. Imports from the United States were only 7.9 million pounds in 1953, compared with 8.9 million in 1949.

Spain

(a) Exchange allocations for United States tobacco have been extremely limited, despite the historical pattern of trade with the United States. The Monopoly and Ministry of Finance strictly control all tobacco purchases. These measures have severely restricted United States exports of dark tobaccos even though they have been offered to Spain at competitive prices.

(b) Clearing agreements are believed to be in effect with several of the important suppliers of tobacco to the Spanish market.

imports from Brazil and the Dominican Republic have been increased sharply in recent years compared with prewar. Imports from the United States are far below prewar levels.

United Kingdom

(a) Preferential tariff: For many years, the United Kingdom has maintained a preferential tariff on imports of tobacco from Commonwealth countries. At present, the differential in the tariff on United States leaf and Commonwealth leaf is 18½ pence per pound (21.5 United States cents), for the principal category of leaf imports. It is impossible to measure accurately the effect this preferential duty has had on imports and utilization of United States tobacco. Displacement of United States leaf has continued and developed for a long period of years. The tariff preference has been a most important factor in the increased tobacco production in Commonwealth areas, and the reduced share of the United States in the British market. During the period 1919–23, only 6 percent of British tobacco imports was of Commonwealth origin; the average of 1951–53 was 45 percent. At present the tariff preference amounts to only about 3 percent, although in prewar years it was as high as 20 percent. The current duty on imports of United States unstemmed leaf containing 10 percent or more of moisture is the equivalent of a little more than $8 per pound—roughly 12 times the export value of the tobacco.

(b) Purchase agreement: A postwar development of great significance to United States flue-cured-tobacco growers is the purchase arrangement, originally negotiated in 1947, whereby British manufacturers agree to purchase a large percentage of the Southern Rhodesian tobacco crop. Under existing terms of the agreement, purchases are fixed at 85 million pounds (farm weight) for 1955, and 80 million for the years 1956–58. This agreement has acted as a strong stimulus to increased production in Southern Rhodesia. Imports into Britain from Southern Rhodesia increased from about 16 million pounds in prewar to nearly 60 million in 1952 and 1953.

(c) Dollar allocations: For a number of years, purchases of United States leaf have been limited by dollar allocations. At present, the system provides for tobacco purchases from "dollar areas" sufficient to cover current manufacturing requirements—or about 61 percent of the total usings of light tobaccos. It does not take into account the drastic decline in the United States share in total manufacturing operations over the past 6 or 7 years.

(d) Mixing regulation: At the suggestion of the government, British manufacturers agreed a number of years ago to use 5-percent oriental tobacco in cigarettes produced for home consumption.

Under the impact of this combination of barriers, the importation of United States tobacco into the United Kingdom fell from 76 percent of the total in the prewar (1934–38) period to an average of only 51 percent in 1951–53. On an absolute basis, imports from the United States declined from an average of 213 million pounds during 1934–38 to an average of 150 million pounds for 1951–53. Conversely, imports from outside the United States (mostly Commonwealth) increased from an average of 62 million pounds in 1934–38 to 147 million in 1951–53.

Uruguay

(a) Dollar premiums: Tobacco importers in Uruguay have had to pay a premium in order to obtain dollars for tobacco imports.

(b) Bilateral agreement: In effect with Greece, providing for $100,000 worth of tobacco purchases from Greece during the period May 1954–April 1955.

West Germany

Bilateral agreements: A number of trade agreements are in effect with other countries, providing for the importation of substantial quantities of various commodities including tobacco into Germany in exchange for industrial goods. The most significant of these, as far as tobacco is concerned, are those with Greece, Turkey, Brazil, and Colombia. Their effect has been to pressure German tobacco manufacturers to expand their purchases and usings of oriental leaf and non-United States cigar tobaccos. Under the impact of these agreements, the United States proportionate share in the German market declined considerably from 51 percent in 1950 to 43 percent in 1953.

COMPETITIVE EXPORT AIDS

Algeria

Export subsidy: This was made effective in 1954, in order to boost tobacco exports to areas outside of France and its overseas territories. It is too early to assess the full effects of this new subsidy system, but it may eventually cut into United States exports of light and dark air-cured tobaccos.

Colombia

Export subsidy: An export bonus, which in 1954 amounted to about 40 percent of the selling price, is paid to tobacco exporters. This has already encouraged the export of dark tobaccos to Germany and France, both of which are markets for United States dark types of tobacco.

Cuba

Commercial agreements: Cuba has commercial agreements, covering the exportation of Cuban tobacco to other countries. Agreements have been concluded with Argentina, Chile, Germany, Spain, France, and the United Kingdom. These probably have had some adverse effects on the level of exports of dark and cigar tobaccos from the United States.

Dominican Republic

(a) Export monopoly: The government has been granted permission to establish a consortium which would have the sole right to purchase and export tobacco. This paves the way for easy negotiation of bilateral trading arrangements and subsidization of exports.

(b) Commercial agreement: This was recently negotiated with France and provides for the importation into France of $1 million worth of Dominican tobacco annually.

Greece

Bilateral agreements are in effect with a number of countries, including Portugal, West Germany, Italy, Uruguay, Austria, France, and Egypt. All of these countries are outlets for American tobacco. (For significance to United States tobacco, see under comments on these countries.)

India

Import licensing: From July 1954 India has had a system of ad hoc import licenses covering the goods of countries guaranteeing to purchase lower grades of Indian flue-cured tobacco.

Italy

(a) Tie-in sales: Italy, a monopoly country, in recent years has facilitated the export of certain types of tobacco by the tie-in sales method. By means of this, the sales contracts for scarcer and more desirable tobaccos with some Western European countries have included other types not so much in demand. We have no indication that this trading arrangement has been discontinued, and it appears to have had some effect on exports of United States dark tobaccos.

(b) Trading arrangement: The Italian Tobacco Monopoly, a government agency, has an agreement with the Swiss Cigarette Manufacturing Association covering imports of Italian tobacco into Switzerland in exchange for Swiss exports of cigarettes to Italy. This agreement adversely affects exports of United States fire-cured tobacco to the Swiss market.

Madagascar

Guaranteed market: The French tobacco monopoly virtually guarantees to take the total production of Maryland-type tobacco in Madagascar. Incentive prices are maintained, and United States Maryland has been practically eliminated from the French market.

Paraguay

Exchange subsidy: There is an exchange subsidy, tied in with the minimum selling prices, which has encouraged the export of tobacco in larger volume to Spain and France, both formerly very important outlets for United States dark tobaccos. The exchange subsidy was recently raised to about 100 percent.

Southern Rhodesia

Purchase agreements: (see under United Kingdom, Australia, and France.)

Turkey

Bilateral agreements: (See under Italy, West Germany, France.)

Union of South Africa

Export subsidy: An export bounty or subsidy is in effect, permitting exports at less than world market prices. For the 1953–54 export season the bounty was up to 40 percent of the minimum selling prices. Exports totaled 4.4 million pounds in 1953, compared with only .3 million in prewar years.

MONOPOLY COUNTRIES

In many countries, most phases of the tobacco industry are controlled by a governmental or quasi-governmental agency. Policy with respect to import trade frequently is undertaken arbitrarily. The volume and kind of tobacco products manufactured, and the type of leaf used in their manufacture, are established by the government. The government in a monopoly country is in a position to direct consumers' tastes toward certain domestic and imported tobaccos, without regard to preferences or the traditional manufacturing and trade pattern. Monopoly policy is often based on political considerations. Countries in the free world having monopoly control of tobacco include the following:

COUNTRY AND TYPE

Austria: Government.
Ecuador: Leased.
Formosa: Government.
France: Government.
French Morocco: Leased.
Haiti: Leased.
Iran: Leased.
Iraq: Leased.
Italy: Leased.
Japan: Leased.
Korea: Leased.
Peru: Leased.
Portugal: Leased (two companies).
Spain: Leased.
Sweden: Government.
Syria and Lebanon: Leased.
Thailand: Government.
Tunisia: Government.
Turkey: Government.

Tenth Anniversary of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago the State of Israel was created and

from virtually nothing the people have developed a country that has been marked with extreme sacrifice and hard work rarely seen in the last century. As a visitor to Israel 3 years ago I was able to experience firsthand the undaunted courage of the people and those charged with administering the governmental affairs.

I join with all others in wishing continued peace and progress to the State of Israel.

Grant or Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include for the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram addressed to me from Gov. Foster Furcolo, of Massachusetts, and an editorial from the Boston Herald supporting Governor Furcolo's stand on the issue of extending unemployment insurance benefit payments:

BOSTON, MASS., *March 31, 1958.*
Representative EDWARD P. BOLAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

I am enclosing a copy of the telegram which I have sent today to the President urging an extension of unemployment compensation benefits for at least 13 weeks on the basis of a Federal grant, rather than a Federal loan. I respectfully urge your cooperation in supporting an immediate extension of unemployment compensation benefits for at least a 13-week period on a grant basis. "The large number of Massachusetts workers who are presently unemployed and who have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefit payments have resulted in great personal hardship for entire families. I respectfully suggest that your proposal for the extension of unemployment benefits on a loan basis will create unnecessary hardship for industry and workers alike in Massachusetts. I urge you to consider an immediate Federal extension of unemployment benefit payments on a grant rather than a loan basis. A Federal grant authorizing at least a 13-week extension of benefits would provide immediate assistance to unemployed workers without injury to the competitive position of Massachusetts."

Sincerely,

FOSTER FURCOLO,
Governor.

GRANT OR LOAN

One recommendation in Governor Furcolo's antirecession program has our unqualified approval. It is that any Federal contribution for the extension of unemployment compensation benefits be on a grant rather than a loan basis.

We have previously criticized the administration's unemployment plan for its failure to discriminate between full-time members of the work force and in-and-outers. Neither the Federal Government nor the States should be called upon to subsidize nonbreadwinners during this emergency.

The financing of the extension program is another and equally important question.

The Associated Industries of Massachusetts has testified against the extension plan on the ground that it might lead to federalization of the employment-security program. This does not strike us as a very serious danger provided the program is temporary and is financed by a Federal grant. But the imposition of new obligations on the State via the loan route could be extremely dangerous.

For, as Mr. Furcolo quite correctly observed, throwing the burden of benefit extension on our State fund, even on a long-term loan basis, could force an increase in the tax on employers and place Massachusetts at a competitive disadvantage with other industrial States. We need to attract more industry here, not drive it away. And if the balance of our State employment security system is upset we may be forced to look for more permanent Federal aid.

The objection is, of course, greater in the case of other proposals, such as Senator KENNEDY'S, which would force the States to liberalize their programs permanently with only a 12-month assist from the Federal Government. But Congress will surely see that.

The dangers of a loan program are not so obvious. Bay State spokesmen in Washington should follow the governor's lead on this one.

West's Weapon Against Moscow, as Seen by Dr. Dobriansky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include an interview given to the antibolshevik bloc of nations by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, distinguished professor at Georgetown University, lieutenant colonel in the United States Army Reserve and national chairman of the Ukrainian Committee of America. The antibolshevik bloc of nations is an international organization dedicated to the liberation of all the captive nations in the Communist empire, Dr. Dobriansky answers questions from an American point of view on subjects that range from Russian colonialism to missile warfare. These questions are of pressing moment and the answers are put forward clearly and incisively. The interview which appears in the current issue of ABN Correspondence follows:

Question 1. In what way do you think it would be possible to overthrow the Russian Bolshevist imperium, if the leading statesmen of the free world are not prepared to give active support to the national liberation revolutions—as was the case in Hungary?

Answer. Rationally, in order to overthrow the Russian Communist empire there is no other way possible than that of active western support of all the national liberation movements in this vast and unprecedented empire and of the eventual revolutions which they necessarily imply. As entertained by Mr. George F. Kennan, the notion of a transfiguration of this empire through cultural erosion is based on a sophisticated miscomprehension of the totalitarian enemy and a dangerous misreading of contemporary history. Mr. Kennan has been wrong so many times and with such uncanny consistency that truly, for those who have followed his thinking closely, he has become notoriously unreliable.

The equally unrealistic notion of evolution toward freedom in this last remaining empire, as advanced by CIA Director Dulles and others, is only a phraseological variant of the preceding one. Those who intellectually cling to either of these notions are obviously most susceptible to the perilous ideas of accepting the status quo of the Russian Communist empire and permanently (if it were at all possible) dividing the world into two broad spheres of influence. With some calm reflection given to this ideational generation one cannot but conclude that the only alternative is a liberationist approach which in essence precludes these wishful intellectual steps that in the end can only spell disaster for the free world.

Now, the possibility of being forced to adopt this liberationist approach is real and promising. The force of objective circumstance rather than reason may compel our statesmen to support actively the patriotic movements. This could occur in short time. For example, should the patriots of Poland reach a breaking point and the entire population revolt, it would be well nigh inevitable that this revolt would spill over not only into Ukraine and other parts of the Soviet Union but also into East Germany and West Germany, whereupon the West could not but assume the inevitable stand. Especially in the light of the Hungarian revolt, it would be foolhardy for our policymakers to ignore this short-run, real possibility.

Question 2. Do you not think that the passive attitude of the western major powers toward the national revolutionary fight for freedom of the peoples subjugated by Russia is helping to hasten on the outbreak of a nuclear war?

Answer. There is no logical doubt in my mind that this passive attitude maximizes the chances of a hot-war outbreak. By definition this passive attitude toward the liberation movements in the Russian Communist empire, which fundamentally embraces Red China, North Korea, North Vietnam, and even Yugoslavia, means the absence of any implemented policy of liberation. This lack of implementation guarantees Moscow the freedom to consolidate its empire, to resolve almost any tension in the confines of its empire, to continue its long-range military planning at tremendous costs to the captive populations, to attain not only to military adequacy but even superiority in relation to the West, to incite at will and with initiative tensions in the free world, and to strike first against the United States when the risks become well calculated.

Taken in toto, these elements add up to the fact that time is on the side of our enemy, assisted negatively by us. Sheer containment and an arms race are no solution for the prevention of a third world war. On the contrary, at staggering costs they will build their own psychological momentum to get the thing over with. They will in no way prevent several of the elements mentioned above from being fully utilized by the enemy. Aimless predictions of a cold war struggle for the next 10, 20, and even 50 years are in the nature of mouthy utterances rather than results of reasoned analysis of the basic institutional factors at work. Again, the climactic paradox of our situation might well be the salvation of the passive West by the bold mass revolts of the patriotic populations in the Russian Communist empire, as indicated above. If we are to drift with history, it might as well be along a right course determined by those who have least to lose materially.

Question 3. In view of the free world's inferior strength as regards classical weapons, how could it withstand a war of aggression on the part of Russia with conventional weapons, without being the first to resort to nuclear weapons, if it misses the

only opportunity of destroying the Bolshevist imperium from within; namely, by supporting the national liberation revolutions?

Answer. This question is more intricate in character than it appears. First, the initial proposition on the inferiority of the free world in conventional weapons is itself subject to serious question. Quality and innovations are more important considerations than sheer quantity. On these bases it is doubtful that at the moment the enemy enjoys any clear-cut superiority across the board in these weapons. Second, the possible choice between the use of conventional weapons and that of nuclear is a widely discussed problem, especially in connection with the possibility of limited wars. However, in the event of direct Russian aggression, no matter how effected, it is unlikely that much thought would be devoted to this choice since the war would necessarily be unlimited and recourse to nuclear weapons would be spontaneous on the part of the West.

There is no reason to believe that with the act of war the United States and other free nations would then be inclined to place credence in Moscow's word not to use nuclear weapons. Moreover, in this situation there would be no moral restriction against the use of the best and most efficient weapons, namely the nuclear ones. The horrors result from their particular misuse, not from their general use which the horrible act of war itself justifies. It surely would be no crime to reduce the enemy as expeditiously and economically as possible. But by far, less costly is the liberationist way of achieving this end without a global hot war. The captive nations are the West's greatest weapon against Moscow. Unfortunately, up to now only Moscow knows this best.

Question 4. Why does the free world not take part in the fight for freedom of the peoples subjugated by Russia, seeing that Russian Bolshevist colonialism represents a grave menace to its own existence, too?

Answer. There are four reasons accounting for the neglect of the free world to actively support the national liberation forces in the Russian Communist empire. One, as concerns the formidable forces within the Soviet Union itself, is plain ignorance. Many in high places are simply uneducated in regard to the primary empire of Moscow. Some have been misinformed and a few even disinformed by anti-Communist but pro-imperialist Russian emigres. In the United States ignorance still is the chief enemy.

The second reason is the understandable fear of precipitating a global hot war. Carried to the extreme, this fear would lead to national self-paralysis and, individually, many are already in their minds at this point. The way some argue, it seems that nothing positive and offensive should be done for fear that this would lead to a hot war. Coupled with the first reason, this one largely explains a lack of understanding with regard to the aims, objectives, and art of the policy of liberation.

An unphilosophical materialism is the third reason. Assuming the absence of the two preceding reasons, it is evident that this third one, a reason of the will rather than intellect, is independently sufficient to account for the free world's neglect. In brief, this reason holds life is short, let's enjoy what we have, just live and let live, and to do these things, let's be realistic and accept the status quo of Moscow's vast empire. This form of myopia and spiritual decadence is, of course, not new in history. Sufficiently generalized, it could again plunge a civilization into oblivion. However, it is a force today which must be kept constantly in harness.

The fourth reason is plain, misguided thinking. Granted some degree of knowledge concerning all the captive nations in the Russian Communist Empire, it appears that many officials do not know what to do with it. Pointing to Western Europe and elsewhere, they see trends toward federation and supra-national organization and then, by some poor logic, react unfavorably toward what they consider a "balkanization" and "splinterization" of Eastern Europe and Asia. Ironically, these same individuals would be the first to oppose exploiting cartels and huge business monopolies, for example. The obvious point is the qualitative substance of the political or economic entity. There is a world of difference between a free federation of states and nations and a forced one. The U. S. S. R., for instance, is even worse than an involuntary association of nations. Under Russian domination it has sought to become a cemetery of nations.

Question 5. Is it not true that the only guarantee for a lasting peace and for the security of the whole world lies in the disintegration of the Russian imperium into independent national states for all the subjugated peoples, all the more so since Russia is the last and most terrible colonial empire in the world? For what reason is the disintegration of the British and French Empires approved of, whereas the idea that the Russian Empire should be preserved in the future, too, at least within the frontiers of 1939, is supported?

Answer. Nothing is more powerfully true in the international realm today than the idea expressed in this question. Whether one reasons about this forward or backward, the predominent single guarantee of lasting world peace and security is the dissolution of the Russian Communist Empire. In point of fact, it is the last and most terrible colonial empire in the world. To be sure, there would still be problems in the world—in Africa, the Middle East, in Asia, and elsewhere. But with the decisive breakup of this Russian colossus, the environment and climate would be ideally compatible with the world's interests of lasting peace and security.

Taken solely in terms of power factors, it should not at all be difficult for one to visualize this international environment once the Russian colossus is destroyed and kept permanently so. If this should prove difficult, then one ought to reason out this problem backward, i. e., in terms of historical sequence. In the period of 1917–22, had the national republics of Georgia, Armenia, Ukraine, Turkestan, Azerbaijan, White Ruthenia, the Far East Republic, and others succeeded in resisting the Red Russian armies, would there have been a Soviet Union, followed later by an expanded empire? Obviously not. The course of history would have been entirely different and the particular problems confronting the free world today would be nonexistent.

This kind of historical analysis demonstrates, too, the unrealism in which the idea of restoring the 1939 frontiers of the Russian Empire is drenched. Aside from considerations of moral and political principle, the idea is patently naive when one considers the cumulative causation of East European history and the pragmatic military, political, and economic values of the additions to Moscow's empire since 1939. Often ignorance and disinformation underlie this advocacy of the 1939 frontiers, but the possibility of this being realized is as remote as the possibility of resurrecting the independence of the Baltic nations without the collapse of the Muscovite empire. Finally, unless one operates on a double standard, compromising political principle, it makes no rational sense to approve the disintegration of the British and French Empires and at the same time approve the idea of the 1939 frontiers. In fact, the Russian Empire is incomparable in modern times for its tyranny, genocide, and dehumanization.

Question 6. Do you think that the state independence of Ukraine, Caucasia, White Ruthenia, Turkestan, and other peoples forcibly included in the Russian imperium, as well as the independence of Russia within her ethnographical territory would liberate the world from fear and danger?

Answer. My answers to the preceding questions furnish in themselves the adequate answer to this one. Without doubt the independence of Ukraine, Caucasia, White Ruthenia, Turkestan, and other captive nations in the primary empire known as the Soviet Union would liberate the world from fear and danger. However, in our advocacy of the independence of these captive nations we must hold out the prospect of easy federation of these and other states into compatible unions. For example, the nations in the Caucasus could gain immeasurably by this process. In our political thinking the impact of technology and economics, and their integrating effects cannot possibly be ignored. There are multiple possible arrangements both in Eastern Europe and Asia, and these should absorb our thoughts at this stage to a marked extent.

However, before any free and democratic federation can be launched, there must necessarily be independent states, independent and sovereign, to make the free choice of whether to federate or no, and if to federate, with whom and in what directions. Only in this way can the norms and principles of western civilization be fulfilled. These after all, are basic and fundamental to our fight.

Federal Salary Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of April 23, 1958, sets out some substantial reasons for the necessity of immediate action on the Federal pay raise legislation. Hundreds of Federal employees, including postal workers in my district, have been waiting a long time during these rapidly rising cost of living days for a satisfactory pay increase:

THE CASE FOR RAISING CIVIL SERVICE PAY

Mr. Eisenhower has evidenced a good deal of well-founded concern over the danger of a deficit in the Federal budget. He has continually put off his decision on a tax cut. He has vetoed the pork barrel water resources bill on the ground that it provided $350 million for wasteful projects. He has vetoed the bill freezing farm price supports at a high level, and there is talk that he may veto 2 bills providing pay raises for Federal workers. One provides $417 million a year in raises to 950,000 civil-service workers, and another, passed by the Senate, offers $320 million a year more to 500,000 postal workers.

As he has made plain to businessmen and labor leaders, Mr. Eisenhower is for holding the line on wages and prices. He realizes that the worst way to spur business is to let prices go any higher.

The trouble is that everybody has his own pet exceptions, and Mr. Eisenhower himself has by all odds the biggest. While nobly slicing a few hundred million here and a few hundred million there, he is demanding approval of a foreign-aid program which would

export $4 billion at a time when it could be put to good use licking our own recession. It would be sent overseas, where there is no recession, and meanwhile European economists are begging us to cure our recession before it does spread abroad.

Anyone who is puzzled by the administration's reasoning is hastily assured that much of the foreign aid is spent in this country. If foreign aid is to be defended because it makes more money available here, we can think of more direct ways of accomplishing the same thing.

As long as the President doesn't feel he can spare a penny from the billions which go abroad—in some cases behind the Iron Curtain—we don't see how he can refuse a few crumbs to the postal and civil-service workers right here at home.

The Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the unhappy Poles have had their ups and downs in their long and eventful history. Their annals are full of glorious deeds and sad tragedies. And the constitution of May 3, 1791, marks a glorious day in Polish history. Late in the 18th century Poland was prey to her greedy neighbors. In 1872 she had already lost considerable territory to Austria, Prussia, and Russia by the first partition. Poland herself was not strong enough to prevent that tragic event. Her weakness and helplessness had become too obvious to the Poles, and many enlightened patriots among them had been trying to devise means whereby the country's governmental machinery would be improved and strengthened by the solid support of the populace. As early as 1788 a committee was formed for the specific purpose of drafting a constitution. The completion of this exacting task took long, but when completed early in 1791, it was regarded as the crowning achievement of a band of liberal, wise, and patriotic statesmen.

That historic constitution as adopted on May 3, 1791, was an epochmaking document, a great landmark in Poland's history. The governmental machinery was modernized and brought up to date by the inclusion of many liberal and progressive features. The king's authority was limited, though he still retained many of the prerogatives of his position. His executive power was to be shared with a council of six guardians of the laws, made up of the primate and the heads of five departments. This council may be regarded as the forerunner of cabinet government in that country. Roman catholicism remained the official religion of the country, but the regime became tolerant of other sects. The nobles retained many of their privileges, but townsmen became eligible for some of these privileges formerly reserved to noblemen. Agreements signed between peasants and their landlords came within the purview of the law. There was the legislature of two chambers elected on the basis of larger electorate. In short, by the constitution of May 3, 167 years ago, Poland moved from an unlimited autocracy to a limited monarchy. In its day this was considered a phenomenal advance, to be accomplished without bloodshed. It was the most advanced governmental reform in central and eastern Europe.

We all know too well what followed the adoption of this liberal instrument. Poland's enemies, fearing that the birth of liberal ideas in Poland may spread to their lands, and also anxious to rob unhappy Poland of what was left to her citizens, made war on Poland. Before the constitution was put into force, Poland found herself under attack. Against the superior forces of her enemies she could not long resist. In the end she lost out. The second partition followed in 1793. The constitution of May became a dead, defunct document. Soon after that Poland was no more; she was parceled out among her three powerful neighbors—Austria, Prussia, and Russia—and for more than a hundred years, Poland lived only in the hearts and minds of suffering Poles. But they never gave up the hope of regaining their national independence and reviving the spirit of the constitution of May. From then on, from the time of the adoption of that constitution on May 3, that day has become a Polish national holiday. I am happy to join liberal and patriotic Poles in the observance of that great holiday, the Polish Constitution Day.

APRIL 16, 1958.

Mr. CHARLES BURKE,
Polish American Congress, Inc.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BURKE: This is to acknowledge your letter of April 15. I shall be pleased to join with my colleagues in commemorating Polish Constitution Day, May 3, 1958, in observance of the 167th anniversary of the event.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. VAN ZANDT.

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
Washington, D. C., April 15, 1958.

The Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN VAN ZANDT: May I draw your attention to the approaching anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day, Polish national holiday, which for 167 years is being celebrated on May 3.

This act of wise statesmanship, enacted by the Polish Diet in 1791 in Warsaw, by unanimous solemn vote, brought about important political, social, and educational reforms destined to strengthen the Polish state at a time of threatening dangers from imperialistic neighboring powers.

Men, who undertook the task to guide the Polish nation on the path of social progress, belonged to the most enlightened brains of 18th century Poland. They were inspired by the ideals of the American Declaration of Independence and influenced by the French proclamation of the rights of man and citizen.

The principles laid down in the May 3 constitution survived while Poland was struggling for independence and were referred to in the constitutional laws of the reborn Polish state after World War I.

Free Poland's Constitution Day was May 3, and it is still observed in the hearts of the people within the country, and throughout Polish communities in the world.

The imposing on Poland in 1953, under Soviet directives, of a constitution on Communist pattern, similar to that of all other peoples republics, did but reaffirm the attachment of the Poles to their historic charter of 1791.

It became a tradition for Members of the United States to commemorate on the floor of their respective Houses, Poland's national day on May 3, to evoke links of friendship between both nations, and to stress United States interest in the fate of Poland.

Members of the United States Congress, who visited Poland lately, unanimously agree that although the Polish Government is Communist, the Polish people are not. American visitors are impressed by the friendly feelings of the population toward the United States of America. As a matter of fact, the western trend in Poland has not been eradicated in spite of great efforts of Communist propaganda to discredit the western democracies.

The commemoration of the May 3 constitution by the United States Congress will undoubtedly find a favorable response among the people in Poland.

Your support of the cause of Poland on that occasion will be greatly appreciated by the Polish American Congress.

I take the liberty to enclose for your attention a memorandum listing a few items of actual interest concerning Polish problems.

Yours sincerely,

CHARLES BURKE,
Washington Representative, Polish American Congress, Inc.

POLAND'S KEY POSITION IN CENTRAL EASTERN EUROPE

The subjugation by Soviet Russia of the formerly free and sovereign countries of central eastern Europe after World War II proved to be—as time went on—one of the main sources of international tension. A direct consequence of this shift of power was the division of Europe, totally artificial from a historical, cultural and economic point of view, and detrimental to the very idea of a United Europe.

The demarcation line dividing Europe is based solely on Soviet power policy considerations with the purpose to serve farther expansion of international communism.

Thus the ideological conflict between communism and the free world was brought nearer to western Europe and therefore to the United States of America resulting in a state of cold war in the relations between East and West.

Poland, by her geographical situation, number of inhabitants and natural resources, forms a key position in central eastern Europe.

As a general rule United States foreign policy has in the past concentrated its main interest on Germany and Russia, and less attention was paid to the countries situated between those two powers.

This attitude was largely responsible for the fact that wartime agreements, such as Teheran and Yalta, were concluded with the U. S. S. R. in disregard of Poland's vital interests as well as of the other eastern European countries.

Similarly the idea of finality with regard to European nations under Soviet hegemony which found some adherents in the United States of America, and was expressed by certain American writers—curiously enough on the very eve of the events in Poland and Hungary in 1956 which contradicted flagrantly this assertion—showed underestima-

tion of the importance of Poland and other captive nations as potential factors of security and peace in Europe.

CONDITIONS IN POLAND AND UNITED STATES ECONOMIC SUPPORT

The people of Poland, inspite of ruthless Communist subjugation on the Stalin pattern, have maintained their patriotism and moral resistance. Their feelings and beliefs did not flinch under Communist indoctrination and terror. This also applies to the much exposed young generation.

The Poznan revolt and the October events of 1956, which took place under popular pressure, have shown the resistance of the Poles against Soviet rule and their aversion to every form of communism. Ideological slogans, like "Polish road to socialism" proclaimed as a new program by the Gomulka regime are regarded by the average Pole merely as tactical moves, Communist style.

It is fully realized that the country finds itself in a compulsory situation toward Soviet Russia. The suppression of the Hungarian freedom rising by Soviet troops, practically without any reaction of the Western Powers, remains as a threatening memento.

Under these circumstances but a slim restricted margin is left for the development of direct relations with the West and the United States of America in particular.

It seems therefore profitable to the United States of America to take advantage of every possibility to give the people of Poland moral encouragement by proving interest in their fate through concrete facts such as economic support recently granted. Although this might represent a calculated risk it is in line with psychological and political necessities, considering the feelings of the Polish people who looked to America for economic support.

SOVIET INSISTENCE THAT THE STATUS QUO IN CENTRAL EASTERN EUROPE BE RECOGNIZED BY THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Soviet recent successes in intercontinental missiles and sputniks are being exploited by the Kremlin to obtain final recognition of its domination over the countries of central eastern Europe.

In his address of December 20 last, delivered to the Supreme Soviet, Khrushchev asked the West "to recognize the status quo—that is the situation characterized as it is by the existence of Socialist and capitalist states."

His language became violent in Minsk, on January 22, when he replied to President Eisenhower's proposal, that "in the interest of peace and justice the right of free choice of the captive nations be discussed at the summit conference."

In the subsequent exchange of letters and memorandums with the United States of America and the Western Powers, the Soviet Union took a menacing attitude with regard to every proposal to place on the summit agenda the problem of the captive nations. The U. S. S. R. termed such a request as an insulting interference in the domestic affairs of those countries, in spite of the fact that this request was motivated by agreements and treaties binding the Soviet Union.

It is evident that Soviet Russia reserves for herself the exclusive right to exercise control over these countries using the respective Communist parties as docile instruments of action.

It is useful to remember that any country subjected to communism is considered by Soviet Russia as virtually conquered for the Soviet bloc with all consequences deriving therefrom. This means in practical terms that any effort on behalf of the people of that country to replace the Communist system of government by a democratic one, through free voting expressing the popular will, is regarded as a hostile interference in the omnipotent right of the Communist Party to rule the country. And therefore as an act of aggression against Soviet Russia and other member states of the bloc. The use of Soviet troops to extinguish the Hungarian freedom rising constitutes an evident proof of Soviet policy methods.

Judging from a wider perspective of possible future developments in other parts of the world—this shows a real menace of international Communist infiltration.

The obstinacy with which the Soviet Union opposes any discussion of problems relating to the captive nations and insists so strongly now on the sanctioning of the status quo finds additional explanation in the following consideration:

The Poznan revolt of 1956, followed by subsequent developments in Poland and the Hungarian uprising, are proofs that the countries behind the Iron Curtain are in fact a weak spot in the Communist empire. The more so that the repercussions of these events were far reaching as far as the Soviet bloc is concerned, and their influence strongly felt in the Communist Parties abroad.

U. N. O.'s reactions to brutal methods applied by Russia to Hungary, although expressed by resolutions, which were without practical consequences, had a negative effect on Soviet propaganda. The Kremlin is therefore anxious to close once and forever the Hungarian chapter.

In addition to that the Soviets try to obtain a complete disinteressment of the Western Powers, and the United States of America in particular, with regard to the countries submitted to their influence.

In this way the U. S. S. R. would acquire a totally free hand in their action against all efforts of the people to gain more independence.

From our American point of view even tacit acquiescence to Soviet maneuvers aiming at the sanctioning of Moscow-sponsored Communist domination of formerly free and sovereign countries—would alienate the people of those countries and be detrimental to the United States of America from a moral, political, and military point of view.

A Modern Pilgrimage to Jerusalem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, recently the Saturday Evening Post published a moving account of an inspiring excursion through the Holy Land, along roads used by the prophets, saints, and Jesus Christ himself. The article, entitled "I Took the Jerusalem Road," was written by Mr. Daniel Brown who is presently serving as information officer at the American Embassy in Amman, Jordan, and who before joining the Foreign Service, served on my secretarial staff. Mr. Brown is a native of Sparta, White County, Tenn., and former publisher and editor of the Sparta Epositor. I am sure that Mr. Brown's vivid and descriptive account of the Holy Land will be of interest to my colleagues and others. It is an article that should be preserved and I ask unanimous consent that the article be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

I TOOK THE JERUSALEM ROAD

(By Daniel Brown)

Next Sunday will be Easter in the Holy Land. On that day I plan to make again the world's most fascinating 2-hour drive. It is easy for me to do this, for I live in Amman, Jordan—2 hours' easy driving from "Jerusalem, the Golden"—and between the two points lie some of the most intriguing, yet least known points of interest in the world. On this trip I plunge from 2,500 feet above sea level at Amman to 1,300 feet below at Jericho and the Dead Sea in 1 hour, and climb to 2,400 feet above at Jerusalem in the next.

Amman has its roots deep in the book of Genesis. The first king of the Ammonites was Ben-ammi, youngest son of Lot by his younger daughter. He was conceived in a cave near Zoar on a wine-soaked night after Lot and his two daughters had fled doomed Sodom, leaving their wife and mother standing as a pillar of salt by the Dead Sea. Amman is the Philadelphia of Christ's time. A fine Roman amphitheater stands on one of its main streets.

Ruins of a Roman citadel crown the brow of one of its seven hills. On this hill 3,000 years ago Joab, acting on orders from King David, placed the patriotic and trusting Uriah, the Hittite, in the front ranks of a great and bloody battle, there to be slain. Uriah's demise left David, off in Jerusalem, a clear field with Uriah's beauteous wife Bethsheba, who was to bear him a famous son. This son grew up to be the "wise king," Solomon, builder of a great temple that crowned a famous height in Jerusalem, at the other end of my Easter pilgrimage.

Rabbath-ammon, the "City of Waters" of King David's day, is now Amman, the fast-growing capital of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. Jerusalem "the City on the Hill," although retaining its age-old name, is tragically divided now between Jordan and Israel, a no man's land running through its heart. All of the major holy places, however, are on the Jordan side, and they blend with the historic and merely scenic to make the drive from Amman a glorious adventure for scholar, historian and tourist.

My first breathtaking thrill, driving out of Amman in the direction of Jerusalem, is the view to my right over the hills and plains of Gilead. The hills march away in splendid ranks, their purples, ochers, mauves, lavenders, and russets combining in a massive, yet delicate velvet counterpane. There is still a balm in Gilead, for the simple little shrub producing this fragrant ointment flourishes today on the hillsides as it did in Gilead of old. Among these hills is the River Jabbok, where Jacob wrestled all night with an angel and emerged from his battle with a greater appreciation of goodness and right and the new name, Israel. He named the plain which was his wrestling arena Peniel—the face of God—"for I have seen God face to face."

Somewhere off in the oak forests of this land is the unmarked and unmourned grave of Absalom, rebellious son of David. Absalom raised an army against his father and took on the forces of Joab in the mountains of Ephraim. In an amateurish display of generalship, he rode his mule under the boughs of an oak, was "taken up between the heaven and the earth," and dispatched by Joab.

The battle was long and bloody, with 20,000 casualties between the two armies, but it was more remarkable in another way. "The wood (of Ephraim) devoured more people that day than the sword devoured." Modern-day military analysts wonder if this was not the greatest mass a. w. o. l. of all time.

The spot whence these areas are viewed is the Circassian village of Suweilih, whose citizens are supplied with water from a Roman cistern. This spot in the days of Christ was a watering station on the caravan route from

Gerasa—present-day Jerash—in the north hills of Gilead, to the Nabataean city of Petra, carved out of the rose-red sandstone cliffs in south Jordan. Gerasa, like ancient Philadelphia, was a commercial center in the Roman Decapolis and enjoyed immense if short-lived prosperity. Its ruins today constitute the best preserved of all provincial Roman cities. Its massive stone columns and colonnades survive because, after trade routes shifted, the area was long deserted. When the present Circassian settlement of Jerash was founded, about 80 years ago, the old city became a handy stone quarry, and some finely cut masonry is to be seen in the goat pens of the new town.

Whereas Gilead is on the right side of the road as I drive along, on the left are the painted mountains of Moab, bearing the name of Ben-ammi's brother, borne for Lot by his elder daughter. It was in this naked wasteland that Moses incurred the wrath of God by striking a stone with his staff. The bitterness of the Lord poured forth in the form of saline water and Moses was told to go up onto Mount Nebo, the loftiest peak, to be shown the promised land and there die. His remains lie in a secret grave on those heights today.

The bones of Moses' successor, Joshua, rest on the north side of the Hill of Gaash, off the Jerusalem road 15 miles out of Amman. Joshua, who led the Israelites across Jordan and stormed and captured Jericho, died at the age of 110 and lies "in the border of his inheritance * * * which is in Mount Ephraim." His sepulcher is 27 feet long, for truly Joshua was a big man in the history of his people. Like many of the monuments of Judaism, his grave is today a Moslem shrine.

At a point near Joshua's tomb the road enters the Valley of Jethro, named for the father-in-law of Moses, from which it is not to emerge until it reaches the floor of the Jordan Valley. Soon the ancient town of Salt appears, and the road begins to descend in earnest. The people of Salt have long been known for their fierce independence. As early as 1444 B. C. Salt was spoken of in a respectful manner when described along with the other cities of the inheritance of Judah. Such towns of the mountains and plains as Goshen and Carmel were mentioned merely by name, but Salt was called "the City of Salt," even though it was a community in the wilderness.

West of Salt and deeper in the wadi I come to a sign marking sea level. For the next 35 minutes of travel toward Jerusalem I shall be below the level of the sea. But still the waters of the Dead Sea are not in view. They lie 1,300 feet down and around many curves of this tortuous highway. To the right and below me is a valley of fire and water. Flaming oleanders grow in wild profusion along the banks of a sparkling stream which tumbles down to the Jordan. To the right and the left towering bluffs reach skyward, covered with new spring grass and ablaze with the scarlet blossoms of wild anemone—the Biblical "lily of the field"—with roses of Sharon and other wild flowers in yellow, pink, and purple. The effect is that of rich Persian carpets hung on both walls of a narrow hallway.

Soon the road spills into the Jordan Valley, and the Dead Sea shimmers in the sunlight to the left and still far below. Behind now are the mountains of Moab. Between them and the sea stretch the plains of Moab. In this land was enacted one of the Bible's most inspiring stories of devotion, the Book of Ruth.

Presently I reach the Jordan River, spanned by King Hussein Bridge. A few rods downstream is the spot where Jesus was baptized by John. And just to the north of here, Joshua's legions roared down out of Shittim and camped on the banks of the river before they passed over it, on dry land—thanks to an earthquake, which jarred the powdery banks down into the stream, creating an earthen dike. Further north is Gilgal, the first campsite of Israel in the promised land. There Joshua raised a monument of 12 stones, one for each of the 12 tribes.

Most persons seeing the Jordan for the first time are disappointed at its narrowness and muddiness. In summer it is possible to hop across the river on high spots in its channel. But in winter, after heavy rains in the north, it can be a sizable and dangerous stream.

At this point I am traveling through the lunar landscape of the Jordan Valley. These heaped-up silt deposits were once the floor of the Dead Sea and now form a useless stretch of salty ash pile. The Jericho oasis looms ahead, suspended between the west-bank continuations of the ash heap and the wilderness that rises behind it toward Jerusalem. According to tradition, the seer Elisha once passed this way and tasted of the water of a certain well. Finding the water salty, he flew into a flit of pique and tossed a handful of salt into the spring. The water thereupon became sweet. Fortunately for the inhabitants of the oasis, it has remained so ever since. Elisha's fountain now supplies water not only for the city of Jericho but also for many of the 80,000 Palestinian refugees in nearby camps, and for sizable units of the Jordan Army—formerly the Arab Legion of Glubb Pasha—encamped in the valley.

To the north and west is the spot where Joshua bellowed forth commands causing the sun to stand still upon Gibeon and the moon to halt in the valley of Ajalon. Beyond this place, in the cave-riddled wilderness to the west, Joshua in one busy day slew the kings of Jerusalem and Hebron and three lesser potentates, threw their bodies into a cave and rolled stones over it which remain unto this day.

Jericho, possibly the world's oldest continuously inhabited community, is also the world's lowest. It stands on a slight rise above the Dead Sea. Here transpired one of the Old Testament's most awesome and best-known events, the destruction of Jericho's walls by the shouts and trumpet blasts of Joshua's legions—and, as one might suspect, by a second fortuitous earthquake. Of all the inhabitants of the town, man, woman and infant, only Rahab, Joshua's undercover agent—the harlot with the house on the wall—escaped the slaughter, together with her family.

This city laid waste by Joshua lies a mile and a half north of present-day Jericho, which stands on the ruins of Byzantine and Crusader Jericho. The ancient city reached its peak under Herod, who died here in 4 B. C., crazed with disease and pain. Jericho had been farmed out to him by Cleopatra for the equivalent of about $150,000 per year. She in turn had received the rich date-palm gardens of this oasis from Antony, as a small token of his esteem. Apparently she cared little for them.

Archaeologists today are sifting through digs well below the level of the time even of Joshua. There are good indications that man was building stone forts here as early as 7000 B. C. A tourist recently asked Dr. Kathleen Kenyon, British archaeologist in charge of the dig, to point out the remains of the walls from Joshua's time. Dr. Kenyon was horrified that anyone would waste his time on "modern" Jericho.

Towering above the excavation is the Mount of Temptation, where Jesus fasted for 40 days. Built into the mountainside by a Greek Orthodox order—and utilizing some of the very caves where, tradition has it, Jesus fasted—is a monastery.

Satan took Christ to the summit of this mountain to show him in the twinkling of an eye "all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them." An energetic person who takes the time to make the climb today derives especial appreciation of this Biblical account. From the peak one may survey Sodom, Gomorrah, Hebron, Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Samaria, Gilead, Gilgal, Jericho, Moab, Edom—indeed, the kingdoms of the world of that day.

Just out of Jericho in the direction of Jerusalem there rise out of the Dead Sea the black and ugly cliffs of Qumran. In caves here Bedouin shepherd boys in recent years discovered apparently worthless rolls of parchment which the world now knows as the Dead Sea scrolls. New discoveries are being made from time to time, but many scholars have concluded from already uncovered scraps of records that John the Baptist, who exerted much influence on the life of Christ, was a member of the Essene community, a hermitlike monastic sect that inhabited this inhospitable lizard's nest on the edge of the Judean wilderness. There is speculation that during the "lost years" of Christ's life, the Teacher himself may have been a member of this sect, practicing its rituals of fasting, self-denial and mortification of the flesh before he considered himself worthy to take up his final victorious task.

Now begins the climb through the desolate wilderness of Judea, hell's half acre multiplied ten thousand times over. Hardly a blade of grass is to be spotted in this flint-scattered void, even in these days of spring when the fields of Amman and Jerusalem and the oasis of Jericho are lush with vegetation. It takes 15 minutes to climb out of this pit of Satan to the brink of a hill where green fields again make their welcome appearance.

At this spot I pass the Inn of the Good Samaritan, where the wayfayer, beaten and robbed, was comforted and taken to the inn by a lowly Samaritan. The walls of the inn, in relatively good condition, house a Jordan Army guard post on what I must now begin calling the Jericho Road. Indeed, the storied road from Jerusalem to Jericho crosses and recrosses the present macadam road a score or more times. It is preferred to the latter by the diesel-fearing donkey drovers.

Swinging around a sharp curve beyond the inn, I see for the first time the towers of Jerusalem breaking majestically on the view. Many a devout pilgrim's heart has swelled and his eyes have welled with tears as this first glimpse of the Holy City has thus thrust upon his vision.

From this spot the road prowls for another 10 minutes in the valleys and low places beneath the city. Then it makes the final climb up the boulder-littered incline to the summit. Verily, "the hills surround Jerusalem as the Lord surrounds his people." Here is the Apostle's Well where Christ and his fellows often stopped for a drink of cool water as they traversed the Jericho Road.

At the summit of the last rise is Bethany, home town of Mary, Martha and Lazarus and of Simon the leper. A neat and new little Franciscan church stands over the traditional house of this Bethany family that enjoyed Christ's special friendship. Tourist guides like to point to a ruined stone building in the courtyard of the church which they say is the house of Lazarus and his sisters. Swifts flit among its tumbled walls. Guides also point out a ruin higher on the hill which they vow was the home of Simon, where Mary anointed the Lord with precious nard, wiped his feet with her hair, and was blessed for her act.

Up a rude and stony trail is a tomb said to be that of Lazarus—more likely a clever bit of the Crusader fakery that abounds in the area—where Christ performed one of His supreme miracles. A Moslem caretaker ushers me into its clammy depths, about 15 feet below street level, and booms in

stentorian tones as I emerge, "Lazarus, come forth." This modern-day miracle is wrought for 10 piasters, the price of a small, hand-dipped taper.

Around a curve and only a few score yards from Bethany is Bethphage, whence Christ on Palm Sunday began his triumphal ride into Jerusalem on the borrowed colt of an ass. A small church is built over a boulder revered for having served as the mount for the ass. Bethphage is Arabic for "home of the fig," alluding to the time when a hungry Jesus, on his way to oust the money-changers from the temple in Jerusalem, cursed a barren fig tree at this spot and caused it to wither and die.

Swinging around yet another curve I see on the left of the road the Hill of Evil Council, where certain notables of Jerusalem met to conspire against Christ. Next in view is the Hill of Offenses, where Solomon kept his 1,000 wives. The hill is now crowned with evergreens. Nestled among them is a small hotel which does well to accommodate 100 pilgrims on this Eastertide.

On the slopes below is the Field of Blood, a potter's field purchased with the 30 pieces of silver cast aside by Judas in a fit of remorse after his betrayal of Christ. Afar to the left are the eastern slopes of Mount Zion. There the church of St. Peter in Gallicante stands over the site of the Palace of Caiaphas and a grotto believed to have been the prison into which Christ was cast on the night of his passion. The garden of this church is one of the most serene in Jerusalem. Through it runs the stairstepped Roman road over which it is said the legionnaires brought Christ from Gethsemane. It was at this spot that Peter thrice denied Christ before the cock crew.

Below is the Jebusite village of Silwan—old Siloam—and the vale of Kidron, believed by many to be the "valley of the shadow of death." It is hard below the walls of Jerusalem, whose glorious panorama now spreads before me. At 3 or 4 o'clock in the afternoon, while it is still light in the Old City, deep shadows are falling in the valley, whose grass is kept eternally green by the cool, still waters of the pool of Siloam and Job's Well. In the former, the sight of the blind man was restored. There are those who hold that the patriarch of Uz bathed the boils of his affliction in the sweet waters of the latter.

Down in this valley is Absalom's pillar, supposedly erected in the king's dale by Absalom because "I have no son to keep my name in remembrance." In fact, the pillar, carved out of the living rock, dates from a much later time and was probably erected by the Maccabees, who, like the Crusaders of much later years, went about the countryside patching up history's frayed fabric according to their own blueprint.

The Palm Sunday route from Bethphage comes down across the Mount of Olives to the right, just beyond the Garden of Gethsemane and the Basilica of the Agony of our Lord. It proceeds across the vale of Kidron and up to now-blocked Golden Gate, through which Christ entered. In the garden are eight ancient olive trees, lovingly tended by the Franciscan Fathers, which date from the time of Christ's entrance into the city. They still bear fruit.

By the garden is the tomb of the Virgin Mary; and across the road, just under the walls of the Old City, is St. Stephen's chapel, raised by the Greek Orthodox over the spot where it is said the first Christian martyr was stoned to death from the walls of the city.

Swinging off the main road now, I make my way under the walls to the back of the city. I enter through Dung Gate, so called because, until recent years, it was through this back door that the city's refuse was heaved. As I enter the North African Quarter, largely ruined and unoccupied since the shellings of the Palestine War, Mt. Moriah, and the temple area rear their domes and minarets on my right. It was here that a heavy-hearted Abraham went, willing to sacrifice his only son, Isaac. It was here that the Jebusites had a mammoth threshing floor and that David, out of favor with God, erected an altar to his Master but was not allowed to raise a temple. His son, Solomon, beloved in the sight of God, did rear a magnificient temple, only to have it destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar in 586 B. C. It was in a later temple that Christ, at twelve, confounded the elders and, near the time of his crucifixion, created a furor by chasing out the money-changers. He foretold the destruction of this temple, and in A. D. 70 it was indeed destroyed by the Romans, along with the rest of the city.

This has been the holy place for Jew, Pagan, Christian, and Moslem. After it served as the shrine of the early Jews it was the site of Hadrian's spurious temple to Jupiter. Queen Helena, mother of Constantine, first Christian emperor of Rome, came to Jerusalem and ordered all such temples laid low. The area then became the city's rubbish heap. When the Arabs took over in the seventh century they hastily cleared the debris and erected, first a simple wooden mosque, and, later, the present grand Dome of the Rock.

Later still the Crusaders occupied Jerusalem and in the Dome founded the Order of the Knights Templars. An intricate wrought-iron screen is all that remains to mark the fact that the Christian knights passed this way, for the Dome of the Rock is today Islam's third-holiest spot—the place where Abraham went to offer up Isaac. It is still the grandest example of Islamic architecture, weatherbeaten and wartorn though it is.

Visible also are the domes and golden crosses of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher. Though time-ravaged and ineptly patched, this is certainly the holiest church in Christendom, erected supposedly over the traditional site of the crucifixion and burial of Christ. Six Christian orders—the Latins, the Greeks, the Armenians, the Assyrians, the Copts, and the Abyssinians—all have shrines here and vigorously compete for hours of worship.

The lowly, ebony-skinned Abyssinians, weak in number, have literally been pushed out of the building by their stronger Christian brothers. Their shrine is on the roof, where the monks huddle in ramshackle rabbit warrens which they have built for themselves. Once a month, except in March, they celebrate Christmas. At this season, during Eastern Holy Week, they observe the strange rite called Searching for the Body of Christ. These gentle, devout, unprotesting people trace their origin to a supposed mating of Solomon and the Queen of Sheba. Their liturgical language is Geez, the all-but-forgotten tongue of ancient Ethiopia.

From the time of Saladin, the Moslem family of Nusaibeh has kept the key to the massive weathered oaken doors of the church and thus has kept the peace among the clamoring Christian factions. The early fourth-century church built by Constantine was burned, rebuilt, and destroyed again. The present structure is much as it was when completed by the Crusaders in the 12th century.

Here ends my fascinating 2-hour journey—but not the story of Jerusalem, the eternal. Jerusalem has been besieged 50 or more times, partially destroyed on 30 occasions, and 5 times razed to the ground. But the City on the Hill, sacred to Christian, Jew, and Moslem, will live forever.

"If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning."

Can Airlines Fill the Gap?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in the past several months, passenger rail travel has been in the process of passing from the American scene. The effect of this transition will be very difficult to evaluate.

There is every reason to believe that the Nation's air carriers will profit most in this development. There is serious question in my mind whether they are prepared for the high volume of traffic which will require safe and economic transportation.

The following editorial in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 30, 1958, inquires as to whether airlines can fill the gap:

CAN AIRLINES FILL THE GAP?

In noting the passing recently of several name passenger trains, we deliberately refrained from voicing the idea that the king (railroading) is dead, long live the king (airlines).

It simply wouldn't be so on many counts. No one can flatly write off rail passenger business as extinct—not unless he possesses special clairvoyance which sees no further technical developments in the railroad field.

Besides, it wouldn't be true anyhow. The real king is the private automobile. Driving accounts for better than 85 percent of all trips. But airlines are edging up in the long-haul passenger field with close to 5 percent of the trip volume.

Thus, literally by default, the airlines are picking up a sizable chunk of what the railroads have abandoned. It's a fair question to ask if they're up to it, or if the passenger will get a fair break?

We ask this because presently some of the airlines are making grumbling noises about the no-show control program instituted only last fall to protect the passenger from himself, so to speak.

American Airlines has been the chief complainant, backed by some of the smaller carriers like Mohawk. According to American Airlines, the three-way control setup (reconfirmation, a $3 penalty on no-shows and early ticket pickup) simply isn't panning out. The line complained that its passengers were being overly inconvenienced. Bookkeeping costs of managing the program reportedly are higher than the benefits.

Some of this well may be true. We've heard other airlines rant against the bookkeeping complications. Yet might not the $3 penalty be far too low, simply not enough to jar people into thinking about how they inconvenience others?

In any case, we find this move a strange one on American's part because for years it led the way in a drive to cut late cancellations and no-shows. It makes us wonder if there may not be en entirely new trend coming into being in air travel.

This would involve—within certain high-density runs like Boston-New York-Washington, Cleveland-Columbus-Cincinnati—regular, almost on-the-hour daytime flights involving no reservations whatsoever.

Why not? If you miss one trip, you'd know another would be along very shortly. Shuttle-type service already is virtually in existence now between Boston and New York,

where you have large numbers of travelers who continually travel on standby basis.

As a result they've put in DC–6 equipment which can carry large volumes over faster schedules on some of these eastern short runs—for which this type of plane was not designed at all.

Similar service between Cleveland and Columbus would be highly welcome; we hope it's on the books to help ease a serious travel pinch.

Despite the growing popularity of air travel, reportedly 75 percent of the American public still has never flown. Obviously there remains a huge mass market yet to be tapped. Why hasn't it been done faster? Not fear, we're sure, but possibly because of the immense amount of redtape—reservations, baggage checking, checking in, and such—holds many people back. So speed the day, we say, when the fuss is removed from flying.

Beware of the Red Bear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that we should continue testing nuclear and thermonuclear devices so long as the Soviet Union threatens the safety and security of the United States and its free-world partners by refusing to accept an ironclad inspection system for outlawing such devices.

The Communists have launched a tremendous propaganda drive against such tests, perhaps because there is truth to the report that they burned their own hands in testing such devices.

Nevertheless, I am convinced that we should continue testing under safeguards developed by our responsible Government leaders and scientists.

I note that recent discussions of the Nation's leading scientists at Asilomar, Calif., led to a conclusion that continued atomic tests were not producing radioactive fallout sufficient to endanger the present and future health of human beings.

I further noted that it was the consensus of these scientists that United States tests were being conducted so as not to produce a fallout harmful to the future of civilization.

At this point, I am inserting an excellent editorial on this subject that was published in the Los Angeles Examiner of April 30, 1958:

The nuclear weapons tests in the Pacific this summer, which the Russians are trying so hard to stop, may produce the most powerful deterrent to future war the world has ever known.

They would be the exclusive weapons of the free world.

This is the reason why the Russians have mustered the full strength of international communism against the forthcoming American tests.

They know the vital purpose of the tests may be to prove the final and vast capacities of remarkable and fantastic nuclear weapons, hitherto unheard of and still entirely unknown to the Communist powers.

They believe, and with the greatest possible weight of reason, that American scientists have developed and perhaps perfected an unprecedented range of nuclear weapons that will make the costs of aggressive war prohibitive and that will deprive future aggressors of all prospects of success.

They know the Pacific tests may raise invincible safeguards against war, and may consolidate the universal hopes of peace and security.

They know the difference between holding and not holding these vital tests is the important difference between the Communists having the top hand in the struggle for world domination and of not having it.

They are clamoring for calling off the tests, because they recognize that this may be the point beyond which they cannot go and will not dare to go in their aspirations to put the whole world under the Communist heel.

The Pacific nuclear testing grounds this summer may give us a deterrent to war and a power for defense so tremendous that we will be closer to permanent peace than we have ever been since the menace of communism cast its evil shadows over the face of the earth.

The Russians are striving desperately to stop them, in their own unholy interest.

We will net them be stopped at our own dire peril.

Child Health Day, Cystic Fibrosis, and a Call to Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 1, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, today, May 1, is Child Health Day. Every year since 1928, the President of the United States has issued a proclamation declaring May 1, Child Health Day.

In 1916—12 years earlier—Julia Lathrop, the first head of the Children's Bureau, wrote to the Secretary of Labor:

May Day has a long and pleasant tradition among all English-speaking children. It might well be chosen by their elders as a day which should be not only a festival but also year by year a celebration of some increase in the common store of practical wisdom with which the young life of the Nation is guarded by each community.

In 1933, President Franklin D. Roosevelt—in his first May Day proclamation—supported the slogan: "Mothers and babies first."

Nine years later, in 1942, Child Health Day initiated a campaign for immunization against diphtheria and smallpox. Another year medical and dental examinations for children entering school for the first time were emphasized.

For the past weeks, you have heard me on several occasions tell you about the disease called cystic fibrosis. Mr. Speaker, cystic fibrosis is a vicious disease. It strikes 7,000 newborns every year, and 5 Child Health Days later, half of these boys and girls have died. A cystic fibrosis victim at the age of 20—in 1958—has about the same additional life expectancy as the average person at the age of 100. Almost 100 percent of the cystic fibrosis children die before they have a chance to die of something else.

On this Child Health Day, 1958, let us resolve to stop cystic fibrosis' child-killing spree. Research can do a lot for these youngsters. I have received letters from several doctors during recent weeks and they all agree that we know very little about the disease. Dr. Justin Andrews of the National Institutes of Health, when asked, in February of this year, about how much has been done, researchwise, to date, in the area of cystic fibrosis, testified: "Not very much."

I hope that next year, on Child Health Day, I can report to you progress made in the meantime to wipe out cystic fibrosis.

A few days ago, I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD extracts from the many letters I have recently received urging acceleration and expansion of our national cystic fibrosis research programs. Let me refer you to pages A3565 and A3575 of the RECORD of April 21, and pages A3836 and A3842 of the RECORD of April 28. And then let me refer you to your hearts. Our hearts will tell us that we must declare war on cystic fibrosis.

Beware of Summit Meetings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include a recent editorial which appeared in the Charleston (W. Va.) Daily Mail. The editorial takes the position that it is utterly ridiculous to attend a summit conference with the Russians in the light of past experience and that we should quit yielding to pressure from the British and French on the subject. I take the same position, Mr. Speaker, and I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

IF EVERYONE IS AGREED WE SHOULD NOT GO TO THE SUMMIT, WHY TAKE THE TROUBLE?

President Eisenhower obviously does not want to attend a summit meeting with the Russians and from the American point of view doubts the value of the gesture.

Secretary of State Dulles is, if anything, even more resistant until the Soviets have met certain requirements as to good faith. There is just no point in talking, if the Soviets will not agree to discuss the only problems of any moment.

Former President Truman is much of the same mind, and, although he puts it differently, stoutly supports his successor in his reluctance to lend himself to Soviet propaganda.

Dean Acheson, Mr. Truman's Secretary of State, backs him up. He goes a little further, in fact, to suggest that in time of peace the President of the United States should not participate in any summit meetings on any score. He cites the failure of the Paris conference at the close of World War I and the Geneva conference in 1955 as examples of futility.

Here we have, then, a powerful concensus that under present conditions and without more binding guarantees of some useful exchange there is no advantage and the possibility of greater danger in any American accommodation to the Soviet timetable.

And yet, in the face of this, it seems to be taken for granted that by some road and in due time the President will eventually go to the summit and do what no one thinks he ought to do.

Why?

The only answer with any currency seems to be that the United States must yield its better judgment on the demand of its allies, particularly the British and the French, who are being pressed by their leftist and radical politicians. In other words, the United States must embark on a foolish course to allow Prime Minister MacMillan to appease his Laborite opposition.

This isn't statesmanship at all. It is simply town hall politics played on a global scale.

Real Unification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, during these times of confusion and discussion of the unification of the Armed Forces and the reorganization of the Pentagon I believe it most refreshing to report an occasion which demonstrated to the maximum the effectiveness of real unification.

Last weekend in New Orleans there was dedicated the Alvin Callender Field which is a joint reserve training center for all the Armed Forces. This was unification in its purest and simplest form.

I admit I have a very deep interest in Alvin Callender Field because I have nourished the legislation which brought it into being. It is in my district. It is the first major military defense establishment in the New Orleans area since the turn of the century when the Algiers Naval Station was established.

So important and so great was the dedication of the Alvin Callender Field that from all sections of the Nation came the military in the uniform of the Army, the Navy, the National Guard, the Air Force and the Coast Guard.

The principal address the night before the dedication was made by the Secretary of the Navy, Thomas S. Gates and the field itself was dedicated by Admiral Arthur W. Radford, the immediate chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Each made a profound impression on the citizens of New Orleans. Each demonstrated the fact that the services can live in unison. Each exemplified the spirit and the being of unification in the Armed Forces.

The newspapers of New Orleans, the Times-Picayune, the New Orleans States, and the New Orleans Item as well as the newspapers of the surrounding territory, the West Band Herald and the Plaquemines Gazette, contributed their best to the event.

Of course it is impossible to direct your attention to all the newspaper editorials and all the speeches made on the occasion so I have asked permission to publish here the speeches of Secretary Gates and Admiral Radford and an editorial from the Times-Picayune which bespeaks the spirit and appreciation of the entire community.

I might also say it was a distinct pleasure for me to have my colleague from the Second Congressional District of New Orleans, HALE BOGGS. While HALE BOGGS represents a different district we, in New Orleans and the First District, feel that he is an important part of our community and we were glad to have him present.

My colleagues, I suggest that you read the following editorial and the addresses by Secretary Gates and Admiral Radford:

AIRBASE UNANIMOUS

The dedication and public opening today and Sunday of the Nation's first specially designed, joint, air reserve training center mark a national event in sound planning, efficiency, economy, and unanimity which transcends the fulfillment of our own metropolitan area pleasure.

The concept goes back in general about 8 years; in particular, with reference to the Alvin Callender Field area, a little less; but 8 years isn't bad, even on the modern scale, for completion of a vision of such magnitude, imagination, and engineering.

If Congressman HÉBERT didn't originate the idea, he certainly swarmed over and pushed it like a mother hen; and he has been among the first to praise the almost unfailing cooperative zeal and help from every quarter, local to national, that really hatched the egg.

While spectators catch their breaths over the active and static samples of the Nation's aerial defense might, marshalled for the show part of this historic occasion, some of the generators and fosterers of the project will remember when breath ran a little short over a few threats to its final or timely realization.

But for once, at least, the big good idea was a cinch to win. All the travail is behind, we hope, and celebration is very much in order.

Memories have to stretch 33 years to that first 125-acre donation for a public airport by the late George A. Hero, down on the river; to its dedication in 1926 in memory of New Orleans' illustrious air fighter of World War I, to whom the 3,215-acre base is now rededicated; to its recognition in 1928 as the South's largest nonmilitary landing field; to its inauguration of night flying in 1929, and maybe even to the Navy's transformation of it 15 to 17 years ago, in World War II.

Thoughts have to enlarge to take in its retransformation; its logical place in and apt fixing of the metropolitan airport pattern; its likage by way of the new river bridge, and developing expressway routes, to every part of our sprawling community; its service to active duty and weekend warriors of Navy, Marines, Air Force, Air National Guard, Coast Guard, and Army also have been mentioned) not only in Louisiana, but eventually throughout the gulf area, where in 1957 reserve flying was tops in membership and participation.

Commissioned last December, operating in high gear since January, the United States Naval Air Station, Alvin Callender Field, today has its deserved spot in the national searchlight; it's proud to have you, neighbor, from New Orleans and all around.

REMARKS BY THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, THE HONORABLE THOMAS S. GATES, JR., NAVY LEAGUE DINNER, ALVIN CALLENDER FIELD DEDICATION, ROOSEVELT HOTEL, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

I don't suppose it's ever really true that the speaker of the evening is as happy in that first appalling moment he finds himself on his feet with his undelivered speech lurking in front of him as he always says he is.

But in a very real and deep sense I am happy to find myself in New Orleans tonight, at this dinner sponsored by the Navy League of the United States, to assist in the dedication of a new Naval Reserve air station, named in memory of your native son, Alvin Andrew Callender.

New Orleans has always been a magic name. You have a centuries-old culture and tradition linking you to France and the Old World, and a new tradition in gaiety, music and the arts that is one of the brightest threads in the fabric of American life. You are steeped in history, yet you exemplify the industrial might and progressive spirit of the New South.

You sit at the mouth of the greatest river in the world, and your tremendous deep-water port links you with the commerce of the seven salt oceans of the world.

You have a long and proud military history, and your sons have fought America's battles with valor and distinction ever since America existed. One of those sons was Alvin Callender, whom we honor tonight.

So I am glad to be here, and grateful to Congressman ED HEBERT, who invited me.

I have worked with ED for all the more than 5 years I have been in the Navy Department, for he is one of the outstanding members of the Armed Services Committee of the House. With my own business background, I compare that committee to a board of directors, to whom the operating executives turn for counsel, authoritative policy and the power to get things done. In many ways ED knows more about our business than I do. He never asks me to do anything—all he ever wants are facts—and he sure wants those.

This Reserve air station that we dedicate tomorrow is itself a bright example of the sensible, efficient partnership between the armed services that ED and many others have worked for. The Naval Air Reserve, the Air Force Reserve, and the Air National Guard will work together, sharing land and facilities and costs—while each will maintain its mission and identity and the pride of outfit that is the hallmark of good military spirit. Thus and in countless other ways we in the military, our friends in the Congress, and our superiors in the executive are working toward safety with solvency. Safety for our civilization against the ever-increasing military threats from abroad, and solvency for our economy in an expanding American way of life.

And it is extraordinary how the American tradition of ready reserve military forces has stood the test of time and the trial of war. Today, as they always have, they provide backup strength to the regular forces, making an indispensable contribution to our safety—and at a minimum cost to our solvency.

It stirs the imagination to think of the Reserve pilots who will train from this field, always adding new knowledge and new skills to their sound foundation of training and experience. On his country's call, one may find himself flying the bitter darkness of the North Atlantic night searching for the deadly killer submarine—another catapulted from the carrier's bow to seek the enemy in the deep blue sky high above, with the shocking roar of the jet afterburner fading away, as he moves with incredible speed up and out to meet the foe—still another endlessly patrolling some distant sea against any threat to our maritime lifeline. These pilots and air crews and their devoted mechanics are your friends and neighbors, and they are something more—the citizen warriors that have traditionally kept our country free. Your Mayor Morrison, who met me today,

and who heads the Reserve Officers Association, understands these things very well.

Alvin Callender was this kind of man. He was a distinguished civilian aviator who flew with great courage and effectiveness in the Royal Canadian Air Force and the Royal Flying Corps in World War I. He lost his life in aerial combat, in the war fought to make the world safe for democracy. Let us always pay tribute to him and to the countless thousands who died so that we may live in freedom. Let us ourselves always be ready to earn freedom for our sons, and to pay for freedom, with money and toil—if need be, with life itself. Nothing less than this measure of devotion will keep us free.

Yet there is still another requirement. We must be intelligent. We must look at the nature of the physical world, and the new science, and adapt our military thinking to it. The Navy, for example, must deal with all these things—radar, advanced electronics, atomic energy, supersonic flight, ballistic missiles—space exploration. You name it—we have it. And we will have other things undreamed of today.

This audience, on this occasion, is entitled to ask "How does all this fit in with our Naval Air Reserve training program? What is the future of Naval Aviation?" And the answer, I believe, is that it fits in very well, and that the future of Naval Aviation is bright.

It comes about this way. Not now, not tomorrow, but soon—it will be technically possible for each major power to destroy the other utterly with thermonuclear rockets and other weapons. And by the employment of secure weapons launching bases, such as the Navy's own rocket-launchiing Polaris submarine, it will become possible for each nation to destroy the other no matter if it is itself struck first. So then we will have true nuclear stalemate. And it will even be possible to have this capability relatively cheaply—for a relatively small fraction of the total defense cost. But because this deterrent is mutual, it does not mean that Communist aggression will cease. They will still pursue the combined political and military probing and searching for weakness in the free world that has marked their policy for many years—with a good many sorrowful successes. The only proof against these tactics is the solid, rock hard unity of the free world against aggression—whether political, in minor military operations or in full-fledged limited war.

This free world of which I speak is an oceanic alliance, held together with the cement of sea and air power. At the nation's need we see naval aircraft hunting submarines—striking the sources of enemy naval power—guarding our ships and our sea flanks against air attack—safeguarding the commerce of the seven seas. We see marine landing forces employing helicopters to assault vertical envelopment objectives, and naval and marine aircraft supporting the Marine divisions ashore. We see sea-based air controlling the seas as it has since the airplane came of age.

But we in the Navy have no ambitions to do everything alone, or to grow bigger for bigness' sake. We do not pretend to know all the answers, or to possess all the capabilities needed for the country's defense. We believe in unity of purpose toward a single national end—the defense of ourselves and our allies. We believe in the kind of mutual support and partnership between the services that comes from the mind and from the heart. We believe we have come a long way toward achieving this, and are making more progress every day. I give you this multi-service and multi-purpose Alvin Callender Field as an example—only one among thousands.

And now I think I am entitled to speak with frankness and sincerity to the members here of the Navy League of the United States—the civilian arm of the service. Working together—for I too am a civilian—we have a right and a duty to make the country aware of seapower to the best of our ability, so that the Navy may attract the support and understanding that it needs and deserves to do its job. We have an equal right and duty to support and aid the Army and the Air Force in their vital roles, as indispensable to the country and to the Navy as it is to them.

Now finally, I want to talk a little bit about our people. In the Navy today there are 675,000 men and women in uniform, 190,000 Marines, and 400,000 civilians. In our Reserve components there are 850,000 men and women. These dedicated men and women stand alert and ready for trouble wherever it may come—off Formosa, Indonesia, Iceland, Suez, any corner of the world. They are a big slice of America, with all the hopes, desires, worries, and ambitions of the rest of us. These people and their brothers in service are in fact our greatest national resource. Devoted young soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines—young scientists, young technicians, young warriors. And their leaders, who devote their lives to the defense of us all. Let us be very sure that we support them in our communities, recognize them, help them to do a better job for us all.

ADDRESS BY ADM. ARTHUR W. RADFORD, FORMER CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF, AT THE DEDICATION OF ALVIN CALLENDER FIELD, NEW ORLEANS, LA., APRIL 26, 1958

Congressman HÉBERT, Judge Perez, Secretary Gates, Captain Hood, ladies and gentlemen, visits to the State of Louisiana have always been pleasant experiences for me. I am both delighted and honored, therefore, that you have asked me to participate in the dedication of Alvin Callender Field.

The purpose for which this field has been constructed, unity, is the subject I would like to discuss with you for a few moments this morning. In view of the threat which faces us, we must concern ourselves with the development of means to deter war. Unity of purpose, therefore, becomes a paramount objective.

In my opinion, the best way to deter war at the present time and during the foreseeable future is to be ready and strong in all respects. This readiness must be evident in the military field. Economically we must be strong, and that too must be evident. Morally and spiritually we must lead, and our aims must be clear. Readiness in these fields is not a matter of separate compartmentation in each, but rather one of interdependence and integration. Military power depends in great measure on our industrial and economic strength and both depend on our national spirit and determination.

From a military point of view, we must continuously maintain and modernize a force capable of coping with any form of aggression the Soviets might choose to initiate. We cannot have only a big war force or only a small war force.

The most dangerous form of Soviet aggression would be a surprise atomic air attack on the United States. We must therefore have such a strong atomic retaliatory capability that the Soviets will be deterred from such action. If we succeed in deterring the Soviets, and I believe we are doing so today, there exists the possibility that they will choose a lesser form of aggression such as a local war launched by a Soviet satellite. We then must have the means of meeting a local aggression quickly and decisively in order to prevent it from becoming bigger. Together with the forces our many allies have been able to raise because of our military assistance programs, I believe the free world has today the means of meeting effectively any form of attack.

Our Armed Forces today are a team whose overall combined capabilities form a deterrent with a readiness clearly evident to the Soviets. Our great task is to insure that we maintain not only a true readiness, but a superiority over the Red bloc. This will require the combined efforts of all of us. As I see it, these are some of the steps we must take.

First, we must have unity of purpose among our Active and Reserve forces. As I have mentioned, readiness is the key factor. No longer will we be able to spend months mobilizing and training. The training must be done now. This will require maximum cooperation among all the services of both the Active and Reserve components. This airfield provides a great step forward in this regard. It is the first joint Air Reserve training center in the country, I hope it is the first of many similar joint establishments.

Second, we must meet and surpass the Soviet scientific challenge. The real test will not come this year or next, but sometime further in the future. How we meet the test depends on what our youth does—beginning today. Through nationally directed efforts, the Soviet Union is now graduating twice as many engineers as the United States. I do not advocate that we adopt the Soviet school system. We cannot concentrate on quantity at the expense of quality. Nevertheless, our educational system must be geared to produce the caliber of leaders, scientists, and professionals needed in the future. Our military power and industrial prowess will depend on the products of our educational system. So, again, we have a need for unity of purpose.

Third, we must maintain our economic strength as an essential element of national security. The Soviet challenge in the world economic war is in some ways more serious than their military challenge because it is harder to combat.

Fourth, we must guard against complacency and self-satisfaction. So long as international communism remains dedicated to world domination, I see little chance of relaxation of the threat to our security. We must not be deluded by soft-soothing phrases from the Kremlin. These are but tactical variations designed to further the Communists' overall strategic aims. If we show that we are strong and ready militarily and economically and that we have the will to fight for our freedom, we can hope that a climate may eventually be created in which productive negotiations with the Soviets can be conducted. This will require unity of purpose between national and local government, the Active and Reserve military forces, and the business and industrial elements of our Nation.

Anyone examining the history of your State cannot fail to form the distinct impression that Louisiana has long demonstrated unity of purpose. Louisiana has a military tradition dating back to the earliest days of French and Spanish colonial rule.

Participants in the ceremony on December 20, 1803, when Governor Claiborne took formal posession for the United States of the Louisiana Territory, were Franco-American citizen soldiers of "Clark's Battalion" and a small detachment of United States Regulars. Thus began the friendly relationship between the Active and Reserve forces which continues after almost 155 years.

Louisiana citizen soldiers fought with distinction under General Jackson at the Battle of New Orleans in 1815. The Washington Artillery Company, formed in New Orleans in 1838, was the forerunner of National Guard units which have won honors on many battlefields. The honors and traditions of the Washington Artillery Company are perpetuated today by the 141st and 935th Field Artillery Battalions.

The Louisiana State Naval Militia was formed shortly before the Spanish-American War and was the forerunner of Naval Reserve

activities in Louisiana which today include the Navy and Marine Air Reserve squadrons in training here at Alvin Callender Field.

Air Force activities in Louisiana go back to World War I with the establishment of Gerstner Field at Lake Charles. Since that time, several fields have been activated in this State, perhaps the best known of which is Barksdale, sometimes referred to as the Mother of Flying Schools.

During World War II, Louisiana was one of the most important training areas for both Army and Air Force units. Many of the 20th Air Force B–29 crews General Twining had the privilege of commanding in the air war against Japan were trained here in Louisiana. During the years from 1940 through 1943, 1,200,000 troops received their maneuver training here before being sent off to battle.

I think this review of your history indicates the extent to which we of the military have depended on the State of Louisiana in our constant efforts to be ready for whatever missions may be assigned us. I think it also shows the extent to which the State of Louisiana has cooperated with us. I call this real unity of purpose.

As you know, there has been an Alvin Callender Field in Louisiana for many years. Today, we seek to perpetuate his name and memory with a bigger and better facility. Alvin Callender's strong belief in the cause of the Allies during World War I was shown by his eagerness to enter combat. He couldn't wait for the possibility of seeing combat with United States forces. Instead he joined the British Royal Flying Corps in June 1917 and by April 1918 was flying in France. On October 30, 1918, he gave the last measure of devotion for the cause in which he believed. He joined the many other heroes who have died to preserve our Nation.

In honor and memory of his name, I expect all those who train and use this field to display the courage and faith of Capt. Alvin Callender. They will be proud to serve with his example before them. It should be a source of pride as well to serve at a field which is unique in that, from the very beginning, its sole purpose has been joint use by the several Air Reserve components. You thus give to the entire country an example of the teamwork and unity of purpose so important to our security.

Thank you.

Birthday of Congressman Thomas J. O'Brien

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues in the House in congratulations upon the birthday of our friend, TOM O'BRIEN.

No one in the House has been more thoughtful or more kindly in his everyday contacts with Members than the gentleman from Illinois. There has never been anything too much to do for him in his way for any other Member. He always has time for a friendly chat and to do a good deed for those he values as his friends.

I hope that he will enjoy many more years in this House and that they will be as happy and as fruitful as the ones that have preceded it.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, May 3, is one of the most significant landmarks in Poland's history is the constitution of May 1791. The drafting and the adoption of that document by the Great Diet (or Parliament) 167 years ago was a real turning point in the history of the Poles. By it they effected a peaceful revolution in their form of government without resorting to the violent and terrifying measures characteristic of the French Revolution. By the adoption of that liberal and progressive document Poland's leaders led their countrymen from the feudal path of the Middle Ages to the broad, democratic highways of modern times.

That constitution restrained the authority of the monarch, and introduced ministerial responsibility in government. The intricate and obstructive features of the old system and many class distinctions associated with it were eliminated. A bicameral legislative body with full legislative authority was created. Economic and social barriers between the nobility and the townsmen were broken down. The townsmen recovered their judicial autonomy and were admitted to many higher offices. Religious toleration was established and the peasantry was taken under the protection of the law. The constitution thus abolished the worst abuses from which Poland had been suffering for centuries. As has been justly observed:

> Through the abolition of the most crying political evils of the old regime * * * and granting of increased freedom of action to the middle and lower classes, the constitution marked a great advance upon all previous attempts at reform in Poland.

But this democratic document aroused the ire of Poland's enemies, who fearing that through this document Poland might regain her former strength, hastened to fight her and bring about the eventual partition of Poland. As we all know, before the unfortunate Poles had any time to enjoy the benefits of their new constitution their country was parcelled out among the autocrats of Austria, Prussia, and Russia. Having lost their independence, all Poles became subjects of alien governments in their own homeland. Still, they managed to keep alive the spirit of their national independence—drawing spiritual sustenance from the principle enunciated in that constitution. At the end of the First World War they all happily witnessed the defeat of their oppressors, and they rejoiced at this opportunity to regain their independence.

A strange coincidence is that May 3 comes in the midst of the 15th anniversary of the heroic uprising in the Warsaw ghetto—April 19 to May 16, 1943—which is being solemnly observed in the Jewish communities the world over.

We should pause today to remember the heroic resistance 15 years ago of the Jewish community of Warsaw to one of the most inhuman and brutal persecutions in the history of mankind. After the Second World War the horror of the systematic Nazi program to destroy the Jewish community in Europe was revealed. The problems of the postwar era have made us forget the valiant stand the Jewish communities made to resist the Nazis, but we should remind ourselves of the suffering of the Polish Jewish community least we forget one of the darkest pages of human history.

The aim of the Nazis was the extermination of the Jews in Poland. The numerous pronouncements of the Nazi leaders during the first 3 years of occupation made that aim unmistakably clear.

The Nazi pattern for dealing with the Jews consisted of four consecutive stages: First, depriving the Jews of civil rights; second, driving them out of the economic life, thus making it impossible for them to sustain themselves; third, segregating them in ghettos where they would perish of famine and disease; fourth, destroying those who had survived the previous stages. The last stage was begun in the spring of 1942.

The increasing number of daily acts of persecution left no doubt that the Nazis were engaged in a savage campaign of extermination against the many thousands of Jews who were considered unfit even to work as slaves for the Nazi regime. The Warsaw Jewish community died heroically resisting the Nazi persecution. The underground Jewish organization in Poland made it clear in its messages to the free world that it was anxious to offer resistance to the Nazis, but it had no arms or ammunition. Arms were finally obtained with the assistance of the Polish underground movement with which the Jewish organization had maintained continual contact. The underground and various labor Zionist groups organized a Jewish defense corps. It first took the field against the Nazis in Warsaw in January 1943. A full-scale resistance effort did not get underway until sometime in April and the fighting continued well into May. The fight between the Jews and Germans ended in the complete eradication of the Warsaw ghetto and other Polish ghettos. It was a daring, if futile, action for the Jews to undertake against the overwhelming superiority of the enemy.

Patriotic Poles and Jews together fought the Nazis for days and inflicted heavy German loses. After their victory, the Nazis proceeded to liquidate the ghetto. On April 21, 1943, SWIT, the clandestine radio of the Polish underground broadcast a message:

> The last 35,000 Jews in the ghetto at Warsaw have been condemned to execution. Warsaw again is echoing to musket volleys. Women and children defend themselves with bare hands. Save us.

These were the last words.

Out of the martyrdom of Polish Jewry has risen a reborn Jewish homeland. Five years after the Warsaw crime the independence of Israel was proclaimed. The vision behind the establishment of

Israel was inspired by the Nazi terror. Israel opened her arms as a refuge and haven where Jews from every land might come to live in dignity and freedom.

Today once more the fate of the Poles is tragic. In their country today more than 25 million Poles are not even permitted to celebrate this constitution day. We of the western democracies join all Americans of Polish ancestry in this celebration and heartily express our hope that soon all Poles will again be able to observe freely and without fear in their beloved homeland the anniversary of their constitution day and all that this means in terms of human freedom and political justice.

By Their Fruits Ye Shall Know Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a column entitled "Our Flexible Foreign Policy," written by Constantine Brown and appearing in the Washington, D. C., Evening Star on April 29. The writer views the United States as being largely influenced by our more timid allies to proceed toward a summit conference with the Russians, a conference which we know, on the basis of past experience, would be foredoomed to failure. I recommend to the people in the State Department that they read this column, and I trust that they are aware of the fact that the majority of Americans, regardless of what certain pollsters may say, are against any more summit debacles. If anything could be gained by summit talks it would be a fine thing to proceed without delay, but I am positive that the Russians would not be willing to meet with the United States and other free countries at the summit if the free world stood to profit thereby. The Russians want such talks for propaganda purposes and some of our allies want them for political purposes. Commonsense and history militate against such a course and our leaders full well know it. Why do we, therefore, not stop kidding ourselves? Khrushchev has said to us, "We will bury you yet." Let us beware.

The article follows:

OUR FLEXIBLE FOREIGN POLICY

In the summer of 1919 this reporter had lunch in Paris with Emir (later king) Feisal of Iraq and his famous adviser and mentor, Colonel Lawrence of Arabia. At the time, Greece's brilliant Premier Venizelos was leading Western statesmen, not only on Greek affairs, but also on every facet of western European affairs. I asked the emir what he thought about it.

He had a faraway look when he replied, "My friend, you have surely seen in the desert a little donkey leading a string of camels." Would Feisal apply the same figure of speech now, when the policies of the United States, in regard to the Soviet Union, are being so largely influenced by our weaker and timid British and French allies?

Washington is a city of contradictions. There is only one question on which there is unity of thought. In off-the-record talks responsible officials, legislators, and military men all agree that a summit meeting under existing conditions would be an utter waste of time, serving only Comrade Khrushchev's propaganda goals.

The drive for summit talks was initiated with trumpets and drums nearly a year ago by the Kremlin. Neither President Eisenhower nor Secretary Dulles could see any advantage in such a gathering. It offered no chance to relax the tensions which have their deep roots in the Kremlin's efforts to achieve world domination.

There seems to be little doubt in the minds of many policy advisers that America would become the sacrificial lamb at a summit meeting. The reluctance of our top leaders to play into the hands of Stalin II (as Khrushchev is now described) appears to be to no avail.

Our allies, supported by a small but highly vocal group of American ideologists, are actually pushing the administration to take once more the road to Geneva where we reluctantly went in 1955 principally to assure the success of the British Conservatives at the polls. Hence, our rigid demands for a purposeful summit meeting are being watered down. The all-important question of German unity which Mr. Dulles has insisted must have top priority on the agenda has been removed after talks in London between Chancellor Adenauer and Prime Minister Macmillan.

Negotiations at the ambassadorial level in Moscow have been slowed down by Khrushchev's insistence that they must be conducted separately unless we agree to participation by the Poles and Czechs. Our objection to those two puppet states was the same we had in 1944 to the two Soviet provinces of the Ukraine and Byelorussia becoming individual members of the United Nations. Their presence in the U. N. like the attendance of Poland and Czechoslovakia at a summit meeting is meaningless since they are merely Charlie McCarthys of the Kremlin. The British were the first to reject this demand by Khrushchev. Yet within a few days they changed their minds and have successfully pressured Washington into at least considering the proposal for the sake of "saving" the summit meeting.

The London and Paris governments know only too well that a summit gathering will not bring a relaxation of tensions unless the free world is willing and ready to yield to the wishes of Comrade Krushchev. This reporter has not met a single responsible official in Washington—or in the foreign countries he has visited recently—who actually believes that the men in the Kremlin want a relaxation of tension except on their own terms.

Democracies are tightly united only in a shooting war—and even then that unity is sometimes questionable. Events have demonstrated that since the beginning of the cold war our allies have been going their own way in keeping with what they believed to be their own individual interests. The inside story of the war in Korea proves this fully. They have given lip service to our utterances for a common front and collective security. The NATO supreme commander, Gen. Lauris Norstad, recently stated that he needed at least 30 ground divisions in Western Europe. He has 15. The Warsaw pact nations have 52 exclusive of Russia's 184.

The administration has been accused frequently of lacking a foreign policy. This is an exaggeration—it does have one, but it changes with the winds that blow from across the Atlantic.

Israel's 10th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to offer my congratulations to the State of Israel in this, the 10th anniversary of its founding.

It has been 10 remarkable years of disappointment and encouragement, strife and peace, struggle and accomplishment, and as we look back, the pattern we see is definitely one of growth.

Immigration has more than doubled the population in these 10 years and Israel is today made up of people from the Middle Eastern countries, from Yemen, Iraq, North Africa, Turkey, in addition to the many countries of Europe and of the Western Hemisphere. The resulting social and economic challenges are being met and Israel's own, distinctive culture is emerging.

We have watched the State of Israel progress in science and the arts, in agriculture and industry, and we all hope for it the attainment of its goals in the years ahead.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the revolutionary spirit of the 18th century has had profound impact in many countries. New ideas were taking roots in the Western World, liberal and progressive ideas seemed to be spreading in all directions. In this country our Revolution produced the Declaration of Independence and the constitutional form of government. In France the cry for liberty, equality, and fraternity led to the French Revolution, and in Poland the spirit of equality and tolerance, and also the urge to revamp the governmental machinery, led to the adoption of the May constitution in 1791.

That constitution attempted, for the first time, to introduce a responsible cabinet type of government in that part of Europe. Monarchical authority was considerably curtailed, and that of the people's representatives was enhanced. The Polish peasantry was relieved from the arbitrary authority of local feudal landlords and placed under the protection of the law. Even more significant than these changes was the guaranteeing of religious freedom to all citizens of the country. Today we are happy to join freedom-loving Poles everywhere in the celebration of this anniversary, the 167th anniversary of the adoption of this great epoch-making document, the Polish Constitution of May 1791.

Short Term Amortization of New Capital Assets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced H. R. 12316, a bill identical to S. 3718 introduced by Senator CAPEHART earlier this week.

I firmly believe the enactment of this bill is the stimulant our economy needs to promote more jobs and encourage greater capital investments.

The principal objective of this legislation is to provide for a short-term amortization of new capital assets. What greater boost does the small businessman need at this time than to enable him to invest in necessary building, equipment, and machinery which can be depreciated over a shorter period of time. The effects of a program of this type would increase employment immediately and provide greater stability to the working force of the Nation.

Passage of this legislation would be a great stimulant to the entire country. It would encourage initiative and the expansion of business and industry without costly Federal subsidization of so-called temporary programs which, through experience, we have found to drag out into permanent Federal projects competing with private enterprise.

In my district alone, this bill would aid the farmer, the fisherman, and the lumber industry and many small businesses.

The farmer would be able to invest in new machinery which could be depreciated within a 5-year period as contrasted to a 10-year period now provided by law for some types of farm machinery.

The fisherman would be encouraged to invest in new boats and equipment and in costly repairs and renovation of the same.

Where the lumber industry is concerned, the benefits would be twofold. Allowance for short-term depreciation on building units both for industrial and private uses would create a greater market for lumber. The demand for lumber products together with the advantage of short-term depreciation on capital assets would be the adrenalin this industry needs.

I could enumerate by the hundreds businesses such as wholesale and retail establishments, transportation systems, heavy industry, rental housing, small factories, and the like that would discover in this legislation the boon they have been searching for.

In all my years of public service I have been one of private enterprise's strongest advocates. I have seen our country grow because of the initiative and farsightedness of those who also believe in this precept. In this day and age of growing socialism when the small businessman and the large one alike, need the added incentive and encouragement, in my opinion this bill is that shot in the arm that can snap us out of a lethargic state and an overemphasized reliance on the Federal Government.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Serious Limitations of President's Antarctic Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared in relation to the President's Antarctic proposals.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERIOUS LIMITATIONS OF PRESIDENT'S ANTARCTIC PROPOSALS

President Eisenhower last Saturday announced a most significant and historic proposal for an 11-nation treaty to preserve Antarctica as a continent for research and to prevent its becoming a battleground.

The announcement was sent to all the countries now engaged in Antarctic scientific work as a part of the International Geophysical Year, including the seven territorial claimants there.

I ENDORSE THE SPIRIT, BUT QUESTION IMPLICATIONS

At the present time, I should like to commend the high spirit in which the United States has made these proposals, a spirit of good will and conciliation of what might prove to be a most quarrelsome problem.

The White House announcement is in keeping with our President's continuing deep interest in using science for peace.

The proposal is also one of the most significant examples of generosity on the part of one nation to other nations of the world.

The United States, as I have stated many times before, has done more actual work in exploration and discovery in Antarctica than all the other nations combined. The United States has clearly established her rights to territorial claims over wide areas of the Antarctic continent, rights which we have thus far not asserted specifically.

WE HAVE DONE MOST OF EXPLORATION

The Antarctic consists of some 5½ million square miles. Of that vast area, nearly 75 percent—around 4 million square miles—have been seen by United States eyes alone.

So, in offering to enter into the type of treaty described by the President, we are being most generous, indeed perhaps overgenerous, for it is we who have made most of the sacrifices to date and it is we who possibly have the most to lose.

Yet we are basically interested in cooperation with nations, not quarrels, in minimizing of East-West disputes, rather than widening them, in harmony within the Western World, not disunity, if we can feasibly attain these goals, without undue risk to our own interests.

DON'T GIVE UP A SQUARE INCH AT PRESENT

At the same time, I should like to state emphatically, as I stated on February 13, on the Senate floor, as recorded on page 1765, that the United States had best look to the preservation of its own flag interests—I emphasize its own flag interests—before it now or ever relinquishes title to as much as a single square inch of Antarctica.

It should be noted that, under the proposal, all territorial claims in Antarctica would remain in their present unresolved status. No new claims would be permitted.

The White House pointed out that the United States has direct and substantial rights and interests including the right to file territorial claims.

NEED FOR CAUTION CITED

In drafting the treaty suggested by the President we must use a particular large degree of caution. There are many factors which the United States must consider before it enters into any agreement of this nature.

1. First of all, we regard treaties as inviolable.

However, one of the nations which is involved in the Antarctic treaty proposal is Soviet Russia.

Time and again, this nation has shown her contempt for obligations established under treaties and international agreements.

We have no assurance that the Government of Russia will respect our rights under this treaty any more than she has respected her past commitments.

Are we therefore to write ourselves into a trap of Soviet making?

I trust not.

In any event, I certainly would not commit myself to a treaty even before it has been written; much less before all of its ramifications are understood.

I am glad that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has heard testimony on this subject.

To my way of thinking, we must find out a great many more facts, as must other interested committees of the Congress.

WHY HAVE WE NOT AERIALLY PHOTOGRAPHED ANTARCTICA?

2. As one reviews the record of America in the Antarctic, one sees, once again, that it is a record marked by great deeds of valor on the part of outstanding explorers of many nations. I am glad to say that American heroes have written some of the most outstanding chapters.

But as I read that record, too, I also note this fact: The United States has—I say very bluntly—been seriously negligent in not determining exactly what there is of value in the Antarctic.

Despite all of the scientific work we have carried out, we still do not have anything beginning to resemble complete data on two counts:

(a) We have never completed an aerial photographic survey, with adequate ground control points, of all of Antarctica; and

(b) We do not have thorough geological surveys of the rock outcroppings on the continent.

And so we are in the dark as to the mineralogical and other values of these 5½ million square miles. Why?

Why, I ask, have we spent tens of millions in Antarctica without these most fundamental types of reports and charts?

It seems elementary, but I know of no intelligent bargainer who would ever give up so much as a single inch of real estate, to which he is entitled, if he didn't know what was on and under the real estate.

And so I am opposed to the United States relinquishing a square inch of the continent, at least until we know exactly what we are relinquishing.

VALUE OF MINERALS CHANGES

Even then, the fact of the matter is that minerals which may appear to be inaccessible or which may appear to be uneconomic to extract, as of 1958, may be both accessible and economic to extract a few years hence. So why write them off as valueless?

Who would have predicted 20 years ago that a substance known as uranium would be important?

And all the other miracle metals which have come to the fore in the war and postwar decade show that we had best go very slowly in determining if any mineral is undesired, so to speak.

WE HAVE WASTED EXPERIENCE OF MANY EXPLORERS

3. Another ironic fact about our record is that some of the American heroes who have made greatest contributions to Antarctic exploration are not now engaged in Antarctic work.

I am not going to attempt an analysis of individual case histories involved. But I say that it is strange, indeed, that some of the great men who have devoted virtually their lifetimes to braving the elements and advancing the interests of our country's flag in Antarctica are not now engaged in this work.

We are wasting their precious experience, and I should like to know why.

WHY ARE WE GIVING UP OUR STATIONS?

4. A further disquieting fact is that the United States is going to turn over some of its scientific stations to other countries.

Naturally, I welcome IGY or other scientific cooperation, but I ask: "Is the Government of the United States so poor, are the people of the United States so disinterested, that we cannot afford even to maintain our own stations? In all of the $40 billion budget for the defense of the United States, is there not enough money to be found to at least continue the stations which we have established?"

NEEDLESS DUPLICATION OF UNITED STATES AGENCIES

5. The United States, although it has a record for many years of work in Antarctica, still has no clear-cut, coordinated policy or program of its own in Antactica.

At the present time, there are 14 separate agencies of the Government, interested or conducting studies in this region. There is without doubt considerable duplication of effort on the part of these several organizations. There is almost certainly a high degree of administrative overlap and confusion.

In other words, Mr. President, we as a Nation really don't know where we stand. We are, on the one hand, offering to establish an apparently sensible program of international utilization in Antarctica, while on the other hand, our own national policies lack direction and coordination.

That is why I have proposed S. 2189—to coordinate our policies through a Polar Commission.

I have spoken on many occasions concerning our Government's unfortunate drifting policies in Antarctica. I have repeatedly urged that we establish a special commis-

sion to administer and direct our Nation's Antarctic program.

Only 2 weeks ago, Mr. President, I told my colleagues in the Senate that time was running out with regard to our Antarctic program. Now, however, it appears we will have an extension of time by virtue of the proposed treaty. This time should be used to "get our own house in order," so that we will be able to move forward with a coordinated United States crystalized Antarctic policy.

LET EARLY SENATE HEARINGS BE HELD

Therefore, I urge once again that action be taken on my own and other bills calling for the creation of the Richard E. Byrd Commission. I respectfully request that the Senate Education and Labor Committee schedule hearings on this vitally important bill in the immediate future, so that this Congress will not adjourn without some concrete action.

A great many of the Members of the Congress have been deeply interested in this subject. Without, in any way, underestimating the contributions of others I should like to single out, in particular, the notable work of the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Congressman ENGLE, who has introduced a companion bill, H. R. 7869, and the work of my colleague, the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

As I indicated recently on the floor of the Senate, it appears—speaking very frankly—that Polar Commission legislation will be dead for the 85th Congress unless speedy action is taken by both Senate and House committees.

Let the speedy action come.

Let us not waste the time which providence has granted us. If we delay action this time, Mr. President, we may not be granted another chance.

CONCLUSION

All in all, the President's 11 nation proposal is a highly motivated program. But it has considerable limitations and is a long way away from being a United States antarctic program for our own flag purposes.

Texas Teacher Saves Students in Tornado-Hit School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, my State of Texas has been struck in recent days by a series of tornadoes that have taken human lives and caused great property damage.

Among the news accounts of the destruction resulting from the tornadoes, a United Press story appearing in the New York Times on last Saturday stands out vividly. It tells how the presence of mind and quick action of a Texas teacher, Mrs. Dorothy Marthis, saved her junior high school students in the town of Lacoste from injury or death.

I ask unanimous consent that this story of calm heroism in a moment of great danger be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAS CLASS SAVED AS A TORNADO HITS

LACOSTE, TEX., May 2.—A teacher herded her junior high school class to a downstairs classroom today moments before a tornado ripped off the roof of the building. It dumped steel girders on desks where the children had been sitting.

None of the children were injured. They were trapped by debris on the first floor of the 2-story school. Rescuers had to dig through debris to free them.

"It was a miracle," Deputy Sheriff Alex Cardenas of Bexar County said.

Mrs. Dorothy Marthis, 27-year-old teacher, said that she sensed something was about to happen when the sky turned black.

She moved her pupils to a downstairs room where they huddled together to await the storm.

"I didn't know the roof was gone until I looked up through a hole and saw the sky," Mrs. Marthis said.

Effect of Installment Buying on the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the outstanding economic statesmen in this country is the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. Yesterday an article appeared in the New York Times, written by Senator O'MAHONEY, entitled "Do Installments Peril the Economy." This article considers the explosive danger to our economic system of the Nation's hugh payment debt. It is a remarkably wise and perceptive analysis.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DO INSTALLMENTS PERIL THE ECONOMY?—A CONGRESSIONAL SPECIALIST ON CREDIT DISCUSSES THE NATION'S HUGE TIME PAYMENT DEBT AND ITS POSSIBLE EFFECTS ON THE RECESSION

(By JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY)

WASHINGTON.—Now that the recession is officially here, we may finally get an answer to the troublesome question of whether installment credit has gotten too high. It is no secret that Americans' installment debt, or the amount of money people still owe for things they have bought on time, has risen spectacularly in recent years—from about $9 billion in 1948 to a peak of more than $34 billion last December.

I hope that the answer to this question is not a dramatically catastrophic one; I hope that repossessions and failures to meet time payments won't snowball the economic downturn by dumping used consumer goods onto a declining market. Time will tell, but clearly that possibility is with us, for consumer credit can curl our economic hair.

To combat the recession, Washington advisers call for a restoration of confidence. It must be remembered that confidence and credit are not synonymous. A credit system which is extended to the breaking point, by no down payments and eons in which to pay, will destroy confidence and ruin sound government.

A clue to the danger we face lies in the fact that installment spending for consumer durables—the big things like cars, refrigerators, TV sets—began dropping in January and may well be contributing to the recession. It is my personal hunch that this is the proof that people had overextended themselves on installment purchases and have had to retrench; it also serves to reinforce my feeling that now is an important time to take a keen look at the wholy installment segment of the economy and to act to prevent future excesses.

The fact that many antirecession moves are being aimed at the consumer to stimulate buying does not affect this situation. Certainly in an economy that is already sick, it does not help to stimulate it with phony buying—purchases without any cash payment by people whose income and jobs are in jeopardy. Efforts to stimulate sound installment purchases, using, for example, extra income from an excise-tax cut as a downpayment, are all to the good, of course, but such buying would in no way be dampened by sound consumer credit regulation anyway.

In recent years, several of my senatorial colleagues, Republicans as well as Democrats, have shared apprehension over the installment credit situation. We have watched the growth of this form of money lending, and we know that it alone was largely untouched by the anti-inflation credit restraints exerted by the Federal Reserve Board until very recently on the other major sectors of the money market. We also know that installment credit, based on steady employment and payrolls rather than tangible collateral, may prove to be built on quicksand in a declining economy.

Now I, for one, feel strongly that a healthy consumer credit market is essential to our mass-production economy and the well-being of our people, and that it is a national responsibility to see that it is soundly based. Therefore, before I discuss the dangers in the present situation and what ought to be done to correct things, let me make plain just how important installment credit is as a force for growth in the economy.

When the average person steps into his gleaming new car to drive into the country, the chances are he will be traveling in a vehicle he calls his own but which, in fact, belongs to the seller. As he whirls along the highways, he views clusters of new homes from which television aerials spring like trees in a grove; to most of them a debt tag is attached. And if this average driver were to step into any of these houses, he would find all kinds of luxurious items—dishwashers, clothes dryers, furniture, even the jewelry in madam's bureau—in use and unpaid for, bought on time.

Homes equipped with inventions for taking the drudgery out of housework, speedy automobiles, the gadgets of modern living, even world tours on a pay-later basis—all these, and more, sold on credit, have helped raise to record proportions the total output of the American economy.

Nothing illustrates this better than the automobile industry. The 4,000 automobiles manufactured in this country in 1899 were sold only to the very rich. When they were brought with the reach of the common man, first by Henry Ford and his concept of mass production, and then by installment selling, the total output was fantastically multiplied.

As car sales increased, the whole national economy benefited. New markets were made not only for steel and copper and zinc, but for glass, for fabrics, for rubber and a vast multitude of commodities without which the automobile could not be made. New jobs were created not only for those operating the machine tools on the production line but also for those who built the tools and supplied the raw materials which go into every car.

Clearly, the rise of the installment credit technique for increasing retail sales has been as important as the general use of commercial credit in the healthy expansion of our fundamental production and distribution capacity.

After all, business cannot be conducted on a cash basis.

Generally, however, the credit which makes economic growth possible is the confidence of society that those who borrow money have the assets to repay the loan. In most lending operations, the assets of the borrower—blue-chip securities, real property, the inventory or stock of a corporation, and the like—are put up as collateral for the loan. They are the guarantee to the lender that, come what may, he can get most of his money back out of the possessions already owned by the borrower. This commitment also tends to make the borrower more cautious.

In this fundamental respect installment credit is different. Here the confidence of the lender rests upon the belief that the borrower will have the assets to pay up in the future, when the time comes to pay the installments. The only collateral posted by the buyer is the article he is purchasing and this is not really his, since in most cases, he buys on a conditional sale and title does not pass to him until his final installment payment is made.

In substance, then, credit for a time purchase is granted by the lender in the faith that the buyer's income will remain steady enough to meet regular payments for 12, 24 or even 36 months; his security is the article sold—the television set or automobile or washing machine—which drops enormously in value the minute it leaves the retail store. No lender of commercial credit—say, mortgage money—accepts so ephemeral a guaranty for his largesse.

For this very reason, the risk taken by the installment credit lender is greater than in most other business loan operations. His interest charges, naturally, are likely to be greater, too.

And this leads me to stress the noteworthy fact that installment credit was unrestricted by the tight money policy pursued by the Federal Reserve Board for more than 2 years as a weapon to discourage inflation. The instrument for tight money policy is the power of the Federal Reserve Board to raise or lower basic interest rates, that is, to set a minimum price on the cost of borrowing money. Many commercial borrowers could and often have deferred new funding operations when the high cost of money made the transaction too expensive to be profitable.

The installment buyer does not measure things that way. Here we have an individual driven by the desire (self-generated or inspired by zealous salesmen) for some new possession. He pays little or no attention to the rate of interest he is paying or whether it might be absurdly high in relation to the cost of the article or his need for that article. His sole concern is whether the monthly payments seem to fit within his income, and, of course, he presumes his income will not shrink in the coming months.

This lack of buyer-resistance to high interest rates at the consumer-goods level has in effect negated the tight money policy in this sector of the economy; installment credit has remained easy money. By the same token, installment credit is untouched now that the tight money policy has been dropped. Psychologically, the relaxed monetary atmosphere may tempt installment sellers to offer even easier terms—smaller down payments and longer time periods—but this probably will not add appreciably to the already swollen installment credit lists.

Consumer credit is now a far larger sum than all the cash in circulation. It is, in my view, a sum so enormously important in the Nation's economy that the question of its soundness (i. e., the probability that all the huge debt will be repaid in full) becomes a national issue.

Has the consuming public overextended itself?

This is a frightening question. Let us look for a minute at the reasons why it arises especially in the consumer credit field.

1. By and large, the individual consumer determines for himself how much debt he can carry. Most installment sales retailers and their finance companies make no real effort to find out whether the buyer about to sign an installment contract might already have a dangerous percentage of his pay check committed to other credit purchases. Even if they find a big commitment, the chances are they will go ahead with the new conditional sale anyway.

2. In many instances, the financing, because of the risk, is at usurious interest rates. The usury laws apply to loans of money. Since installment credit results from the sale of goods, legal ceilings on interest rates are lacking and the uninstructed purchaser pays rates that are in higher brackets than he often realizes.

As an example of this, let me cite a recent credit offer made by a very reputable retail store. A housewife who wishes to make a major purchase may agree with the store's credit people that she can afford monthly payments of, say, $20. The store then grants her credit to purchase 10 times that amount of goods, or $200 worth. Each month, she pays her $20 plus a service charge of 1½ percent on the remaining balance; but she is also entitled to maintain her debt to the store at $200 and make $20 worth of new purchases each month to be paid for later. If she does this, she continues paying 1½ percent a month on the balance—for an annual interest rate of 18 percent.

3. The rise of the credit finance company, although a worthy institution in many ways, presents another difficulty. Today, a great deal of installment credit money is loaned, not by the seller of the article, but by a separate company in business solely to lend money. In effect, these credit companies pay the retailer for the article you purchase; you pay the credit company. Under this system, the company, seeking to make a profit on its operation, charges a very high interest rate.

Recently, a Federal Reserve Board study of consumer installment credit found that automobile dealers pass on to finance companies more than 95 percent of the debt on the cars they sell, and that retailers in other fields pass on nearly half of their customers' debts.

4. More important that the high interest rate is the fact that the system relieves the retailer of any responsibility for the soundness of his sale. And this, in turn, is an open invitation for the irresponsible, fast-talking, fly-by-night dealer.

Senator A. S. (MIKE) MONRONEY, chairman of a subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on automobile marketing practices, declared during hearings last year that "it was freely admitted that many destructive sales tactics were practiced by the fringe of the industry, and that while only a small percentage of the trade engaged in gyp methods, phony advertising, packed prices and misleading offers, these things had a demoralizing effect on the automobile industry as a whole." Even the ethical majority is being badly squeezed because dealers must pay cash for their stock and sell on credit, with diminishing profit margins.

The automobile industry is not alone in offering what can only be described as wildly unsound credit terms, but it presents some striking examples: "1958 model; no fixed downpayment; your old car is all you need to offer; drive home the No. 1 deal—even if you still owe on your present car."

Even in 1955, according to the Federal Reserve, 30 percent of those credit buyers of new cars who had also bought the traded-in car on credit had debt still outstanding on the car they traded in. It is doubtless true that many individuals are capable of taking on new debts before retiring old ones, but when this becomes a practice it would certainly seem to be a warning of difficulties around the corner.

5. The final element I want to stress is that the installment purchaser represents a segment of society at the bottom of the income scale. He is among those most likely to be laid off when jobs get scarce, and least likely to have any financial reserves. Into this group fall the young people from 18 to 24 who are caught up in the desire to possess the conveniences and luxuries of the present era—and have no first-hand knowledge or recollection of the great depression after 1929.

So, in sum, this is our situation: by the latest figures available, there is a little more than $33 billion in credit outstanding, backed largely by faith in steady employment at a time when unemployment is rising, assumed largely by people who never knew the great depression, unregulated by the Federal Government because its users pay no attention to interest rates, and uncontrolled by normal market caution because the sellers (or lenders) take no responsibility for the soundness of the loans.

Up to now, there seems to have been little concern, either in the Government or private business, for the dangers inherent in all this. For example, the United States Chamber of Commerce reported recently to the Federal Reserve Board that of approximately 4,000 businessmen who replied to a questionnaire, about 50 percent thought consumer credit might be too high for safety, and yet 70 percent opposed any Federal regulations because ours is a time of peace.

The Federal Reserve Board itself, having recently completed an exhaustive study of the consumer credit situation at the request of the President, concluded that regulation or control was not needed, even though its Chairman, William McC. Martin, previously had agreed that standby control powers might be advisable. The Board seems to have been persuaded by such hoary arguments as: "Self-regulation is a sufficient protection against abuse," "The people should have the right to spend their own money as they please," and, finally, "The law of supply and demand will take care of any excesses."

In other words, this kind of problem isn't the Government's business except in time of war. Why shouldn't it be, if maintenance of a stable economy is—and it is—the Government's business?

What should the Government do, particularly now that it is realized that Soviet Russia is waging economic war against us? What kind of control or regulation should we have? The answer is simple—reestablishment of the legal authority behind the old World War II regulation W. This authority would enable the Federal Government to require a minimum downpayment on any installment purchase, based on a percentage of the selling price, and a maximum length of time in which the debt must be paid off. The fact that the monthly payments would be higher—over a shorter period—would make the buyer more keenly aware of the debt he was assuming. Also, the requirement of some downpayment would be an effective brake on many an irresponsible consumer (and on the salesman tempting him) because it would force him to have some hard cash on hand.

These devices would quickly put installment credit on a basis that the Nation could know was sound. They might, at least initially, curtail installment purchasing. But those who argue that, in a declining econ-

omy, nothing should be done that might cut down consumer buying, I would say simply this: Regulation W restraints need not lead to a measurable reduction in consumer purchasing if the installment credit market is already soundly based. If, as I suspect, the base is weak, it is far better for the national economy to cut back in an orderly fashion to a healthy market than to go on to a catastrophic collapse of a phony market.

Obviously, few factors are more important to the economic stability of the country than the continued ability of the installment debtor to meet his debt. In the past few months there have been distressing signs that installment credit collections are becoming more difficult. We are told that banks are beginning to find a higher ratio of delinquency among debtors.

These are symptoms of trouble, or termites eating away at the basic support of our economic structure. It is the clear job of Congress to study the situation and pass legislation that will give the Government the power it needs to step in.

At this stage, I am personally uncommitted on the question of whether the Government's power to issue credit regulations should be mandatory or permissive; whether the power should be granted to the Federal Reserve or to some other agency. This can be determined after hearing the experts and assessing the attitudes of those who would administer the controls. I am also not prepared to state just what the terms should be, whether one-fifth to one-third down and 15 months to pay, as under the final stage of regulation W, or some other combination.

In any case, I can only hope that the present recession does not cause the market supported by installment credit to collapse before Congress can enact a protective law.

In candor, I do not think such a catastrophe is impending unless we refuse to act. Delay can be disastrous. I believe even the threat of it should force immediate action to save the great American consuming public from the blanishments of irresponsible supersalesmen and from the excesses of its desires for the luxuries of modern living. On the basis of past experience, I am sure that congressional interest in this vital matter will be nonpartisan.

These are not times of peace and prosperity. They are times of scientific, military, and economic conflict on a level mankind has never before experienced. The cold war in which we are engaged, especially with a domestic recession in progress, can be more dangerous than any of the brush wars some of our military men talk about. The survival of the system of private ownership is the issue of our time; we cannot afford to risk its stability.

Tribute to Senator Bridges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the May 1 edition of the Exeter News-Letter, Exeter, N. H. The article, written by James P. Lynch, editor of the News-Letter and a widely read political writer, pays fitting tribute to the leadership and ability of my colleague, the senior Senator from New Hampshire, STYLES BRIDGES.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOWN IN OUR CORNER

(By James P. Lynch)

It was 5 o'clock on Saturday afternoon and most businessmen were either out at the golf course or relaxing at one of their favorite spots. But in Washington important legislation was being considered and the Senate was in session throughout the day.

We were seated in the vice president's office in the Capitol when a messenger came in to inform Senator STYLES BRIDGES that his colleagues were waiting for him in the Senate cloakroom.

The Senator hurried away to be present for this conference for his vote was indeed important. Bustling outside were various members of Congress and their staffs holding briefings on matters of government.

Again remember, this was on a Saturday but you could easily forget and think it was another day.

Some may consider this an unsual day but it is a typical one and stresses the need for electing men of courage and leadership in the days ahead.

Just previous to joining us in the Vice President's office, Senator BRIDGES took to the Senate floor to present his views on the legislative matters of the day.

He was firm and determined for his vigorous leadership has been an inspiration to his fellow colleagues in the Senate.

Others Senators look to BRIDGES for counsel for they realize he will champion legislation that will prove beneficial to the Nation.

While Democrats fear him they also respect his leadership. Down through the years his voice has rung out in support of measures that have benefited the American people.

HUMAN DYNAMO

But what of this human dynamo who has built up seniority in the Senate. On occasion his adversaries have been critical of his health only to realize that his physical fitness is far better than that of most men many years younger.

Saturday was an illustration but it is typical of the grueling schedule that Senator BRIDGES undergoes daily.

As he walked to the cloakroom very few realized the fast pace that the Senator's schedule called for that day.

In this day and age when there's so much talk going around concerning dedicated men, it would be wise for the people to consider BRIDGES and many of his colleagues in this classification.

Perhaps, he too, would have enjoyed relaxing on a Saturday afternoon. It would be folly to think otherwise. But STYLES BRIDGES wasn't thinking of himself Saturday. He was considering the people of the United States.

Each and everyone of you were in his mind as he fought for legislation.

But the Senate floor incident and the meeting in the cloakroom were only part of the role he played on Saturday and throughout the week.

History is being written today in Washington and when your children and your children's children study the greatness of this Nation they will be reading about the man by the name of BRIDGES whom you sent to Washington.

BENEFITS COUNTRY

For regardless of party beliefs, the United States has benefited extremely well from New Hampshire's choice to the Senate in the person of BRIDGES.

The Senator was at work early that morning, long before some of his staff members. He finds it convenient as well as necessary to get to his office hours before the Senate convenes.

Regardless of how early he arrives there are always people waiting to see him to discuss their individual problems. As pressing as is his schedule he never turns a deaf ear to a particular cause for he is desirous to do his utmost for his constituency.

While some of the duties are relegated to members of his staff, under no condition does he lose personal touch with any situation. The Senator makes it a point to pass final judgment on any move members of his staff will make.

The Senator takes his responsibility seriously much to the annoyance of those who try to pressure him into a decision.

Leaving his office he heads to the Capitol to be on schedule when the Senate convenes in the morning. Newer Members in the Senate look to him for advice and as the record will show STYLES BRIDGES has counseled many successful political leaders during the early days of their careers.

FIGHTS FOR BELIEFS

Seniority does not always breed leadership but the Bridges case exemplifies capabilities of a remarkable degree for many years. His astuteness in fighting for what he believes in has been one of the greatest assets of the Nation.

When we talk about America's leadership in world affairs we cannot overlook the Bridges contribution.

When we discuss giveaway programs of the so-called liberals neither can we divorce the name BRIDGES from the subject for he cautioned long before passage of all these programs of the waste and extravagance.

In all his greatness the Senator is a humble man. He has not forgotten the many sacrifices he had to make to rise to this important position in Government. He accepts his responsibility as a challenge.

During recess for lunch he crammed into his busy schedule more administrative matters. There were a few appointments too that had to be kept before he returned to the congressional debates.

Around 6 p. m. he returned again to his office. There was still more work to be done before he called it a day. About an hour elapsed and the phone rang. The Senator didn't bother to wait for one of his staff members to answer it as he had a good idea it was a call from home.

LONG HOURS

On the other end of the line was Doloris Bridges, his attractive wife, who called to check in with the boss and see that he was O. K. It was going to be a late meal that night for she long ago learned never to plan scheduling early meals as they would always get cold.

What's his average workday; 8 hours, 10 hours, 12 hours? Certainly not, because if any of these were his schedule then STYLES BRIDGES would feel as if he had been enjoying a vacation. The Senator presently devotes up to 16 hours of the day to official duties.

While these long hours work an undue hardship on the Senator they certainly point out, regardless of so-called liberal propaganda, that conservatives offer the greatest leadership in politics today.

STYLES BRIDGES is not a conservative because of political expediency. He is a stanch advocate of the fundamentals of conservatism and fights hard for these principles.

He is not an idealist for his practical nature steers him clear of unattainable dreams.

He believes in a strong America and, as most military men down through the years know, he has always endeavored to recognize their problems.

The workingman never had to fear BRIDGES because his foresight on their behalf is more

to their advantage than that offered by many of the union leaders.

His sound economic views have irritated the spenders in government but STYLES BRIDGES never confessed to being their ally. He has endeavored down through the years to instill in the minds of the people that government spending can only be paid for by taxes and you are the taxpayer.

There are no hidden sources of money to tap and the cost reverts back to you. When the Senator fights for economy in government he is battling for you.

While we were with him in the Vice President's office we could not help but wonder if eventually he will occupy this position.

ALL THE QUALIFICATIONS

It's an important role for a leader and STYLES BRIDGES has all the qualifications. However, it would benefit the Nation greater if the senior Senator from New Hampshire moved down Pennsylvania Avenue to the White House and served his country as President.

He lacks none of the qualifications necessary to occupy this position and he has many assets that would be beneficial to the Nation.

New Hampshire can be proud of STYLES BRIDGES and you can be sure that he is proud of the State. His leadership illustrates to the Nation that the size of a State does not always indicate the caliber of its people in public life.

STYLES BRIDGES does not have to take second place to any man in public office. He has set a pace for others to follow.

Unemployment Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article just released by the Secretary of Commerce concerning unemployment statistics.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE SINCLAIR WEEKS

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK is reported in the press today as accusing me of releasing deceptive April unemployment statistics on Tuesday.

He is absolutely wrong. The facts clearly disprove his reckless charge of distortion.

The figures were the regular official monthly estimates of the Census Bureau, honestly collected and honestly released in the same way as they have been for the past 15 years. Because the sample was increased in 1956, it is even more accurate than in previous years.

Moreover, my release on Tuesday most certainly did state that the seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment rose from 7 percent of the labor force in March to 7.5 percent in April and gave reasons for this rise.

The fact overlooked by the Senator is that 600,000 more people were at work in April—to a total of 62.9 million—and 78,000 fewer people were unemployed.

Instead of playing politics with the plight of the jobless, Senator CLARK should feel as glad as I do that thousands are returning to work. He should join those of us who are doing all we can to stimulate increased employment.

Defense Reorganization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Daily Iberian is one of the most influential daily newspapers published in the rural areas of the State of Louisiana.

It has taken some time for the real problems of the so-called Presidential Defense Department reorganization to get to the hinterlands, but judging from this editorial in the Daily Iberian, the country folks are beginning to see the light.

There has never been such a propaganda machine organized and functioning with so much wrong information as those elements attempting to sell to the Nation the President's version of a defense reorganization program. There is no dispute about the desirability of the objectives, but there is a great difference of opinion as to the potential dangers of the language of the bill.

Here is the Daily Iberian editorial—

DEFENSE REORGANIZATION

The so-called Pentagon plan backed by the President brings up the perennial problem of consolidation and unification of the Armed Forces of the country. It appears to us that this can only be solved by an examination of what we want our Armed Forces to do and to be capable of doing.

First and foremost, we want them to act as a deterrent to the outbreak of major war. Second, we want them to be able to handle minor wars in such a manner and in any part of the world that these brush fires do not become major conflagrations. Third, should war strike, we want them to insure that the scene of conflict is away from our shores, and to be able to project and support our military effort in an overseas theater.

These are really the basic rules and missions which we, the American people, want our Armed Forces to do, and for which we are ready to pay, in terms of dollars and the time and training of our young men. The question is how to accomplish these tasks.

Let's look at the President's proposal. It is in effect a proposal to let George do it; George being the Secretary of Defense. George is supposed to assign roles and missions; to determine the size and composition of our Armed Forces; to handle single handedly a budget in the tens of billions of dollars; to act as the master of strategy; to administer and command our forces at sea and in the field.

There is more concentration of power in this proposition than the American people have ever dared to delegate to any one person—and this, not in the crisis of war, but as a basic peacetime procedure. This is to be done by a revamping of the basic Unification Act of 1947, which reserved some of these functions to the Congress and to the President. Let's examine that act.

In the first place, its very name is a misnomer. Its basic premise was that it took 2 services and created 3 services out of them, with all the overhead, duplication, an confusion inevitable that goes with them. It created the separate Air Force out of the former Army Air Corps. Essentially the President's proposal is to undo this act, and provide for a combined service—which is about what we had before. It does bring the Navy into the same act; but will this accomplish what we, the American people, deem to be wise and in our best interest? We believe that it does not.

It is the Navy, and the Navy only, which can assure that the military might of the United States can be projected and supported across the seas. It is the Navy that can act from the high seas, without complications involving the territory and sovereignty of other nations.

Witness Egypt, at the time of the Suez crisis; witness Korea, where our forces were able to fight and exist based solely on the sea. The Navy has amalgamated the power of the aircraft into its concept of control of the sea until no one could dream of separating them.

Therefore, after a fair trial, let us admit that the basic premise of the 1947 Triplification Act was unwise; let us amalgamate our Army and our Air Force into a single land-air service, essentially as the Navy has done by amalgamating into a single sea-air service.

Thus we will resolve nearly all of our difficulties; we will have a naval service, the greatest and most flexible in the world, ready and capable of insuring to us and our allies the vital control of the seas, and thus capable of projecting our military might into any corner of the globe; and we will have a land-air service, flexible and mutually supporting, for the long-range missilery of the future and capable of fighting and holding ground wherever it is needed. These objectives are not in conflict. They are complimentary.

Have we statesmen big enough to envisage and propose this solution?

Nixon Doing Another Good Job on Current Latin American Tour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the popular historian and political scientist, Professor Polyzoides, writes in the Los Angeles Times of the outstanding job being done by Vice President RICHARD NIXON on his current Latin American goodwill tour as follows:

NIXON DOING GOOD JOB ON CURRENT TOUR

(By Polyzoides)

Vice President NIXON undertook a bold and courageous job when he tackled his goodwill trip to 8 South American republics, with a first visit to Uruguay and then his participation at the inaugural ceremonies incidental to the swearing-in of President Arturo Frondizi of Argentina. That this happens at a time when we have a major task of recapturing our old popularity in Latin America is certainly an item of major importance.

This act, incidentally, testified to the fact that the United States is particularly gratified over the reestablishment of popular constitutional practices in a number of the friendly neighboring countries to the south of us, including Argentina.

SEQUEL TO PERON

In this connection one may mention in passing that even though the last presidential election in that country came as the sequel to the overthrow of Peron, it nevertheless took the solid support of more than 2 million Peronista votes to elect Frondizi.

When it comes to the question of improving our relations with South America, what should be taken into consideration is that all our interest in that area notwithstanding,

we have not done as much as we should down there.

It is no mere incident that while we were paying more attention to the Middle East, West Europe, and southeast Asia, the Soviet Union was increasing its penetration and its efforts in the Western Hemisphere.

DICTATORS OUT

The overthrow of such dictators as Peron in Argentina, Rojas Pinilla in Colombia, Marcos Perez Jimenez in Venezuela, and Paul Magloire in Haiti have constituted events of the very first importance. It is along the same lines that normalization of political conditions in such progressive republics as Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador, where Dictators Odria, Villaroel, and Velasco Ibarra gave way to such distinguished presidents as Manuel Prado, Siles Zuazo, Ponce Leon Enriques, constituted political steps of great consequence.

Similar changes occurred in Guatemala, now normalized under President Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes; Nicaragua under progressive Luis Somoza; Costa Rica under Echandi; Honduras under Morales Villeda; El Salvador under Jose Maria Lemus, and so on.

That leaves only three dictatorship surviving—in Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Paraguay under Batista, Trujillo, and Stroessner, while everywhere else from Brazil to Chile, not to mention Mexico, parliamentary democracy is progressing in strong strides.

AMONG REASONS

One reason for some loss of our popularity in South America was that rightly or wrongly we have been accused of favoring a number of extremely conservative elements in those countries; a major grievance, however, is due to our expressed opposition to certain economic and business measures in which Latin Americans are interested.

This became noted at the Buenos Aires Pan-American economic conference last September, where many spokesmen insisted on such things as creation of something like a Pan-American common market, establishment of a central bank, and things of that sort.

Further reluctance on our part to extend to South America the kind of economic aid we so lavishly provided for other countries is another cause of dissatisfaction. All of which taken together explains why one must wish Vice President NIXON the fullest success in his undertaking.

Politics and Foreign Policy—Address by Senator Mansfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the relationship between politics and foreign policy is always troublesome to patriots. No American who loves his country wants to play politics with its safety. But there are differences between the parties on foreign policy which ought to be recognized, and the American people have a right to choose among the alternatives which are open to them in the field of foreign relations.

One of the most statesmanlike and judicious statements I have seen on this subject is the address made by the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] before the 1958 Campaign Conference for Democratic Women. The Senator draws a clear distinction between endangering the welfare of the country by attacking the opposition for partisan advantage, and debating the issues and offering viable alternatives. One is the course of partisan recklessness and the other the course of partisan responsibility.

The address to the Democratic women is the kind of wise and lucid analysis of the problems of foreign policy we have come to expect from the Senator from Montana. I congratulate him on it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address, entitled "Politics and Foreign Policy," delivered by the Senator from Montana before the 1958 Campaign Conference for Democratic Women, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICS AND FOREIGN POLICY

As I look around the room I see the faces of very good Americans. I also see the faces of very good Democrats. They are the same faces. As a matter of fact, I cannot detect a single American in the room who is not a very good Democrat or a single Democrat who is not a very good American.

The company could not be nicer.

As Democrats we want a victory at the polls in November and we are going to win a victory. As Americans we want to secure America in a peaceful world and we are going to get that kind of America and that kind of world.

We have not won the victory at the polls, yet. We have not got a secure America or a peaceful world, yet. To achieve both requires the ablest though and the most dedicated work of which we are capable. To achieve both requires competent, concerned, and consistent leadership. I am confident Democrats are capable of that kind of thought and that kind of work and that kind of leadership.

I want you to have this thought on foreign policy in mind before we plunge into the 1958 political campaign. As Democrats, I know that you will work and work hard to defeat Republicans and to elect Democrats. As Americans, however, I call upon you to cooperate, to cooperate responsibly with all Americans regardless of party in the search for the peace that will give us a secure nation in a secure world.

In an election year, cooperation with the opposition on any issue is not easy. It will be difficudt for Democrats and with good reason. We have seen in the past an irresponsible opposition grow so reckless as to ignore the needs of the Nation on foreign policy. We have seen members of that opposition seize on international difficulties as the occasin to cast vile slurs upon the integrity and the patriotism of our great party and the tens of millions of Americans who have supported the party through the years.

The temptation is there to reply in kind. It is an understandable temptation but I urge you not to yield to it. I urge you not to follow the ugly precedent set a few years back by the opposition in its desperate search for political victory. We want, as I said, a victory in November. But I say to you in equal earnestness that if we can win only by deliberate distortion of the truth, by willful destruction of the personal reputations of our opponents, by ruthless sacrific of the Nation's position in the world, then we do not deserve a victory.

We are going to win but we are going to win on the issues. Foreign policy is one of those issues. To cooperate responsibly with the opposition on foreign policy, as I have urged, is not to bury this question. It means simply that we do not distort the question for party advantage. It means that we act with restraint, bearing in mind at all times that what we say and do here is heard round the world. It means that we do not slander the character, we do not, by innuendo or otherwise, cast doubt on the personal integrity or the patriotism of any member of the opposition simply because we may disagree with him, simply in order to win votes.

In short, we stick to the issues in foreign policy. Believe me, there are issues in this matter. The American people are entitled to a full discussion of them in the months ahead. Let me, in the remainder of these brief remarks, try to summarize some of these issues as I see them.

This administration is trying to sell the American people on the idea that there is peace in Korea, in Formosa, and Vietnam in the Far East. It is not very modest, either, about claiming credit for this peace. I tell you that there is no peace in those areas, and the administration knows there is no peace. What there is, is a tenuous truce. It was won not by any magic of this administration but by the bloody sacrifices of thousands of Americans and others and by the expenditure of billions upon billions of dollars.

We made the effort in the Far East—in Korea particularly—because Americans, Democrats and Republicans alike, believed it was necessary to make it for our own security and freedom. The Republicans will try to tell the American people that Korea was a Democratic war but look back through the records of 1950. You will find that the intervention in Korea was just about the only act of the Truman administration that Republicans fully and wholeheartedly endorsed. As a matter of fact, they were so enthusiastic about it many of them even wanted to carry the war into China. That is where Americans would be fighting now if the Democrats had not restrained this Republican enthusiasm.

The job of peace in the Far East is not yet finished. This administration has had 5 years to do it but it has merely sat with its eyes closed on the brink, propped up by American military commands on 24-hour alert within sight of the coast of China and by aid to others of a billion or more a year. This is called peace and the American people are asked to thank the Republican administration for it.

That is one issue of foreign policy. There are others. There is the whole question of foreign aid and its maladministration. One of the things we need to find out and find out soon is whether the aid program is supposed to serve the ends of foreign policy or to provide a dumping ground for voluntarily or involuntarily retired Republican politicians and surplus colonels.

The world has changed drastically since the days of the Marshall plan. But except for the pressures that have been exerted by Congress to reduce expenditures and to improve methods, this administration goes on in foreign aid as though everything has remained the same. It has passed out arms from Cuba to Japan, throughout the world, with inadequate thought to the ultimate effects of these weapons. It has gone on giving away aid when it is clear that other countries and our own people would both be better off if we would put an equivalent effort into helping these countries become self-supporting.

That, too, is an issue of foreign policy on which Republicans and Democrats differ. There are others. We have not yet got stability in the Middle East despite the so-called Eisenhower doctrine. This administration has tilted with windmills in that region. It has toyed with autocratic and dictatorial movements and nations, while it

overlooks with almost snobbish disdain countries like Lebanon and Israel which are struggling to keep the concept of freedom alive in an area that reeks of terrorism, militarism, and conspiracy.

That, too, is an issue on which Republicans and Democrats differ and there are others. We Democrats do not believe that public relations are a substitute for intelligent policy, that generalities on peace are the actualities of peace. We do not believe that this country is remotely secure so long as the weapons of mass destruction continue to pile up throughout the world.

We Democrats do hold that peace can be achieved and that it is going to be achieved by a leadership which, first of all, believes peace is possible and, second, is willing to work day and night, 7 days a week to get sound and equitable agreements for its preservation.

Let me say, finally, Democrats in Congress will cooperate responsibly with leadership of that kind, regardless of its party label. By the same token, I know that all Democrats are going to work to see that this Nation gets that kind of leadership.

Poland's Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by myself, entitled "Poland's Constitution Day—A Reminder of Freedom-Loving People's Refusal To Be Dominated."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION DAY—A REMINDER OF FREEDOM-LOVING PEOPLE'S REFUSAL TO BE DOMINATED

As we all realize, Saturday, May 3, when the Senate was in recess, marked the 167th anniversary of the foundation of constitutional government in Poland. I join many of my colleagues in paying tribute not just on that occasion, but throughout the year.

This anniversary serves to point out the vital importance of Poland in the current struggle between East and West. Although forcibly allied politically with Russia, the overwhelming proportion of the people of Poland are stanchly allied spiritually with the nations of the West.

The same spirit of independence and love of freedom which was responsible for the drafting of the Polish constitution 167 years ago, still burns brightly in the hearts of the citizens of Poland today. The people of Poland aspire to freedom and democracy. We sympathize with and support these legitimate aspirations, and we are endeavoring to assist these noble people in coming closer to the day when they may once again live under the provisions of their own cherished constitution.

Recent actions by our Government and by private United States organizations have offered encouragement to the spirit of freedom in Poland.

One example of this encouragement was the grant—which I have previously commended—by the Ford Foundation. It establishes a program of scholarly and cultural exchange with Poland and other east European nations. These funds will enable research scholars, professors, and experts in many fields from Poland to visit the United States and nations of western Europe. Funds from the first allocation are enabling 40 Polish scholars to study in the United States. Many of these individuals are even now studying and doing research at our leading universities. Similarly, this grant will allow United States citizens to study in Poland.

Another purpose of the program is to finance the purchase of American and west European textbooks, periodicals for distribution to Polish educational institutions.

Likewise, as Senators well know, our Government has entered into an agreement for a long-term loan of $95 million for the purpose of purchasing wheat, fats, cotton, and mining equipment, thus assisting in strengthening the economy and health of Poland and lessening her dependence on Soviet Russia.

These and other types of assistance, such as the hoped-for resumption of CARE shipments, are, I believe, in the best interests of the United States and the free world. However, we must never let it be misinterpreted as a support of Communist domination over Poland. Conversely, we must make it known to the world that we are supporting the hopes and the heartfelt desires of the Polish people that they may continue to weaken the chains which unfortunately exist between their nation and the totalitarian authority in Russia.

The goals of the people and the people of the United States are parallel. As symbolized by Kosciusko and Pulaski and other deathless leaders, both peoples believe in freedom—both believe in the dignity of the individual—both believe in independence and self-determination.

When the people of Poland hold out their hands in friendship and supplication to us, we would be betraying our common ideals if we were to ignore them.

On Saturday's occasion of the anniversary of the Polish Constitution and today and every day, we salute the people of Poland who are continuing the struggle for their worthy objectives.

We also salute the more than 7 million patriotic Americans of Polish extraction of the United States, including, of course, the vast Polish-American segment which has contributed so much to my own State.

We further make known our solemn pledge to continue to offer all possible encouragement to the Polish people in order that the day may soon come when they may once again enjoy the liberties for which brave Poles have sacrificed so much in so many uprisings, including the Poznan revolt, throughout Poland's history.

Rear Adm. Robert L. Campbell, United States Navy, Lauded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the expressions in the editorial from a recent issue of the Long Beach Press-Telegram regarding Rear Adm. Robert L. Campbell are heartwarming. They represent the unanimous feelings of many thousands of people who know, respect, and admire him, including myself. It is good to know such men as Admiral Campbell occupy key positions in the United States Navy.

The editorial follows:

ADMIRAL'S TRANSFER LOSS TO LONG BEACH

Rear Adm. Robert L. Campbell, commander of the United States naval base here for the past 2½ years, leaves April 30 to take on a new job, command of the services forces, Pacific Fleet. His transfer is a real loss to this community.

Some military commanders are tight-lipped men who feel it is not their place to utter any opinions about the world around them. When they remain mum on questions that involve both the community and the Armed Forces, unnecessary difficulties and misunderstandings arise.

Admiral Campbell, however, has done a marvelous public-relations job during his service here. He hasn't remained aloof but has participated in community affairs to the extent that his position would allow. This has made Long Beach's relationships with the Navy more congenial and constructive.

For example, the question of where to locate the new Navy landing could have been held in suspense for years by indecision resulting from not knowing what the Navy preferred. After studying the question, Admiral Campbell made it clear what would be best from the Navy's point of view. The city had something to go on, and the question was promptly settled.

He has always been candid, helpful, and friendly. Our salute for a job well done, and we know he will serve with distinction in his new assignment.

Is Congress Going To Do Something About Sports Rackets?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I exposed the manipulations and machinations of a certain degenerate segment of the professional boxing mob which should have the immediate attention of the appropriate committee of the Congress.

I regret that I am not a member of that committee, but I am sure that those of this body who have already evidenced a deep interest in the conduct of professional sports will include boxing along with professional football and baseball in their deliberations.

My words, spoken from this floor, did not fall on deaf ears.

From all sections of the Nation I received letters and telegrams. Practically all were in accord with my views. Those few who did oppose, and there were very, very few, had their own purposes to serve for their own reasons. Denials were made by the principals which were to be expected. They had better make denials—or else.

Sports commentators from all over the Nation spoke and wrote their pieces. I have selected two typical expressions.

One comes from Dan Parker, the prominent sports editor of the New York Mirror who never knew how to pull a

punch. His article is typical of the reactions of the American press.

The other piece is by Cro Duplantier, the executive sports editor of the New Orleans States, who knows more about this particular smelly business, perhaps, than anybody else except the principals themselves.

First is Dan Parker's piece and then is Cro Duplantier's piece.

After reading them I again ask: "How long is Congress going to wait to do something about it?"

[From the New York Mirror]

PATTERSON-HARRIS MATCH WOULD PROVE CUS A PHONY

(By Dan Parker)

Among other things, the fight racket invents its own past participles. When a fight manager is insolvent, he doesn't say he's broke. He is broken. The past participle of copyright, by the same token, is copywritten. Thus, Cus D'Amato isn't broken, even though Floyd Patterson, his heavyweight champion has been as inactive as a voting machine in Moscow. On the other hand, Cus has Floyd copywritten.

All this falderal is necessary to explain a copywritten story, authorized (past participle of the nonexistent verb form of the noun author) by one of the boys on the boxing beat to fill a Monday morning void. The substance of this piece of extra light fiction was that Patterson and Roy Harris, the built-up tyro from Cut and Shoot, Tex., would meet for the heavyweight title at Roosevelt Raceway next August.

Shielding his vocal orifice with the Homburg he uses as a conversation strainer, Mr. D'Amato verbally splashed the copywritten story with a ripe tomato by snorting: "Nothing to it."

Then, speaking ex officio as the Duke of Humbug, from under his towering, castle-like Homburg, His Dukeness warned all and sundry that he was working on at least five different matches for Floyd and that if any of the people he was negotiating with dropped so much as a misleading hint about it, they would be automatically out the picture.

Whether the guillotine has been abolished in the Duchy of Humbug, no one is quite certain but the duke has been known to shout: "Off with their heads!" to commoners who have the temerity to question him about matters of state.

If I were permitted five guesses as to the matches the Duke of Humbug is working on, I would list them in this order:

1. The new princeling of Monaco, at catchweights.

2. Commodore Dutch, Rtd., of the Chesty-Slovak Navy.

3. Pete Rademacher, who decked Floyd in their last bout, with the breeze of one of his wild swings.

4. Pete's Uncle Zachariah Habenschnaben, a sausage stuffer.

5. The Old Woman Who Lived in the Shoe.

If all these suggestions sound ridiculous, consider the implications of a Patterson-Harris match and see how much more probable any of them is than a meeting between Floyd and the Texan. Harris is under the aegis of I. B. C. through Frankie Carbo and his manager of record, Lou Viscusi. Carbo is a silent partner in the Houston club Viscusi operates as a sideline, although the boxing laws of all States forbid managers to be promoters and vice versa.

Some weeks back, D'Amato took Patterson down to Houston for an exhibition bout in the Carbo-Viscusi club, which is an I. B. C. television outlet. This gave rise to the report that a Patterson-Harris bout was in the making. If, after all his pious preaching about the holy war he was waging against the iniquitous I. B. C., D'Amato walked right into its den, he would be unmasked as a colossal fraud. At this stage, one would guess that D'Amato would have no truck with this crowd. Still, there is his visit to Houston to show his fighter at the Viscusi-Carbo club. Besides, the New York State Athletic Commission's records contain a transcript of his testimony before the Helfand investigation, supporting Honest Bill Daly and admitting he was collector of tribute for the New York Managers' Guild, since outlawed. Since that time, D'Amato has pleaded that he was so naive he didn't realize he was doing anything that would endanger his chances of winning his merit badge.

Strictly on his own resources, Harris, as an opponent for Patterson, would probably be a softer touch than marshmallows in a bed of meringue. Bob Baker, an honest fighter, in an interview some time after meeting Roy in Houston a year ago, said he almost knocked Roy out with an accidental punch while carrying him in a buildup bout. In Houston, Harris had to win—even when Willie Pastrano, a protege of the same cozy little group that is pushing Harris, for whom Angelo Dundee fronts, met him there.

The idea of a fellow with Harris' rather limited experience outpointing a ballet-dancing boxing master such as Pastrano is too ridiculous to think of as something that could happen without benefit of script. Just as Bob Baker's defeat had been. After Pastrano lost in Houston to the Cut and Shoot Kid, there was to have been a return bout in Chris Dundee's Miami Beach Club with Guess Whom winning. Something happened to change the program, however, and to this day, nothing has been mentioned about the return bout after the original postponement. This could have been long-range planning to keep Harris' record clear for title-challenging purposes. With Machen and Folley temporarily out of the way as serious contenders, Harris suddenly becomes hot merchandise again.

The ironic part of his spotless record is that it no longer is without blemish on paper. In the latest Ring Record Book, through a printer's error, a four-round knockout one Willie Miller scored against Will Harris, a Peoria lightweight, in Milwaukee last December 28, has been charged against the Cut and Shoot Kid.

The sudden windstorm issuing from the IBC's ballyhoo jet turbines is part of a concerted move to force D'Amato out of his solid ivory tower. From Syracuse simultaneously come windy challenges from the winner of Wednesday night's Mike DeJohn-Nino Valdes bout (which DeJohn figures to annex for strategic reasons). Meantime, Willie Pastrano will be hurling trans-Atlantic thunderbolts at the Iron Duke from Perfidious Albion, if his voice can be heard above Babel that it still dominated by the knightly prattle of D'Amato. Jim Norris' resignation as head of the IBC, of course, automatically makes it an entirely different organization, and, with Truman Gibson his successor, what I mean is that it will be worse than ever. This bureau is impartial. It fervently hopes that D'Amato will hold out not only against the IBC and its hoodlum satellites but also against all other challengers except my Favored Five. We've had everything else in the festering fight racket. Now, let's have a heavyweight championship bout in a sealed length of giant-sized concrete sewer pipe, stood on end.

REPRESENTATIVE HÉBERT'S GIANT STEP

(By Cro Duplantier)

When Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT delivered his speech on boxing yesterday in the House of Representatives, he took two giant steps forward toward correction of the ills that plague the business.

The New Orleans Congressman who bluntly accused persons identified with the International Boxing Club with having forced Ralph Dupas to submit to a shakedown in order to get a shot at the lightweight title, in effect, not only diagnosed the business' principal ailments but turned the spotlight of publicity on them.

In the eradication of any disease—the public health authorities will tell you—these are always the first steps, correctly identifying it and educating the public about it, educating the public about how it spreads, whom it affects, what the results can be.

The education, actually, is the big thing, because you've got to eradiacte the elements of mystery, the elements of baseless fear, the methods of combating or preventing it.

Twenty years ago, for example, poliomyelitis—polio or infantile paralysis, if you wish—was a dreaded word. The sickness struck so secretively. It was so sudden. It was so indiscriminate.

Then the campaign started to learn more about it, to educate the public, to get support for a program to study potential cures. Today, while polio still exists, it is no longer the fearsome thing that it was, because man knows that a vaccine is available to make him practically immune to it.

A disease which affects the Nation's politics, its business, or its sports is no different from one which attack man's body.

It needs the same diagnosis, the same education. And an effective vaccine, in the form of legislation, can be provided.

What HÉBERT told the House yesterday has long been suspected by many fans—that boxing is manipulated by a small group which controls many of the name fighters and most of the titles. And there were many who suspected how these few stayed in control.

But HÉBERT spelled it out, insisting that Dupas' story was a typical one, the story of the worthy challenger being forced to sign up with a "member of the International Boxing Club's fraternity of favored managers" before he gets the approval for a title shot.

This accomplished, the IBC is in the driver's seat. The champ may lose the title, but the IBC doesn't.

His comparisons of the leeches in boxing with the racketeers in other fields was not unwarranted, and his charge to his fellow Representatives was a strong one.

Demanding action, he asked:

"We denounced monopolistic practices in business and corporations. We denounced racketeering in labor unions. We cry out against defiance of antitrust laws in professional baseball and professional football. Will we sit by idly while professional prize fighters are being victimized by musclemen?"

HÉBERT'S are not the first efforts made to expose the behind-the-scene manipulators, nor is his the first suggestion for action to curb them. There have been others, including some of the victims, men like heavyweight champion Floyd Patterson and his manager, Cus D'Amato, for example.

But too often their efforts have resulted in disaster for themselves, for the IBC has a way of freezing out of business the individuals who oppose its will.

But HÉBERT'S efforts could well be the first successful ones.

If Congress carries through with HÉBERT'S suggestions for action, the IBC, which prides

itself on matching "worthy opponents" may well find that it has at last met one.

In fact, it could find that it is badly overmatched.

Full Disclosure in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal has been one of the foremost American papers in fighting for full disclosure in Government. The Journal has had a healthy fixation on the immense importance of the cleansing effect of full public scrutiny on Government operations.

For this reason, a recent editorial in the Milwaukee Journal entitled "Secrecy Loses a Round," reporting the progress in the Federal Government toward full public disclosure, is very encouraging.

This editorial shows that in the legislative as well as the executive branch of our Federal Government the public interest is winning battles in the war against secrecy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRECY LOSES A ROUND

One big hurdle has been happily cleared in the drive against suppression of routine government information to which the public is entitled. The House quickly passed the basic corrective measure put forward by the study committee under Representative Moss (Democrat, of California). Senate concurrence now seems a good prospect this year.

The attack is on misuse of a 1789 law intended merely to give the Cabinet departments necessary housekeeping powers, including records management. This has been stretched, by non-Cabinet agencies as well, into a license to lock up records whenever they feel like it. The correction simply says, with sublime brevity, that the housekeeping law does not bestow such license.

Some bureaucrats have tried to frighten Congress by absurdly asking if it intends to open every last file drawer in Washington to be pawed through by all comers. Of course not. Other, specific laws are ample to safeguard properly classified secrets. This has to do only with normal access to normal public records. If a case can be made for withholding a particular part of such information, the right recourse is to seek express legal authority, not to assume blanket discretion.

This enactment, if or when achieved, won't automatically end the problem. It never ends. There will always be officiousness to be vigilant against, and irrelevant assertions of executive prerogative to combat. But the intent of Congress—the doctrine that government belongs to the people, not to the bureaucrats—will be spelled out with crystal clarity, and that will be the landmark.

Nor will such legislation, even if fully effective in its sphere, touch other areas of Government secrecy. One is Congress itself. Congressional Quarterly, a private research agency, finds that one-third of all committee meetings so far this year have been closed. That's better than the 1954 peak of more than 40 percent, but still far from the irreducible minimum of necessity.

A comparatively high rate of secrecy in hearings on foreign and military affairs is understandable, and some details of military appropriations can't be blabbed. But the House Appropriations Committee hasn't had even one public session yet this year. House Ways and Means best showed how much room there is for reform; its secrecy ratio last year was 93 percent, so far this year 5 percent.

Distribution of Food Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, one evening as I was driving from the Capitol, I heard a radio broadcast which attracted my attention. It was a broadcast called "Three Star Extra," with Ray Henle reporting from Rome. Because of the importance of the broadcast, I asked for a copy.

One item of particular importance in the broadcast was when Mr. Ray Henle said, speaking about the people in Rome, Italy—

One official said to me, "You people call it farm surplus. Why don't you call it reserve food, and with the reserves of food you now have, costing you a million dollars a day in storage alone, you have a great political instrument to win friends."

I fully concur with Ray Henle's remarks in the broadcast, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of the radio broadcast be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The future of Italian politics will be decided in a parliamentary election late in May.

In a nutshell, here is the prospect: The Christian Democrats, now the most numerous party, are almost certain to remain in that position—gain or lose some—but they say over here not likely to win a majority of the Italian Parliament seats. Therefore, a deal with parties either to the right or to the left is to be expected in order to form a government after the election. Either case holds some good.

Most observers feel that a move to the left would give Italy still more social progress, which she could stand, and do it at least partly under a system of free enterprise. A move to the right might mean alliance with the Italian Liberals—actually conservatives—the leader of whom is a friend of the United States, of NATO, and of Italian participation in the European common market.

This election will not be affected by economic fact. Much attention is paid here to the economic trend of the United States, but Italian economy would not be adversely affected even from a continued recession in the United States, sufficiently to be noticed at the election time.

There is much evidence in Italy as to how American help has kept this nation solidly in the free-world lineup. Therefore, no authority in Rome thinks the Communists will gain ground in the parliamentary election. Most of them think Communist strength will fall off.

The strength of the Communist Party lies in its very excellent political organization down to the precinct level, and they obviously have plenty of cash. Except for our help, the Communists might well be in the saddle here. Even with our help, Italy has a strong Socialist Party and her free industry must compete with nationalized industry.

There is much good feeling here toward the free-enterprise system, but the nature of Italy's politics makes it difficult for Italy to break loose from socialistic ties, just as England finds it hard.

United States foreign aid and our mutual-assistance program have strengthened Italy's chance to remain at least partly in the free-enterprise rank. Also, outstanding social-welfare programs of private industries, such as Fiat automobile and others, have kept workers from falling for the Communist line.

Our people are doing wonders here with American farm surplus. In fact, our technicians running this program already have changed the diet of much of the younger generation of Italians from largely spaghetti to one of vegetables, soup, milk, and other dairy products, along with protein products.

One official said to me, "You people call it farm surplus. Why don't you call it reserve food, and with the reserves of food you now have, costing you a million dollars a day in storage alone, you have a great political instrument to win friends."

And this official went on to say, "What you Americans need is another Herbert Hoover who would organize your food resources and distribute them on a broad scale to feed those who are hungry and to improve the diet of poorly fed people. This, in turn, would get you more prestige in the world than armaments and satellites in outer space. It calls for bolder planning and bolder thinking than I think you have done so far."

This is Ray Henle reporting in Rome.

Talmadge Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Talmadge Has New Farm Plan," from the April 26, 1958, issue of the Waycross (Ga.) Journal-Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALMADGE HAS NEW FARM PLAN

Senator HERMAN TALMADGE has come up with what appears to be a sound plan to give the Nation's farmers a fairer share of the national income.

His plan calls for the abolition of all price support loans and acreage controls. Farmers would be free to plant as they pleased and their products would sell on a free market.

Farm income would be bolstered by giving growers of tobacco, cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and peanuts direct Federal payments covering the difference between open-market prices and 100 percent of the fair earning power parity level.

Each farmer growing basic commodities would be given a domestic production quota

to be expressed in pounds, bushels, or bales instead of acres.

A bill of sale would be required with the farmer's application for sales price support payments.

TALMADGE contends that the plan would eliminate a lot of redtape, end regimentation and dictation imposed by acreage controls, and take the Government out of the business of buying, storing, and selling farm commodities.

Georgia's junior Senator said his plan will cost approximately half as much as the $3.250 billion spent on present farm programs.

Already several of TALMADGE's colleagues in the Senate have had some kind words for the proposal.

Besides putting more money in the farmers' pockets the thing we like about the plan is that it would put a lot of people back to work and presumably would slow up the present farm-to-city migration.

In our own county, for example, more and more land is going into the Soil Bank. According to 1958 figures, just released, 69 percent of the county's cotton allotment and 23 percent of the tobacco acreage has been proposed for acreage reserve.

Last year the figures were 40 percent of the cotton and 15 percent of the tobacco. The increase is sizable.

Senator TALMADGE's plan may not have all the answers, but it sounds to us like a lot better deal for all concerned than the program under which farmers and taxpayers are now suffering.

Agreement to Safeguard Salmon Runs of Columbia River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, development of dams to improve flood control and provide low-cost power without further decimating the migratory fish runs of the Columbia Basin is one of the most complex problems confronting the Pacific Northwest region. Because the Columbia is an international river, solution of this problem involves important questions of policy in negotiations between the United States and Canada.

Earlier this month, the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee held hearings to determine what progress has been made, if any, to resolve differences between the United States and our northern neighbor over future development of the upper Columbia. Unfortunately, testimony from officials of our Government has not been encouraging. Prospects seem dim for an early completion of negotiations on future use of the boundary waters of the Columbia.

Despite the apparent lack of progress, there emerged from the hearings definite indications that the eventual solution will have far-reaching effect on fisheries of the two nations. Canada has threatened to divert part of the Columbia's flow into the Fraser River, which spawns a major Sockeye run of North Pacific salmon. If such development were carried out, the salmon of the Fraser would be doomed. Moreover, if agreement is not reached soon for water storage in the upper reaches of the Columbia, pressure will increase to locate high dams and vast reservoirs in the middle Snake River region which provides the major spawning ground for migratory fish on the American side of the border, particularly Chinook salmon.

The upper Columbia is a so-called fishless river above Grand Coulee Dam. It has huge potential for water storage needed to check floods and to create kilowatts. This is the area where additional efforts to build big dams should be concentrated. An excellent editorial discussing this subject appeared in the Astorian-Budget of April 25, 1958. I ask consent to include this material in the Appendix with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Astorian-Budget of Astoria (Oreg.) April 25, 1958]

AGREEMENT VITALLY NEEDED

A dispatch from Washington tells of testimony by Assistant Interior Secretary Ross Leffler that it is vitally important for Canada and the United States to reach agreement on development of the Columbia River so that Fraser River sockeye salmon runs will not be decimated by proposed hydroelectric development there.

Such agreement certainly is important for preservation of the Fraser fish runs and for rendering unnecessary a proposed diversion by Canada of Columbia River water into the Fraser.

It is also important for protection of fish runs in the Snake River, if agreement can be attained in time to permit power developments on the Columbia River above Grand Coulee that will relieve some of the pressure for Snake developments.

Fate of fish runs on two streams, therefore—the Fraser and the Snake—are in jeopardy while potential hydroelectric power on the fishless upper Columbia is going to waste.

Common logic indicates that the place where maximum possible power development should be sought is on the upper Columbia, where no salmon runs exist. Grand Coulee has killed them.

But simply because Canada and the United States have been unable to agree on joint use of this river, no power projects are being planned there. Meanwhile it seems as though everyone who wants to build a dam is anxious to do so on the lower Snake, threatening the one remaining major salmon spawning stream in the Columbia River system.

And in Canada the power folk are proposing to destroy the highly valuable Fraser River runs which only lately have been restored after long years of study and hard work.

Senator NEUBERGER has been pressing hard for a United States-Canada agreement on the Columbia River problem. He is absolutely right in doing so, and his efforts deserve early success, the earlier the better for the future welfare of the fisheries of two great river systems.

Reds Give Little, Profit Much

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, even American citizens have a disproportionate notion of the benefits of the Russian program of technical assistance to other nations. Actually the Russian program is dwarfed by comparison with our own immense generosity. A recent editorial in the Milwaukee Journal develops the facts and figures which show how much credit the U. S. S. R. is getting for the little it is giving.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD at this point following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD, as follows:

REDS GIVE LITTLE, PROFIT MUCH

Russia and her satellites have made but meager contributions to the United Nations technical assistance program for underdeveloped countries, yet they are reaping valuable political rewards. This point is clearly developed in a recent study by Robert Loring Allen, associate professor of economics at the University of Virginia.

The U. N. regular technical assistance program came into being in 1948. In 1950 it became a permanent U. N. institution. From 1950 through 1957, about $175 million was spent under the expanded program. The United States made 55 percent of total contributions. Great Britain contributed nearly 8 percent and France and Canada about 5 percent each.

Russia and the east European countries have given only 3.7 percent of the total since 1950. In fact, it was not until 1953 that Russia started to support the expanded program. Before then, Soviet delegates sharply criticized the program as the tool of western imperialism and an extension of United States foreign aid.

The Communists had an abrupt change of heart when they saw that the program was becoming a popular and successful international undertaking. They began making minimal contributions. Now they are boasting of their U. N. technical assistance role. In November, 1956, for example, a Soviet U. N. delegate asserted in a general assembly speech that "the Soviet Union had always taken a positive attitude to the United Nations programs of technical assistance."

"The principal impact of Soviet and east European participation has been psychological and political rather than economic," Allen writes. "Before the Soviet Union and eastern Europe began to participate, certain underdeveloped countries felt the program was not fully multilateral; with them in, such countries argue that it is a better program. In their eyes the Soviet Union has risen above its objections to the expanded program in the interest of helping underdeveloped countries."

West Coast Petroleum Glut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have called to the attention of this body and of the administration the serious dislocation of the west coast petroleum industry due to oversupply of products. In further clarification of this situation two leading oil editors, Ed C. Lloyd, of the Los Angeles Examiner, and Robert J. Sullivan, of the

Los Angeles Times, have recently set forth details of general interest.

Mr. Lloyd's column is as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Examiner]

OIL PRODUCERS ASK REVIEW OF COAST IMPORTS

(By Ed C. Lloyd, oil editor)

A current rate of imports not to exceed 55,000 barrels a day, and a second half 1958 rate of 54,000 barrels daily, would be sufficient to make up the deficit between domestic supply and demand, which is the policy of the Federal Government's Cabinet Policy Committee for District 5, California, Oregon, Washington, Arizona, and Nevada.

So ran a statement submitted yesterday by the Oil Producers Agency of California to Capt. M. V. Carson, Jr., administrator of the voluntary import program, and supporting an immediate review of west coast oil imports.

The agency said the first half 1958 figure of 55,000 barrels a day compares with permissible amounts of 220,000 a day and an average actual rate of approximately 160,000 barrels daily during the first quarter.

Failure of demand to reach expectations was given by the agency as the main reason for the reduction in need for supplemental imports.

In its December 12, 1957, report which brought district 5 into the import program, the Cabinet Committee estimated that petroleum demand in the district would approximate 1,286,000 barrels a day in the first half of 1958. This estimate is about the same as demand in the first half of 1957, as shown by United States Bureau of Mines figures.

As a matter of fact, the agency said demand in the first quarter of this year was 10 percent under that of the corresponding period of 1957.

On the basis of the latest information from both the United States Bureau of Mines and the American Petroleum Institute, the agency explained that this period demand was around 1,200,000 barrels daily, against 1,351,000 barrels in the first 3 months of 1957.

It was concluded by the agency that there was no present indicators to lead to the belief that second quarter demand will improve in relation to the subsequent quarter.

Mr. Sullivan's column is as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times]

WEST COAST OIL STOCKS 38 PERCENT TOO HIGH

(By Robert J. Sullivan, oil editor)

West coast oil inventories of 145 million currently are estimated to be 40 million barrels in excess of desired levels, according to a yardstick worked out by William F. Kirk, manager of the economics department of General Petroleum Corp.

"Inventories of crude oil and petroleum products resulting in a turnover rate of 4.5 times a year appear to be about maximum for the west coast petroleum industry," according to Kirk who based his theory on United States Bureau of Mines statistics. "This turnover rate corresponds to a minimum of 81 days' supply and appears to be a good yardstick for measuring both inventories needed and surplus supplies."

The current excess of 40 million barrels, therefore he estimated, if maintained will result in the industry here operating with an inventory surplus of 38 percent or 31 days' excess supply.

"Assuming that inventories remain at their present levels and that demand reaches 464 million barrels, the turnover rate will be only 3.2 times during the year 1958, with supply amounting to 114 days," Kirk said.

According to his studies, inventories on the west coast turned over only 3.6 times during 1957, with the industry operating on 110 days' supply. The 5-year average, 1953 through 1957, was 95 days with a turnover rate of 3.9 times a year.

Storage capacity at refineries, tank farms and terminals is 57 percent full, compared to 37.4 percent a year ago.

"As these facilities are used principally for working storage, any sustained use in excess of 50 percent of capacity is a serious impairment to orderly and efficient operations," Kirk concluded.

The Full Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the entire American public cannot attend the hearings on the so-called reorganization of the Department of Defense now being conducted by the House Armed Services Committee.

Unlike the proponents of the President's plan for reorganization, the opponents do not have a high-geared propaganda machine. The opponents are under compulsion to depend entirely on the meager information given out by the daily wire services, the radio and television media. These services, in reporting what is taking place in the limited capacity of the armed services room, are doing a splendid job but they, too, are limited in equipment.

Under orders, nobody in the Pentagon can speak out in public against the proposal but anybody can speak out in favor of the plan. It seems to me this is a rather one-sided way to handle such a controversial subject.

In addition to this Pentagon gag on those who oppose the plan there are powerful propaganda groups which have been able to tell only one side of the story to the American people and have created the impression that everybody in the Pentagon and everybody in uniform is in favor of the President's proposed legislation. There could be nothing further removed from the facts and the truth.

In an effort to get the widest coverage possible for those who are opposed to the language of the proposed law because of its dangerous implications I have asked permission to publish here in full the statements of two of the highest ranking military officers in the uniform of the United States. They are Admiral Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations and a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Gen. Randolph McPate, Commandant of the United States Marines. Admiral Burke's comments are given here. General Pate's comments appear on another page.

These men can well speak for themselves and have done so before the committee.

I now let them speak to the entire membership of the Congress and assure you that they cannot be charged with speaking nonsense simply because they oppose the position of the President of the United States.

Read their papers carefully and you will soon learn that those of us who oppose, not the objectives, but the violent language of the President's proposal are not talking through our hats or talking nonsense as the President suggested before the newspaper editors of America.

STATEMENT OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, ADM. ARLEIGH BURKE, UNITED STATES NAVY, BEFORE THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I appreciate the opportunity to contribute to your deliberations on the important subject of the organization for the defense of the United States.

Organization is the framework by which effectiveness of our military forces is achieved. Organization not only determines who is responsible, and who gives commands, and who advises, and who does the fighting, throughout all the echelons of the military services, it not only provides the flow chart of how orders, and information, and intelligence, and reports flow from one element of the military forces to another, but organization can also influence greatly how problems are solved and whether full information can normally be given to all facets of the problems.

Organization can assist in assuring that the various possible solutions to a problem are thoroughly and candidly examined, so that premature action is not taken on one of the possible solutions without measuring the consequences, or without adequate analysis of the other possible solutions to the problem.

Organization largely determines who examines the problems, who submits views, and how decisions are made. It is important that those who can contribute do contribute, for solutions to problems which confront the Department of Defense and the military services have vast impact on the future of the United States.

Organization also has great effect on how juniors in the organization prepare themselves for assuming responsibilities in the future. Organization, coupled with the manner in which it is administered, will influence officers either to exercise initiative and to advance ideas they develop or to become compliant. The only source of future leaders in the armed services is the younger officers in the services. It is, therefore, most important that they train themselves to exercise initiative, to examine problems thoroughly, to recognize their duty to contribute their best judgments to solutions in which they participate, and above all to retain the spirit, enthusiasm, and the willingness to enter combat which have been the hallmark of our predecessors.

Organization is most important, but other factors also contribute to the effectiveness of our services. Most of these factors are interrelated and influence each other. Obviously, the most important factor is who fills the slots in the organization. The knowledge, the understanding, the character of individuals who man the organization are even more important than the organization itself. Good men can make a poor organization work well, and poor men cannot make a good organization work at all.

The stability of the organization, the resources available to the organization, the various controls imposed on the Department of Defense and on the Armed Forces, all have important bearing on the effectiveness of the services.

No one can work long in any organization without seeing ways in which it can be improved. I have given a lot of thought to possible changes in the existing defense organization. There have been many different

ideas advanced on how improvements could be made. This committee is a proper group to resolve these differences into a sound plan founded in carefully drawn legislation.

The basic requirement of our defense organization is that it be responsive to the Nation's security needs, now, and in the future. The Defense Establishment must have stability, and it must at the same time have flexibility. Both are important, so that it may be capable of absorbing the impact of new technology, new concepts, and new weapons.

Change is an inevitable process in a dynamic organization. It is part of the business of progress. The important thing about making changes is to be sure that they are really improvements. Change is not in itself progress. The changes neded are those which will make the defense organization more effective than it is today as an element in the security of the country.

It is reassuring to know that this committee is devoting its full attention to this important matter. The broad extent of your knowledge and experience in matters relating to national defense is widely recognized. It is fine proof of the rightness of our governmental system which places the power and responsibility of ultimate decision in representatives elected by our people.

Whatever law emerges from these deliberations will be wholeheartedly supported by the United States Navy. The fact that the Navy and our sister services are able at this point to participate in these important deliberations and to present our views is significant.

Whatever emerges from these deliberations, moreover, should carefully reflect the intentions which are to be fulfilled. The legal authority should be provided to do those things which need to be done. The law should be precisely and clearly drafted so that those intentions can be implemented under the terms of the law, so that the law cannot be misinterpreted in the future to include actions not now intended, or which would tend to defeat the expressed intentions. I hope that the resultant statute will insure that the intent is clearly spelled out in all provisions of the legislation.

I would like now to give my understanding of what is intended to be done and the manner in which it is proposed to do it.

THE AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

It is my understanding that the primary objective of the proposal is to insure that the Secretary of Defense has clear, indisputable authority under the President, of direction and control over all matters in the Department of Defense. The legal authority for supervision over the department will rest in the person of the Secretary of Defense. His authority will be clarified.

I am in accord with clarifying the authority and responsibility of the Secretary of Defense as necessary to accomplish this. If he is to run the Department of Defense efficiently he must have appropriate authority to do it.

UNIFIED COMMANDS

It is my understanding that the commanders of each specified and unified command will have full operational authority over the operating forces assigned to them, such as assigning missions or tasks to subordinate commands, deploying units, assigning forces to subordinate commands, and assigning operational or tactical control as the commander deems necessary. Forces may not be assigned to a unified or specified command or withdrawn therefrom except on authority of the Secretary of Defense upon the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I support the objective of having the authority and responsibility of the commanders of unified and specified commands clarified so as to insure they have full operational authority over their forces.

It is also my understanding that the military services will continue their responsibilities for administration, discipline, training, and other such matters rather than having them become the responsibility of unified or specified commanders. Support such as logistic support, replacements of personnel and ships, repairs and overhauls of ships, maintenance and overhaul of aircraft would also remain with the services.

It will require very close cooperation between the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the unified commanders, and the services to insure that the operating forces are fully ready and trained for combat, and fully supported by the services. It is most important that the operating forces be supported adequately and that the funds and resources available to the various elements of the Department of Defense be distributed so as to be most efficiently used. The military services have developed the techniques and experienced organizations to provide the necessary support to the combat elements of their services and these organizations should continue to be used. Close attention must also be paid to the necessity of having the support rendered to operating forces be fully responsive to the individual needs of the particular force being supported.

It is understood that there are no substantial changes expected to be made in the unified and specified commands or in the way the commanders operate and are supported. This is important, since the methods of implementing the proposals are as important as the proposals themselves.

CHAIN OF COMMAND

I am in accord with elimination of the present executive agency chain of operational command established by the President's message accompanying Reorganization Plan No. 6 and the substitution therefor of direct command from the President to the Secretary of Defense, through the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the unified and specified commanders. This will permit quick action when necessary and insure that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are cognizant of all significant operations. There are many details connected with operations, however, especially details concerning support, logistics, communications, and so on, with which the Joint Chiefs of Staff should not be concerned. These details should remain with the individual services.

Should the Joint Chiefs of Staff become involved in the detailed direction of operations and their support, they will not have sufficient time to devote to the important problems of strategical direction, advance planning, and broad policy.

Should the Joint Staff be increased to such an extent that it handles details, two things can happen:

First, the Joint Chiefs of Staff may not be fully informed as to what its staff is doing.

Second, the staff might interfere with the duties of the services and of the commanders of the unified and specified commands, resulting in confusion of responsibilities or derangement of the supporting systems.

CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

The proposals that the Chairman select the Director of the Joint Staff, that the Director and the Joint Staff operate under the management of the Chairman, and that the prohibition against the Chairman having a vote be removed, are, in my opinion, in the interest of more efficient management. These proposals all add to the importance and prestige of the Chairman.

This is all right. As long as the other members are not mere figureheads; as long as they have the ability, knowledge, experience, and machinery to develop views and have those views considered in the solution of the problems; as long as any chief can present his views to the Secretary of Defense or the President if he desires; and so long as the Chairman has the duty prescribed by the present law to inform the Secretary of Defense of those issues on which the Joint Chiefs of Staff are not agreed, the additional prestige of the Chairman is good. Since decisions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff will be made by the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a corporate body, and not by the Chairman alone, the proposals in regard to the Chairman are satisfactory.

THE JOINT STAFF

There have been many proposals in regard to the Joint Staff. The size of the Joint Staff would have to be increased somewhat to take care of the operational functions additionally assigned to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. There are differences of opinion as to how much this increase should be. If the Joint Chiefs of Staff get into details of operations, the increase needed will be considerable, or conversely, if there is a substantial increase in the size of the Joint Staff, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or at least the Joint Staff, will involve themselves in details or in matters other than strategic planning and operational direction. This would not be good. I, personally, favor holding to a minimum the increases in the Joint Staff.

I am in favor of limiting the tenure of the Joint Staff to 3 years with an extension of 1 year only under exceptional circumstances when approved by the Secretary of Defense. This will reduce the possibility of making a career out of duty on the Joint Staff. Similarly, it may be desirable to provide for at least a 3-year period between successive duties on the Joint Staff.

I am also in favor of the provision to have the members of the Joint Staff selected by the Joint Chiefs of Staff equitably from the Army, the Navy and Marines, and the Air Force. Representation such as this will avoid having the Joint Staff manned by people with a single background and will permit cross-fertilization of ideas. It is my understanding that the important positions, the positions of influence, in the Joint Staff will be rotated among the services as is presently done.

The procedures for the Joint Staff and its organization are now undergoing study. The questions connected with procedures and organization of this very influential group are not easy to resolve for the staff must not only operate quickly, but must provide the correct answers to complex problems. There must also be methods worked out so that arbitrary decisions are not made and that preconceived views on the solutions of problems are not imposed by subordinate echelons on the elements of the staff who have been directed to prepare the papers concerning a problem. Although details such as these are not subject to legislation they are brought up to emphasize that not only is the legislation itself important to the effectiveness of the organization, but that the related matter, the method of administering the organization is equally important.

RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING

I am infavor of establishing a Director of Defense Research and Engineering in the Department of Defense not only to eliminate duplication and to stop unproductive development before millions have been spent on it, but, more importantly, to insure that no gaps are left in our research programs and that promising research is pushed to completion quickly and economically. There is a need for a Director of Defense Research and Engineering to assign responsibility for research in new fields such as satellites.

At the same time each of the services has research and development organizations which have been successful in developing much new material and new and improved weapons and systems. These organizations are experienced and are responsive to the needs of the operating forces of their services.

It is my understanding that these organizations will continue to function largely as they have in the past, but in the future their programs will be generally supervised by the Director of Defense Research and Engineering. Each service will continue to be responsible for research peculiar to the needs of that service, such as antisubmarine warfare research for the Navy. The Director of Defense Research and Engineering should have sufficient funds available to him to exploit new scientific breakthroughs which show promise of achieving significant results. It is understood that the authority given to the Director of Defense Research and Engineering will be exercised so as not to generate instability in promising programs already underway whenever a need is generated for another program.

MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

Although the words "separately administered" are proposed to be removed from the Declaration of Policy of the National Security Act, it is my understanding that the three departments will be administered and controlled in the same manner as at present. The law will continue to provide that the military departments are administered by their respective Secretaries under the direction, authority and control of the Secretary of Defense. Each Secretary will continue to be responsible for the support and administration of all forces in his department, including those in the unified commands. He will continue to be responsible for personnel administration, training, purchasing, research and development, budgeting, and such matters. This is sound, for the existing organizations in the military departments are experienced and are particularly adapted to the needs of the forces of their own department.

The only responsibility that will be taken away from the Secretaries of the military departments is responsibility for operational control of forces assigned to unified and specified commands. I do not believe that loss of this responsibility will downgrade the position of Secretary of a military department. It is important that this position not be downgraded. The Secretary of a military department exerts a tremendous influence on the esprit de corps, morale, and sense of dedication in the service he represents.

We have been most fortunate in having good, enthusiastic, and experienced men accept these positions, and the United States will be the loser if the importance of these positions is so diminished that only men of lesser caliber will be attracted to them.

GENERAL

I am also in accord with the intent not to do certain things, including:

1. Not to merge the services into a single service.
2. Not to establish a single Chief of Staff or take steps leading to a single Chief of Staff.
3. Not to create a general staff.
4. Not to establish a separate service of supply.
5. Not to involve the Joint Chiefs of Staff in details of operations or support of unified commands.
6. Not to centralize administrative matters.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I would like to bring up a point sometimes overlooked.

A sound organizational structure for our defense system is necessary. But the most important element in any human endeavor is the people whose intelligence, knowledge, experience, and dedication make the organization work.

In the Armed Forces you cannot go out and hire experienced military people. You can't hire an admiral or a general to take command of operating forces. You have to train men for these positions, and this takes a long time, a lifetime.

Any organization plan has to provide the kind of environment which attracts inspired young men to make the service a career—young men who want to accept and discharge military responsibilities.

You have to have people in the services who know how to, and who want to, defend their country when the chips go down, when the security of the Nation is at stake.

Whatever else a military organization plan provides, it is important that the spirit of the services be preserved. It must be an organization that allows for that vital incentive, pride of service.

In the Armed Forces today we have that pride of service. We have men who are proud of their regiments, men who are proud of their wings, men who are proud of their ships—in short, men who are proud of the traditions of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and of the Marines, whose exploits in the history of our country have reflected honor and valor among Americans and respect among the nations of the world.

Motivation of servicemen cannot be legislated. It stems from patriotism, pride of service, recognition of professional competence, opportunity to assume responsibility, and the satisfaction of accomplishment. These are simply parts of the human element which, in the final analysis, is the vital ingredient of everything we do. And this vital element we must preserve.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Threat to American Economy by Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal has recently emphasized the great importance of a speech made a few days ago by Mr. Allen Dulles, which pointed to the immense importance of our American economy meeting the production challenge of the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, which calls on our Federal Government to take prompt and decisive action to end the recession, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD as follows:

SOVIET ECONOMIC THREAT IS SHOWING MOUNTING VIGOR

The Director of the country's hush-hush Central Intelligence Agency, Allen W. (the other) Dulles, seldom makes public speeches. When he does, they deserve attention.

Dulles told the United States Chamber of Commerce the other day that the United States can't afford a prolonged recession if it wants to keep ahead of Soviet Russia and if it intends to keep large areas of the world from falling into Communist hands.

The CIA Director painted a most disturbing picture.

Forced draft industrialization is proceeding in Russia. The United States is still ahead, but the U. S. S. R. is gaining. Two startling facts: In the first quarter of 1958, Soviet industrial production was 11 percent higher than a year ago and United States production was down 11 percent. And for the first time, in the same quarter, Russia and China together surpassed this country in steel production.

As its production climbs, Russia is increasing its trade with the free world, particularly Western Europe. It is already a supplier of basic metals in a few traditional American metal markets. Said Dulles: "Once they have penetrated western European markets to the extent that these markets become substantially dependent on Soviet industrial and raw materials, they will have a new and formidable weapon of economic warfare."

Since 1954 the Russians have provided $2 billion of development and military aid, mostly on a loan basis, to non-Communist countries. They are stepping up the pace. Attractive trade and aid offers have been made to nations of Asia, Africa and even South America.

The Soviets have real advantages in this kind of economic warfare. Dulles explained: "They have no budgetary controls when it comes to diverting funds to urgent national policies. There need be no prior consultation with parliaments or the people. They have no interest rate problems. They have no legislative restrictions. They have developed an attractive package credit deal."

And where does the current recession fit into all this?

"A recession," Dulles said, "is an expensive luxury. Its effects are not confined to our own shores. Soviet propagandists have been having a field day in recent months, pounding away at American free enterprise. The uncommitted millions are being told: 'See, we told you so. Crises and unemployment are inevitable under capitalism. Communism is the only true road to social progress.' "

The CIA chief said he considered the challenge the most serious this country has ever faced in time of peace. Inasmuch as it is based largely on economic and industrial growth, he said it was one which should "concern very directly" the Nation's business leaders.

Dulles might also have directed his warnings to Washington, where the administration, the Congress, and the leadership of both political parties can't decide on methods to end the recession. Until there is some policy determination in the Government, it's difficult to see what business leaders alone can do.

Competitive Differences Between the United States and Russian Economic Systems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as part of the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Nelson C. Smith, executive vice president of the Atlantic Coal Co., of Boston. This is a speech which Mr. Smith delivered before the Greater Providence Chamber of Commerce and although I do not necessarily endorse the views or specific recommendations of Mr. Smith, I do think that he has done an unusually good job of explaining some of the competitive differences between our economic system and the Russian. I

think this a very interesting approach to a problem with which we will be increasingly concerned in the years ahead.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF NELSON C. SMITH, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, ATLANTIC COAL CO., AT A MEETING OF THE FOREIGN TRADE CLUB OF THE GREATER PROVIDENCE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, SHERATON-BILTMORE HOTEL, TUESDAY, APRIL 15, 1958

Because social welfare as well as national productivity are involved, recessions are a major concern to the nation.

Since Americans have often demonstrated their willingness to give their lives for their country in time of war, it is inconceivable that, when an even greater peril confronts us, any Americans will permit the surrender of this nation to Khrushchev and his alien ideologies. And yet such an outcome may be forced upon us within perhaps 10 or a dozen years if Russia can continue to exploit her workers through low wages that bear little relationship to the productivity of these workers.

Furtehrmore Khrushchev, by fixing Russian consumer prices at perhaps twice the level that might prevail under an economy of free competition, can extract from his already poorly paid workers what might be considered the equivalent of a 100 percent sales tax.

With such an advantage, from the point of view of profit-making potential, as compared with competitive free enterprise, the Russian employer—in this case the Russian Government—can earn enormous profits out of the bondage labor of its people. No wonder Russia's productivity can rise at a rate of 8 to 10 percent a year, compared with the rate in our own gross national product averaging nearer 4 percent. Actually, the latter figure, as a measure of growing productivity, is much too high, for half the rise represents inflation. The expansion in American productivity in fact, tends to vanish when recessions begin to take their toll.

High wages in this country can produce a marvelous standard of living. However, unless our economy can be maintained on a profitable and productive basis, free of major economic cycles, and free from restraints to expanding productivity, such as slowdowns, featherbedding, labor-management squabbles, and resulting shutdowns, then we will no longer be able to compete with Russia and still maintain a high level of wages. Unless we meet Russia's economic threat, we may be forced into an orbit as a satellite that revolves around Moscow.

If we use our enormous talents in the field of production, and eliminate the obstacles that stand in the way of expanding our productivity, so that we can maintain our present lead over Russia, we will be able to maintain a high standard of living. But even then we may be obliged to tax all our citizens, not only the wealthy ones, at a high rate, in order that our Government can compete on a more equal basis with Russia's growing wealth, when seeking the favors of the world's uncommitted nations, or the continued friendship of nations we now consider firmly bound to us.

We are currently spending some forty billions a year to meet Russia's military might, and very little to meet the far greater danger of her new economic threat. Are we going to default on this new area of conflict? Are we to yield in this more sinister phase of the cold war? Are we going to consider only such measures as are politically expedient? Are we going to seek political advantage in the face of a crisis more acute than any military danger this Nation has ever encountered? Or shall we resolve that—no matter what the cost, we will deal effectively with this new problem?

I raise these points because the medicine required to cure our economic ills may not taste any better than do most medicines. How are we to overcome the obstacles so that our productivity will expand at the same rate or even a faster rate than that of Russia? Let us consider one of the principal deterrents to increasing American productivity—the current recession. How can it be cured without setting off simultaneously the fuse that would ignite an equally perilous inflation? Can a solution be found at a moderate cost—one that can eventually be recouped?

In looking for the causes of our recessions, we can find a hint in the behavior of some of the recent recessions and depressions in this and in foreign lands. Is there any one set of circumstances that could perhaps have accounted for the greatest depression in our history occurring during the early 1930's? Could the circumstances which prevailed at that time explain why France, England, and Germany suffered severe though much less intense depressions while our economy was prostrated? Could such circumstances also explain why Russia has been virtually free of the cyclical phenomena that have plagued the western world in varying degrees for ages? I believe there was such a circumstance—the extent of common stock holdings in various countries at that time.

America had the biggest stock market boom of all time during the 1920's. Common stocks were more widely held than ever before in any country. Common stocks represented closed to 70 percent of the total liquid wealth of the country by 1929. Could this major segment of our liquid wealth have been almost wiped out during the 3 succeeding years without some major repercussions on oureconomy? This raises the question of the hen and the egg. Was the impairment of security markets a cause, or merely a manifestation of the depression? Did not the greatest known depression follow the world's greatest rise of common stocks?

In the European countries common stock holdings among the peoples of those nations were extensive, but only perhaps half as widespread as in the United States. Would this not account for British, French, and German recessions of only one-half the intensity of that suffered in the United States? Russia, with no Moscow stock exchange, would have no fluctuating security markets to upset her economy. According to this theory, should she not be immune to our kind of cyclical convulsions? Here, perhaps, is a clue to the causes of our business cycles.

Recessions are, of course, primarily a phenomenon in the field of business—in fact they are customarily referred to as business recessions. They ordinarily begin to assume serious proportions after our security markets have taken a nosedive. We can all recall how often recessions are ushered in by serious breaks in the stock market. Such breaks in the market are frequently measured in terms of many billions of dollars of losses.

Company managements, aware of the impact on their businesses of a drastic curtailment in security prices such as that which was reducing the Nation's total liquid wealth by as much as $50 billion in late 1957, understandably start reducing their inventories, their budgets, their overtime payments, and ultimately their payrolls. It is the same kind of precaution for weathering a storm that the mariner uses when he cuts down sail as storm clouds appear.

A downturn in business, a recession, can become cumulative; a business depression can result, unless speculative forces are brought to bear with sufficient force to change the declining trend of liquid wealth represented by falling security values. Not until after security markets have turned up, are business indexes likely to follow.

If business uncertainties, the fear of insufficient future revenues to meet continuing obligations, tend to shrink the business activity of tens of thousands of corporations, no wonder that a recession develops. Conversely, if businesses see better earnings ahead, they automatically expand and create more jobs. It is essentially prosperous businesses that create jobs, and shrinking business prospects that mean falling markets—diminished liquid wealth as security prices fall—a further downtrend in business indexes, and then reecession.

The above discussion is intended as a background for the proposed action to end so-called recessions. Large reductions of personal incomes taxes have at times been proposed as a cure. This would be most agreeable to nearly all of us. But this would be an expensive and perhaps a dangerous course to follow. It would present the very real danger of inflation. It would mean that Americans would be living even more luxuriously at a time when an extreme austerity in Russia is threatening our future.

The most direct cure for recessions, since they represent business declines, is a direct stimulus to business. Here is an opportunity for a relatively small sum to restore the $50 billion or more shrinkage in the Nation's wealth. (It should be remembered that it is unthinkable that our American economy is so rugged that the striking of $50 billion from the Nation's reservoir of liquid wealth would leave no scars on our economy.)

A reduction of perhaps 10 points in the corporate tax rate, say from 52 percent to 42 percent might cost the Nation $5 or $6 billion a year. Reducing the largest single cost of doing business to corporations by an aggregate of $5 billion would restore 10 to 15 times this sum to the value of corporate securities, because common stocks usually sell at 10 to 15 times their earnings. This would tend to raise security prices at least $50 billion and bring them back to the prosperity levels of prerecession days. This would mean that as little as $4 to $5 billion of corporate tax savings should not only restore the soundness of the security markets, but would also restore to prerecession levels the earning power of the corporations which create most of America's jobs. Billions of dollars of projects abandoned or curtailed since the stock market breaks of late 1957 would once more become feasible. More jobs and more overtime would become necessary. The recession would be broken.

But how about the cost? Would this action actually cost $4 or $5 billion? A postponement of 4 to 5 billion of corporate income taxes would actually cost far less than $4 or $5 billion. Experience shows that a large portion of any increase in corporate earnings is usually paid out in additional dividends—some of which are taxed at even higher rates than the 52 percent levied against corporations.

By maintaining personal taxes at existing levels, much of the relatively small cost of reestablishing the prerecession earning power of corporations would be recaptured in the form of added revenues from personal taxes. The unemployed, returning to work, would again be swelling withholding tax collections.

But the corporate tax dollar lost actually only need to be deferred. The entire program of corporate tax reductions could be geared to the percentage of the Nation's unemployed. When the total number of unemployed reaches, say 4 percent a corporate tax reduction to the 47-percent level should become automatic. Each additional 1 percent of unemployment, as determined by Government published monthly figures, would call for an additional 5-percent reduction in the corporate income-tax rate. As unemployment figures return to normal (perhaps 2½ percent) on the following month, the tax benefits would cease and the Government loss in corporate taxes could then be added to the regular corporate taxes, payable perhaps in five annual installments. This would tend to stabilize corporate earnings and greatly limit, if it did not com-

pletely eliminate, so-called booms and busts. The cost would be low, and would ultimately be recovered. One of the most serious obstacles to the adequate expansion of American productivity would be removed. Equally important, the Russian boast of having alone conquered business cycles would henceforth lose its validity.

CLOSING REMARKS

Just why is such a talk as this, which could have been delivered at almost any type of meeting, particularly pertinent to groups such as this—a group particularly interested in foreign trade?

It is pertinent to us because Russia is our real competition abroad as we attempt to win friends and influence people and work with the other nations of the world.

Russia is our competition as we attempt to influence noncommitted nations toward our way of life in our various aid-and-trade programs.

Russia is the competition we will face more and more in the years ahead as she reaches out to dominate the world.

ou no doubt have noticed the 2-cent cut in the aluminum price. It's due to Russia. Russian aluminum monopoly undercut the price and the effect was felt throughout the world. Here is a definite manifestation of Soviet monopoly competition in action. Khrushchev has put the world on notice to take him seriously when he threatens economic war. Socialized capital of Russia can attack other commodities at any time and plague orderly world markets.

The best way that we can meet this competition is with increased productivity at home and with better and more intelligent aid-and-trade programs abroad.

Correction of Labor Abuses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal has an enviable reputation for objectivity and independence in politics. It has been in the forefront of American newspapers that have called for correction of labor abuses. It has frequently criticized organized labor. It is a fair-minded newspaper however, and recently it carried an editorial entitled "Absurd Words Against Labor," which puts the remarks of Theodore R. Iserman, a New York attorney, who attacked organized labor before the chamber of commerce annual meeting in Washington, in proper perspective.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABSURD WORDS AGAINST LABOR

Theodore R. Iserman, a New York attorney who is supposed to be a specialist in labor-management relations, made some ill-advised statements the other day in a speech at the United States Chamber of Commerce annual meeting in Washington.

Iserman told the businessmen that growing labor-union power was a more immediate threat to our way of life than the military might of Soviet Russia. The remark was reminiscent of Arizona Senator BARRY GOLDWATER'S statement a few months ago that Walter Reuther and the UAW are a more dangerous menace than the sputniks or anything Russia might do.

Iserman said further that the big labor unions could bring the country to the brink of disaster, as they have done time after time, in peace and in war. He said that in addition to economic power the labor unions have political power great enough to intimidate politicians.

The statements have little value in an honest consideration of the problems of labor and management relations. Iserman fails to accept the fact that labor unions and their 17½ million members have a permanent status. The time is long since past for considering whether labor unions should exist. The major issue today is dealing with the abuses of the union movement within the framework of a democracy, just as the abuses that arose with the rapid growth of big business in the early part of the century were dealt with.

Iserman's comparison of the threat of labor-union power with Russian military might is absurd. We have no control over the government of Russia. But the labor unions are in our own house, and if the house needs cleaning, a legislative broom can do the job.

The Milwaukee Journal and the Nation Salute the Fulbright Exchange of Scholar Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the very finest United States foreign policy programs, which I have been pleased to support from its very inception, has been the international educational exchange program, as originally authorized by Public Law 584, of the 79th Congress.

This outstanding program, which helps us and helps our friends so effectively, rightly bears the name of the man who conceived and brought it into being, and encouraged it step by step, our distinguished colleague from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Many splendid tributes have been paid to the program, both on the floor of the Congress, in the newspapers and magazines of this Nation, and in other mediums.

I was pleased to note, however, in the Tuesday, April 29 issue of the Milwaukee Journal, one such editorial salute which deserves particular reference because it sums up so well the program's tremendous achievements.

The editorial was entitled "Thirty-three Thousand Fulbright Scholars," and I shall reprint it shortly.

Previously, I have pointed out on the floor of the Senate just what this program means in the exchange of scholars in so many fields—in the humanities, in the social sciences, in the physical and natural sciences, and in other miscellaneous fields of endeavor. I am glad to say that each week brings news of additional scholars from my own State going abroad, or additional scholars coming from abroad to my own State; particularly to the University of Wisconsin.

BASIC ACCOMPLISHMENTS

In House Document No. 164, published last April, the State Department, in its report on the 1956 operations of the program, summed up the program's achievements in 5 basic categories:

First. The constructive personal influence of grantees.

Second. The fostering of interests in the United States abroad—interest in our history, our literature, our culture.

Third. The practical exchange of knowledge and skills.

Fourth. The fostering of English language training and the general breaking of language barriers.

Fifth. The raising of educational standards.

At the present time, I will not attempt to develop any 1 of these 5 themes; each of which could be written upon at great length.

EXCHANGE OF HEALING SPECIALISTS

But I would like to point out a few illustrations of what the program has meant in just one aspect of the exchange of knowledge and skills. In this instance, I refer to the exchange of knowledge and skills in the healing arts.

I do so because, on this very day, I am commenting on another phase of science for peace.

I do so, too, because the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his sixth state of the Union message so wisely referred to the tremendous opportunities available to this Nation through means of a joint attack by the scientists of the world against the scourges which afflict mankind.

1956 TO 1957 STATE DEPARTMENT SUMMARIES

And so, after the Milwaukee Journal editorial, I ask unanimous consent that several additional items be printed, which illuminate this Fulbright category of exchange of knowledge and skills.

The first consists of excerpts from the 1957 Fulbright program summary, as printed in House Document No. 164.

Included in these few paragraph excerpts are a few figures from an overall table of statistics for 1957, showing how healing experts have been exchanged.

The second consists of excerpts from a previous State Department report, that for 1956, entitled, "Swords Into Plowshares." This excerpt shows how Fulbright experts in rehabilitation of the handicapped have nobly aided the cause of therapy abroad.

But this is only the beginning. More needs to be done.

More will be done.

I say this in this particular week, when the Handicapped Committee of the People-To-People program is meeting here in Washington on this very Wednesday, to be followed on Thursday by a meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

GREAT INTANGIBLE VALUES

I point out that this exchange of healing and research experts is but one

small phase of the overall Fulbright program. It is one of the tangible phases of an operation which has brought incalculable benefit, both tangibly and intangibly.

I ask unanimous consent that all of these items be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIRTY-THREE THOUSAND FULBRIGHT SCHOLARS

When the first Fulbright scholarships were awarded just 10 years ago, they went to 65 Americans and 36 foreigners. It was a modest beginning for a program that since has led to the largest international educational exchange in history.

The program was founded August 1, 1946, when the 79th Congress passed Public Law 584, originated by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat of Arkansas, for the promotion of international understanding. Two years of patient spadework followed before the program started to roll.

By the fall of 1947, the first 2 educational exchange agreements had been signed. The Fulbright Act, as it came to be known, authorized the sale of American military surplus goods to foreign governments for their own currencies, with the understanding that part of the funds would be set aside to finance educational exchanges. The program later was augmented by Congress with further financial support.

As of this year, approximately 33,000 people have received Fulbright grants, including some 4,000 in 1958. They include Americans for whom the program has financed graduate study, advanced research, university lecturing or teaching abroad, and foreign citizens for whom it has provided travel funds so that they could come to the United States to study, teach and train.

Fulbright scholarships this year are being exchanged between the United States and 31 other countries. Since the program's inception, 39 different countries have participated. Senator FULBRIGHT said recently that he hoped there eventually would be Fulbright scholars in the Soviet Union and that Russian scholars would come here under the program.

Extending the program to Russia would be in keeping with the stated purpose of the act: "To promote a better understanding of the United States in other countries and to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries."

In just one decade the Fulbright Act has done much to widen the range of international contacts between scholars and teachers. In its second decade it could become a potent force for understanding between the United States and Russia.

EXCERPTS ON EXCHANGE OF MEDICAL RESEARCHERS AND TECHNICIANS

EXCERPT FROM REPORT ON THE OPERATIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE UNDER PUBLIC LAW 584 (85TH CONG., 1ST SESS., H. DOC. NO. 164, P. 3)

* * * * *

C. Exchange of knowledge and skills

The nature of the activities authorized by the Fulbright Act and the requirements that these pursuits be carried out at or in connection with a school or institution of higher learning has meant that the program is conducted in an atmosphere of scholarship and academic advancement. As far as gains in international understanding are concerned, it has been found that associations between Americans and their foreign colleagues in the same field of interest become lasting ones. Furthermore, cooperation between them is advancing the frontiers of knowledge to the mutual benefit of all. A few examples will show the broad range of their study and research projects:

* * * * *

A physician from California conducted research in Italy on an improved vaccine for smallpox. Subsequently, he was asked by the Ministry of the Interior to visit Italian pharmaceutical firms to help them get started in producing the refined vaccine. He was asked to address the Second European Biological Standards meeting in Rome last June to make the final recommendations on the safety, purity, and potency of smallpox vaccine, which would form the basis for all European manufacturers for release of smallpox vaccine and its testing by state agencies.

* * * * *

A neurologist from Kansas collaborated with the Belgian director of the Neurological Service and Laboratory of Neuropathology of Bung Institute in Antwerp, in research on sclerosis. Their findings have since been reported in medical journals in Belgium, France, and the United States.

An American doctor from Massachusetts General Hospital was requested by the Vellore Christian Medical College in India to strengthen its anesthesia department and help train Indian doctors in this field. He also gave generously of his time to the clinical work of the hospital and made a lecture tour to Indian medical centers.

Excerpt from 1956 report on the operations of the Department of State

FIELDS OF STUDY AND TEACHINGS

Fields	American grantees	Foreign grantees	Total
Medical sciences:			
Dentistry		12	12
General	4	101	105
Gynecology and obstetrics		12	12
Nursing	2	10	12
Occupational therapy	2	1	3
Pediatrics	1	5	6
Pharmacy		5	5
Psychiatry		8	8
Public health		2	2
Surgery, general		14	14
Other specialties	17	52	69

EXCERPT FROM SWORDS INTO PLOWSHARES (ISSUED JULY 1956, P. 34)

A new venture in international understanding—The story of the educational exchange program authorized by the Fulbright Act of 1946

* * * * *

2. Social Rehabilitation

Both American and foreign grantees have helped to introduce American techniques for the rehabilitation of the handicapped. One young woman returned to organize Belgium's first center for reeducation of cerebral palsied children. Aided by an eminent Belgian neurologist, who also visited the United States, she is pioneering in a field in which Belgium was far behind.

Similar work has been carried out in Norway by American specialists. The Norwegian Association for Aiding Cerebral Palsied Children noted, "There was no possibility of obtaining specialists in Norway for this particular field. We shall always be grateful to the Fulbright Foundation for its help in finding just those people who had the right instinct, imagination, and initiative to break new ground in this discipline in Norway." Occupational therapy, introduced into Italy by an American grantee, has resulted in the establishment of training centers in four Italian cities. The demand for trained therapists by Italian hospitals has since shown a marked increase.

Desmond J. O'Neil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Glendive (Mont.) Daily Ranger of April 30, 1958, there was published an editorial covering the life and career of an old friend, Desmond J. O'Neil. This editorial was written for the Daily Ranger by Mr. G. C. Hoole, former publisher of the Dawson County Review, and an oldtime newspaperman in Montana, as well as a longtime friend of Mr. O'Neil.

Desmond O'Neil was a great Montanan, a fine citizen and an outstanding lawyer. We of Montana will miss him; but because of his wise counsel, his great understanding and his sense of tolerance we will all be the beneficiaries of his friendship. He was a good, a kindly, and a decent man.

I ask unanimous consent that this tribute to a great Montanan be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Glendive (Mont.) Daily Ranger of April 30, 1958]

DESMOND J. O'NEIL

(By G. C. Hoole)

The editor has asked me to write an editorial appreciation of the late Desmond J. O'Neil, a most eminent citizen of our city and a good friend of mine, whose recent death saddened our community.

This is a difficult assignment as it is hard to write about our dear friends and associates.

I had the pleasure of knowing Mr. O'Neil rather intimately during my 46 years in Glendive, particularly in connection with the Glendive Building & Loan association of which he was manager for many years and I was and still am a director and officer.

Mr. O'Neil was a native of Glendive, the son of oldtimers, Mr. and Mrs. Edward F. O'Neil, who came to Glendive in the very early days of the railroad. Mr. O'Neil, Sr. was a locomotive engineer on the Northern Pacific.

Desmond was graduated from the old Glendive High School, before the Dawson County High School was created. Following graduation from Gonzaga University, Spokane, he was graduated in law from Georgetown University in 1911. For several years he was county attorney of the new county of Musselshell and lived at Roundup. I first met him in Miles City when he came down to the Cowtown with the Roundup Baseball Club.

He returned to Glendive in 1914 and opened a law office and was soon associated with the late Judge C. C. Hurley until the latter's death in 1932. He built up a fine law practice and in 1949 Thomas Cavanaugh became a law partner.

In 1916 he was married to Esther Cavanaugh, daughter of another pioneer Glendive family. Their home has ever been a center of hospitality and friendship.

Mr. O'Neil became a director of the First National Bank in 1919 and in January 1935

was elected president. He was also vice-president of the Jordan Hotel Co.

He was always very active in civic, political, and church affairs in Glendive. He served as president of the chamber of commerce; exalted ruler of Glendive Elks Lodge, No. 1324; grand knight of the Knights of Columbus, Glendive Council No. 2245, and State deputy of the Knights of Columbus in 1926.

Buffalo Rapids irrigation project owes much to the efforts of Mr. O'Neil to make the undertaking a reality.

He was very prominent in Democratic Party councils and was always active in every election. He was county chairman for many years and also represented Montana at several Democratic National Conventions.

His friends were all who knew him and all who admired business sagacity, integrity, and high ideals. He occupied a niche in Glendive's life that will be hard indeed to fill.

We salute you, Desmond, as an able attorney, a public-spirited citizen, and a nobleman in every sense of the word. Requiescat in pace.

Senator Ralph E. Flanders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, many Americans, from all over this country, were grieved to hear that the great Senator from Vermont, RALPH FLANDERS, has decided to retire from this body at the end of this term.

In my own State of Wisconsin, Senator FLANDERS is highly regarded by many citizens in both parties. Recently the Milwaukee Journal carried a beautiful editorial tribute to this great man. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial entitled "Flanders' Fabulous Career" be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD as follows:

FLANDERS' FABULOUS CAREER

RALPH E. FLANDERS, who has announced his retirement as United States Senator, has had a fabulous career. On the way from apprentice machinist to Senator from Vermont, he was engineer, inventor, industrialist, bank president, and an authority in the machine tool business and industrial economics.

It was a career in the Horatio Alger pattern. He had only 7 years of formal education, most of it in a 1-room school. His first job paid $2.40 for a 60-hour week.

Mild in appearance, FLANDERS is an outspoken and courageous individualist. A lifelong Republican, he worked with the New Deal during the depression of the thirties. In conservative Vermont, he called himself a liberal Republican. Shortly after arriving in the Senate in 1946, he challenged tradition by making floor speeches, and protocol by tangling with his party leader, the late Robert A. Taft.

He introduced the original censure motion against Wisconsin's Senator McCarthy in 1954, challenging the McCarthy way of fighting communism. After the Senate voted censure, he explained that he had acted as he did because the American people were being led in directions that were not good for the country. One factor that entered into the censure verdict was McCarthy's charge that FLANDERS was senile and that they should get a man with a net and take him to a good quiet place.

When we think of RALPH FLANDERS, however, we think of none of these facets of a full and successful career. We think of what he once said about his early years:

"My family was far from wealthy, although it was not poverty stricken. It is true that little money came in. But most fortunately I had parents who appreciated the best things in life. Not only were they deeply religious but they had an appetite for things of the mind as well. During brief periods of increased income there were always books to be bought. A thirdhand piano was purchased and music lessons provided for the girls."

Such words have pertinency in these days of deep concern about education and juvenile delinquency.

Favor McGee Bend Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the McGee Bend Dam project on the Angelina River is extremely important to Texas. McGee Bend Dam promises a better life for the people of the heartland of southeast Texas and part of our gulf coast area. This vast area needs the hydroelectric power, the water conservation-flood control features, and the added recreational facilities which would result from the completion of the McGee Bend Dam project.

Recently I received a copy of a resolution from the County Commissioners' Court of Jasper County, Tex., which was addressed to the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives. This resolution, unanimously passed by the county governing body of Jasper County, Tex., demonstrates the support which the McGee Bend Dam project enjoys among most of the people of the area it will serve.

Mr. President, a distinguished Texan and former Vice President of the United States, our reverend Cactus Jack Garner, often paid a high tribute to the County Commissioners' Courts of Texas. He used to tell visitors to his office, when he was Speaker of the House of Representatives and later when he served as Vice President under Franklin Delano Roosevelt, that if they really wanted to know what the people were thinking they ought to talk to their county commissioners.

Mr. President, bearing in mind John Nance Garner's high opinion of the fact that the county commissioners are close to the people and know what the people want, I think it is significant to note that this resolution points out that the McGee Bend Dam project has the support of the overwhelming majority of the people of Jasper County, and that support is stronger today than in the past.

The executive committee of the Beaumont, Tex., Chamber of Commerce recently approved a resolution which outlines in detail the need for the completion of the McGee Bend Dam. This resolution points to acute water shortage in the great industrial area of Jefferson County, Tex., and it points out that the McGee Bend Dam project when completed will ease the flood damage on the Angelina and Neches River. It also points to the fact that the project enjoys the support of the vast majority of the people in the area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the resolution adopted by the County Commissioners' Court of Jasper County, Tex., and the resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Beaumont Chamber of Commerce.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Beaumont (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce has consistently and actively supported and worked for upstream development on the Neches and Angelina Rivers; and

Whereas the present development was authorized by Congress in 1945 to include McGee Bend Dam on the Angelina River, and Rockland Dam, dam A, and dam B on the Neches River; and

Whereas dam B already has been constructed and is partially valueless without a larger dam upstream; and

Whereas the Congress appropriated planning money for McGee Bend Dam in 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951, and 1952; and

Whereas the Congress has appropriated $5,500,000 in construction funds for McGee Bend Dam; and

Whereas these funds have been expended or obligated, and additional funds are necessary; and

Whereas the President's budget calls for $4,500,000 for McGee Bend Dam to continue construction on this project; and

Whereas there is an acute and long continued shortage of water in the industrial area of Jefferson County, which shortage endangers a present industrial investment whose replacement value would be in excess of $2 billion, and prohibits an expansion of an estimated $1 billion in the next 10 years; and

Whereas the present oil refineries in Jefferson County pay in excess of $90 million annually in excise taxes on refined gasoline which would be increased with major planned expansions; and

Whereas these refineries and other industrial plants in Jefferson County pay many additional millions into the Federal Treasury; and

Whereas the expenditure of construction funds for McGee Bend Dam will bring great economic benefits to the residents in the area of the dam itself; and

Whereas the project will ease the damage and suffering from floods on the Angelina and Neches Rivers; and

Whereas no evidence has even been presented that would indicate McGee Bend Dam is an unsound project; and

Whereas the vast majority of opinion in the area above and below the dam is completely in favor of building the dam at once: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Beaumont Chamber of Commerce urgently recommends the appropriation of the $4,500,000 included in the budget for continued construction on McGee Bend Dam; and be it further

Resolved, That we commend our Congressman, Hon. JACK B. BROOKS, for his efforts on behalf of McGee Bend Dam and urge him to continue his good work; and be it further

Resolved, That we commend the Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON and the Honorable RALPH YARBOROUGH for their strong support and urge them to continue giving every assistance toward success of this vital project; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be addressed to the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, with copies to all who should have knowledge of this action.

Approved this 29th day of April 1958 by the executive committee of the Beaumont Chamber of Commerce, Beaumont, Tex.

JOHN E. GRAY, *President.*

Attest:

HOWARD J. HICKS,
Executive Vice President.

From: The Commissioners' Court, Jasper County, Tex.

To: The Appropriations Committees, United States Senate and United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

"Whereas the Commissioners' Court of Jasper County, Tex., has on previous occasions passed resolutions supporting the McGee Bend Dam project, expressing the views of the people of Jasper County; and

"Whereas it has come to the attention of the Commissioners' Court of Jasper County that there is still before the Congress of the United States, the matter of appropriation of additional funds for this project, and that there will be heard opposition by a minority group to this appropriation; and

"Whereas the Commissioners' Court of Jasper County is desirous of expressing to the Congress of the United States the wholehearted support for this project in its entirety by this court, and the people of Jasper County; and

"Whereas this project is of utmost importance to not only the citizens of Jasper County, but to the entire development of southeast Texas, and to the Nation as a whole for the purposes that this dam has been proposed; and

"Whereas at public hearings held in the past, open support has been expressed by the overwhelming majority of the people, and the feeling is even stronger today in support of this project than ever before; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States may not realize the importance of this project to our industrial development, flood control, hydroelectric power, and the vast recreational opportunities offered: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Commissioners' Court of Jasper County, Tex., and the people of Jasper County, Tex., hereby urge the serious consideration of the Appropriations Committees, and the Congress of the United States for the continued orderly progress of McGee Bend Dam, this year and all future years in its full magnitude."

The above and foregoing resolution was passed by the Commissioners' Court of Jasper County, Tex., on the 1st day of May 1958, at a special meeting of the commissioners' court, whereupon it was moved by J. W. Jones, commissioner of precinct 4, that said resolution be adopted, and the motion was seconded by Harvy Horn, commissioner of precinct 3, and said resolution passed unanimously.

A. L. MAYS,
County Judge.
ROY ELLIS,
Commissioner, Precinct 1.
JOHN D. DUBOSE,
Commissioner, Precinct 2.
HARVY HORN,
Commissioner, Precinct 3.
J. W. JONES,
Commissioner, Precinct 4.

Attest:

EULIS HANCOCK, *County Clerk.*

GI Rejectees Consequence of Education Breakdown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there is an old maxim, trite but true, that chickens have a way of coming home to roost. I desire to call attention to some ugly fowls that are perching now on our doorsteps.

Bem Price points out, in an article for the Associated Press, that 1 soldier in 4 in the American armed services is rated incapable of being trained for anything but menial tasks. These men receive basic training and then are released because they cannot be taught to do anything of real use to the armed services. We are spending nearly a half billion dollars a year to draft, equip, and train, in a sketchy way, men who are unfit for military service in forces that require intelligence and skill of the citizen soldier.

Now, Mr. President, we find the result of refusing to spend money on education. Here are the products of inadequate schools and poorly trained teachers. And here is the real irony of it: The States which refuse to go along with an aid-to-education bill which equalizes educational opportunities, because they do not wish to tax their people to support schoolchildren in other States, are the States that bear the brunt of military conscription. Draftees from disadvantaged States are rejected in disproportionate numbers; draftees from other States must fill their places. The price of citizens of one State declining to support the educating of boys in another State is resulting in the manning of the military with their own sons.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Bem Price entitled "'Meathead' GI's Plague Army," which appeared in the May 4 issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

"MEATHEAD" GI'S PLAGUE ARMY
(By Bem Price)

Fort Dix, N. J.—By Army standards, roughly 25 percent of the Nation's young men are smart enough only to dig ditches, swab floors or polish pots and pans on kitchen police.

At a time when advances in Army weaponry require a large assortment of skills, 220,000 of the Nation's 884,000 soldiers are rated incapable of being trained for anything but menial tasks. Further, 2 of every 5 men drafted through Selective Service this year will be rejected, chiefly on physical grounds.

To obtain 136,000 ablebodied men last year, the draft boards rejected more than 50,000 others, a rejection rate of 37 percent. This year, physical requirements have been tightened and the rejection rate is expected to reach 42 percent.

And last year the Army released 44,170 men after putting them through 8 weeks of basic training because they were unable to learn anything of value to the Army.

While the Army is the only service which still resorts to the draft for manpower, the Air Force, Navy, and Marines have their troubles, too.

Of the 176,360 men in the Marines, 31,780 are classed among the mentally slow. The Navy has 634,000 men, including 101,840 in the marginal intelligence group. As for the Air Force, a spokesman said that it had never made a head count of its mentally slow, though 1 sampling indicated that 9 percent of its 998,000 men were in this group—roughly 90,000 men.

It costs somewhere in the vicinity of $1,600 to induct or enlist a man, transport, pay, feed and clothe him during basic training. This means that the Government is spending more than $470 million to train men of dubious value to the Nation's Armed Forces.

Here at Fort Dix, a ruthless weeding out process is underway—and certainly it has an effect on the morale of trainees.

Under the present law, if a man is physically fit and scores as much as 10 points out of a possible 100 on an intelligence test, he must be inducted, or enlisted.

Upon arrival at the reception center here, the new men are subjected to nine aptitude tests. On the average, 16 percent will have no aptitudes for service life at all.

(This percentage probably will run higher at other reception centers. Fort Dix draws recruits or inductees from an area where compulsory education laws are generally enforced.)

So what does Fort Dix do with men who are of marginal value? Immediately after taking their aptitude tests, the men are assigned to training battalions. Usually it takes 2 or 3 days for their aptitude scores to catch up with them.

Some of the company commanders go through the motions of training these mentally unfit men. Most weed them out of the company and assign them to menial tasks such as cleaning latrines, so that the training of others is not retarded.

First Lieutenant U. E. Webber makes an effort to train them. "These are the men," he said, "who require the most supervision. They are the ones who have to learn by automation and repetition."

Any veteran would recognize them. They are the men who, when the command "left face" is given, promptly turn to the right. They are the men who require endless practice in field stripping a rifle. At times, Webber's drill instructors have made the inept men carry stones in their left hands in order to distinguish right from left.

When the word comes that the inept are to be discharged—and their identity is learned by the rest of the company—the reaction, said Webber, among the more intelligent men is: "Hell, they ain't the dumb ones. We are. We passed."

(There is some suspicion that the word has been passed among draft eligible youngsters that the way to avoid service is to flunk the aptitude tests. The Army is considering ways to check this.)

The boss of the training regiment is Col. W. B. Edwards. He resents the fact that in the past, a good many of the marginal intelligence men have been assigned to the Infantry.

Edwards takes the long view. "If a man is going to stay 10 to 15 years in the Army and still be a private, then my policy is to get rid of him. If he is willing to study and learn, keep him." Edwards concedes that some of those going out now might be saved and used, but they've got to produce. They can't sit back and say the Army owes me a living.

Not all those rejected as inept are necessarily so. This applies particularly to the foreign born and to Puerto Ricans. All of the tests at Fort Dix are given in English. Some graduates of high schools in Europe have failed the aptitude tests, including a goodly portion of the Hungarian freedom

fighters who came to this country. Obviously language was a barrier. Fort Dix is now trying to obtain permission to give the tests in the native tongues of the foreign-born.

The fact that a man has no skills which the Army can use is no precise measure of his ability to earn a living, but it's a fairly good indication. The majority of those rejected have worked at day labor jobs when they worked at all.

Col. Jefferson J. Irvin, Chief of the Army's Retention and Promotion Branch in Washington, observed that this steady influx of the not-too-bright really hurts.

"Where there are no intelligent followers," he said, "there is no leadership. The day when you could throw anybody into the infantry went out with Frederick the Great (the 18th-century Prussian King whose army was probably the most rigidly disciplined in history). We haven't put automatons (the mindless soldier who obeys by reflex) into the line of battle for a couple of hundred years."

Is there a tendency for draft boards to select the mentally slow just to get them off the streets and out of the community?

"No," Irvin replied. "I believe the draft boards do a conscientious job. I believe they take a cross-section of the community. They get a cross-section of American manhood."

The low mental and aptitude requirements were established in wartime 1945 when the Nation was scraping the bottom of its manpower pool. On the aptitude tests, a man is considered of marginal value if he scores less than 90. The man who scores 110 is officer material.

In the 13 intervening years, no adjustment has been made by Congress to improve the quality of the peacetime services. There is now before the Senate, a House-passed bill which would permit the President—in effect, the services—to stiffen the requirement that anyone scoring a mere 10 on intelligence test be inducted. The modification would apply only in peacetime and would raise the mental requirements, thus permitting the services to build a cadre of intelligent, highly trained men around which the services could expand in an emergency.

During the House debate last August, Representative LESLIE ARENDS, Republican, Illinois, made this observation in a floor speech:

"When we consider the fact that the modern army today is made up of complex electronic devices, guided missiles, atomic weapons, intricate communication systems and exceedingly mobile transportation methods, together with the substantially higher requirements for individual initiative in smaller unit operations, it becomes quite apparent that the Army's need for higher quality inductees increases almost daily."

That's the problem for all the services in a nutshell. There was a time when strong backs and weak minds were handy to have around to perform the menial chores. Not any more.

Reorganization of Defense Department: Is Congress Getting the Full Picture?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL J. KILDAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Armed Services is holding hearings on the proposal to reorganize the Department of Defense. The committee is under the heavy responsibility of gathering all information on the subject, not only for its own information but for the information of the Congress. The reliable Army, Navy, and Air Force Journal expresses doubt as to whether the executive department is making that possible:

IS CONGRESS GETTING THE FULL PICTURE?

We hope the no-compromise attitude of the President and his advisers on Defense reorganization will not result in the suppression of any evidence or professional advice that might assist the congressional committees in making decisions on this important piece of legislation.

The administration's fight-it-out-on-this-line policy now appears so well established that President Eisenhower felt it necessary to issue a statement last Saturday from Augusta, Ga., which gave the inference that he was repudiating the conciliatory attitude shown last week by Secretary of Defense McElroy. Mr. McElroy, it is recalled, made an excellent impression on the House Armed Services Committee by his willingness to discuss differences and his offer to reword some sections of the administration's proposed law. As one of the Nation's top sales experts, Mr. McElroy doubtless was using a salesman's approach; he was avoiding sharp and open conflicts in anticipation of reaching an understanding most favorable to his side. Apparently, the President's advisers on reorganization were frightened by this technique. The final result was that both the President and the Defense Secretary issued public statements that they would hold the line on the administrations' reorganization proposals. Whatever the intent, the result has been to weaken Mr. McElroy's effectiveness.

Meanwhile there are rumbles that all the information is not getting to Congress. One significant study on reorganization is the Wheeler report (see the Journal, January 25, 1958), made last year under the direction of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This report was not made public then, at a time when the Gather and Rockefeller reports were getting national publicity, and it has not been made public since. News Commentator Martin Agronsky recently brought the suppression of this report to the attention of the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee. He also told his NBC radio audience that the Wheeler report conflicts with the administration's plan in that, while recommending some changes in the Defense Department, it holds that the President and Secretary now have adequate powers to bring about these changes.

The Wheeler committee, under the chairmanship of Maj. Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, United States Army, included ranking officers from each of the four services and its report was said to be unanimous. We think Congress should have the benefit of its study and report.

Interested Nations Should Set Up Arctic Inspection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, an interesting article entitled "Acting Without Soviets," written by Roscoe Drummond, was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of Sunday, May 4, 1958. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTING WITHOUT SOVIETS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

There is no reason, no necessity, no value in allowing the Soviet veto in the U. N. Security Council to prevent the interested nations from acting at once to set up the American-proposed international air inspection to guard against surprise attack over the Arctic.

Why should the West take the Soviet rejection as a total roadblock? Why let ourselves be stymied and put off by the Kremlin's "No"?

Let's act on our own to establish the first open-skies inspection system over the strategic North Polar route which, after it begins functioning, the Soviet Union might find compelling reasons for joining.

Obviously it would be better to have the U. S. S. R. participating in such inspection from the start. But, as the debate before the U. N. Security Council showed this past week, the Russians are interested in talking about the danger of surprise attack but not interested in doing anything about it. That's what the Soviets want—nothing done.

Let's do something about it. It would constitute a real gain, a large gain and might well prove so compulsive that the Soviets would have to join.

Isn't it worth trying?

This is what could be done:

Britain, France, Canada, Denmark, Norway—and any other interested country—could begin negotiations at once to work out the required technical arrangements, arrangements which have been studied considerably already.

They could invite the Soviets to every session of the talks in the hope that there might be a change of mind in the Kremlin somewhere along the way.

Once the technical procedures are agreed to, these nations can begin the Arctic air inspection immediately with an open-ended, daily invitation to the Soviets to join at will and thereby to extend it over appropriate Soviet territory.

Unquestionably this is only half a loaf of useful open-skies inspection. But it would be valuable in itself.

We Americans should be realistic enough to recognize that it is not the Russians alone who are concerned lest the on-the-alert United States bomber flights to the Arctic accidentally go awry. Canada has been worried. Others of our allies have been worried. Some of the neutrals have been holding their breath.

The advantages of setting up an Arctic air inspection, covering the Arctic Circle and, if necessary, without Soviet participation, would be these:

By being willing to subject our defensive Arctic flights to agreed, orderly international air inspection, the United States would gain incalculably in the confidence and trust of the whole free world.

It would strengthen the morale of the NATO alliance. It would reassure the critical segments of public opinion within our allies. It would ease the sincere anxieties of many neutrals.

It need not in the least weaken the United States defensively. It would strengthen our position morally and identify American leadership, in the cause of reducing the fears of a jittery nuclear world with positive action in a way which has been lacking.

It would make it visible to the whole world that the Soviet Union, not the Western na-

tions, is blocking a valuable cooperative action.

It would be heartening to most nations to see tangibly that all action does not have to wait on the Kremlin.

You may recall that after President Eisenhower's stirring offer of United States support for a U. N. atoms-for-peace agency, the Soviets stalled and hobbled the negotiations for months on end. Then the United States suggested that if Moscow was determined to stand out, the other nations proceed without the Soviets. Moscow soon changed its decision and quickly ratified the statute.

The Kremlin can keep the Security Council from setting up the Arctic inspection, but they can't prevent the interested nations from doing it themselves. Why not go ahead?

Effect of Government Policies on the Cost of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently I introduced a resolution calling for a congressional investigation of the effect of Government policies on the cost of living. The purpose of the investigation would be to determine how governmental policies could foster the growth of our economy without shoving prices up to one destructive peak after another.

Yesterday the New York Times carried an excellent article by Richard Rutter analyzing certain aspects of this cost of living problem.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARADOX IN PRICE: WHY UP IN SLUMP?
(By Richard Rutter)

Time was when a glass of beer cost 5 cents, a steak dinner less than a dollar, and a new car $400–$500.

Millions of Americans do remember those days, for as time goes it was only yesterday—in the 1930's, to be exact. The same people are all too well aware that working for the Yankee dollar now is not what it used to be.

The shrinkage in the purchasing power of the dollar was dramatized the other day when the latest cost-of-living index came out. It stood at 123.3 (1947–49 equals 100), or 0.7 percent higher than a month before. A year before the index stood at 118.9. It has gone up 20 percent or so in the last 10 years. That raises these vital questions?

Why have prices risen right through a recession period?

Will they ever come down?

As to the first question: Prices have been rising mainly in the fields of food and services. This has been the trend ever since 1948. There is a reason—labor costs. These, too, have been on the increase for years. It costs more to get a haircut, to have repairs made in an apartment, and so on.

But this should be put in perspective. Those good old days of lower prices were actually not so long ago. Consider the statistics about the purchasing power of the dollar. Based on the same 1947–49 level, it was 136.4 in the critical year of 1929. It did not fall below the 100-percent mark until 1948.

In the last 2 years this same purchasing power has dwindled from 78.3 to 81.1 percent. In short, inflation has not been stopped at all. This key economic problem remains. That is why both parties in Congress—and the administration—are reluctant to go ahead with a tax cut.

Concerning the second question about prices dropping: all signs say no because of past experience and current manufacturing practices. History shows that prices as a whole have fallen only twice in this century—in 1920–21 and in 1929–32. The last time was when the depression of the 1930's was at its worst. They did not decline in the two most recent recessions, those of 1948–49 and 1953–54.

No major industry has reduced prices to any major extent in the current recession—and that includes automobiles, hardest hit of all.

As Gilbert and Sullivan said in the Pirates of Penzance, "a paradox, a paradox, a most ingenious paradox."

The story of the American dollar covers more than 150 years. There are general price indices going back before the United States was the United States—to 1749. These are based on a level of 19–0–14 as 100.

The index was at 68 percent in 1749, held fairly stable and then soared in the Revolutionary War. By 1777 the index had climbed to 123 percent. It kept rising until it hit a high of 226 in 1779. Thereafter it declined, falling to a low of about 63 percent in 1791.

In the 19th century prices became firmer, with only minor fluctuations. But by the end of that era they had started to advance.

Another spurt occurred during World War I. The index shot up from 100 in 1914 to 157 in 1918. In the 1920's prices ranged between 193 and 179 on the average.

It seems inevitable that prices will continue to rise. Exhortations for labor and business to hold the line just haven't worked. This year, for instance, millions of workers will get automatic wage increases, and that's aside from others who benefit from cost-of-living escalator clauses.

This is one spiral that looks endless. And it's the general public which pays and pays.

Statement of the International Executive Board, United Steel Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement of the international executive board, United Steelworkers of America, adopted March 17, 1958, Washington, D. C.:

The international executive board of the United Steelworkers of America, meeting in Washington today, expresses its real concern for the state of our national economy in general and for the state of the steel industry in particular. We agree with the statement which Iron Age made last week that: "It's no recession in the durable goods industries. It's a real depression." More than 200,000 of our members are unemployed and more than 300,000 are underemployed, working less than full time. Thus, almost half of our total membership is suffering from this depression.

The basic steel industry is operating a little more than one-half of capacity. Our Nation, and the free world, is literally losing steel at the rate of more than 60 million tons a year. By our inaction in this crisis, we are thus permitting Soviet production of this basic defense material to catch up with us.

In the economy as a whole we are sustaining a lose in real wealth—goods and services which would have been produced but for the depression—at a rate of $40 billion a year. Effective action to halt this loss, and to eliminate the hardships and suffering which are the consequences of unemployment in our industry and the economy, is overdue.

The time for action was months ago, as we said on January 6, 1958—not next month or some undefined date in the future. The course of action is clear. This is the nine-point program which will place us on the road to recovery:

1. Federal income tax cut for lower-income groups.
2. Eliminate or reduce Federal excise taxes which impede or reduce consumption.
3. Federal raising and extension of unemployment compensation benefits, as specified in the Kennedy-McCarthy bill.
4. A broad program of constructive and much-needed public works.
5. An expanded Federal housing program.
6. Passage of a Federal school construction bill.
7. Economic aid for distressed areas.
8. Increase the Federal minimum wage to $1.25 per hour and expand coverage of the act.
9. Implementation of the Full Employment Act of 1946 by other appropriate Federal fiscal and financial action.

We particularly want to emphasize the need for taking steps now—not next month—which will provide the immediate purchasing power necessary to enable Americans to buy automobiles, refrigerators, and other consumer durables, and the need for instituting programs which will permanently increase the real wealth of America by providing schools, houses, and public works, while also releasing purchasing power which will end the current depression.

Those who oppose these programs or seek to delay their institution because of their concern for a balanced budget are afflicted with a peculiar kind of blindness—they can't see the real wealth of America which lies behind the dollar signs. When we have idle factories and idle men, when our productive system is working at half speed—as the steel industry is today—we are losing real wealth every hour. We are losing the goods and services which these idle facilities could be making. When we spend money to start the wheels of industry moving again we increase the real wealth and the real strength of the American economy. If we stay where we are the Government's budget may look better but all of American will be poorer, not only in dollars but, more importantly, in the human values and in the goods and services which are our real wealth.

The United Steelworkers of America has done its part to help the economy. Under our supplemental unemployment benefit plans, the steel industry contributes when times are good and pays out benefits to unemployed workers, for a full 52 weeks of unemployment, when times are bad—thus placing additional purchasing power in the hands of those most likely to use it when the need for maintaining spending power is most pressing. We support the Kennedy-McCarthy bill for the extension and increase of governmental unemployment compensation benefits, which will provide, in part, for all workers some of the benefits which we

have negotiated under SUB. And we note the shocking fact that in a few States, such as Ohio and Indiana, reactionary State governments have prevented our and other SUB programs from operating and from paying out, without cost to the Government, millions of dollars to unemployed steel and other workers. It is ironic indeed that a Republican administration in Washington has proposed to spend tax dollars (although not enough) to extend unemployment benefits as an antidepression measure, but Republican administrations in Ohio and Indiana have prevented the steel industry from complying with its collective bargaining agreement to do the same thing without cost to the taxpayers.

In conclusion, the international executive board of the United Steelworkers of America calls upon the administration and the Congress to act now by taking all of the steps necessary to end this depression. The steps which have been taken to date are not enough. They are too little. We do not believe that in this emergency too much can be done. After all, it is far preferable to stop action if events demonstrate that it is not needed, than to permit suffering and hardship because of the failure or delay in initiating remedial action.

We endorse the proposal of President David J. McDonald for the immediate establishment of a Presidential commission consisting of representatives of management, labor, and the public to help formula and implement this program for the restoration of economic health to our economy.

Wisconsin's Historymobile Begins Its Fifth Annual Tour of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most interesting and valuable of the many services to my State performed by the Wisconsin State Historical Society is its historymobile. This trailer-mounted museum tours the entire State every summer—this will be its fifth year—carrying well-prepared visual exhibits of the State's cultural heritage for the people to see in their own communities. This project is supported by individual donations from the people of Wisconsin.

I have received an interesting statement prepared by Pat McGinnis, the director of the public contacts for the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, telling of this year's Wisconsin historymobile exhibit, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered printed, as follows:

THE HISTORYMOBILE, WISCONSIN'S ONLY TRAVELING MUSEUM

(By Pat McGinnis)

The 1958 historymobile exhibit is one which the State Historical Society of Wisconsin believes is of special significance. The Peoples of Wisconsin exhibition portrays a broad story of nationality groups who have settled in Wisconsin and who have contributed their cultural heritage to the greater progress of the State.

Because the historymobile is visited by thousands of Wisconsin children and adults each year—a half million persons have viewed it during its first 4 years on the road—the State Historical Society felt that the exhibit must carry not only history, visually and attractively presented, but a broader lesson in human understanding. The Peoples of Wisconsin exhibit does just that through its display of Old World traditions and customs, its story of immigrant and settlement, its presentation of the arts and skills of over 50 Wisconsin nationality groups, the traveling exhibit graphically unfolds a story of mutual understanding among all the peoples of the State.

In these difficult times, when understanding between nations is so ardently desired, the new historymobile exhibit is particularly appropriate. It is the hope of the State Historical Society, which operates the historymobile, that the Peoples of Wisconsin exhibit will carry with it the means whereby the citizens of Wisconsin, and especially the children, can reach a deeper understanding of human brotherhood and mutual respect for the peoples of the world.

Senator Hill Speaks on 25th Anniversary of TVA—An Example of Democracy in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago the Congress sent to the President for his signature the legislatiton establishing the TVA which has since resulted in one of the Nation's most remarkabel achievements and the creating of one of its greatest assets—not merely in material terms but also in terms of the influence it has had on the attitudes of the world toward our Nation and toward our concept of democracy. One of the fathers of that legislation is the Honorable LISTER HILL, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama. In the May issue of the Progressive, Senator HILL in a very fine article eloquently recounts the story of this legislation. I commend this article to all my colleagues and believing that it will add to a better understanding of the ideals and significance of this great national asset, I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD under unanimous consent. The article follows:

TVA: DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

(By Senator LISTER HILL)

Twenty-five years have passed since the historic legislation creating TVA was enacted, and a new generation of Americans has grown to maturity. A generation is time enough to test the truth of an idea and the strength of a concept. It is also time enough for people to forget what life was like before that concept was built into our Nation's life.

An anniversary is a time for remembrance and for recognition. It is a time for reappraisal. For me TVA's arrival at the quarter-century mark is a moment of special poignance, and of peculiar obligation. My obligation to remember and to reappraise is a deep and personal one, for I was one of the sponsors of the legislation which created TVA, and of all the members of the conference committee appointed to adjust the differences between the two Houses in 1933, I am the only one who is today a Member of the Congress. I am the only one who has had the privilege of participating year by year in legislation affecting TVA, first from my seat as a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House, later as a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. Alone of all the witnesses when the President signed the act in 1933, I have seen the dreams we wrote into the statute become reality. Dreams of a better future, of a widening economic opportunity for the people, and faith that a new kind of agency of Government could help to provide it—all these are captured in the charter we wrote for TVA.

This is a good time to tell the new generation why TVA was established, and what it has accomplished. Once more a troubled world is reminded that vision is required lest the people perish, and that the great imperative of government is to offer hospitality to dreams and then to find ways to translate them into effective works. It is a good time to give to every American a sense of pride in the vitality and the strength of TVA, and to explain, if we can, why this agency has been able to survive atacks and neglect, why it continues today valiantly planning for the future, its spirit unbroken, facing its relentless adversaries with courage, faithful to the vision written in its statute.

It is important for the new generation to know that this dream of the unified development of all the resources of a great river basin for the people's benefit was not borne out of sectional interest nor parochial concern. It was born because statesmen from the Great Plains, from the mountainous West and the industrial East, saw this Nation as one and indivisible, and knew that the country they loved and served would be strong only as each region grew in strength. The great and indomitable George Norris, of Nebraska, was the leader in the Congress. A valiant band worked with him. TVA is shaped in their image, indelibly marked with their integrity, their moral purpose, and their vision of a Federal program which would never forget the people for whom it was enacted. Its survival, its growth, its strength today is their memorial.

Let me remind this new generation what life was like in the region when TVA was created. There was a great river, its tributaries rising high in the mountains of North Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia. It flowed south through the foothills of Tennessee, turned west to meander across the sunbaked fields of Alabama and of Mississippi, swung northward to meet the Ohio in Kentucky, then to join the mighty Mississippi on its course to the gulf. It was a moody and inconstant river, changing from season to season: an angry flood in spring and winter, a sluggish trickle in summer and autumn when shoals and sandbars held it almost useless for navigation. In flood and in drought, racing or heavy with summer's languor, in every season the river was dark with the precious cargo it carried—the fertile soil of the valley, to be wasted in the sea.

For generations that soil, the priceless heritage of the people, had washed away. This was an agricultural area, one of the oldest in the Nation, an area of small farms, growing the cash crops for which the climate was ideal but which left no cover to protect the ground as it lay, bare and unfrozen, helpless against the pelting winter rains. Once majestic forests had been denuded, a sacrifice to avarice, to ignorance, and to hunger. So the rains were unimpeded. They took the soil to the river, and the river carried it to the sea, and every year the brown scars of erosion grew wider and deeper over the land-

scape. Every year more farms were abandoned. Every year fewer jobs became available, and the youth of the land was exported along with the soil and the timber. Every year the people had less hope and less faith in the future. In 1933 the people of this region had an average income only 45 percent of the national average, in spite of the wealth of resources with which nature had endowed it.

This was the region before TVA. This was the problem facing the Congress. And a heritage from World War I provided an opportunity. Then, when German submarines had halted the shipments of nitrates from Chile, the Government had built facilities for munitions production at Muscle Shoals in northern Alabama, and construction of a dam across the Tennessee was begun to supply the power required for operation of the nitrate plants. The war was over before the project was completed, and Congress had to decide what to do with the idle properties. The general assumption was that the properties were "surplus" to the Government's requirements, and should be sold. To most people the question before Congress in the early twenties was relatively simple—how to dispose of the properties most advantageously.

In the beginning only a few men had the vision to see that the properties were not surplus to the needs of the Government at all, that they were an asset which could provide the beginning of a new approach to an old problem. The fight, first to keep those properties in the hands of the Government, and then to devise a method to promote their effective use, went on for more than a decade. I came to Congress in the midst of that debate, and I shall be forever grateful that I have had a part in this great struggle throughout my whole career in public service. Twice bills to provide for Government operation of the properties at Muscle Shoals were adopted by the Congress. Twice they received a Presidential veto. It was not until 1933, under the dynamic leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, that the statute creating TVA was approved by Congress, the properties at Muscle Shoals were turned over to the new agency, and the President who had expanded the scope of the original proposals with his vision and his dreams signed the enabling legislation. A great concept started along the road to realization.

Twenty-five years have passed since that day. Today the Tennessee River is no longer a menace and a problem. It has been put to work for the people. A series of majestic dams has transformed it. Now a chain of lovely lakes, its bars and shoals have vanished, and commerce moves in stately sequence over a modern water highway. Last year more than 2 billion ton-miles of freight was carried on the river, in contrast to less than 33 million ton-miles which moved, mostly in short hauls in 1933. Grain comes down from the upper Mississippi, oil and sulfur move up from the gulf, automobiles, trucks, steel, and coal are carried for unloading at thriving river ports on the Tennessee. From the Great Lakes to the gulf the products of other regions come to new markets in this valley, and the river serves the people.

The new generation has grown accustomed to the interregional exchange of goods. And it is spared the terror of floods. Today the people know that when the rains come and the water rushes down in angry torrents, the same dams which control the river to create a navigation channel will stand watch through all the days and all the nights of peril, silent guardians of their safety. This is the only United States river so controlled, the only river where, under a single management, a whole system of dams and reservoirs can be mobilized in harmony to protect the people and their property.

The new generation has never known what it was like before TVA, how anxious watchers gathered on the river's banks, how desperate families moved their household goods to the hills. They do not know how often this uncertain river held the lives and health and well-being of the people in jeopardy.

The new generation does not know what life was like before transmission towers rose high from valleys and mountains to carry the lines that bring to the people power generated at these multipurpose dams and in gigantic, modern steam plants built by TVA. It was a different kind of region then. In 1933 there were only 225,000 residential electricity consumers in the entire area where power from TVA now reaches more than 1,300,000 domestic consumers, and they used small amounts of electricity in their homes and almost none at all on their farms. Only 3 percent of the farms, just a few near towns or cotton gins, were connected for electric service. All over the region the countryside was dark at twilight. Today more than 95 percent of the farms use electricity in their homes and in their barns.

The river is serving the people throughout its length today because of the act of Congress which created TVA. That is not all. The forest resource is coming back, the cycle of devastation reversed. Since TVA began, almost half a billion pine seedlings have been planted and are growing to maturity. Slowly the scars of erosion are healing. Where acres were brown and barren, now pastures lie green beneath the sun and the landscape is more beautiful, the land more productive.

Today this region has started the long road back to robust strength and abundant productivity. This is a record for every American to view with pride. There is nothing like it anywhere. This is the record which profoundly moves me as I recall the day when TVA began. This is the record which makes me salute the management of TVA on this anniversary. For in this region their performance has outstripped our dreams. This does not often happen. Every legislator grows weary with awareness of great concepts which grow meager in execution, of noble ideas corrupted in administration. TVA is different. The new generation should find out why. I cannot give a simple answer, but I believe that part of the magic lies in the kind of statute Congress drafted. We did a better job than we knew.

We were uncertain, as we strove to create this new agency to deal with old problems. Reluctant rivers had been improved for navigation from the beginning of the Nation. The problem of vanishing resources had been with us a long time. But always rivers and resources, problems and opportunities had been considered piecemeal. In TVA we tried something new and bold. The heart of the great concept lies in the fact that for the first time in the history of Federal legislation Congress accepted the unity of nature. In this one river basin the interrelationship of land and water, of trees and pastures, of men and nature, received statutory recognition. This was a more startling innovation than it sounds. For then and now the traditional organization of the Federal establishments divides responsibility for the resources of a river and its basin among a dozen bureaus and departments, each with a single purpose, a different head, working under separate statutes. We gave TVA responsibility to inaugurate a total program committed to the full development of all nature's resources for all the people.

At the same time we tried to build a bulwark against the steady tide of centralization. Even then we knew too many decisions were made in Washington on the basis of papers and reports; too much was decided by remote control. The experts were too far from the problems, the administrators too far from the people. So we told the Board of TVA to make its headquarters in the region, close to the work to be undertaken. We made it an independent agency, corporate in form, removed as far as possible from centralized control in Washington. We gave the power of decision to the men in the field.

We wanted TVA to be efficient, and we accepted the basic principle of modern management, still rarely recognized in Government. We gave authority commensurate with responsibility and we determined to judge by results. By law we freed the agency from the rigidities of the classified civil service. We told the Board to select its own employees, but barred for all time political considerations in appointments. We authorized the Board to buy or condemn the land and the equipment required in its program, and to sell whatever proved to be surplus. They could enter into contracts, and sue and be sued.

All these characteristics have proved to be essential—the unified approach, the location in the region, the accountability which is the counterpart of independence, the stern rejection of political manipulation. All have been vital to TVA's success. But greater than any one of those, I believe, is the fact that somehow the overriding purpose of the statute was clear on every page. It was clear in the legislative history of more than a dozen years. These administrative innovations were not to be ends in themselves, nor were the projects and the programs they would facilitate be objectives in themselves. Every undertaking was seen as a means to widen the economic opportunity and promote the well-being of the people. That is of course the ultimate objective of every Government program, but the purpose for which projects are built is too often obscured by the projects themselves. Construction becomes an end in itself. Somehow, in some way, some ingredient in the formula we devised for TVA has kept the overriding purpose sharp and clear. Every report from TVA reveals it. It is clear every time a witness from TVA testifies before a committee of the Congress. It accounts for the notable efficiency and the high morale of the staff of TVA. They never forget the purpose of their labor.

It was an act of faith when, after so many years of effort, Congress placed the destiny of this new agency in the hands of the three men chosen for the board. That faith proved to be contagious, and early in its history TVA took the steps which have made the people of the region a part of the great program. It mobilized their energies for a total assault on the forces of resource devastation. It was an act of faith in the people when TVA rejected such alluring proposals as the recommended purchase of great tracts of forest land, all abused and some abandoned, in order that a gigantic program of reforestation might be inaugurated on Government-owned land. It was an act of faith when TVA declined to begin the acquisition of vast acreages of wornout cropland that it might be devoted, unhampered by the need to support farm families, to experimentation in the application of the new fertilizers to be produced as Muscle Shoals. It chose the slower, the harder way. TVA determined that the people who in the period of their private ownership become trustees of the Nation's resources should themselves take part in the program.

A new epoch in Federal administration began. The experts got out of their offices, away from their papers. They went to the people, and the people joined them in a great demonstration program. Farmers joined and showed their neighbors what would happen to the land and to their incomes as they began to use the new kinds of fertilizers produced by TVA as tools to

change the management of their farms. Owners of woodlots and forest joined. Slowly the demonstrations spread over the valley and farther—demonstrations in tree planting, in selective cutting, in sawmill operations; demonstrations in fertilizer use, in new farming practices, in the development of recreational areas.

Today the average income of the people has risen from 45 percent to 63 percent of the national average. There are more jobs for the new generation. There are jobs in cheese factories and in poultry processing plants because the land has been turned from soil-exhausting to soil-conserving crops. There are jobs in the forest products industries, 50,000 of them, because tall trees stand on land that was barren in 1933, and the people plant and they plan for a stronger forest resource in the future, investing their private funds in their faith. Last year alone new private investment in wood-using industries in the valley reached a total of more than $43 million.

There are new kinds of jobs in new manufacturing establishments. There are jobs because of the development of the magnificent recreational resource which has already attracted private investment of more than $80 million, as TVA has divested itself of area after area, and turned over to the people, for public and private development, the land adjacent to the beautiful man-made lakes. In this region, as nowhere else, the people have participated in a Federal program inaugurated to promote their well-being. They have taken risks. They have had faith. They have shared the dream.

The people have had a major part in the development of the great regional power system. With the exception of direct sales to agencies of the United States and a few large industries, TVA is a wholesaler of power. Today 151 distribution systems with a total investment of almost $600 million deliver the power to the consumer. All are locally owned and managed, two privately owned, the rest rural cooperatives or municipal systems. In contracts with TVA these distributors agree to charge the rates established to promote abundant use, and to dispose of revenues in such a way as to achieve the objectives in the statute. In the beginning their participation in the program was an act of faith, too, for when TVA's resale rates were announced in 1933 no one knew what revenues those rates would provide. The experts of the private companies serving the area said the people would not use the power the dams would produce. The people of this region have proved them wrong. The high use, low rate pricing policies which the private power companies had been too timid to risk turned out to be sound. At low rates, the volume of sales did rise, and increased revenues resulted. It was a demonstration that the public interest could be served without the financial ruin predicted by the private power companies.

I am proud when I survey the financial record of TVA. My colleagues of 1933 would be proud if they could know that from the beginning, revenues from power sales have covered all the costs of operation, including depreciation, and in addition have provided for the Government, the owner, a return which has averaged 4 percent on the investment. I am proud to know that over $400 million from proceeds has been reinvested in the system, enhancing the Government's investment without requiring appropriation, and that $240 million has been paid to the Treasury in cash. But I am proud that TVA has never forgotten why it was created. It was created to serve the people, all the people of the United States, to demonstrate what happens to a region and to a power supplier when power is used as a tool to develop the economy of a region, to raise the standard of living of the people.

TVA was not conceived as a military project. But today TVA is in the forefront in the development of atomic weapons, missiles, vital light metals, and new chemicals. Almost three-fourths of TVA's power output goes to defense and defense-related industries. More than half—a staggering 30 billion kilowatt-hours in 1957—goes to the Atomic Energy Commission plants at Oak Ridge and Paducah. These plants alone use twice as much electricity as New York City, and more than is used by all the homes, businesses, and industries in each of 41 States.

The triumph of TVA is not recorded in the excellent financial reports, or in its contributions to the Nation's defense. It is recorded in the homes and farms of the region—in the installation of stoves and washing machines, refrigerators and freezers, milking machines, pumps, water systems, and hay driers. It is recorded in the increased use of electricity by the people, not only in the region it serves but all over the Nation. The symbol of TVA is not a balance sheet, no matter how impressive. The symbol of TVA is revealed when the lights go on at nightfall all over the region. They shine from barns, and kitchens, and parlors, deep in the coves and high on the hillsides.

When President Roosevelt sent his special message to the Congress urging prompt enactment of the TVA legislation, he said, "If we are successful here we can march on, step by step, in a like development of other great natural territorial units within our borders." We have been successful here. While we have not yet marched on to the creation of other valley authorites, we are moving step by step in the improvement of Federal administration of resource development. TVA has had an important impact on other Federal programs. I hear echoes of TVA when plans are now submitted to the Congress on a river basin basis, when coordinating committees are established in the field as the central agencies of Government and try to achieve the shadow of the unified approach without the substance. I see a trace of TVA when the potential recreational value to the people is included in the benefits expected to be realized from construction of new Federal projects, and small watersheds are brought to our attention. I note with satisfaction improvement in the land purchasing procedures of some Federal agencies as they adapt TVA experience to their requirements. I am aware of better personnel practices as a result of TVA's development of its independent merit system, and I see modest efforts to follow its pioneering in the adoption of effective and honest procedures of collective bargaining. I see the results of TVA's achievement when I read the advertisements of the fertilizer companies, as they begin to provide the farmer with new and better plant food for his land. I find it in the lowered rates for electricity charged by private companies today.

The spirit of TVA echoes around the world. I hear the echo from India, from Iran, from Uganda, and from Wales. Everywhere, as free men plan their future, they know their destiny depends upon the effective development of all of nature's resources for the benefit of all the people. To them TVA is a pace-setter and a symbol of hope. Its past is open for examination and for analysis. Its future lies in the hands of the new generation.

Schoolchildren Visiting Capitol Are Inspiring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there was published in the Washington Post and Times-Herald this morning, May 5, an article by George Dixon entitled "Schoolchildren Visiting Capitol Are Inspiring."

The one paragraph which attracted my attention more than all the others reads:

> The youthful visitors can't help being better equipped Americans as a result of observing Government at first hand. The impact is something that never could be generated by books.

Mr. Dixon in his article refers to the youth who have been visiting the Capitol this spring, who have come in great numbers. We are always happy to have these youth visit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOLCHILDREN VISITING CAPITOL ARE INSPIRING

(By George Dixon)

Every time I visit the Capitol of the United States these days I absorb a wonderful feeling of reassurance. This is because the great edifice is being overrun. But, happily, the overrunning is not being done by Members of Congress, political horse-traders, favor-seekers, and lobbyists. It is being done by schoolchildren.

Public- and high-school students swarm the Halls of Congress in such numbers that some of our most unresilient Senators and Representatives have to flatten themselves against corridor walls to let the kids squeeze past. But I have yet to hear a complaint from either side. When the compressed lawmakers sag back to normal shape they grunt approval of youth's mounting interest in the operations of Government.

Never before have students below college level shown such avid interest in the goings-on beneath the Capitol dome. Just the other day, to give a concrete illustration, more than 3,000 took the full guided tour through the double-winged structure.

How do I know that all were public- and high-school kids? Because they arrived in organized school groups and were accorded the bargain school rate of 15 cents. All others who take guided tours of the Capitol, from college students to run-of-the-mill tourists, have to pay 25 cents.

Fifteen cents doesn't seem like much in these inflationary times, but I often wish our elected representatives, who run everything in the Capitol—as well as the rest of the District of Columbia—would let the young students in free. I don't feel their interest in how the Nation's laws are made should be subject to assessment.

True, the price of Capitol tours does not represent any of the current inflation. In fact the price is exactly the same today as it was 81 years ago. There has been no increase since Grant was President. But, even so, I don't think students should have to pay for doing something that augurs so well for the future of the Nation.

The youthful visitors can't help being better equipped Americans as a result of observing Government at first hand. The impact is something that never could be generated by books.

It makes you feel good all the way down inside to observe those youngsters making their appraisals. The two places in which they manifest the great overwhelming interest, are the Senate and House Chambers. They want to hear the debates. Sometimes they hear some very bewildering oratory, but not all the time, despite a popular misconception. Frequently, our elected servants get up on the floor and make very great and good sense.

Moreover, it often seems to me that the lawmakers try to make more sense when the students are in the galleries. I am convinced that young and old benefit. I think it's one of the most hopeful things we have.

The 24 guides who conduct the Capitol tours are exceptionally well trained. They are not allowed to rattle off any old sightseeing junk. They not only must know what they're saying, but be prepared to answer some very difficult questions.

From their studies, these kids have an astounding knowledge of what they are going to see, before they ever get here. For instance, they know the history of the "whispering" spot in Statuary Hall. They know that the acoustical freak was discovered by John Quincy Adams when he was a Representative from Massachusetts. The man who was to be our sixth President thought at first that political foes across the hall were talking too loudly. Then he found that if you so much as whisper at one spot on the floor it is clearly audible at a corresponding spot on the other side of the chamber.

I want those kids to keep coming here. I don't care how much they crowd us.

Depression and Prosperity Start at the Grassroots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 11, 1958

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, when we think this economic situation through, I feel certain that many Members of this body will agree that both prosperity and depressions originate at the grassroots and that the best antidote for the present unfortunate circumstances in which millions of Americans now find themselves is a return to the principles of economy and frugality in public as well as private affairs. I believe we have been taking too much purchasing power away from the American people for too long a time.

Now is the time to curb big government and big spending as well.

It is a cardinal principle of economics that the wealth of a nation consists of those things useful to man individually or society collectively.

In a true sense wealth can only be created by the application of labor with or without tools to the resources of the earth. For example, a tree in a forest is a natural resource. So, too, is the coal in the ground. A person can sit under a tree and enjoy the comfort of its shade. He may contemplate the coal in the ground but that will not keep him warm when wintertime comes.

However, if man, using the crudest of tools, cuts down the tree and fashions its parts into a handle for his ax or a mine prop, by this application of labor he has converted the natural resource into something useful to, or usable by, man. So having converted the resource into a useful commodity the commodity so created becomes available in trade, it now has a value and can be symbolized as wealth.

Where wealth is created over and above the normal consumptive demands in the form of capital, producer, and consumer goods, the accumulated excess serves as a deterrent to further production, and normally will cause a lowering of values.

We in the United States are now witnessing the spectacle of lowered production because of the $90 billion inventory of capital, producer and consumer goods now in the hands of the manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers of our country. And the more than $8 billion of surplus agricultural commodities held under loan or owned outright by the Commodity Credit Corporation has acted to depress the commodity markets for American farmers.

In attempting to analyze the present depression, I have given much thought to the millions of Americans now caught in a trap of debt and taxes from which there will be no relief except by the exercise of frugality and economy in all public and private affairs. The tax burden that has been heaped upon the American people at Federal, State, and local levels takes approximately 30 percent of our national income. The more than $350 billion in known private debts, coupled with $325 billion in public debt takes nearly $25 billion of the national income for interest alone.

The inflation which has lowered the purchasing power of the dollar from 82.5 cents in 1946 to approximately 48 cents today has wrought havoc with the value of life-insurance policies, investments, and savings of practically every kind.

Burdened with taxes and wallowing in a morass of debt the people down at the grassroot are trying valiantly to get their noses above water and out of debt. So as they pay their debts, they are restricting their purchasing and business is bad and the inventories are not moving like they used to when money and credit was so easy to get and use.

Now there is another facet to this depression which deserves some attention.

During the past 12 years our taxpayers have been called upon to provide some $73,690,000,000 in foreign grants and credits. This is $20 billion more than we spent from the Federal Treasury for the benefit of our own people. And I ask, Mr. Speaker, that a table showing the expenditures for the past 12 years be included at this point in my remarks:

SPENDING FOR FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND MILITARY AID IN 12 FISCAL YEARS GREATER THAN GRANTS-IN-AID TO STATES PLUS CHECKS TO INDIVIDUALS

In the 12 fiscal years 1946 through 1957, inclusive, the United States Treasury has disbursed more of the taxpayer's dollars for foreign economic and military aid than has been spent in grants-in-aid to State and local government plus all the checks direct to individuals for economic relief, veteran benefits, and all other purposes.

As a matter of fact, this obvious preference of foreign peoples over taxpaying American citizens probably will be one of the debatable issues in the coming congressional elections which canont be soft-pedaled by political maneuvering.

The table following shows the amounts in separate columns spent for foreign aid (grants and credits) and the amounts disbursed as grants-in-aid and checks direct to individuals for the 12-fiscal-year period:

Fiscal year	Reported gross foreign aid	Grants-in-aid and checks to individuals
1946	[1] $6,904,122,806	$1,209,197,198
1947	[2] 8,523,477,612	1,604,670,695
1948	8,087,000,000	5,561,064,446
1949	7,602,029,206	5,493,710,763
1950	6,338,536,000	5,518,878,365
1951	6,624,286,000	4,890,097,620
1952	5,098,000,000	4,241,188,300
1953	7,030,000,000	4,053,941,704
1954	5,155,410,175	4,284,370,322
1955	4,380,920,377	4,306,000,220
1956	4,473,177,000	5,192,136,067
1957	4,625,000,000	6,468,469,730
Total	73,690,136,176	53,194,004,197

[1] Excluding loans to several American Republics.
[2] Including British loan for $3,750,000,000 of which only $2,050,000,000 is included in total above. (Balance not disbursed.) Excludes payments totaling $3,225,975,000 to capital of the International Bank and Monetary Fund.

This bulletin has been compiled from official reports of the Secretary of the Treasury and from reports once either confidential or restricted concerning the foreign transactions of the United States.

Much of the $73,690,136,176 in grants and credits to foreign governments had to be borrowed when our Treasury was running deficits. The cost of the interest is estimated at an additional $10 billion.

Mr. Speaker, much of the foreign aid money has been used by other countries to tool up their industries for competition with the United States not only in the markets of the world but right here at home as well.

Recent hearing before the Ways and Means Committee on the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended, indicates that such basic industries as plywood, textiles, ceramics, glass, steel, cement, and scientific and technical instruments including clocks, watches, cameras, and optical goods have already been severely damaged by foreign imports produced with labor paid far below the American scales.

Just a few days ago, the chairman of the board of the United States Steel Co., Mr. Roger M. Blough, in an address before the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, pointed out that the steelmakers of Dusseldorf, Germany, were able to lay down barbed wire in Cleveland for $40 a ton less than the equivalent product produced by the American Steel & Wire Co., a local subsidiary of United States Steel.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include 2 tables showing the value of our foreign trade in 1956 and 10 examples of specific imports which are damaging the American economy at the present time:

FOREIGN AIDERS AND FREE TRADERS WORK BOTH SIDES OF THE POLITICAL STREET

Around Capitol Hill in Washington almost daily there appears a number of prominent American industrialists and businessmen, including the representatives of boards of trade and chambers of commerce, who contact the Members of Congress and who are available to appear as witnesses for and in behalf of the President's bill for $3.9 billion in additional foreign economic and military aid and for a 5-year extension of the presidential authority to negotiate reciprocal-trade agreements which includes authority to raise or lower tariff or custom rates on imports.

One of the principal arguments for the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is that 4,500,000 Americans find their employment because of foreign trade. This is a specious argument which on careful analysis can be shown to be completely phony.

In the calendar year 1956 the exports of commodities from the United States were valued at $18,837,872,000 and the imports which came in were valued at $12,490,240,000, leaving a favorable trade balance of $6,347,632,000.

Assuming that a large number of American workingmen had their jobs displaced by the cheap foreign imports it cannot be shown that as many as 4,500,000 Americans could receive a living wage from the trade balance of $6.4 billion. This would distribute only $1,422.22 per capita. The table following shows the exports and imports according to classes for the calendar year 1956:

Group classification	Exports	Imports
0 Animal and animal products, edible	$398,000,000	$431,000,000
0 Animal and animal products, inedible	280,000,000	310,000,000
1 Vegetable food products, and beverages	2,017,000,000	2,771,000,000
2 Vegetable products, inedible	1,046,000,000	769,000,000
3 Textiles, cotton, wool, other	1,376,000,000	1,027,000,000
4 Wood and paper	441,000,000	1,588,000,000
5 Nonmetallic minerals	1,810,000,000	1,851,000,000
6 Metals and manufactures	2,006,000,000	2,349,000,000
7 Machinery and vehicles	6,687,000,000	631,000,000
8 Chemicals and related products	1,248,000,000	274,000,000
9 Miscellaneous	1,518,000,000	489,000,000
Total	18,838,000,000	12,490,000,000

In 1956 the Department of Commerce reports 49.8 percent of the imports came into the United States duty free and on the balance custom collections amounted to $709,690,000 an average rate of 11.32 percent.

COMMENTS UPON THE FOREIGN TRADE OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE YEAR 1956

It was reported that American exports in 1956 were valued at $18,838,000,000 while the imports into the United States were of a declared value of but $12,490,000,000 making it appear that there was a favorable trade balance of $6,347,632,000.

In presenting the statistics on foreign trade, the Department of Commerce gave the facts only. There was no attempt made to show to what extent either exports or imports were financed by loans from the Export-Import Bank of Washington or other international banking and financing organization in which the American taxpayers have an interest. Among such organizations are the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development which has made loans for electrical generation and distribution; for transport; for agriculture and forestry and for the development of such industries as iron and steel, pulp and paper, fertilizer and chemicals; mining and for development banks. These loans totaled $3,107,966,464 outstanding as of June 30, 1957.

The Export-Import Bank loans outstanding as of June 30, 1957 totaled $2,520,000,000 exclusively to foreign governments or principals.

Another source by which American dollars are used to build up the economies of foreign nations is the development loan fund of the International Cooperation Administration for which the Congress by Public Law 279, 85th Congress, 1st session, appropriated an advance of $500 million and for which the President asks an appropriation of $650 million for fiscal 1959.

These are examples of how our tax dollars are being used to help build up other countries to ultimately use cheap labor and compete in the world markets with the products of American industry and labor.

Here are 10 examples of manufactures imported into the United States in 1956:

Electric lamp bulbs		157,051,880
Plate glass	square feet	38,754,767
Plywood	do	[1]706,523,548
Glazed tile	do	13,383,174
Binoculars	units	4,249,498
Bicycles	do	1,173,346
Cameras	do	1,034,385
Cotton shirts	dozen	1,225,578
Table cutlery	units	39,309,030
Sewing machines	do	55,156

[1] Over 50 percent of total used.

These are only a few examples of what foreign factories are shipping to the United States, in competition with American products.

Worcester Telegram Endorses Food Stamp Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am indebted to Mr. Leslie Moore, executive editor of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, for sending me a copy of that newspaper's editorial page of April 29 containing an editorial discussing my proposal for a food stamp plan for distribution of surplus food to our needy citizens.

The editorial Food Stamp Plan and the Needy, endorses the idea for a food stamp program even though the newspaper points out that the taxpayers may have to pay the cost of operating such a program to end hunger.

I might say, however, that the cost of a food stamp plan would not be a significant factor at all—for this reason: the Government already buys up and stores this food and has very heavy storage costs; furthermore, it pays the cost now of shipping huge quantities of this food into many States under the present so-called distribution program; in addition, it even pays the ocean freight in many cases in shipping this food overseas to give to foreign governments for the assistance of their own people.

A food stamp plan will save many of the costs which the Government now sustains in trying to get rid of this food.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I submit for inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the editorial which I mentioned, Food Stamp Plan and the Needy, which appeared on April 29 in the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, as follows:

FOOD STAMP PLAN AND THE NEEDY

Two women Representatives in Congress—Mrs. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN from Missouri, and Mrs. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS from Michigan—want the Government to revive the food stamp plan. Their argument is based on three facts: There is widespread unemployment and consequent need of help among many families; there is a surplus of farm products; the Government gives aid to needy people overseas.

Under the food stamp plan as it was applied in the Roosevelt administration, various stamps were distributed to needy families. These stamps could be used to buy specified foods and foodstuffs, at regular stores. The storekeepers got the stamps redeemed at banks.

The merits of the plan were that relief was given through the regular channels of trade, and farm surpluses were put to good use. A disadvantage was that it required grocers and banks to do extra work. The stamps were a form of money—money which could be used for one purpose only—buying certain foods.

There was no magic in the plan. The taxpayers footed the bill in the end. But apparently nobody devised a better method of bringing together the farmer who had more products than he could sell and the family lacking enough to eat.

The Traditional Role of New England in World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable Henry Kearns, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Affairs. It is a very clear approach to the problem of reciprocal trade. While I do not necessarily agree with all of Mr. Kearns' remarks, I believe he states the case in a very clear and emphatic manner.

There being no objetcion, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRADITIONAL ROLE OF NEW ENGLAND IN WORLD TRADE

I am indeed grateful for the opportunity to appear before you this evening on this very important occasion to discuss with you the traditional role played in world trade by the great New England area. It has been a great honor and privilege to work with one of New England's most illustrious sons, Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks. It has been inspiring for me to participate with

the Secretary in serving our country through the Department of Commerce.

Inasmuch as my residence is about as far removed from New England as you can get and still be in the United States, my principal contact with this important area has been through the history books. But in southern California we are proud of New England too. New England has a tradition of foresight, commonsense, courage, and energy. This great city of Boston has for many years exemplified the Yankee trading spirit. From the earliest days of our country, clipper ships sailed from this area to travel the seven seas and to develop foreign commerce for the United States. Boston is the center of private American investment throughout the world.

Nowhere in history has there been an indication that this area bred fear, uncertainty, or lack of self-confidence in its people. Indeed everywhere in the world, the outstanding symbol of commerce has been the intrepid Yankee trader.

There can be no quarrel with the concept that commerce, that is the exchange of goods and services, brings profit both to the buyer and the seller. Without commerce a locality, city, county, states, or nation seriously limits its ability to progress and to care for its people. The world is becoming increasingly interdependent, and at this time our country requires raw materials from the far corners of the world. More important, hundreds of millions of people in far off lands want and need products of our factories and farms.

Just as in the past when the Yankee trader had the greatest influence in the forward surge of our American economy, so today the Yankee trader is needed to keep this world free and capable of constantly improving its lot. Therefore, it is rather disturbing to observe in our industrial and business world so many examples of apparently frightened men. Representatives of business interests in New England, as well as in other areas of the country, are telling their representatives in Congress that America can no longer compete with the rest of the world, that it must have protection against encroachment of foreign goods in our stores and market places.

The textile business, which was originally centered in New England, is beset with serious problems. The evidence, however, does not point to imports as the sole cause of concern of the industry. Indeed, imports are probably one of the lesser problems, inasmuch as we actually export more finished textiles than we import. In the field of flatware, bicycles, watches, and some 26 sensitive items of domestic commerce, industry is still claiming that it must have protection if it is to live.

From the early days of our Republic the tariff battle has been waged. In the past it was believed that a price differential in the form of import duties upon goods coming into this country would give the American producer the necessary protection for him to compete with foreign producers. If those foreign producers operated at a lower wage rate, with greater access to raw materials, or generally in a more favorable productive position, high protective tariffs were demanded.

It is strange, therefore, to now see a shift in this original stronghold of free enterprise to a demand for fixed, arbitrary quotas. To me it is a completely incongruous thing to hear business and industrial leaders extolling the virtues of free enterprise, private property, and the ability to acquire it, referring to these principles as one of the bulwarks of our American economy, while at the same time denying their real belief in free enterprise by requesting and demanding strict quantitative limitations upon competitive articles.

Let me point out, if I may, some of the fallacies of the so-called quota demand.

1. Import quotas add an element of inflexibility and rigidity to world trade, tend to become fixed, and do not permit exporting countries to share in expanding markets.

2. Import quotas by their very nature must be based upon arbitrary decisions of Government; they inject far-reaching governmental intervention and control into the market place. This has always been repugnant to New Englanders in particular.

3. A quota system would require splitting up the market among exporting countries based not upon the decisions of the consumer or buyer, but upon the arbitrary decision of some governmental representatives.

4. Quotas require a huge arbitrary bureaucracy for their administration.

5. History is replete with the examples of retaliation in the form of quotas placed in reflection of our actions; quota action by this country immediately brings about similar restrictions by the countries affected. These restrictions limit with the same rigidity, exports from this country.

6. Classic examples of the early 1930's when import quotas as well as high tariffs were adopted by this country, leave no doubt that import quotas can stifle expanding world trade, destroy markets, and bring about decreasing opportunities for business, agriculture, and industry.

7. From the first days of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act this country has worked continuously to remove quantitative restrictions from the world trade market place. This principle was incorporated in the basic understandings of the GATT. The history of quota removal is a good one and it would certainly be turning back the clock, contracting rather than expanding business opportunity, if quotas were adopted by this country as a means of giving protection to some elements of American business.

8. Quotas have the effect of protecting the inefficient and removing the competitive impetus to new designs, the initiative to seek new techniques, and greater effort to produce in behalf of the consumer.

9. The historic tendency of business to blame its faults and shortcomings on some extraneous force leaves no doubt that if quotas are applied to a portion of American competitive imports, widespread demand for similar protection will develop within a relatively short time in any industry experiencing business difficulties.

Thus, once Government intervention is initiated it tends to feed on itself, constantly spreading to day-to-day business operations, and further curtailing the automatic market adjustments of competition. In these days of international political tension it is absolutely essential that this country retain its world leadership in the economic field. It would be an utter tragedy to adopt the most rigid, most unwise course of all, that of giving protection to American business by initiating a system of severe quantitative import limitations, namely quotas.

May I emphasize now the real stake that this country, and especially New England, has in our world trade picture. It has been well publicized, but should be repeated. More than 4½ million Americans make their jobs as a result of world trade. Last year the United States exported more than $19½ billion worth of our goods exclusive of military, much of it produced in the factories and farms of New England. Last year we imported $13 billion worth of the goods of the world. Approximatetly $10 billion of this was in the noncompetitive sector. It consisted of goods we need to keep our industrial plants operating smoothly and effectively.

Out of a total world trade in 1957 of approximately $32½ billion, it is estimated that less than $3 billion gave serious competition to any element of American business. Yankee traders can recognize a 10 to 1 favorable ratio as pretty good grounds for continuing business. It would therefore be most shortsighted to jeopardize this great factor in continually expanding business.

New England is interested in imports of petroleum and petroleum products. In 1956 this amounted to $123 million. You are interested in the importation of wool for your textile mills. In 1946 this amounted to $37 million. Then there are rubber, sugar, hides and skins, coffee, cocoa, tea, bauxite, iron ore, molasses, and hundreds of other items that move in world trade. These help build the economy of New England, secure jobs, and make it possible for this important area of the country to live a better and fuller life. And this, I repeat, is on the import side.

You are also probably aware that on the export side machinery made by the skilled craftsmen of this area goes to all the corners of the earth. Transportation equipment, in all forms, such as aircraft, trucks, busses, etc., are found traveling the world's highways and skyways. Finished textiles, wood pulp and printing, leather and shoes, primary metals, rubber products, instruments, all create hundreds of thousands of jobs in this area. These jobs are entirely dependent upon our ability to sell American goods to countries of the free world. Our great shipping business, stevedoring, processing for shipment, insuring, all these elements of your economy have a direct interest in the outcome of our world-trade picture.

How shortsighted it will be if the Members of Congress representing this vital, dynamic, courageous part of the country fail to provide the leadership to which we Americans are entitled. They must not allow a relatively few spokesmen of some industries, in selfish, shortsighted presentations of the need for severe limitations uopn competition, to cramp the expanison of world trade that will be vitally essential if we are to grow and prosper in the years to come.

Today, as never before, we must realize that this country's production capacity exceeds its ability to consume by a wide margin. Unless the products of our fields and factories are shipped to the countries of the world we will find ourselves stagnant and limited in our further development.

In the next 60 days this country will make its fateful choice. It may listen to the voices of the frightened men. Or it may listen to those who speak in confident, sure tones of the glowing, prosperous future which can lie ahead.

If it listens to the former it will surely preside over the destruction of our great world trade which has helped bring this country prosperity never before known in the history of the world. It will thus bring economic chaos upon our workers, farmers, and business people.

If it listens to those who speak with vision and courage, it will set in motion the positive forces which will build our world trade to even greater heights. Our Congress must provide legislation which will tell the world that we intend to maintain a positive, aggressive, and thoughtful leadership in the field of world trade. It will tell the anxious world that we will be in business to stay, that our policy will be constant, for at least 5 years. It will give us negotiating authority to reduce impediments to our export trade, and in return we will show our willingness to give reciprocal consideration to imports.

This country needs the courageous leadership of New England, and it needs it now.

Poles Note 350th Anniversary of First Arrival in New World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, May 3, 1958, was the 167th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day.

In commemoration of Poland's National Day, I would like to insert the following article by Ed Wellejus, which appeared in the Erie Morning News of February 27, 1958, pertaining to the 350th anniversary of the arrival of the first poles in America.

Approximately 30,000 of my fine constituents in Erie, Pa., and at least 10,000 more in Crawford and Mercer Counties, are of Polish extraction, and the Polish record in helping to develop this country is one of which they are justly proud.

It is my firm belief that the Polish people, long desiring their liberation from the Iron Curtain, are deserving of every consideration that our Government, through the United Nations, can give them to consummate their cherished dream of freedom:

POLES NOTE 350TH ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST ARRIVAL IN NEW WORLD

(By Ed Wellejus)

This year marks the 350th anniversary of the arrival of the first Poles in America.

Erie's Polish community is expected to stage several commemorative celebrations during the year to mark the anniversary of the arrival of the first Polish immigrants on American soil in Jamestown on October 1, 1608.

The Poles are credited by historians with:

1. Helping to save the first English settlement in America from total failure.
2. Building the first industry in the new world.
3. Saving the life of the colony's first president, Capt. John Smith.
4. Calling the first strike in America. This they won. The strike was called to gain civil liberties and not for economic gains.
5. Manufacturing the first export goods in America.

The colony of Jamestown was founded in 1607 by the Virginia Company of London under a charter from James I. One of the main obstacles to development of the colony was the lack of skilled craftsmen essential to survival.

For many centuries, Poland had been England's principal source of pitch, tar, soap ashes, rosin, flax, cordage, masts, wainscots, and glass. It was natural then that England, wishing to develop her own sources of these materials in America, turned to the Poles for help and advice. Experts were hired and persuaded to depart from Poland for America.

Thus, on October 1, 1608, aboard a ship *Mary and Margaret*, commanded by Capt. Christopher Newport, a company of Poles arrived at Jamestown. Incomplete records show the following names:

Michael Nowicki of London, expatriate Polish nobleman and leader of the group; Zbigniew Stefanski of Wloclawek, Jan Mata of Krakow, Stanislaw Sadowski of Radom, Jan Bogdan of Kolomyja. All were journeymen in desperately needed crafts and experienced soldiers as well. Captain Smith knew Bogdan personally from his visit to Poland in 1603.

The Poles immediately set to work as artisans and instructors, and within 3 weeks had roaring fires going under a glass furnace. This was the first factory in America.

Within 2 months of their arrival, they produced enough tar, pitch, soap ashes, green glass bottles and vases to load the ship Mary and Margaret on her return trip to England. This was the first export of manufactured goods from America.

According to contemporary accounts, two Poles—Zbigniew Stefanski and Jan Bogdan saved Captain Smith's life when he was ambushed by Indian Chief Papahegh.

Reorganization of Defense Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL J. KILDAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a column by Constantine Brown which was published in the Washington Post of May 2, 1958:

EISENHOWER AND REORGANIZATION: SOME CAPITOL LEADERS FEEL PRESIDENT INJECTS HIMSELF TOO FAR INTO DRIVE

(By Constantine Brown)

The consensus of Senate and House leaders is that President Eisenhower has been placing undue emphasis and has gone too far in injecting his own personality into the campaign to put through the Pentagon reorganization program—essentially a product of his White House advisers.

According to responsible legislators, there will be a reorganization bill this year, but it will resemble only vaguely that offered as a "must" by the Chief Executive. That some of the increasing fat in our military establishments has to be trimmed is not being argued. At least 5 percent of our huge defense budgets represents waste.

The armed services need streamlining—as do most of our executive departments which have become topheavy with well-entrenched bureaucrats. But the fundamental opposition to the President's bill is based on the small print which the heads of the armed services committees are reading closely.

Despite the assurances of White House spokesmen that the idea of creating a single chief of staff is as alien to them as it is repulsive to Congress, the legislators who have examined the bill carefully are convinced that the ingredients for such a step do exist in the pending project. They feel certain the present administration will not take advantage but they fear the uncertain future.

Germany, from the time it became a world power after the Franco-Prussian War of 1870 to Hitler's short-lived regime, had a general staff with an omnipotent chief responsible only to the head of state. The Reichstag in the pre-Hitler days appropriated vast amounts for the Armed Forces but had little—if any—control over them. And when the showdown (for which the military forces had been trained for years) came, the single chief of staff system failed the German people.

The German chief of the general staff was selected by the emperor or the dictator, not necessarily because he was the best available man but because he was the most pliable. This cannot happen in this country, it is pointed out, not only because President Eisenhower does not favor this alien system but also because any promotion in the armed services must be approved by the Senate. This is true, say the opponents of the bill who look at the fine print. But they add that it is very rare when the Senate refuses to confirm an appointee of the Chief Executive, especially when the appointment is made in his role as Commander in Chief.

The project offered by the White House is not intended to last only for the next 2 years. It is likely, if passed by Congress, to remain on the statute books for years. Despite the assurances from the White House and from Defense Secretary McElroy that the traditional services (Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps) will not lose their identity by a merger, there is no saying what another President, acting on his own or on the advice of his single chief of staff, may do in the future. This merger power is not actually specified in the law, but according to the testimony of the Defense Secretary, himself, it could be so interpreted.

Legislators remember too well that President Truman, while in office, described the Marines as policemen. This caused a furore in the country. Mr. Truman explained that he did not mean what he was supposed to have meant. But, actually, it was known by those close to the Pentagon that there was a serious drive at that time to do away with the Marine Corps and integrate its divisions into the Army where, it was said, they actually belong.

The advocates of suppression of our elite corps pointed out that the Marines had an important role in the early days of the last century when they fought from aboard ships or were used as a landing force in such places as the shores of Tripoli. But in these modern days, it was said, they no longer belong to the Navy and should not be kept as a separate entity from the Army. In theory this appeared correct, but in effect the Marine Corps has proven its mettle and has become an almost legendary force because of its tradition and the fierce pride of its men in their uniform.

The present administration, if given the power by Congress, would not interfere with the Marines. But there are even today many who scoff at tradition and there is no saying whether in the future we may not have a Defense Secretary of that type.

A Cheer for Miss Knight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Cheer for Miss Knight," which deals with Miss Frances G. Knight, head of the passport office of the Department of State.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CHEER FOR MISS KNIGHT

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

There isn't much good news going these days, so how would it be to hear a word of cheer from Miss Frances G. Knight?

Miss Knight is the director of the passport office of the Department of State. She

succeeded the fabulous Mrs. Ruth B. Shipley who was a civil servant of great charm and stature in the Federal hierarchy.

The good word from Miss Knight is that she has revamped the methods and modernized the equipment of the passport office to the considerable relief and convenience of the United States taxpayer. The Government's General Service Administration estimated that these savings last year amounted to $386,000 which is not a great sum when posed against the multibillion dollar spending which appears now to have been saddled on the taxpayers until the end of time.

Neither is it hay, however, and the conserved sum looks even more attractive by reason of Miss Knight's informal explanation that additional savings were obtained because the passport office averaged an increase of 5.5 percent in work productivity per employee in 1957.

Moreover, Miss Knight expects her employees to absorb a 5-percent additional increase in their workload during the next 2 years.

News of such administrative economies is scarce here in Washington despite assurances from the top executive officials that waste shall be wrung from the operation of the Government. The top brass either does not mean it, or the top brass is unable to plug the comparatively small leaks as Miss Knight plugged that one in her office.

While she was about it, Miss Knight modernized and improved the conditions under which the citizen can obtain a passport. For example, the citizen applying for a passport no longer need be accompanied by a witness to testify to his identity. And, if he desires, the citizen may pay his passport fee by personal check.

The passport office now will accept for identification purposes about what a bank would accept in cashing a check, such as driver's license or a Government security pass. Miss Knight explained that anyone who would fraudulently apply for a passport would not hesitate to produce a phony witness, so why clutter the counters and corridors of passport issuing agencies with two persons for each passport involved.

Miss Knight's methods have reduced from many weeks to 4½ days the time necessary to issue a passport.

Of personal checks, she contended that if the Government accepts them for income tax payments it also should be willing to take them in payment for a passport fee.

Miss Knight's reforms and modernization of the passport office make a lot of sense. A taxpayer might think it a good idea to expose other agencies of Government to Miss Knight, especially any in which the productivity per employee has diminished instead of increased.

This bold and efficient woman is even trying to improve passport pictures; promoting the idea that they should be relaxed and happy, smiling portraits. To that end, she permits color photos and reports that her program to make passport pictures look like something other than rogue's gallery shots is coming along fine.

Conservation Goes Out the Window

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, something that needs to be said over and over again until a change is made has been related in an article recently published in the Scripps-Howard newspapers. It is concerned with Federal mismanagement over the years of a vital Alaska resource—salmon. Mr. Albert Colegrove, staff writer for these newspapers, has recently been in Alaska and in this particular article written at Petersburg, whose very existence is dependent on the vitality of the fishing industry, has prepared a telling indictment of bureaucratic government. He tells how the advice of Alaskans has been disregarded year after year while the overlords of Alaska who exercise their control in distant Washington have created a situation in which there is grave danger that the salmon industry may be destroyed.

I regard the article as factual and the comments of Alaskans quoted therein to be truly representative of the views of most residents of the Territory.

Mr. Speaker, before calling the attention of my colleagues to Mr. Colegrove's article I should like to insert an accompanying editorial comment which appeared with the article in the Washington Daily News:

FISHING MESS IN ALASKA

One of the most popular foods in this country is salmon—fresh, smoked, dried, and canned. Much of it comes from Alaska. But less in recent years.

The salmon catch off Alaska has been declining. One of the reasons: Piggishness. The bigger commercial outfits don't fish for salmon. They trap 'em. Salmon are trapped on the spawning runs. And if it is overdone, pretty soon the spawning diminishes, and hence the salmon diminish.

In the 48 States of the Union, such things as fishing regulations primarily are legislated by the States themselves. They best know the conditions, and State officials, being nearer at hand, are more responsive to public opinion.

But in Alaska, a Territory for 89 years, the fishing rules are laid down by Washington. To get anything done, Alaskans have to go to Congress, or to the bureaucrats in the executive departments, where the play of every other lobby takes its toll. This not only is cumbersome and timewasting—it frequently doesn't get results.

For the story of how this indirect system doesn't work in the case of salmon traps, take a look at the dispatch on this page from Scripps-Howard's staff writer, Albert M. Colegrove, written from Alaska.

This is just another sample of how this huge, resource-laden, potentially rich area is being hogtied because it can't run its own affairs. Statehood would open it up, encourage enterprising Americans to go up there and make it flourish. And if you don't think this would have an impact on the national economy, consider this one point:

Salmon is high priced now. But if the Alaska salmon industry (plus the Japanese and the seasonal non-Alaska trappers who reap big hauls from Alaskan waters) runs out of fish because of inadequate controls, salmon will go a lot higher, if not out of reach.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for Mr. Colegrove's article:

PETERSBURG, ALASKA, May 1.—It is almost impossible to exaggerate the dislike most Alaskans feel today for the Federal Government overlords who rule this Territory's lifeblood industry—fishing.

They believe Washington's experts have all but ruined them.

Ruin will come inevitably, they think, unless Alaska can get statehood, then take fishing matters into its own hands and save the salmon.

This is a bitterly personal matter for the fishermen and canners who live along Alaska's coastlines.

COMPLAINT

This is their grim complaint:

Twenty years ago, Alaskan waters were giving up 6.5 million cases of salmon a year. The catch has dropped steadily. This year they'll be lucky to get 2.5 million cases.

The Federal Government must accept responsibility for the mess. It has had complete control of fishing regulations, and has made its own rules with little heed for Alaskans.

There are other villains in the case of the vanishing salmon—namely the fishing industry moguls of Seattle and the Japanese. But they play secondary roles.

To understand this situation, keep in mind that there are two main types of fishery workers:

The 10,000 boatmen and canners who come up here from the States in May and go home in the fall with their year's wages. Most of them don't give a hoot, one way or the other, about Alaska or its statehood bid.

The 15,000 Alaskans who depend on fishing for a living, and live here the year round. Almost 1 out of 3 working Alaskans is in this group.

CONCERN

The disappearing salmon are of great concern not only to this second group but to the entire Territory. For sick as it is, the fishing industry will put about $65 million worth of seafood into cans and frozen packages this year. About $20 million will be paid to those who live here. This is far and above the money Alaska will get from any other single business.

Typical of the year-rounders are those in Petersburg, a community of 850 persons, mostly of Scandinavian descent. Their spokesman is Lew Williams, Jr., 33 editor of the weekly Petersburg Press. He thunders every Friday against the United States Government's Fish and Wildlife Service.

And if the Government is the villain, the symbol of its villainy is the trap.

The fish trap is, in the words of the Petersburg Fishermen's Union, "the most efficient fish killer ever devised." Briefly it works like this:

A fence is built in the water, extending up to 1,000 feet out from the shore. Salmon, swimming near the shore on their way to streams where they would spawn, reach the fence. They start swimming out to sea, to get around it.

Instead, they pass through a series of funnel-shaped corrals, eventually arriving in a huge, fenced-in, underwater room from which there's no escape.

A fishing boat comes along. Its crew raises the room right out of the water and dumps the thousands of trapped fish into the boat's hold. End of the fish.

ILLEGAL

Fish traps have been outlawed in every State of the Union.

But not in Alaska. (States of the Union control their own fisheries; in Alaska the Federal Government has complete control.)

It is odd, but true: Alaskans, whose lives depend on the amount of fish they catch, time and time again have voted overwhelmingly against the fish trap. And the Fish and Wildlife Service—supposedly dedicated to conservation—time and time again has ignored Alaskan voters and permitted the fish traps to continue.

"What's more," said Lew Williams, "our fishermen have pleaded with the Fish and Wildlife people for many other conservation measures.

"Few of our pleas have been heard.

"We want conservation because Alaska is our home. We're not intersted in making a quick buck and then moving on."

In Juneau, Fish and Wildlife officials proudly told me they had drastically cut the number of fish traps operating in Alaska in recent years.

"Sure," said Lew Williams. "They horse-trade with the big canners. For example: A cannery will have two fish traps in 'played-out' locations. So the owner will offer to remove those two traps—if the Government will let him put just one in a new location. At the one new location, he catches three times as many fish."

SIGN

Ernie Haugen is mayor of Petersburg. He also runs the Pastime Cafe, Petersburg's only restaurant. Prominently displayed there is a can of salmon packed by one of America's best-known companies. On it is a sign: "This salmon was caught by Japanese fishermen." The implied message is clear: Don't buy it.

Most fishermen with whom I talked had nothing personal against their Japanese colleagues. They simply feel our Government was out-slicked in its dealings with Japanese officials.

In the North Pacific Fisheries Treaty a line was drawn which was supposed to separate the areas of origin of North American and Asian salmon. It now appears that the areas to which the Japanese have access contain many salmon of American origin and the Japanese have been catching them in quantity.

Further, we have not been able to get the Japanese to agree to conservation rules which our fishermen obey, such as having nets whoses meshes are large enough to let the younger, smaller fish escape. The State Department is now negotiating for changes in the treaty to remedy these situations, but no one seems to know whether it will be successful.

Big-time canning companies in Seattle defend their purchases of Japanese-caught salmon by saying:

"We have to keep our canneries operating. If Alaskans could furnish us enough fish, we wouldn't buy from the Japanese."

They use the same argument for fish traps—that traps provide an almost guaranteed supply of salmon.

OPPOSITION

It's no secret, here or in Seattle, that the biggest opposition to Alaskan statehood comes from Washington State business interest, mainly salmon packers.

They are making money from Alaska. They have supported politicians who have opposed Alaska statehood and who have opposed efforts to get rid of the fish traps. The salmon packers want no change. They also fear "revenge" measures, such as higher fishing license fees for non-Alaskans if the territory becomes a State.

Certainly, they stand to lose certain privileges if Alaska makes it. The fish traps are bound to go. So are some other types of fish-catcher devices.

"But there'll be no 'revenge' action," said Lew Williams. "It'll be because we aim to stay here and make this land a better place for our kids and their kids. We want to live in Alaska, not ruin it."

Government Estimates a Bumper Wheat Crop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there was published in the Christian Science Monitor of April 29, 1958, an editorial dealing with the question of farm surpluses. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BANE OF ABUNDANCE

Government estimates of another bumper wheat crop evoke no rejoicing either in Washington or South Dakota. Secretary Benson had been making some slight headway in reducing surplus stocks. But favorable weather and extra planting threaten to replenish the burden he has been trying to reduce.

The Department of Agriculture now forecasts a winter wheat crop running close to a billion bushels. Spring wheat is expected to add more than 200 million bushels. This year farmers are putting only about 5 million acres of wheat land into the soil reserve—less than half the amount taken out of production last year.

This is the opposite of what city folk might have expected. For the support price this year is down from last year's level of $2 a bushel to $1.78. But farmers can't operate like the producers of steel and automobiles—they find it hard to cut production to hold prices up. Indeed, they usually increase production—hoping to make up with more units for the loss of income per unit.

There are too many of them to form a cartel to limit production. And the limits put on by Government—acreage allotments—don't really work. Many growers simply raise more on an acre. Others take their chances outside the allotment (and price support plan).

So once more the Nation faces a probable crop carryover of more than a billion bushels. Farmers and Government find abundance a bane rather than blessing. Surely this situation is fundamentally wrong—as wrong as the feast-or-famine rule in the steel industry. Surely it is not beyond the ingenuity of Americans to right both these wrongs—and not merely palliate them with price supports, unemployment compensation, and tax cuts.

Free Enterprise Versus the Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, America's high standard of living and its position of leadership in the world in my opinion may be attributed to our constitutional republican form of government together with a free enterprise economy which provides the maximum incentives for each individual to develop his God-given talents.

There are 2 unique features in our economy. First, what shall be produced is decided by the consumers of America who are free to spend their incomes as they wish. Secondly, producers with the incentive of profit are free to produce goods they believe consumers want.

During the years since World War II, our private enterprise economy has been burdened with many Government controls and a tax structure which curbs incentives. Proponents of the welfare state justify their position, as they believe the average citizen will benefit from more and more Government intervention. It is usually difficult to disprove arguments categorically concerning economic policy. Unlike the physical sciences in the social sciences, we do not often have a chance to experiment and prove our theories.

During the period immediately following World War II, the economies of 2 of the leading countries of Europe were directed along entirely different lines. Great Britain embarked on a welfare state with serious curbs on individual initiative and the rewards for enterprise. Western Germany although ravaged by war liberated the energies of its people. It established a free market economy with the lowest possible taxes consistent with the revenue needs of its government. The results for the average citizen under these 2 diametrically opposite economic courses are now plain for everyone to see.

The March issue of the monthly letter prepared by the First National City Bank of New York contrasts the economic developments in the United Kingdom and in Western Germany during the period following World War II. I believe that this analysis is of such significance that I ask unanimous consent to include it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Prof. David McCord Wright, of McGill University, has made a close study of comparative policies and results in West Germany and the United Kingdom since the war. In a pamphlet published in December by the American Enterprise Association, he notes:

"We have a most interesting test case of the effect upon the condition of the poor of a relatively free market economy as against one heavily paternalistic, controlled and subsidized.

"Offhand, the deeper conceived labor socialists and to some extent of the present United Kingdom economy with the condition of the poor would seem to be the fastest way to raise the income level of the lower income groups. But it hasn't worked out that way."

THE GERMAN MIRACLE

The economic choice faced by West Germany, after the currency reform and granting of substantial autonomy in 1948, was a basic one, according to Professor Wright:

"Had she followed the prevalent European and United Kingdom labor pattern she would have gone in for heavy control, rationing, state directed investment, sharply progressive taxation, tremendous emphasis on equality.

"Instead her policies were entirely different. Emphasis was placed upon incentive rather than literal equality, upon a free market rather than planning, upon modernization rather than routine."

The decision to adopt the Marktwirtschaft—the free-market economy—has paid off handsomely. West Germany, phoenix-like, has risen from the rubble of World War II to economic and financial preeminence in Western Europe—a rise that has been aptly called the German miracle.

This particular miracle lends itself to statistical measurement as can be seen in the charts.

West German workers' real wages (adjusted for price increases) advanced 99 percent between 1948 and 1957. In Britain

real wages went up only 11 percent measured from 1946, 2 years earlier, when its postwar expansion began. Industrial production in Germany in 1948–57 soared 254 percent while in the United Kingdom (1946–57) it went up only 70 percent. Per capita output of goods and services (1949–57), in constant prices, rose 115 percent in Germany as against 15 percent in the United Kingdom.

In the early postwar years, of course, West Germany's level of production was small in relation to Britain's so its percentage increases would naturally be larger.

But it is significant that Germany has kept right on progressing at a more rapid rate. Betweeen 1954 and 1957, gross national product, in real terms, rose more than 25 percent in Germany—as against only 4 percent in the United Kingdom.

HOUSES, CARS, AND SHIPS

In the field of particular industries, there has been similar dramatic improvement. West Germany in the past 7 years has built more housing than the United Kingdom built in 11. Since the population in both countries is the same—about 51 million—per capita housing output in Germany has also run well ahead. Starting from scratch in 1948, West Germany last year had moved up to third place among the world's shipbuilders. In 1948 some 328,000 autos rolled off assembly lines of British factories while only 30,000 were produced in West Germany. Last year German auto output amounted to 950,000 cars—some 100,000 above the United Kingdom's.

In the field of world trade, German exporters, combining high quality with attractive prices, have been able to acquire a growing share of world commerce. While the United Kingdom's share of world exports slipped from 12 percent in 1949 to 10 percent in 1956, Germany's share advanced from 2 percent to 8 percent.

The success of Germany's export drive enabled it to nearly triple its imports between 1950 and 1957 and still make solid additions to its gold and foreign exchange holdings. Starting from practically nothing in 1948, these reserves at latest count amounted to $5.7 billion—well over double those of the United Kingdom.

The German mark has become one of the world's most respected currencies. An important reason for this has been Germany's application over the postwar period of orthodox financial policies to contain inflation—i. e., restraint on government spending to produce an overbalanced budget and tight credit policies to limit borrowing and encourage saving. Moreover, German labor leaders, unlike their British counterparts, haxe exercised restraint in wage demands. Thus, while the cost of living has gone up 44 percent in the United Kingdom since 1950, it has increased only 18 percent in Germany.

LOWER TAX RATES SPEED EXPANSION

What made this economic miracle possible? Professor Wright gives a major share of the credit to a sharp reduction in West German personal income tax rates.

In 1948 West German tax rates went as high as 95 percent. However, an elaborate system of special exemptions for saved and invested income largely nullified the impact of these high rates. Beginning in 1950 the rates themselves were gradually revised downward until now the top rate is 55 percent. This compares with a maximum rate of 92½ percent or higher maintained in Great Britain over this period.

Capital investment is the sine qua non of economic expansion. The amount of investment, in turn, depends on incentives and savings—both of which are heavily influenced by the tax system. High tax rates not only blunt the desire to work and to take risks for profit, but they siphon off funds that could otherwise be available to launch new ventures. The figures tell the story: investment in West Germany, in constant prices, nearly tripled between 1949 and 1950. In the United Kingdom in the same period it increased only about one-half.

Dr. Robert G. Wertheimer, of Babson Institute, recently completed a 5-year study of the postwar German tax structure. His statement last month before the House Ways and Means Committee concisely spells out what was accomplished by the German tax reforms:

"Not only did the economy grow more rapidly than ever in a climate of stable prices but total public revenues also expanded and secured a balanced budget. Income-tax reductions set free entrepreneurial initiative which created a flexible economy providing full employment (in spite of the influx of 10 million destitute persons), steadily rising standards of living and a rapidly growing domestic and foreign investment.

"Taxpayers again could show their incomes and profits without the fear of seeing most of them taxed away. The lowering of the tax rates rapidly increased the ability of all classes to save. Institutionalized saving, for example, increased from 4 percent of the disposable income in 1950 to 8 percent in 1955. Business saving in the form of retained profits and depreciation allowances rose even more rapidly. These savings made possible the financing of the German reconstruction without inflation.

"The lesser dependence of the federal government on personal income taxation as source of tax revenues also solved the plight of the small businessman by permitting him to keep most of his gross profits as seed capital for expansion. The lower income tax burden stimulated the general willingness and ability of people to take risks and to establish new business or to expand existing ones. Wage earners and the professions also became more productive and were eager to work longer hours, overtime, and on outside projects to expand incomes that would accrue to themselves."

OUTPUT AND LABOR ATTITUDES

The huge sums poured into new factories, machines, equipment, and processes (gross investment of $50 billion in Germany between 1949 and 1956 as against $43 billion in Britain) played a big role in the phenomenal increase in German worker productivity. Output per man-hour in Germany between 1948 and 1957 increased 116 percent—as against only 37 percent in Britain between 1946 and 1957.

Increases in worker productivity, while heavily influenced by the flow of investment, also depend on other factors—e. g., the rate of modernization of tools and equipment and the general attitude of labor.

Professor Wright found sharp differences in worker attitudes toward modernization and strikes in the two countries:

"With a few exceptions union sabotage of new methods has been at a minimum in West Germany—in startling contrast with the frantic job consciousness and routine-mindedness of labor in the United Kingdom."

Noting that West Germany has suffered but a fraction of the time lost from trade disputes that the British economy has since 1949, he added:

"The sense of crisis felt by the whole of West Germany and the intense desire of all classes to rebuild the country created a public opinion, both inside and outside the unions, that would not have tolerated anything like the degree of slackness put up with in the United Kingdom."

ARMAMENT BURDENS

One objection often made to the comparison of West Germany and the United Kingdom is the presence for the United Kingdom of a great armaments burden. It should be noted, however, that Germany had more reconstruction to do, relatively speaking, than the United Kingdom.

Professor Wright's assessment of these burdens is closely tied in with the different labor attitudes in the two countries:

"While the presence of an armament burden would have made the West German economy start from a lower level, a nation whose labor force was so much more cooperative and so much more willing to accept change would have had about an equally rapid rate of increase of output.

"Had the unions of the United Kingdom followed the behavior pattern of those in Germany, the United Kingdom would have borne its arms burden and continued to expand relatively easily."

Peter Thorneycroft, who resigned in January as Chancellor of the Exchequer in a dispute over a continued rise in government spending, lists the defense burden as only one of the reasons for Britain's financial troubles. The New York Times of January 24 carried this account of Mr. Thorneycroft's penetrating analysis:

"First we have sought to be a nuclear power, matching missile with missile, and missile with antimissile and with large conventional forces in the Far East, Middle East and Atlantic.

"At the same time we have sought to maintain a welfare state at as higher a level, sometimes even at a higher level than the United States. We have been trying to do these things against a background of having to repay debts abroad during the next 8 years at a total equal to the whole of our existing reserves.

"It was not a mean thing to have attempted these things but no politician should be under any illusions as to what it has meant.

"It has meant that for 12 years we have slithered from one crisis to another—sometimes a balance of payments crisis, sometimes an exchange crisis, but always it has been a crisis. It has meant a pound sterling which has sunk from twenty shillings to twelve shillings.

"This is not a picture of a nation we would wish to see. It is a picture of a nation in full retreat from its responsibilities. It is the road to ruin."

IMPLICATIONS FOR UNITED STATES POLICY

A number of important lessons can be drawn from the sharply-contrasting German and British postwar experiences.

One is the vital role of free enterprise in providing the incentives and the competitive effort which deliver a growing and widely-diffused prosperity while preserving individual freedom.

Ludwig Erhard, Germany's economics minister and a staunch supporter of the free market economy, pointed this up in the October 28 issue of Time:

"The most successful means for the achievement and retention of prosperity is competition. Only by competition can an economy expand to serve all people, especially in their capacity as consumers, and dissolve all advantages which do not result directly from higher performance. Free competition thus leads to progress and profits for the whole social order."

Another lesson is the clear impetus given to production and workers' rewards by labor policies which do not impede technological progress. German labor's receptive attitude toward industrial innovation has paid off in rapid wage increases many times over.

Yet another lesson can be drawn from the differences in what Professor Wright calls "social attitudes" in the two countries:

"A famous English scientist once summed up the difference between a Socialist and a Capitalist in the following terms: 'A Capitalist,' he said, 'is a man who, if he himself is living well, doesn't mind if others are living better. A Socialist, on the other

hand, is a man who doesn't car how badly he himself is living as long as nobody else is allowed to live better.'

"Possibly, in the difference in the two attitudes indicated here, one may find something of the basic reasons for the German miracle."

Finally, there is a lesson for socialist planners who, in striving for income equality, use extortionate tax rates to take away income from the gifted, hard-working individual and spread it around to the less fortunate through various government welfare schemes.

Germany, as we have seen, has chosen a different route—one that has yielded more income for everybody. With sharply reduced tax rates and heroic work effort, Germany has achieved unparalleled prosperity.

Germany serves, thus, as a prime example of what Prof. Henry C. Wallich, of Yale University, pointed up in the autumn 1956 issue of the Yale Review:

"If we try to even up income distribution by means of progressive taxation, we reduce savings and curtail inventment incentives and so slow down growth. If we want to accelerate growth, we have to accept inequality of income.

"From a dollars-and-cents point of view, it is quite obvious that over a period of years, even those who find themselves at the short end of inequality have more to gain from faster growth than from any conceivable income redistribution. A speedup in real output of only 1 extra percent per year will soon lift even the economically weakest into income barckets to which no amount of redistribution could promote them."

Disposal of Agricultural Commodities Under Public Law 480

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a very comprehensive and informative statement made by Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Don Paarlberg before the House Committee on Agriculture on May 5, 1958, relating to the disposal of agricultural commodities under Public Law 480:

DISPOSAL OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES UNDER PUBLIC LAW 480

(Statement by Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Don Paarlberg before the House Committee on Agriculture, May 5, 1958)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to discuss with you operations under Public Law 480 and to present our views on extension of the program. The program has made it possible for us to make constructive use of our agricultural surpluses at home and abroad.

First of all, I wish to make it clear that our major emphasis is on sales for dollars, not on sales for foreign currency. Last year about 60 percent of our agricultural exports were for dollars. We intend to keep that percentage as high as possible, and to keep our total exports as high as possible.

To permit continuation of a high level of exports we recommended: That foreign currency sales under title I be extended for 1 year through June 30, 1959; that the authorization be increased by $1.5 billion; and that title II which authorizes the use of food for emergency relief abroad, also be extended for 1 year. Balances available from the current $800 million authorization for title II, however, are sufficient to permit continuation of operations for the additional period. Title III, which provides for donations through voluntary relief agencies and for barter transactions, does not have an expenditure limitation or an expiration date under the act.

SUMMARY OF TITLE I OPERATIONS

The current $4 billion authorization to make foreign currency sales under title I is virtually exhausted. Signed agreements have committed over $3.8 billion and the small remaining balance is being used to meet emergency situations. We urge, therefore, that prompt consideration be given to the extension.

The agreements already signed provide for the shipment of 586 million bushels of wheat, 3.2 million bales of cotton, 26 million bags of rice, 1.9 billion pounds of vegetable oils, 146 million bushels of feedgrains, 192 million pounds of tobacco, 150 million pounds of meat, 220 million pounds of lard, 212 million pounds of dairy products, 186 million pounds of fruit and vegetables, as well as other commodities.

In 1955–56, the first full year of operation of title I, foreign currency shipments totaled $440 million at export market value. During 1956–57, title I shipments amounted to $900 million.

Agreements signed to date will result in foreign currency payments of about $2.7 billion. About 55 percent of the total will be used for economic development purposes in importing countries, 10 percent will be used to support the defense forces of our allies and the remaining 35 percent is planned for meeting United States expenses overseas and expanding certain United States programs. Currency uses will be discussed in more detail later in this statement.

NEED FOR EXTENSION ACT

Public Law 480 was passed with the primary purpose of aiding in the disposal of large accumulated surpluses. When the act was passed, the Commodity Credit Corporation's investment in agricultural commodities was valued at $6 billion. This investment continued to rise in the next 2 years and totaled $8.2 billion on June 30, 1956. As disposal programs, including CCC exports for dollars at world prices, began to have full effect, this rise in investment was arrested and a downward trend was started. CCC's investment in agricultural commodities on June 30, 1957, was $7.3 billion. It is estimated that CCC's investment in commodities as of June 30, 1958, will be reduced to about $6.8 billion. These reductions, resulting mainly from disposals of wheat and cotton, would have been greater except for the extremely large harvest of feedgrains last year. It seems likely that United States agricultural production will continue at a high level and CCC will continue to take over production in excess of domestic use and commercial export outlets. Emphasis has been given to export sales for dollars and these sales have reached extremely high levels in the last 2 years. But under any foreseeable circumstances dollar sales will not be sufficient to move the surplus which may accumulate in CCC hands.

Originally (we had planned to program part of the new authorization before June 30 if the extension had been granted soon enough. It would be particularly desirable to negotiate large programs during the next 2 or 3 months to yield best results in terms of orderly export shipments and direct benefit to farmers. In the title I program, orderly programing and shipping is extremely important. These are dependent on continuous programing without time out between utilization of separate authorizations. We have run into periods when title I programing has come to a standstill; for example, the development of new agreements virtually ceased in January 1957 when our authorization was almost exhausted. The availability of funds during the following months would have avoided a backlog of program requests from interested countries. This backlog resulted in the necessity to scale down, delay, or exclude country programs, and in erratic shipment performance. Shipments were running about 800,000 tons a month last spring—these dropped off to less than 400,000 tons and increased to about 600,000 tons in January as shipments were being made against fiscal year 1958 country programs.

EFFECT OF EARLY EXTENSION

Obtaining an extension of the act soon would prevent a slump in shipments during this summer and fall. Considering the $700 million in commodities unshipped as of June 30, 1957, and the $1 billion authorization we are now committing, it is estimated that an additional $1.5 billion would result in shipments as follows:

1956–57	$1,400,000,000
1957–58	1,200,000,000
1958–59	1,400,000,000
1959–60	600,000,000

The extension would thus allow us to maintain title I exports in fiscal year 1959 at about the same level as 1957.

PROGRAM RESULTS

Title I originally provided for an authorization of $700 million in terms of cost to the Government of commodities supplied under the program. The value of these commodities at current world prices, of course, is considerably less. This authorization has been raised three times and now is $4 billion. Over $3.8 billion of this limit has moved or will move under more than 100 agreements signed with 35 friendly countries. Most of the balance is in negotiation or earmarked for specific countries. Agreements totaled about $475 million in the year ending June 30, 1955; about $975 million in 1955–56; about $1.5 billion last year; and about $875 million this year.

The increase in title I shipments from year to year has been one of the major factors leading to the rise in our total agricultural exports. In 1954–55 our agricultural exports had a market value of $3.1 billion. Title I shipments were small that year, accounting for 3 percent of the total. In 1955–56 our agricultural exports rose to $3.5 billion. Title I accounted for 12 percent of the total. In 1956–57, the year ending last June 30, agricultural exports rose to an alltime high of $4.7 billion. Title I shipments made up almost 20 percent of the total, or about $900 million.

The rise in total exports was the principal reason that the direction of surplus accumulations was reversed last year. During 1956–57, CCC investment in price-support commodities declined almost $1 billion with the principal reductions being in wheat, cotton, and rice, commodities for which there were heavy movements under the title I program. I would like to mention some of the individual commodity performances.

Wheat: Wheat has been one of our greatest surplus problems. Stocks in Government hands increased in each of the 5 years prior to last year; last year, however, wheat exports reached the record high of 550 million bushels. In other words, last year we exported almost as much wheat as we consume domestically in an entire year. About 200 million bushels of this total moved against sales for foreign currencies under the title I program. The record shipment resulted in a reduction of about 125 million bushels in the carryover of wheat. It is expected that exports this year will be about 400 million

bushels; in order to achieve this total more than 40 percent is being moved under title I.

Soybean oil and cottonseed oil: Exports of soybean oil and cottonseed oil have established new record levels during the past 3 years and will continue high this season. In each of the 3 years the major reason for the increase was shipments made under the title I foreign currency program. Last year, for example, we exported nearly 1.4 billion pounds of these oils. Almost 50 percent of the total moved under the title I program. The title I program has been helpful in keeping soybeans out of price support trouble. Despite a record harvest this year, the impact on the market has been relatively mild. Although the carryover of soybeans by CCC is expected to be larger than last year, the carryover will be only a small percentage of the crop.

Cotton: The major reason that our cotton exports expanded so markedly in 1956–57 was the stability and confidence given to world markets by the CCC export program. Exports last year reached 7.6 million bales, the highest total in a quarter of a century; nearly 20 percent moved under the title I program. The expanded exports have made possible a reduction in CCC cotton stocks for the first time in 6 years. Instead of adding to the existing surplus carryover, stocks this past season were reduced by more than 3 million bales. Additional reductions will be made this year with total cotton exports expected to remain relatively high at about 5.7 million bales. About 15 percent will be moved under title I.

Rice: A substantial reduction in surplus stocks of rice resulted from a record export year in 1956–57 which totaled about 26 million bags, of which 18 million bags moved under foreign currency sales. The title I shipments went to India, Korea, Pakistan, and Indonesia where increases in consumption would be obtained without affecting world markets. These movements have disposed of surpluses which had accumulated since the 1953 crop and have greatly improved domestic marketing conditions.

USES OF FOREIGN CURRENCY

Foreign currencies received in payment for commodities are deposited to the account of the United States overseas and are used for purposes authorized in section 104 of Public Law 480 and specified in the sales agreement. Several departments and agencies have responsibility for administering the expenditure of these currencies. For example, the Department of Agriculture is concerned with the use of currencies for agricultural market-development purposes; the International Cooperation Administration for currencies loaned back to importing countries for economic development purposes; and the Export-Import Bank of Washington for currencies loaned to private business firms.

About $45 million in currencies has been tentatively earmarked for agricultural market development under existing agreements. To date, approximately $10 million of this is being obligated for approved projects together with contributions by private trade organizations cooperating in these projects of over $3 million. Results of these promotion efforts are already evident. Cotton promotion projects undertaken in 21 countries have been a factor in the free movement of cotton overseas and should continue to encourage exports for some time to come. The title I poultry sale to the Republic of Germany plus a promotion project resulted in dollar purchases by that country of more than 4 million pounds of poultry in 1957. Thus far in 1958, West Germany has allocated dollars for an additional 3 million pounds of poultry. Particularly good results have been obtained in Japan in maintaining United States wheat and tallow exports, and increasing the use of United States leaf tobacco. Commercial supermarkets have been opened up in Italy and other countries following a supermarket exhibit held in Rome in June 1956. We believe that as more projects are undertaken and more products exhibited at trade fairs our export markets for many commodities will widen considerably.

About half the foreign currencies expected to accrue under existing agreements will be loaned back to importing countries for use in economic development projects agreed upon with the International Cooperation Administration. Considerable emphasis is placed upon coordinating plans for the use of these funds with the overall development programs of these countries. In approving loan projects for agricultural purposes care is exercised to avoid encouragement of production which would result in reduced outlets for United States agricultural commodities.

The extension of Public Law 480 granted in August 1957 provided for relending of foreign currencies, largely to United States firms and their affiliates, to assist in the development and expansion of private business in foreign countries. The equivalent of about $65 million will be reserved for these purposes in agreements negotiated this fiscal year with Colombia, Finland, Formosa, France, Greece, Israel, Italy, Korea, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, and Turkey. These funds will be made available to private business firms through the Export-Import Bank of Washington when commodities under these agreements are shipped and paid for and proceeds assigned to the bank.

Currencies are also being used for the payment of United States expenses abroad; for the procurement of military services and equipment for military assistance; for education exchange programs; for assistance to American-sponsored schools, libraries, and community centers; for the translation, publication, and distribution of books and periodicals; and for the purchase of goods for other friendly countries.

PROGRAMING OF COTTON PRODUCTS

Senate bill 3420 to extend Public Law 480 contains an amendment which would require that products manufactured from upland or long staple cotton be made available for sale under the program so long as cotton is in surplus supply. We oppose this amendment.

Public Law 480 furnishes ample authority to finance exports of cotton products when this is justified and desirable in the judgment of the Department. However, we now conduct the cotton products export program which protects the competitive position of the United States cotton industry in relation to the sale of cotton products manufactured abroad from United States cotton purchased at world market prices. The program provides for equalization payments based on the raw cotton content of the product exported. These payments have been averaging about six cents per pound so far this season; they permit the price of cotton products to reflect the export price for the raw cotton content of the products exported.

In addition, the sale of cotton products under title I would more than double the cost of financing the exportation of the cotton content of such products. We estimate that the value of raw cotton in cotton textile products is less than one-half the value of the textiles. In some fabricated products, the cost of manufacture is many times the raw cotton content. We would have other problems resulting from the proposed amendment. These include the fact that we normally supply raw cotton under title I to countries which have processing capacity to meet their own needs for manufacturing cotton products.

BARTER ACTIVITIES AND TITLE II

Public Law 480 served to emphasize and strengthen barter operations authorized by previous legislation. Since July 1954, exports of agricultural commodities from CCC stocks through barter have totaled about $900 million at market value.

In May 1957, the barter program was revised to assure that each barter contract results in a net increase in United States exports of the commodity involved and to require the payment of interest by barter contractors taking delivery of agricultural commodities before they deliver the materials to CCC. Program procedures were also simplified this past December.

We are concerned that there is considerable sentiment to amend the law to require the Department to revert to the barter program in effect prior to May 1957. We believe this would be a serious mistake. The Secretary now has the discretion to determine whether or not barter transactions protect the funds and assets of CCC. This means that he will barter whenever the same commodities cannot be sold for dollars. To make it mandatory that the Secretary barter when he is offered strategic or other materials will require him to displace dollar sales.

The purpose of Public Law 480 is to increase the disposition of agricultural commodities. The act provides that title I foreign currency sales should be in addition to usual commercial marketings. This same provision should apply to barter transactions. Under a barter transaction where the exporter sells the commodity to a foreign importer for dollars and the materials received by CCC come from a third country, CCC is merely accepting materials in lieu of dollars unless the transaction results in a net increase in agricultural exports.

I would like to make it clear that the Department favors the movement of agricultural surpluses through barter. For example, we are now discussing barter deals to send about 450,000 tons of food grains, principally wheat, to India in exchange for some of her strategic materials; 22,000 tons of wheat to Norway for Norwegian-produced ferrochrome; and 70,000 tons of corn to France for French-produced ferromanganese. These transactions will result in exports which would not otherwise take place. If they were made without protecting sales that could otherwise be expected we would merely be accepting materials rather than dollars for these exports. We would like to record our strong opposition to enactment of legislation which would remove the discretionary feature of the barter program which enables us to protect the funds and assets of the Corporation.

Our recommendations include extension of the title II program which permits the President to act quickly to relieve distress abroad caused by famine, flood, and other emergency conditions. I understand that representatives of ICA are here in the event information is needed concerning these activities or other Public Law 480 operations with which they are concerned.

PUBLIC LAW 480 AND OTHER FARM LEGISLATION

Although we favor extension of Public Law 480 to permit us to use our surpluses in a constructive manner, this disposal program needs to be part of a farm program that will effectively bring the supply of farm products into better balance with market demand. The program should not be allowed to become a device to postpone needed price support and production adjustments. Public Law 480 is desirable within the overall objective of expanding markets. However, maintaining a range of support prices which is too narrow to permit the commercial growth of markets needed to absorb our production prevents the needed expansion.

TABLE I.—*Commodity composition of programs under title I, Public Law 480, agreements signed July 1, 1957, through Apr. 30, 1958*

[In millions of dollars]

Country	Wheat and flour	Feed grains	Rice	Cotton	Tobacco	Dairy products	Fats and oils	Other	Market value	Ocean transportation [1]	Market value including ocean transportation	Estimated CCC cost including ocean transportation
Fiscal year 1958 agreements:												
China (Taiwan)	7.5				1.7		1.3		10.5	1.6	12.1	15.4
Colombia		2.2		2.8	.5	0.2	2.5		8.2	.8	9.0	11.8
Finland	3.1			.9	3.1			[2] 1.0	8.1	.9	9.0	11.2
France				22.5	2.5				25.0	.7	25.7	29.6
Greece	11.4	4.7				.6			16.7	3.1	19.8	32.7
Israel	9.3	8.8		.8	.2	10.6	2.1	[3] .1	31.9	3.1	35.0	55.4
Italy				20.7	3.0			[3] .5	24.2	.8	25.0	28.7
Korea	24.5	15.9							40.4	9.6	50.0	78.3
Mexico		26.6							26.6	1.6	28.2	63.5
Pakistan	36.6		14.4			2.2	.3		53.5	11.9	65.4	99.7
Peru	2.5		4.4			.2			7.1	.7	7.8	12.8
Poland	50.3	12.1		33.9		3.3	9.9		109.5	10.1	119.6	177.4
Spain		5.0		15.8	5.3	1.0	41.8		68.9	4.3	73.2	83.4
Turkey	15.4	3.0				2.2	21.4		42.0	4.8	46.8	62.4
United Kingdom					5.0			[4] 8.0	13.0		13.0	13.0
Yugoslavia	37.8			15.1			9.9		62.8	7.3	70.1	98.2
Total agreements, July 1, 1957–Apr. 30, 1958	198.4	78.3	18.8	112.5	21.3	20.3	89.2	9.6	548.4	61.3	609.7	873.5
Total agreements, fiscal years 1955, 1956, and 1957 [5]	788.0	95.2	150.6	378.5	111.8	22.3	274.8	48.2	1,869.4	225.3	2,094.7	2,952.0
Total, all agreements fiscal years 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958	986.4	173.5	169.4	491.0	133.1	42.6	364.0	57.8	2,417.8	286.6	2,704.4	3,825.5

[1] Includes only ocean transportation to be financed by CCC.
[2] Dried prunes.
[3] Poultry.
[4] Fresh, dried and canned fruits.
[5] Reflects changes since previous report due to purchase authorization transactions.

TABLE II.—*Approximate quantities of commodities under title I, Public Law 480, agreements signed July 1, 1957, through Apr. 30, 1958*

[In thousands]

Country	Wheat and flour	Feed grains	Rice	Cotton	Tobacco	Dairy products	Fats and oils	Poultry	Dry edible beans	Fruits and vegetables	Meat	Hay and pasture seeds
Fiscal year 1958 agreements:	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Hundredweight*	*Bales*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Hundredweight*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Hundredweight*
China (Taiwan)	4,161				2,000		8,000					
Colombia		1,989		16.5	427	944	14,493					
Finland	1,837			5.4	5,000					[1] 7,055		
France				132.4	4,500							
Greece	6,798	4,268				4,304						
Israel	5,545	8,117		5.0	231	45,987	14,763			[1] 882		
Italy				121.8	4,000			1,429				
Korea	14,346	16,142										
Mexico		20,484										
Pakistan	21,851		2,182			3,996	2,001					
Peru	1,473		672			944						
Poland	28,936	11,804		206.9		33,069	57,320					
Spain		4,826		92.9	8,833	4,723	259,225					
Turkey	9,086	2,825				9,952	143,624					
United Kingdom					7,143					[2] 73,839		
Yugoslavia	22,145			97.8			65,455					
Total agreements, July 1, 1957–Apr. 30, 1958	116,178	[3] 70,545	2,854	678.7	32,134	[4] 103,921	[5] 564,881	1,429		81,776		
Total agreements fiscal years 1955, 1956, and 1957	470,311	75,484	23,321	2,503.8	160,626	107,974	1,784,191	3,000	48	104,846	150,962	9
Total agreements fiscal years 1955, 1956, 1957 and 1958	586,489	146,029	26,175	3,182.5	192,760	211,895	2,349,072	4,429	48	186,622	150,962	9

[1] Dried prunes.
[2] Dried, fresh and canned fruit.
[3] See the following:

	Thousand bushels
Corn	30,564
Oats	1,578
Barley	27,472
Grain sorghums	10,931
Total	70,545

[4] See the following:

	Thousand pounds
Evaporated milk	4,176
Dried whole milk	541
Nonfat dry milk	63,279
Cheese	11,192
Butter	18,718
Ghee	3,998
Butter oil	2,017
Total	103,921

[5] See the following:

	Thousand pounds
Cottonseed and/or soybean oil	559,265
Tallow and/or grease	5,616
Total	564,881

TABLE III.—*Planned uses of foreign currency under title I, Public Law 480 agreements signed July 1, 1957, through Apr. 30, 1958* [1]

[Amounts are in million dollar equivalents at the deposit rate of exchange]

Country	Total amount programed (market value including ocean transportation	Market development (104 (a))	Purchase of strategic material (104 (b))	Military procurement (104 (c))	Purchase of goods for other countries [2] (104 (d))	Grants for multilateral trade and economic development (104 (e))	Loans to private enterprise (104 (e))	Payment of United States obligations [3] (104 (f))	Loans to foreign governments (104 (g))	International education exchange (104 (h))	Translation and publication (104 (i))	Information and education (104 (j))
Fiscal year 1958 agreements:												
China (Taiwan)	12.1			6.0			3.0	2.6		0.5		
Colombia	8.7	0.3					2.2	.9	4.3		0.1	0.9
Finland	9.0						2.2	5.8		.8		.2
France	25.7	.5			4.0		6.4	13.1		1.0		.7
Greece	19.8						2.9	5.0	10.9			1.0
Israel	35.0	.3					8.7	5.0	21.0			
Italy	25.0						6.2	5.4	12.5		.5	.4
Korea	50.0			41.0			2.0	7.0				
Mexico	28.2	2.5					7.1	2.9	13.6	1.2		.9
Pakistan	65.4	.7		5.0			16.4	9.9	30.8	1.1	1.0	.5
Peru	7.8	.7					1.9	1.2	3.5	.3	.1	.1
Poland	119.6				(4)			119.6				
Spain	73.2	1.0						39.3	32.9			
Turkey	46.8						7.0	19.1	18.7			2.0
United Kingdom	13.0	3.3						9.7				
Yugoslavia	70.1							17.5	52.6			
Total agreements	609.4	9.3		52.0	4.0		66.0	264.0	200.8	4.9	1.7	6.7
Uses as percent of total, fiscal year 1958	100.0	1.5		8.5	.7		10.8	43.3	33.0	.8	.3	1.1
Total agreements, fiscal years 1955, 1956, and 1957	2,088.7	34.9	2.0	244.5	42.7	61.5		500.4	1,108.1	19.9	3.4	11.3
Total all agreements, fiscal years 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958	2,698.1	44.2	2.0	296.5	46.7	61.5	66.0	764.4	1,368.9	24.8	5.1	18.0
All agreements, uses as percent of total	100.0	1.6	.1	11.0	1.7	2.3	2.5	28.3	50.7	.9	.2	.7

[1] Amounts shown in this table are subject to adjustment when actual purchases and allocations have been made.

[2] Unspecified amount for possible procurement for 3d countries. Amounts shown in this column indicate a specified amount in the agreement for this use.

[3] In order to provide flexibility in the use of funds, many agreements provide that a specified amount of local currency proceeds may be used under secs. 104 (a), (b), (f), (h), and (i). In some instances, possible uses under sec. 104 (d) are also included in this category. Therefore, estimates based on the best information now available are indicated above under subsecs. (a), (b), (h), and (i). Balances not otherwise distributed are included under subsec. (f). This distribution is subject to revision when allocations have been completed.

The Honorable Will M. Whittington: A Tribute on his 80th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my warmest and most sincere congratulations to an old colleague and friend, Will M. Whittington, on the occasion of his 80th birthday. This distinguished legislator from Mississippi spent 13 faithful and fruitful terms in Congress. His achievements during those 26 years were of incalculable value to his district, his State, and his country. He compiled a record in this House which remains the envy of every man who aspires to the heights of public service.

Assuredly, Judge Whittington's name will always be associated with the great flood-control legislation enacted during the past half century. From 1937 through 1946 he served as chairman of the House Flood Control Committee and under his guidance the Mississippi River plan was repeatedly reviewed, modified, and improved. This, plus his leadership in the general flood-control program through which the Government came to recognize flood damage as a national problem, earned for him the well-deserved title of "Father of Flood Control."

His activities were not restricted to this field. The major credit for the passage of the Government Coporation Control Act in this House belongs to Will Whittington. In 1946 he carried the greatest burden in helping to bring forth, and assure passage of, the Employment Act of 1946. He, more than anyone else, was responsible for the authorization in that law of the Council of Economic Advisers. These enactments, and many others, are eloquent memorials to his services.

But we, who toiled with him in this body for so many years, remember him not only for his legislative achievements but also for the genuine courtesy of his manner. To us he personifies that courtliness for which southern gentlemen are justly famed. I wish Will Whittington many more years of life and happiness.

As chairman of the Committee on Public Works, he continually amazed me with his eminent grasp of the overall water resources problem, the question of flood control, and the protection of our rivers and harbors. No detail seemed to escape him. On many occasions all of us witnessed his marvelous ability to correct men who were testifying before the committee on matters in which they had but one responsibility, against the great multitude of facts which the chairman had to keep in his mind. Veritably he knew the history of every stream, large and small, in the United States.

As author of the Flood Control Act of 1936, he placed for the first time flood control on a national basis. Through the direct control of the Corps of Engineers, he became known as the author of all fundamental flood control legislation. In subsequent years his bright mind brought into law the changes made necessary by the passing of time.

Judge Whittington is a man of very strong character, with an integrity unimpeachable. His word has always been his bond. He has been successful in business to a very marked degree.

At 80 he will be about the youngest man mentally and physically for those years that I have ever known. His devotion to his family, and the devotion of his children and his charming and cultured wife to him is refreshing. He speaks of Mrs. Whittington with a glint in his eye and a ring in his voice as Miss Anne Ward. Their long association has been one of complete happiness, and neither of them will ever realize the blessings they have brought to so many in so many places.

Hon. William M. Whittington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with my esteemed colleague FRANK SMITH, of Mississippi, in wishing for his predecessor in the Congress, the Honorable William M. Whittington, all of the happiness possible as he celebrates his 80th birthday on Sunday, May 4, next.

No man, who has served the House of Representatives has left a more profound imprint upon the national life of his country than has Judge Whittington.

Mrs. Davis has always felt that Judge Whittington and Miss Anne Ward are two of the finest and most helpful influences we have ever had in our lives and she joins me in all of the good wishes we can bundle together for more years of activity and happiness on the Judge's birthday, and that the two of them may continue to enjoy the full blessings of life which they have already experienced and to which they are so justly entitled for many long days ahead.

Hon. William M. Whittington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, over the years Members of this body come and go. Some are long remembered and leave behind a record of service and accomplishments for the good of mankind that will live like stone monuments to their memory. One of those is the Honorable William M. Whittington who reached his 80th birthday on May 2. Mr. Will, as we all know him, had no equal in his chosen field, that of flood control and the improvement of our rivers and harbors. Today American commerce is enjoying good harbors and miles upon miles of navigable rivers, all because of the long service of this great man. Because of his service there are thousands of others who are tilling fertile farms and living in homes secure from dangerous flood waters which in previous years washed away their lands and destroyed their homes and business houses. He was concededly the greatest authority on flood control ever to serve in the Congress of the United States.

Since his retirement from the Congress a few years ago, he has continued to be the same busy man. It is pleasing to know that he is enjoying good health and living his usual active life.

On reaching this great day in his life, his 80th birthday, it is a pleasure to join with my colleagues in extending congratulations and wishing him many more years of active living, good health, and happiness.

Hon. Will M. Whittington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with my Mississippi colleagues in felicitating the Honorable Will M. Whittington, a former and long-time Member of this House from Mississippi, on the occasion of his 80th birthday yesterday.

Will Whittington was a Member of this body when I came here in 1933. My friendship with him grew and profited until his retirement some 6 years ago.

In the quarter of a century that I myself have served in this House, I can truthfully say that in all of that service I never knew a Member who was more consistently dedicated to his work as a legislator. Moreover, I might add that in all of those years I have never known a Member who was more studious of the legislative proposals or devoted more hours to the job of legislating itself. In fact, he was a veritable encyclopedia on the contents and proposals of not one, but all bills pending.

His meticulous analysis of the various legislative proposals was amazing indeed.

Will Whittington was not only a man of knowledge and industry, but more than that, he was a man of high and unimpeachable integrity and character. So, Mr. Speaker, on this the 80th anniversary of the birthday of former Congressman Will M. Whittington, I should like as his long-time friend to salute him and his charming and intelligent lady; and to wish for them many more years of useful life in behalf of their community and Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with others here today in congratulating the Honorable William M. Whittington, a distinguished fellow Mississippian, on the occasion of his 80th birthday, and in paying tribute to him as an outstanding Mississippian and one of the ablest, most honest and courageous men who ever served in the Congress.

Mr. Whittington was first elected to serve the people of Mississippi in the 69th Congress, and remained in the House for the succeeding 26 years. At the end of this time he voluntarily resigned from Congress, but he has maintained his interest and active participation in the affairs of our State and Nation since his retirement.

Mr. Whittington enjoyed the friendship, esteem, and respect of every Member of Congress who served with him, and he has carried with him into his retirement the admiration and high regard of all of us. He was not only a man of unusual ability, but one who devoted his time and energy to the task at hand, finding no time to waste but ample time to counsel and advise with fellow Members, both young and old, on matters in which they were interested or needed help. It was my privilege to serve with him for several years, and our association was always most pleasant and his counsel most helpful. His career and notable contributions to the laws of our country remain as an example and inspiration to all of us. I sincerely wish for him many more years of happiness and contentment.

The Full Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, elsewhere in this RECORD I have inserted the statement made by Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, before the Committee on Armed Services of the House in connection with the proposed reorganization of the Defense Department.

Here I insert the remarks of Gen. R. Mc. Pate, the commandant of the United States Marine Corps.

I believe it significant and interesting to direct your attention to the fact that on Saturday night last in an address before the Reserve Officers Association of the Washington area, General Counsel Robert Dechert of the Defense Department, took occasion to severely criticize the Navy and the Marines, particularly the Marines, for the position taken by them through Admiral Burke and General Pate. Mr. Dechert explained that he was proud of the Marines and a former Marine himself and then he set about chastising them and using language which was most inappropriate and shocking.

This was a clear demonstration of the effect of the Pentagon "gag" rule. Here an official Pentagon spokesman was allowed to attack two honored branches of the armed services without either one of them being allowed to defend themselves.

In my limited capacity I attempted to put forth the true story in a television debate with Mr. Dechert Sunday on "Celebrity Parade" conducted by the able commentator Joseph McCaffery.

"It is not so," was in substance the only defense of Mr. Dechert, although I repeatedly made statements based on the public record of the hearings, Mr. Dechert flatly denied the facts. I would not have been surprised had he said: "That is not true," if I had said "there are Ten Commandments."

In one instance I pointed out to him that the Defense Department, through the technique of withholding appropriated funds, had reduced the fighting combat strength of the Marines from 200,00 to 188,000. He replied that the Navy Department and not the Defense Department had made the reduction. I insisted that it was the Defense Department and not the Navy.

Following the debate I checked with the proper authorities and was informed that it was the Defense Department and not the Navy Department which had reduced the combat strength of the Marines.

I could go on ad infinitum but let General Pate tell the story here, because he cannot speak outside the committee

room under instructions from the Defense Department.

STATEMENT OF THE COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS, GEN. R. McC. PATE, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS, BEFORE THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am appearing before you today in both of my capacities—first, as a participant in the Joint Chiefs of Staff; and second, and chiefly, as head of one of the services, as Commandant of the Marine Corps.

At the outset, let me say that I applaud and support the general objectives and, with only a few reservations, the principles stated in the President's message to Congress of 3 April. Certainly, for example, "separate ground, sea and air warfare is gone forever." This has been so since 1942. We have realized it in the Marine Corps for many years, and I am sure you need no reminder that today, as in the past, we are the service which above all, is at home in all media, in the air, on land and on the sea.

Equally necessary the authority of the Secretary of Defense must be clear and direct. So far as I can discover, no one has ever quarreled with this.

Let me say, however, that important as they are, I do not consider organization and reorganization as panaceas. You have already heard this often; let me repeat it. No amount of organizational tinkering can take the place of good men, wholeheartedly determined to make the system work. Moreover, in the words of Ferdinand Eberstadt, who is something of an authority on Defense organization:

"Fighting spirit is not primarily the result of a neat organization chart nor of a logical organizational setup. The former should never be sacrificed to the latter."

Now, having given these brief general observations, let me comment on some features of the proposed legislation.

First of all, there are a number of aspects of the bill which I endorse wholeheartedly.

The proposed provisions for efficient centralization of defense research and engineering under the immediate control of the Secretary of Defense seem to me to be wise and forward-looking.

Such centralization gives the Secretary of Defense breathing space and means to explore dispassionately the likely capabilities of new technological developments before he assigns them to the appropriate service. If, on the other hand, a service is allowed to pursue research along a given line from the very outset, regardless of where it may lead, any suggestion that the fruit of such development may not belong properly to that service meets with understandable resistance. To avoid such frustrations and to assist the Secretary in carrying out his duty to make decisions as to what service or services will use the various new weapons as they become operational, this feature of the bill is certainly worthy of consideration.

Another proposal which I support completely is that which would facilitate transfer of officers among the services. This can be accomplished today, and sometimes is, but needless redtape obstacles exist. They should be eased, and I believe the proposed provision would effect this. On the other hand, I should regret to see advantage being taken of this or any similar enactment, in such a way as to encourage interservice "raiding" through offers of preferment intended to induce particularly desirable officers to transfer. Possibly it might be wise to insert language in this portion of the bill to insure that any officer so transferred to another service would do so only with his existing seniority.

There are, to be sure, some general features of the proposed bill which, although they do not touch the Marine Corps explicitly, I view with reservation. Perhaps they go further than was really intended. I have no doubt you will recognize these if you have not already done so.

Among these general features are elements of the proposal which relate to the unified commands. While their purpose is not clear to me, so far as I know these commands are operating satisfactorily today.

In addition to these matters which are of general concern, a few of the changes are of immediate interest to the Marine Corps. As your primary witness on the Marine Corps—I view them with real apprehension. I am sure that the Secretary of Defense does not intend to take advantage of these proposed changes to impair our usefulness. But this is a government of laws not of men and we cannot make the laws on the assumption that we will always be blessed by men of today's high caliber. As the committee knows well, the Marine Corps has undergone—and happily, survived—several attempts to reorganize it into nonentity.

With such hard-earned consciousness of history, we recognize the danger of having the answer to whether the Marine Corps shall be a truly effective force or simply a ceremonial unit dependent upon the whim of a single individual rather than the considered judgment of the body which called it into existence nearly two centuries ago. I would certainly hate to think that some future Secretary of Defense might misread the enactment of some of the proposed features of this bill as a mandate from Congress to rationalize the Marine Corps out of a job, or, as General Vandergrift put it somewhat less abstractly, in his testimony before Congress in 1947, "to give the Marine Corps the bum's rush."

To be specific, the feature of this bill which causes me very grave concern as Commandant of the Marine Corps, is the proposal to repeal sections 202 (c) (1), (2), and (3) of the National Security Act as it now stands. These three sections prohibit the transfer, reassignment, abolition, or consolidation of the combatant functions which Congress has assigned to the respective services elsewhere in the National Security Act. Since the history of these prohibitions in section 202 (c), is not well known, you will perhaps excuse me if I retrace my steps to 1949 when the so-called Tydings amendments to the National Security Act were under consideration by Congress.

You will note that, both then and today, the law has treated quite carefully the combatant functions of all the services. With respect to the larger services, the prescription is quite broad, but with regard to the Marine Corps, these combatant functions have been very carefully delineated by Congress. Some of them, as a matter of fact, go directly back 160 years to the Marine Corps Act of 11 July 1798, and have held up to this very day.

That Congress has spelled out the combatant functions of the Marine Corps in this precise language is no accident, as I am sure members of this committee are well aware. It was specifically to insure that the United States Marine Corps would continue to make an effective contribution to national security that the detailed combatant functions enunciated in section 306 (c) of the National Security Act were written into law.

Ours is a specific task, involving something of the land, the sea, and the air. It does not respond to generalization as do the functions of the other services, and our continued usefulness is dependent on the specific language as it exists in the law today.

Moreover, this language has never in any way interfered with our ability to serve effectively with the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, or in a unified command.

Thus, any tampering with these functions—or with the safeguards of section 202 (c) which, in turn, now protect them—could be a most dangerous change insofar as the Marine Corps' future ability to fight is concerned.

In 1949, you will recall, your committee queried the Secretary of Defense as to whether he had plans under his general powers to assign marine aviation to the Air Force, an action which would have impaired the combat effectiveness of the Marine Corps by a stroke of the pen. In the same year there were authoritative proposals which actually reached the Joint Chiefs of Staff that service responsibilities for airborne and amphibious operations be canceled by the Secretary of Defense and made the common responsibility (nobody's responsibility in reality) of all the services. I leave it to your conjecture just how much the amphibious art could or would have suffered.

These are only examples, but you will see that real dangers existed, and that Congress' reservation to itself of the power to make changes in the combatant functions of all the services, was no abstraction but a real safeguard against hasty or ill-considered decisions going to the heart of our military readiness. I consider these safeguards today as one of the principal assurances in law that the Nation can continue to have useful armed services all capable of a continued contribution to the military readiness of the United States. And I find it difficult to imagine how the present law, which, as I have said, insures the continued usefulness of the Marine Corps, can be regarded as unduly restrictive, other than by some future Secretary of Defense who intended sooner or later to alter the marines' status and functions.

After all the Congress is as interested in the effectiveness of the Armed Forces as anyone else. Indeed, it has frequently taken the initiative to improve their effectiveness—sometimes against the opposition of the military services themselves. If a merger, consolidation, transfer, or elimination has sufficient merit to earn the unqualified support of the Secretary of Defense the Congress will certainly give it a most careful hearing.

From the viewpoint of the Marine Corps, I therefore strongly favor retention in law of section 202 (c) (1), (2), and (3) of the National Security Act as it now stands.

As a sequel to this discussion of the possible effects of the proposed legislation upon the combatant functions of the Marine Corps, I believe it would be useful to reexamine just what the Marines contribute to national security, in order to insure that they are actually meeting a real need. Irrespective of any useful contribution which the Marine Corps has made in the past, its preservation cannot be based upon sentiment. It must be based upon unquestioned requirements.

While technology has narrowed the oceans, the United States is still an island nation, and North America is the last great world island. Our potential enemies are separated from us by the seas. Our military history reflects a recognition that we must try to meet our military problems overseas and not wait until they come to our shores. The Marines have done a lot, in years past, to make this military philosophy a success by taking part in emergency overseas expeditions for the specific purpose of deterring little wars or terminating little wars before they become big ones. That is what Marine forces were doing in 1950 when they went to Korea on such short notice. It is what they were prepared to do when they were dispatched to the Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf in the Suez crisis of 1956. And it is what they are ready to do now.

Are crises like Korea and Suez less likely to happen in today's nuclear/missile age than they were in years past? The consensus is they are actually much more likely so long as the Communist orbit and the free world have the capacity to destroy each other

totally, should either trigger the holocaust of total nuclear devastation.

It is because of this hydrogen standoff that the Communist regime, the regime which would bury us, has refurbished its techniques for achieving its ends through lesser war—by fomenting troubles which fall somewhere between the exchange of diplomatic notes and the exchange of intercontinental missiles.

This is the so-called limited war which the Soviets know so well and which they have employed so effectively. In its military aspects it is certainly nothing new. Indeed, it is the very kind of war that has consumed the time and energies of the Marine Corps for most of its two centuries. It is because of today's limited war that the demand is more pressing now than ever before for the ready, flexible, balanced, Marine expeditionary forces prescribed in the National Security Act.

That act prescribes that there shall be 3 combat Marine divisions and 3 Marine Aircraft Wings and that they shall be prepared for expeditionary duty beyond the seas. We have the units, and they are ready to do the job for which they were designed. They are on a war footing and within the limits imposed by the state of the art and by the budgetary restraints, they meet the requirements of today's warfare. If a Marine expeditionary force is needed today—we can meet that requirement today.

It is my conviction that the usefulness of these ready forces is fully recognized. Neither the President's message nor the responsive draft legislation implies any reduction in the requirement for these ready Marine air-ground task forces. And only last week General Twining advised this committee that the mission of the Marine Corps, as expressed in the National Security Act, is completely valid.

From all this, it seems fair to conclude that the proponents of the present reorganization do not visualize it as a lever to reduce the Marine Corps' capacity to make a continued contribution to national security. Nevertheless, as I have pointed out earlier, present good intentions are no insurance against future damage to our usefulness; only in the law can we find such insurance.

You will note that, although I have sometimes used words as "safeguards," and "insurance," I have tried—and hope to keep this point clear—to relate these expressions to the guarantee of a useful, effective Marine Corps. In our view, the present functions of the corps, spelled out in law, do just that. Moreover, in a maritime nation such as ours, someone, whether he is a Marine or not, will always have to perform such functions. If anyone else, any other service, feels capable of doing these things which we have always done, better and more efficiently than we do and have done them, we not only welcome the competition but are perfectly ready to step aside for performance which excels our own. In other words, to use Justice Holmes' phrase, the Marine Corps is always prepared and willing to submit to the test of the open market.

As I conclude, I think I should say that my relations with the Secretary of Defense—and with his predecessor, for that matter—have been direct and cordial. He knows my feelings about the current proposals to change the law. My reactions to those features which directly affect the Marine Corps come from a realization that all legislation has, or surely ought to have, a purpose. If so, and if certain of these proposals are enacted in their present form, it seems to me that some future Secretary of Defense might well feel entitled to believe that Congress had written him a blank check by the repeal of the first 3 subparagraphs of section 202 (c) in the National Security Act.

I have no fear as to the intentions of those now in high office, but the future prospects for preservation of the Marine Corps as a useful, ready, fighting, national expeditionary force, must be the Commandant's constant concern. It is my conviction that the question of whether the Marine Corps shall be a truly effective force capable of making its unique and significant contribution to the national security or simply a ceremonial unit is of such importance to the national security as to warrant the considered judgment of the Congress itself.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, I do not have to assure you, the members of this committee and the Congress, that whatever law Congress may enact, the country will find that the Marine Corps, now and in the future, will carry it out wholeheartedly and without reservation.

Reorganization Defense Department: What Aims?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL J. KILDAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Army Times of April 26, 1958.

The Army Times is an authoritative and competent military publication. Its editorial views are important:

WHAT AIMS?

High-ranking witnesses called to testify before congressional committees on the worth of the President's reorganization plan are expected to operate under some restraint, imposed by the word from still higher up. Nevertheless, enough vagueness lingers about the proposals—despite all the interpretations published in the past few weeks—to make it imperative that a body of expert opinion be built up around a number of important points. To that end, we hope Congress will be tenacious and the witnesses frank.

Many people wish to know, for example, whether the plan's concentration on the need for unification has not been unduly heavy. Nowhere in the President's message is there a critical word for the centralization of power already existing in the Defense Department hierarchy—a power which, fenced in by numerous assistant secretaries, boards, commissions, and committees—has cost us much in wasted effort, indecision, and confusion. Very little reorganization on this level has been proposed.

On the other hand, at the very top, the Defense Secretary and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would be brought into a close and constant relationship. On its face, this is not a bad thing. But, under the proposal, these two men (with the President) would command all operational units of the Armed Forces. The service Chiefs of Staff would be divorced from their services and operate as advisers to the Chairman and the Defense Secretary. Their present assistants would run the housekeeping units, under the service Secretaries. And these would be called upon to serve the logistical needs of the combined fighting arms, formed into joint commands and commanded only by the Defense Secretary and his Chairman.

The Chairman thus becomes, in fact, if not in name, a superchief and all-powerful. With the legal authority voted him to act in this post, one wonders how long the separate Departments of the Army, Air Force, and Navy can endure. (Mr. Eisenhower says this dissolution, or merger, will never occur. With the best intentions on the part of everyone concerned taken for granted, it is hard to see how it can fail to occur.)

If the plan is adopted in its entirety, it is possible that within a few years we will possess a monolithic system of defense depending on 1 or 2 men to make it work. In that space of time, the Joint Chiefs may lose much of their usefulness as their experience with operational activities grows more and more remote. The unified commands, 6 or 8 of them scattered over the globe, will meanwhile have been building "empires" as they competed for men, equipment, and money. Their logistical demands upon the services will be compounded in Washington. And the commands themselves, which had been set up originally to carry out certain objectives, may well be frozen in place around missions which no longer conform to the national needs.

Whatever else our present system does not have, it does possess a certain flexibility. We would do well not to toss it lightly away.

Instead, it might be well at this point to go a little slowly. (We are sure the controversy will drag out in Congress for some time, anyway.) Why not, meanwhile work at defining clear national objectives on which the Joint Chiefs of Staff can base a positive strategy? This has never been done; its delineation might help us form a better idea of the ways and means of putting it in effect.

Spotlight on Pentagon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL VINSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, of the New York Times:

SPOTLIGHT ON PENTAGON: HOUSE HEARING ON REORGANIZATION SEEN AS VITAL EFFORT TO CLARIFY BILL'S SCOPE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The House Armed Services Committee continued yesterday to probe into the details of the President's plan for reorganization of the Pentagon.

The hearings, under the chairmanship of CARL VINSON, Georgia Democrat, are in the best traditions of the congressional function. They are intended to develop the meaning and the intent of the legislation, as well as to determine how the projected bill would alter the established order and affect the security of the Nation.

The detailed questions being asked and answered in the hearing rooms are particularly needed. This is so because most of the official and unofficial comment about the reorganization plan had been extremely general until these hearings started.

Much of the comment has consisted of military platitudes to which no one could take exception but that shed no light on the problems of the Nation's security organization.

The committee members have repeatedly expressed, in questioning witnesses, fears about the actual and implicit powers granted by the projected legislation. Some of the extreme fears, such as the danger of a "man on horseback," are unrealistic or envision highly improbable events.

The committee members, however, are not creating strawmen. Their honest concern about the powers granted by the legislation

and about the intentions of its sponsors is based on solid fact and on a long history of attempts to convert our security organization into a closely centralized monolithic structure.

WIDE POWERS CONCEDED

The question already has elicited, for instance, the admissions that the projected legislation would grant the Secretary of Defense power, without any congressional veto, to eliminate Marine aviation; to merge the Army's Corps of Engineers with the Navy's Bureau of Yards and Docks; to abolish or alter service functions, and to permit the de facto merger of the individual services.

Witnesses have conceded that certain provisions of the law could tend toward the establishment of a kind of general staff in the Pentagon.

All these changes may or may not be desirable; there is sharp difference of opinion about them. The point is, the projected law does not purport to authorize or advocate such sweeping changes, but its legal phraseology makes such changes permissive.

All the witnesses, especially Secretary of Defense Neil H. McElroy, have stated emphatically that such sweeping changes were not intended.

INVESTIGATORS SKEPTICAL

But members of the committee, most of them with long years of experience in military matters, are still skeptical. They are not doubting the truthfulness or sincerity of the witnesses, but are wary of the grants of power conveyed by the legislation. The honest intentions of the present officials in the White House and the Pentagon will not necessarily guide future incumbents.

The reasons for the committee's skepticism are based solidly on experience since World War II. There have been persistent efforts to achieve just what the witnesses say the projected legislation is not intended to achieve: That is, a monolithic Department of Defense with a very powerful Secretary, a single chief of staff, a greater general staff and more or less merged services.

President Eisenhower became quite angry at a recent news conference when he was asked if his reorganization bill would not make it possible for some future incumbent in the Pentagon to establish a "kind of personal army." The question was extreme. Nevertheless, the President, when a general, did favor the monolithic concept of defense organization. He also advocated the changes witnesses now say the projected law is not intended to achieve.

As Chief of Staff of the Army, the President is on record as favoring a single professional Chief of Staff for all the armed services. In 1945 he declared that "if I had my way, we would all be in the same uniform."

He also approved, while as general, a memorandum that, if it had been adopted, would have reduced the Marine Corps to combat units no larger than regiments. It also would have made the Marines' primary function the guarding of naval stations and bases and the provision of lightly armed units to protect United States interests ashore in foreign countries.

In 1944 a War Department proposal for unification, envisaged the establishment of a Chief of Staff, with full budgetary powers, and a Secretary of Defense, without any budgetary authority. Later, in 1945, a Secretary with more powers was advocated, together with a single Chief of Staff over all the armed services.

The concept of a defense structure with a powerful Secretary and, particularly, a powerful Chief of Staff with a greater general staff over all the armed services had been advocated, pushed and urged in one form or another by President Eisenhower and some of his present advisers for more than 13 years.

Congress has always been suspicious of this concept, yet the history of Defense Department organization has been one of a slow drift toward such a centralized consolidation of power.

The current hearings, therefore, are covering familiar ground. At times, the testimony may appear to be shadowboxing, since all the witnesses deny an intent that the projected law appears to permit.

But experience indicates that the congressional fears are not bogeymen. In some respects, but not in all its provisions, the proposed law would seem to dress up in more palatable form the old proposals of 1944 and 1945.

Independent Phone Company Is Important Segment in Economy of a Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein the following article as it appeared in the Lancaster, S. C., News, on April 10, 1958:

INDEPENDENT PHONE COMPANY IS IMPORTANT SEGMENT IN ECONOMY OF A COMMUNITY

The 4,100 independent (non-Bell) telephone companies of America, of which the local telephone company is one, and which serve 11,000 communities and two-thirds of the geographical area of the country, now operate 9,671,500 of the 63,912,500 telephones in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and have a total plant investment of $2,760,214,723.

According to T. Carter Thomasson, manager of the Lancaster Telephone Co., figures released by the United States Independent Telephone Association, reflect the continuing growth and progress of the industry, which has been expanding at an accelerated pace during the past 12 years to meet the unprecedented demands for telephone service occasioned by population growth, increased usage, and a prosperous economy. While the country's population increased 36 percent during the 22-year period from 1935 to 1957, the number of independent telephones soared from 3,185,000 to 9,771,500 or 204 percent, the association said.

The independent telephone industry, through its operating companies, equipment manufacturers, and suppliers, serves approximately 11,000 communities in the United States, which is twice the number served by the Bell System. However, because Bell companies operate in most of the larger metropolitan areas, they have by far the larger number of telephones (54,241,000).

The independent industry has introduced a number of major technical advances in the telephone field, including the first practical dial switching system, which was invented by Almon Brown Strowger, a Kansas City undertaker. Its first commercial application was made more than 61 years ago in an independent exchange at La Porte, Ind. A few years later, the independents introduced the first dial telephones in a number of exchanges in various parts of the country. Today, many independents are installing direct distance dialing whereby the customer dials his own long distance numbers without the assistance of an operator. About 75 percent of all independent telephones are now dial operated.

At the turn of the century, independents introduced dial telephone systems in such large cities as Chicago, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Omaha, which cities are now served exclusively by the Bell System. Some of the cities in which the independents operate include Tampa and St. Petersburg, Fla.; Jamestown, N. Y.; Long Beach, Santa Monica, and the entire suburban area of Los Angeles, Calif.; Fort Wayne and Terre Haute, Ind.; Durham, N. C.; Erie, Pa.; and Lexington, Ky.; Sumter, S. C., and Lancaster, S. C.

The Nation's long distance service is furnished primarily by the Bell System toll network. All long distance facilities are interconnected with indepdent telephone company lines. Long distance traffic between the two segments of the industry is freely interchanged. Agreements are in effect covering routings and divisions of revenues. Many independent companies themselves own and operate a large mileage of toll lines, mostly regional in character, all interconnected with the Bell network and with the toll facilities of neighboring independent companies.

President Challenged on Pentagon Changes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL VINSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by one of the most distinguished military analysts in the country, Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, of the New York Times:

PRESIDENT CHALLENGED ON PENTAGON CHANGES—CRITICS SAY HE IS ASKING TOO MUCH IN ADDITION TO PRESENT POWERS

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The President's program for reorganizing the Pentagon encountered increasingly rough sledding last week before the House Armed Services Committee as a parade of witnesses registered increasing degrees of dissent.

Ghosts of past organizational plans stalked the committee rooms and complicated the hearings. Before the week was out it was obvious that many of the reluctant witnesses—and the committee itself—were more worried about the intent of the administration and the broad permissive powers the new law might convey to this and future administrations rather than about the avowed objectives of Secretary of Defense Neil H. McElroy.

The present powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and the authority of the Secretary of Defense under existing law, and just how these powers would be broadened under the proposed legislation, were under critical and searching examination.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

There was general agreement that the President and his Secretary of Defense already possess the power to accomplish legally some of the objectives outlined in the administration's message to Congress (and to accomplish others de facto). Executive orders have set the wheels in motion in some areas. The Secretary of Defense has issued a memorandum to the service Secretaries which stated that future promotions of admirals and generals to three- and four-star rank would have to be approved by

both the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and those promoted would be selected in part because of "their capacity for dealing objectively—without extreme service partisanship—with matters of the broadest significance to our national security."

The President and the Secretary of Defense also have present power to reduce, eliminate, or merge the public-information sections and legislative liaison sections of the individual services. The President had indicated publicly that these agencies tended to exacerbate interservice rivalries and should be curbed—although it has always been within his power or that of the Secretary of Defense to curb them. Only exploratory studies have been conducted to date.

CHANGES BY ORDER

The President has also issued an Executive order, reversing one he issued 5 years ago, which alters the chain of command in the Pentagon, eliminates individual services as "executive agencies," and removes the service Secretaries from the command channel. This order, however, is still inoperative, since part of the President's new chain of command contemplates the establishment of a "Pentagon command post"—an operations division within the Joint Staff of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—and this would probably necessitate an increase in the size of the Joint Staff, now limited by law to 210 officers.

Another recommendation of the President, that the Secretary of Defense be granted greater budgetary flexibility by Congress and that a new appropriations system be adopted which would enable the Secretary to shift funds from project to project or service to service, has been postponed for implementation until next year and plays no part in the present hearings.

PRESENT POWERS

The Secretary already possesses some of this budgetary power. Congress has granted him, for instance, a sizable emergency fund to be applied as he sees fit, and the Secretary can, de facto, eliminate, reduce, or even increase project and service requests for funds to Congress. The President's plan contemplates still greater financial authority for the Secretary, an issue which involves detailed congressional control of the purse strings.

Further grants of power conveyed by the projected legislation are the subject of some dispute in the hearings; nearly all of them center around the authority of the Secretary of Defense.

That authority today, according to a legal opinion—written for the Defense Department in 1953 by a committee composed of H. Struve Hensel, Rogert Kent, and Frank X. Brown—"is complete and supreme."

"Congress," this opinion declared, "has delegated to the Secretary of Defense not only all the authority and power normally given the head of an executive department, but Congress has, in addition, expressly given the Secretary of Defense even greater power when it made [him] the principal assistant to the President in all matters relating to the Department of Defense."

MEANING OF THE LAW

This opinion explicitly stated that "there are not separately administered preserves in the Department of Defense." The phrase "in the present law"—a phrase which the President is seeking to repeal—that the "Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force shall be separately administered by their respective Secretaries" simply means, the opinion continues, that "the Secretary of Defense cannot exercise his supreme power so as to destroy the separate entities of the three military department."

The 1953 opinion also pointed out that despite the overriding authority granted to the Secretary of Defense, Congress has explicitly written into the present law certain limitations upon that authority, some of which the administration is now seeking to eliminate. Perhaps the most important and controversial limitation was the specific assignment by Congress of combatant functions or "roles and missions" to the services. The Secretary is explicitly forbidden from "transferring, reassigning, abolishing, or consolidating" such functions. He cannot accomplish the same purpose by detailing or assigning personnel or directing the expenditure of funds. He cannot merge the three military departments, nor can he establish a single military commander of supreme general staff over all the services.

He may, however, after first reporting his intention to the Armed Services Committees of the Congress, change or transfer from one section of the Pentagon to another functions which are not expressly frozen by law. And finally, as a check upon his authority, any Secretary of an individual service or member of the Joint Chiefs may take his case to Congress "after first so informing the Secretary of Defense." This clause, too, is repealed by the new legislation.

The administration's proposed changes would eliminate most of these restraints upon the Secretary's power. The new law would specifically permit the Secretary to alter combatant functions or roles and missions.

REDUCTION OF SERVICES

The separate services would be retained de jure, but de facto might be reduced to training, supply and housekeeping units. The power of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and of the expanded Joint Staff under him would be increased. A director of defense research and engineering with broader powers than any prior Assistant Secretary of Defense would be created to control service research.

The command functions exercised tacitly or de jure by the military heads of the various services would be limited to such forces as the service secretaries might determine—not including any forces assigned to unified commands.

There may be—in fact there still was—last week, legal debate about exactly what these new grants of authority would mean. But there was no doubt that they broadened considerably—in legal terms—the already great authority that is resident in the Secretary of Defense.

No 5-Cent Post Stamps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Camden Chronicle, Camden, S. C., of April 30, 1958:

NO 5-CENT POST STAMP

As predicted here a long time ago, first-class postage will be no more than 4 cents, whether your letter is going across the street or across the continent. The administration request for 5-cent postage (4 cents locally) which was passed by the Senate, was killed in conference by 2 of the 3 Senate conferees, Chairman OLIN D. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, of the Senate Post Office Committee, and Senator MIKE MONRONEY of Oklahoma.

Subsequently, the Senate and House conferees agreed on pay raises for 530,000 postal workers that will average about 9.5 percent, which is a considerable hike over the 6 percent suggested by the President.

Thus, administration supporters were quick to predict a veto, and Senator FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas, sponsor of the 5-cent stamp and the third Senate member of the conference committee, is quoted as saying: "I don't see how President Eisenhower could possibly sign this bill."

And perhaps he shouldn't. It is not a good bill in any sense. It is, at best, a stopgap measure that will increase revenues, raise pay and leave the post office in the same mess it is in now. It is unrealistic in sidestepping the establishment of a basic postal policy outlining post-office services that should be supported by postal revenues, and the authorization and financing of a long-range full-scale moderization program, as urged by Senator JOHNSTON. Both of these, as the Senator has pointed out, are essential to the formulation of proper postage rates and pay scales.

Perhaps a veto will clear the way to start over on a really constructive, forward-looking postal bill. But we still say you need not expect to pay more than 4 cents to mail a letter anywhere in the United States of America.

Retirees Who Are Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BURNS
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, a lengthened life expectancy is a major accomplishment of our day and age. We have not, however, taken proper cognizance of the many problems encountered by our senior citizens who live the added years our science has given them.

Pending before a subcommitee of the House Education and Labor Committee, chairmaned by the very able and knowledgeable Congressman from Minnesota, the Honorable ROY WEIR, is legislation designed to place the proper emphasis on this most important subject and the many inherent problems.

Apropos to the subject, I include an editorial from the Honolulu Advertiser, April 5, 1958, which, while factually in error as to the Honolulu Board of Supervisors' action, makes a very sound contribution to the subject of the problems of our aging.

The editorial follows:

[From the Honolulu Advertiser of April 5, 1958]

RETIREES WHO ARE ALONE

This Territory, like the rest of the country, has an urgent need for housing for elderly people whose income is low. Some provision has been made by the Federal and Territorial governments for low rent dwellings for people with families, none for those who are alone in their old age. These number nearly half of the 13.5 million Americans who are over 65 years old.

Mrs. Mary Cleverley, who is here for a week representing the Federal Housing Administration, warns that institutional old age apartment housing, like that projected for the Kaneohe district, will not alone solve the problem. She finds that the great need

is for modest homes that can be rented for $50 a month. That rental is based on an estimated retirement income of $200 a month. It does not take into consideration those people who have only social security income, or pensions of $108 or less a month.

* * * * *

Hawaii Housing Authority's projects, with Federal aid, provide for some of the Island families who require low rent shelter, but has not been permitted to house elderly people who are alone. It was blocked in an attempt to do so within the past month, when the Honolulu Board of Supervisors rejected City Planning Commission approval of a building project for that purpose.

Census figures of 8 years ago, the latest available, show that of about 21,000 persons over 65 years of age in Hawaii, 11,000 were alone. National figures of the same census showed 13.5 million people over 65 years, of whom 7 million were widows, widowers, unmarried or divorced. There are many more now. Lee Maice, Hawaii's housing administrator, estimates there will be 20,000 here by 1970.

* * * * *

The plight of people who are alone in their old age actually is graver than that of those who have mates, yet for some reason, that has not been explained, they have been ignored until recently; still are receiving less attention in most places than they are given here. In Hawaii their need has been at least recognized, although efforts to assist them with shelter have thus far been unavailing.

This situation, locally and nationally, requires a practical solution. Talk of $200 a month incomes and $50 rentals is very fine, but the dismaying truth remains that there are millions of Americans who do not have that kind of money. Institutions provide an existence of sorts for some of those who do not, but institutionalizing the country's elderly people is unworthy of this Nation and of the American people.

It is shameful to condemn those who should be enjoying in freedom the comforts of what we term their golden years to confinement, which is exactly that, however much effort is made to soften its impact while they wait in hopelessness for death to overtake them.

Liberal Viewpoints of Americans for Democratic Action Stretched To Suit Circumstances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Americans for Democratic Action was founded with one of their main objectives being to clarify the aims of the New Deal and to work for their attainment.

Like the majority of liberal organizations, their principles are as liberal and flexible as is necessary to meet any line of reasoning they want to follow at any given moment.

The Americans for Democratic Action, being controlled by Democrats, looks at unemployment under a Democrat administration as not being an economic emergency, but approximately the same amount of unemployment under a Republican administration calls for pellmell action regardless of long-range considerations.

The Chicago Daily Tribune, in its editorial of April 28, forcefully points out the ADA's liberal double-talk as follows:

IT DEPENDS WHOSE RECESSION IT IS

Americans for Democratic Action, appropriately described the other day in a staff report of the Senate Republican policy committee as a vehicle for socializing the United States, has come up with its program for ending the recession. The chairman, Robert Nathan, summarized the contents pretty well when, in an attempted crack at the Eisenhower administration, he said, "If business is not as usual, politics is."

The A. D. A. prospectus calls for a tax cut of $8 to $10 billion. It then stacks up a pile of spending projects which would commit the government to billions of dollars in inflationary deficit spending. Among these are outright Federal grants for school construction, Federal grants for those not covered by unemployment insurance, Federal action in aid of depressed areas, and extension of jobless pay to 39 weeks at 50 percent of weekly wages.

We recently had some fun reciting what Democrats, particularly Harry Truman, had to say about the current recession and what they were saying about the recession of 1949–50, when Truman was President. The A. D. A. also invites this comparison. In a recent statement urging a crash Federal spending program, such as Nathan advocates now, the A. D. A. stated, "If this recession were allowed to run its natural course, this would cause further needless human suffering and cost the whole country additional billions."

When the Truman recession was in progress, the A. D. A. managed to remain calm, although that slump was, in some respects, wider and deeper than the present one. The A. D. A. statement of July 19, 1949, read, "We are now in no economic emergency which would make it necessary to rush pellmell into an improvised program of action that discarded longer range considerations."

The inference would appear to be that a recession isn't a recession if the New Dealers are in charge, but that the Nation is obliged to run pellmell into improvised spending programs if the responsibility can be assessed against the Republicans.

Resolution on Unemployment Compensation and Antirecession Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution on unemployment compensation and antirecession bills as adopted by local 163 of the UAW–AFL–CIO, Detroit, Mich. I join with its president and membership in urging the Congress to take immediate steps to institute legislation that will bring a halt to the recession.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND ANTIRECESSION BILLS

Whereas 5 million or more people are unemployed in the United States and over 415,000 in the State of Michigan or over 14.3 percent of the total Michigan labor force; and

Whereas currently, the labor situation is very unsettled. Many manufacturing concerns are working an average of below 32 hours a week, and many are staggering work schedules with no definite work pattern, causing additional loss of working days and purchasing power; and

Whereas hundreds of thousands are completely unemployed in the State and are existing on the present standard of unemployment compensation and have had to resort to direct relief for the bare necessities of life, and other thousands of unemployed are ineligible for unemployment compensation; and

Whereas these hundreds of thousands of persons who have exhausted their claims must rely on public assistance which is being flooded daily with new requests for direct relief; and foreclosure and evictions are staring them in the face, with the future holding no promise of improvement; and

Whereas an immediate program to relieve the hardships of unemployment is needed. In addition to extending unemployment compensation benefits, there should be a moratorium on house payments, subject to Federal legislation, during periods of unemployment with no interest accruing for that period. The Federal Government should offer to refinance mortgages and land contracts for homeowners facing eviction due to unemployment. Such refinancing should provide reasonable interest rates, deferment of payments, and waiver of interest during periods of unemployment; and

Whereas the antirecession bills now before the United States Congress should have the full support of all organizations. These bills are:

Unemployment Insurance, S. 3244, H. R. 10570, Kennedy-McCarthy bill.

Housing, S. 3373, Senator John Sparkman bill.

School construction, H. R. 1 and S. 777, Kelley-Neuberger bills.

Hospital construction, Hill-Burton Act (extension).

Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance, H. R. 9467, Forand bill.

Minimum wage, S. 1267, H. R. 4575, Morse-Kelley Bill, and S. 1853, Kennedy bill.

Area Redevelopment Act, S. 964 and H. R. 6215, Douglas-Spence bill: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That local 163, UAW–AFL–CIO go on record calling upon Congress to do all in its power to support the passage of this legislation and take immediate action to alleviate the hardships created by unemployment; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be presented to Congresswoman MARTHA GRIFFITHS at this membership meeting, Sunday, April 27, 1958, and mailed to United States Senators PAT MCNAMARA and CHARLES POTTER, and all Congressmen from Wayne County, Mich.

The Impression We Leave at Brussels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a thoughtful article about the American exhibit at the Brussels Fair by Miss Dorothy Thompson, which appeared in the Washington Star of May 1, 1958, entitled "The Point of Our Brussels Exhibit—Basic American Mes-

sage Preferred to Models as the Center of Focus."

I feel sure that many will agree with her that the American pavilion should include an exhibit emphasizing the American heritage of freedom.

The article follows:

My column suggesting that we ought to have something better to serve visitors to the Brussels Fair than a cuisine centered around the hot dog found some spirited opponents and defenders of the hot dog. I never suggested there should be no hot dogs but that the canines should be kept on a leash and that we should have one restaurant to appeal to gourmets. It's not un-American to like a little refinement.

In the fashion parades, we are showing mink coats and original models by our top designers as well as cheap and pretty cotton dresses from the jobbers.

I haven't seen the fair, but an editor friend who has, complains of more fundamental things. He says the United States pavilion of Architect Edward D. Stone, a light, airy design in concentric circles, is beautiful, but that the exhibit as a whole presents an aspect of restless confused movement without a focus, a picture of a civilization that is going hectically toward no discernible goal.

The circles gather around a pool, actually the center of the show. Down a ramp to a raft in it models parade—making girls and clothes the focal point of American culture? The background is dominated by a mural of the cartoons of Steinberg whom I find amusing without understanding the prominence. Everything, my friend told me, is so contemporary and transient as to suggest that America has neither past nor future but lives wholly in the present.

But America is tradition as well as movement and change. And America has a focus. That focus is belief in the high destiny of humanity and in the American mission to help realize it for ourselves and all mankind. Maybe it's difficult to express that focus in a show, but it's expressed in all our great monuments to the heroes who have believed in it and recorded their faith in immortal words. Of these the greatest is the Lincoln Memorial.

How many millions of Americans and others have mounted the long flight to the room where the homely, ungainly somber President sits, unposed, in bronze? The face wears no photogenic smile. Loneliness, even tragedy, emanate from the figure.

But more impressive than the statue are the words of the Gettysburg Address and the Second Inaugural carved tall in stone. Once I heard Charles Laughton repeat them in a reading. He spoke without any inflection of his voice or change in facial expression. He told me afterwards, "I thought of stone speaking. I wished to absent myself."

Words are more immortal than stone, steel or bronze. They live in minds and hearts for milleniums, if they speak truth to the soul.

Somewhere in this exhibition the great continuity of the American message should find expression. The words of Jefferson, Lincoln, the first Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, the second Roosevelt, Wendell Willkie, and of the American poets forever singing her song. They might move as news dispatches are presented in moving lights, silently, above the movement and clamor.

Surely people would pause, reading with wonder, learning that America is more than electronics, atomic reactors, great manufactories, but that past, present and future, it is the home of great souls.

What has happened to us that we shrink from displaying this, dismissing as corny anything that inspires and aspires? Great nations do not live by bread alone, and above all America has never so lived.

Even if foreigners did not read, Americans would, and reading, remember. And that, of itself, would be a good thing.

Scholarship Programs for Adult Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, in emphasizing the establishment of scholarship progams for our youth, we must not ignore the development of another great potential in our population.

There are many adults who, for one good reason or another, did not complete their formal education. Certain responsibilities—mainly financial—have prevented them from renewing and completing their educational pursuits.

Given facilities and financial assistance, however, these adult citizens would have an opportunity to develop their full possibilities. Their subsequent contributions could be of tremendous value to the Nation, especially in the fields of science and research.

Suggestions regarding scholarship programs for these undereducated Americans are contained in a thought-provocative letter I received from Richard E. Gordon, Jr., M. D., of Englewood, N. J. Dr. Gordon has an outstanding reputation in the field of mental health and education.

His thoughts on the matter are so timely and well-expressed that I ask unanimous consent that his letter be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

ENGLEWOOD, N. J., *April 3, 1958.*

Representative FRANK OSMERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C

DEAR MR. OSMERS: Thank you for giving so much of your time and attention to the subject I raised regarding educational opportunities for mature students. I shall elaborate briefly in this letter what I suggested.

Mrs. Gordon and I have for some time been aware of the large relatively untapped potential of partially educated adults in the population. We have wondered should not an omnibus educational program take this group into consideration, as well as the untapped reservoir of capable high-school students, Certainly many adult men who must work to support families and women who cannot attend full-time classes because of domestic responsibilities would receive the stimulation and incentive to finish their studies and prepare themselves for careers in science and education if they also would be eligible for financial assistance.

The educational opportunities afforded veterans under the GI bills have taught us all in government, science, and education that the mature student is a better student on the average than his younger colleague just out of high school. These bills wisely included provisions for the serious part-time student in a bona fide program to receive educational benefits. There can be no doubt that this assistance provided the extra incentive to many veterans to make the sacrifice of time and effort to continue education.

Thus we are suggesting: (1) That education bills include provisions for adult as well as younger students; (2) that they assist part-time students; (3) that adult women as well as men students be eligible. Regarding the latter, married women are enormously important as educators and in certain sciences. As their children grow older fully educated women themselves usually reenter full-time teaching and research.

Mrs. Gordon's and my own specialized studies in this area have naturally been in the area of mental health. Although such factors are not primary in an educational program, nevertheless the mental-health implications have some importance. We have found that persons with an incomplete education have a greater sense of frustration. They have a greater tendency to emotional disorder than the general population and those who have completed college.

We would suggest that educational benefits include scholarships and grants-in-aid to certain eligible adults. Additionally we suggest that educational expenses of all college student members of the family be tax deductible—including not only expenses of children in college but also those of the adults.

Thank you again for your thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD E. GORDON, M. D.

We Can Cure Our Economic Ills by Effective Action in Using Good Sound American Commonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the best advice to all public servants is that you cannot fool the American people, and that doing the right thing and the best thing for the people over the long pull is always the best politics. Far too often political expediency is practiced by public servants, irrespective of its results on the future welfare of all the people, especially in an election year.

If a Member of Congress, for example, is swayed by the flood of letters from the many pressure groups who generally think only of the immediate welfare of their own segment of our population, then he is bound to be in trouble with many other people in different vocations. The only answer is to study the overall, longtime effect of proposed legislation to determine whether it is good or bad legislation, and does it or does it not square with the principles which have made America big and fine and strong and free. Then after making such a study vote your honest convictions, which you can defend before your constituents face to face.

In my remarks in the House on last January 20—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A387—I urged that Congress reduce the budget by at least $3 billion, and then give an across-the-board reduction in in-

come taxes. Had Congress done that we would by now have had the recession whipped. But no, the Democrats in control of Congress embarked on a pump-priming, reckless spending spree full speed ahead, which has scared the individual and business with money in the bank to the end that they are holding onto their dollars, which now will do little to cure unemployment. We should have learned a lesson from the last pump-priming spree which took place between January 1933 and Pearl Harbor. After spending 47 billion tax dollars, there were sill according to the records 11,369,000 Americans unemployed, or about the exact number as were unemployed 7 years previous. Then came Pearl Harbor and over 12 million Americans were soon put to work, in uniform, and hundreds of thousands never returned. In 1945 World War II ended and shortly thereafter the unemployment rolls again began to mount; and again, at the time our boys were sent to war in Korea, approximately 5 million Americans were unemployed; and again millions of Americans were put to work, in uniform, and thousands of them never returned.

Now it may be that we have been on the brink of war several times during the past 5 years, but the facts are that not one American mother's son is being shot at any place in the world today and there is more money in our banks today than at anytime in the history of our country. Why? For the very simple reason the owners of those dollars are fearful of what this liberal Congress might do, and they have good reason for their fears as they know what liberal Congresses have done in the past, but I say in all sincerity that there is nothing so wrong with our economy that good American commonsense cannot cure, for certainly all this Congress has to do is to begin now, even at this late date to prove to the people with money to spend, that they can safely spend for themselves and families and for business expansion.

You ask how can it be done? I say just as many other conservative Members of Congress and most thinking Americans are saying today, which is that by the simple procedure of Congress beginning from this day to the very last day of this session prove conclusively to the American people that this Congress is primarily interested in keeping our United States Treasury solvent, and the people's personal investments protected.

The people know that since this session of Congress has already spent over $2 billion more than should have been spent up to this time, little if any tax relief can be expected or hoped for, but they certainly have a right to demand that this spending spree be brought to a halt in order at least that another burdensome tax increase will not be imposed upon them.

The thing that will give people employment and keep them employed, and thus save this Democrat controlled Congress from their own follies, is for them to act promptly to return confidence to the people as I here recommended. By so doing, private spending will replace this ineffective Federal pump-priming spending which must all sooner or later be paid back with compound interest, or else repudiation with its resulting aftermath, socialism.

Yes, Congress must do that and more to make sure of the people's confidence in their Government. Before this session comes to a close, legislation must be passed to curb the powerful union bosses who have so unjustly imposed on their own members, and on many Members of Congress, such unreasonable demands to do their bidding, or else, and which to a major degree has caused this recession and the loss of employment and frightened the people from spending their own dollars. Congress years ago had the courage to adopt an antimonopoly law and that law has kept business corporations from becoming too large and powerful and that law has proven to be good for all the people. Let us now have the courage to do likewise in respect to the huge powerful labor unions. I am sure most of the union members would welcome such a law today. We must not, we dare not fail in our responsibility as representatives of the people in this critical hour regardless of all pressures brought upon us daily just to please a few at the expense of the best future welfare of all.

Roads and Highways Our Greatest Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial, "Roads and Highways Our Greatest Need," which appeared in the April 17, 1958, issue of the Hancock Clarion, of Hawesville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

ROADS AND HIGHWAYS OUR GREATEST NEED

From the beginning of recorded time, trails, roads, and highways have had the attention of men all over the world. The broad highways of the Caesars throughout the Roman domain were largely the reason that the then known world was conquered and held by the Roman Empire. Their chariots required good roads to be able to travel and overcome the enemy countries.

Napoleon also constructed good highways for France that gave the Napoleon dynasty advantage over other countries and was thus able to resist aggression. Roads have played an important part in the history of the world and wars have been fought and won or lost because of the roads or the lack of them.

Roads in America have long been the great need for the expansion of our country. The famous old Santa Fe trail to the west in the rough and rugged days of our pioneers who sought to wrest that great domain west of the Mississippi and build the great Nation that this country is today, played an important part in the settlement of the West. At first only as a buffalo trail, later it was marked by the prints of the wheels of covered wagons, and in many places by the whited bones of those who fell by the wayside.

All down the centuries roads have been important in the advance of civilization. Man's first invention—the wheel—made it important that roads be built and from that time on to now the building of roads has commanded the attention of man and their needs multiplied many times over as time progressed and improvements of travel came into being.

With the slow moving ox or the plodding teams of horses or mules that powered the covered wagons of our forefathers needed roads over which the pioneers might seek and find the better places of habitation and by them the course westward was marked and wound their uncertain ways to the eldoradoes that our pioneers sought in that unknown and the dangerous land toward the Pacific coast. Gold in California, silver in Colorado, the great stretches of grasslands where cattle could graze and grow fat for the slaughter were the incentives of those hardy men and women who braved the dangers to find new homes in the West and roads were needed to lead their way.

With the advent of the motor car and the truck, and with the advanced production of fuel to power them the building of roads became an increasingly important achievement and a necessity that could not be denied. The few poorly constructed roads and highways of the late years of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries soon came inadequate and the demand was present to build hard roads that could be traveled with greater assurance and greater safety. Gasoline and the auto became identical twins in the advance of progress, and to meet the demand for their use the building of more and better roads became a must in the way of our Nation.

In the early years of the present century the first appropriation of any extent by the National Congress called for the expenditure of $75 million for road building among the States. What a tremendous sum that seemed to be and much argument was waged for or in opposition to its expenditure. That was the beginning of the wedlock of the Federal Government and the States in the construction of roads and highways in our Nation. It was the beginning that skyrocketed into the billions that have been spent in the less than half a century since that time.

The rugged trails and roads that marked their crisscross pattern across the Nation became well constructed and surfaced highways that led to all parts of our country. Their need was so great that haste made waste in many instances and too narrow or poor grading soon took their toll of the money spent and the waste was magnified and the system degraded. Safety had given way to speed and hurry, and with the planning in many cases poorly organized, the work of that early day was largely a loss and a waste.

Today we recognize that there seems no limit to the demand for more and better roads and highways, and the ingenuity of our people is taxed to devise better and safer road construction. Broader and more accessible roads are the needs of the day if we are to be able to meet the demands of the foreseeable future. Not only must we consider the needs of the traffic to carry the transportation loads that are and will be required, but the safety of our people are the needs that must be taken thought of and action taken to work to the better safety of all on our highways.

During the year that has passed we have had improvements in our roads and highways that presage an even greater momentum in the months ahead. Hancock County has had some improvement in road building during the past few years but a greater need is before us. How that need can and will be met will largely depend upon the wisdom and foresight, as well as the

initiative taken by our public officials. It is theirs to carry on and work diligently toward more and better roads for Hancock County. The fine new bridge across Yellow Creek and the fine State highway being constructed between Patesville and Easton that were secured for our county in the year that has passed should be just a beginning to what we should and could have in the months ahead. But we can't just stick in our offices and expect that they will come to us without effort on the part of our officials. It will take work and concentration and if Hancock County fails to get its share of road building during the next 2 years other counties with more progressive officials and those with initiative will reap the rewards that we should have.

Millions of dollars will be spent on roads and highways in Kentucky during the next 2 years and their planning is now in the process of making. To tarry and loaf on the job now may mean an irreparable loss that will never be overcome in the years ahead. What our County will acquire is now in the process of arrangement and to dillydally without progressive thought and action will surely mean a staggering loss to our people. What shall we do about it?

Modern Courts Grew From Lawless Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Stroudsburg (Pa.) Daily Record of May 1, 1958:

MODERN COURTS GREW FROM LAWLESS LANDS

(By Hon. Chester H. Rhodes, president judge, Pennsylvania Superior Court)

As I previously stated, before the Norman Conquest in England in 1066, there were no lawyers, and justice was administered in a manner similar to that on the continent.

During the occupancy of England by the Romans, the Roman system was undoubtedly present. It appears, however, that when Rome abandoned England in the 5th century its system was no longer followed.

For 200 years thereafter the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes extended their conquest over most of England, and their systems were essentially those of tribal law and custom, with justice administered by the leaders of the tribes.

As the conquests were consolidated by the Anglo-Saxons, a basic feudal system was evolved with land as the most important of the economic mediums. After the Norman conquest there was no immediate or drastic change in the system which had been established subsequent to the fifth century.

William the Conqueror gradually extended his personal rule over most of England. Ultimately, under his feudal system, all land was held either directly or indirectly under him.

Criminal offenses were no longer considered merely offenses against the local lord but against the king himself, and the criminal could be tried for treason. The criminal law was administered in the name of the king's peace. Although William the Conqueror allowed the local courts to remain, he created the king's court, the curia regis, which had extensive power derived directly from him.

The realm was divided into districts, and circuit justices presided over the courts when they happened to be in the region. At all other times the sheriffs presided over the local courts.

A distinction was made between those matters which were within the jurisdiction of the king's courts and the church courts. Christianity had come to England as early as 597, and it brought with it some of the developments from the Continent. The church courts had jurisdiction almost exclusively of matters involving the canon law. Such matters as wills, marriage, and divorce were solely within the church's domain. Church courts also had jurisdiction over crimes involving members of the clergy.

It is to be noted that wills involved only personal property, and, in fact, the distinction in the separate administration of personal property and real estate of a decedent was not finally abolished in Pennsylvania until 1949.

During the reign of Henry II, in the 12th century, many significant legal advancements were made in England.

A court of exchequer was established to handle matters of a financial nature. A court of common pleas was developed to hear controversies between the King's subjects of a civil nature; the King's bench handled criminal matters.

During this period the foundation for what we term the "common law" was developed. The common law is a law of precedent—the decisions of the judges in prior cases are applied either directly or by analogy to later cases. In fact, it is the law common to the realm. Pennsylvania is still considered a common law State.

In 1215 King John was forced to sign the Magna Carta, with which we are all familiar. By its execution, King John recognized that the law, and not his personal whim, was supreme.

Among the provisions to be found therein is that guaranteeing to an accused the right to be judged by his peers, or, as is commonly referred to, trial by jury. In view of the complexity of writs issued in civil cases and the resulting abuse, the chancery or secretary of the King began recognizing the requests of persons desiring equitable justice when the common law provided no remedy through the established writs.

Today equity jurisdiction is exercised in our courts in unusual situations where there is no adequate remedy at law. In Pennsylvania, until 1836, there were no separate equity courts, but the law courts administered equitable principles on the law side.

By the act of 1836, Pennsylvania received a separate equity court; and, although the same judges who sit in the common pleas court also sit in equity court, the two are separate and distinct tribunals from the standpoint of the principles applied and the remedies available.

By the time America was colonized, the English system of courts was fairly well established. The King's bench had criminal jurisdiction, the common pleas had general civil jurisdiction, and, to some extent, there was equitable jurisdiction in the chancery court, although the common pleas court had not relinquished its complete equitable powers.

In 1644, King Charles II granted a charter to the Duke of York covering the land occupied by the Dutch. In due time the English obtained possession of this territory along the Delaware River, and the laws of England were applied so that public welfare and common justice would be accomplished.

On June 14, 1681, William Penn assumed possession of the colony by virtue of a royal charter which gave him power to appoint and establish judgeships, justices, magistrates, and to make ordinances for the preservation of peace and the better government of the people according to the laws agreed upon in England.

These laws provided, among other things, "that all courts shall be open, and justice shall be neither sold, denied or delayed * * * that in all courts all persons of all persuasions may freely appear in their own way, and according to their own manner, and there personally plead their own cause themselves, or, if unable, by their friends. * * * That all trials shall be by 12 men, and as near as may be, peers or equals, and of the neighborhood and men without just exception."

Where the life of an accused was in jeopardy, it was provided that a grand inquest or a grand jury composed of 24 persons be held, at least 12 of whom had to agree that the accused should be brought to trial.

From the time of William Penn until the Revolutionary War, there were a number of statutes enacted which related to the administration of justice, and there was some dispute between the English government and the colonial government concerning these laws and the system of judicial administration.

The struggle was not resolved until the Revolution made the colonies free from the control of the English government. It was during this formative period that our present system of courts began to develop and take on the form they have today.

Under the Federal Constitution of 1787, Congress has set up Federal courts inferior to the Supreme Court of the United States. Consequently, in addition to the local and appellate courts of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, there exists a system of Federal courts for the administration of justice when Federal law is involved.

In many instances the legal relationship between persons, including corporations, depends upon State laws, and this is determined generally in the State courts. In other instances their legal relationship may involve the Federal law, and this generally is determined in the Federal courts.

In some instances a matter may involve both State and Federal law and be determined in either or both courts. The criminal law provides an example.

If a person unlawfully produces or sells alcoholic beverages or narcotics, he may be tried in both the State and Federal courts, and it is possible that he may be sentenced to imprisonment by either or both.

The Federal system is similar to that of the Pennsylvania courts. Those with local characteristics are called district courts in which most cases are initiated. In Pennsylvania there are three Federal districts—eastern, middle, and western. Each district has a chief judge with one or more associates.

Above these courts is the court of appeals which hears from the decisions of the district courts. From the circuit court, appeals may be had to the United States Supreme Court by special allowance.

The United States Supreme Court may allow appeals from a final State adjudication if it considers that a substantial question of Federal law is involved. In addition to this system of Federal courts of general jurisdiction there exists in the Federal Government a number of specialized courts such as Court of Claims, Tax Court, and others.

Cherish the Federal Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting and timely editorial appeared in a recent issue of the American Banker, "the only daily banking news-

paper" in this country. It was called to my attention by an outstanding banker and friend, Mr. M. E. Cooper, president of the Bank of Wiggins, Miss.

Because of the soundness as well as the timeliness of the editorial, I submit it herewith for the RECORD. The editorial is as follows:

CHERISH THE FEDERAL CREDIT—FAILURE TO DO SO COULD TURN RECESSION INTO DEPRESSION

There is one way that we can really make this readjustment and recession period into a full dress depression. Deficits and spending that dissipate the Federal credit will do it if we lose our heads and our guts.

How much deficiting and spending it will take to create fear where there should be confidence cannot even be guessed. But there is a breaking point for the credit of the United States. Congressmen who are being glibly importuned to cut taxes and add to United States spending should not forget this very important fact in attempting to control our economic future by the deficit method.

How could a breakdown of the credit of the United States come about? It could happen at any point that our foreign creditors get the idea that Treasury deficits and guarantees have piled up to such a point that another devaluation of the dollar is inevitable. Simultaneously, very likely, economically sophisticated people with money in savings institutions might very likely begin hoarding or sending their money abroad. Foreign holders of deposits in American banks, in such a set of circumstances, would begin to withdraw them. Foreign holders of United States Treasury certificates would become sellers, transferring the proceeds overseas.

Net result would be a vicious spiral of contraction of bank credit, pressure on the reserves of the Federal Reserve banks and epidemic loss of confidence in our money and credit system. It happened in 1932 and 1933, when the program of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation became interpreted as a commitment by the United States Treasury to underwrite the liquidity and refinance the losses of the American financial system, banks, insurance companies and, indirectly, big business. The breaking point then was much closer than realized by anyone who favored the RFC in February 1932. We were off the gold standard and into dollar depreciation by March 1933.

We can ill afford to risk approach now to a repetition of similar undermining of the Federal credit in the guise of a recession cure. In the 1930's the cure was so evanescent, the aftermath so lasting, that we wonder that people have forgotten so easily the almost 10 years of lack of faith in our economy which followed dollar devaluation in 1933. The number of unemployed remained in the millions; industrial investment for expansion almost stagnated. World trade stayed in a slump and efforts to bring about international economic cooperation as a foundation for peace were torpedoed because of the insecurity of American business and politics. How long this depression cycle then would have lasted had we not let Europe blunder into World War II and get dragged in ourselves is anyone's guess.

Confidence is a big and important word in our economy today.

But in no area is confidence more necessary than in the soundness of our Federal credit, the value of the United States dollar, and the stability of prices.

ABA President Welman, in his Georgia bankers' convention address, counseled "forbearance and willingness to do with less profits and wage and salary increases" to assure stability of prices, adding: "One thing which the public would understand clearly and to which it would respond quickly would be a cessation of the seemingly never-ending rise in the cost of living and the bringing about of some reasonable price stability."

Other observers have voiced like views; i. e., that a buyers' strike against constantly rising prices is at the root of this recession, and people will begin spending again when they feel they are getting their money's worth for their not so easily earned dollars.

Stability of prices is the reward of the saver. Without it, savings are not worth saving. Stability of prices is also the best guaranty of stability of the dollar and of maintenance of that international and national confidence which is so essential to keeping our recession from deepening into a depression characterized by worldwide fear of collapse in our credit and in the value of the United States dollar.

"Cherish the Federal credit," said George Washington in his Farewell Address. True in 1798, our first President's advice is as true and timely today as it was then.

Baths for Arabs, Nothing for Guards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH Q. ALEXANDER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include the following editorial which appeared in the Mooresville (N. C.) Tribune of April 10, 1958, entitled "Baths for Arabs, Nothing for Guards":

BATHS FOR ARABS, NOTHING FOR GUARDS

Perhaps we're too close to the trees to see the forest. But some of the things our National Government does leaves us dumbfounded, bewildered and, usually, stripped of our cash for things that don't appear to make sense at all.

Take, for instance, the expenditures for so-called foreign aid. We are in the process of shelling out nearly $5 billion for half the world in the hope that the money will buy us friends in time of need.

And at the same time, hundreds of thousands of these same citizens who are being called upon to cough up part of this money are being denied things they need while they offer both their money and their time in the interest of national security.

Last week, the lead story in the Tribune said that there would be no Federal funds for the construction of a National Guard armory in Iredell county this fiscal year.

The State, county, and town have all put up their share of the money required to build an armory for the local unit of the National Guard. The town has even bought a sit which it will turn over to the State just as soon as our armory is built.

More than 100 local citizens are members of the National Guard. They devote one night a week to preparing themselves for service in defense of their country, should circumstances arise that demand it.

But the powers that be in Washington say we cannot have the money for an armory here even though the building now being used by the National Guard was long ago condemned as a fire hazard.

The building is unfit actually even for storage of equipment. Yet, the guardsmen make the best of it and do little complaining.

And at the same time, we are spending millions of dollars abroad to build shower baths for camel drivers, modern highways across an arid desert in a country that has no automobiles to speak of, and other such nonsense.

Like we said, we may be too close to the trees to see the forest. But we cannot understand how a shower bath for a camel drived in Egypt can be more useful in defense of our country than a local armory for training of our citizen-soldiers here at home.

It's Now Time for the House To Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from The Flint Journal, Flint, Mich., for May 2, 1958, entitled Demand Grows for Union Curbs. The editorial urges House action on the Senate-passed bill to place stronger safeguards around union pension and welfare plans.

The Flint Journal's editorial reflects also the sentiment of the Sixth Congressional District as expressed in the results of my recent questionnaire survey. To a question concerning the President's Labor-Management legislative recommendations, 87 percent of the respondents were in favor, with only 6 percent opposed and 7 percent giving no opinion. I believe this is indicative of a strong public sentiment for legislation to eliminate the abuses that have been revealed by the Senate Select Committee. It is now clearly up to the House to act.

The editorial follows:

DEMAND GROWS FOR UNION CURBS

The Senate this week passed a bill designed to protect millions of Americans now covered by pension and welfare plans.

At present it is uncertain whether the House will act before Congress adjourns this summer.

It is a good bill. It requires detailed reports on administration and financing of welfare and pension plans, and is designed to eliminate the flagrant abuses which Senate committees have uncovered in recent investigations. Some of the worst abuses have been disclosed in union-operated plans. They include embezzlement, improper insurance commissions and service fees, and collusion between management, union, and insurance representatives.

The importance of such legislation is underlined by the fact that more than 60 million people are now covered by such plans involving about $35 billion.

There has not been much opposition to the legislation from labor leaders. Most leaders approve of such protection for themselves and their followers. And it is recognized that opposition to such obviously constructive legislation would immediately make them suspect by the members of their organizations.

But there is another reason for the absence of serious opposition from labor leaders. They are willing to submit to such regulation as a means of strengthening their position in opposing other, stricter regulation.

More and more people in this country are becoming convinced that it is necessary to

curb the monopolistic power of labor unions. These people feel that unions should be subjected to the same kind of restrictions which the antitrust laws put upon business. Many union members are fed up with what they call dictatorship from their leaders, and undemocratic practices in their organizations. Some members are even calling for right-to-work laws.

Union leaders are deathly afraid of this growing demand for action to curb their powers. They unloose their biggest propaganda guns against it, labeling every such move as "antiunion" or "union busting."

It is easy to see the strategy involved in not opposing strongly the legislation designed to protect welfare and pension funds. Union leaders will point out that they were willing to submit to such legislation, and therefore are not opposed to regulation as such—but only to "union-busting" laws. They will claim that they welcome reasonable curbs, but they will dub any further restriction "unreasonable."

And if they shout loud and long enough, which they will, the strategy probably will be effective.

The enactment of further remedial laws to curb labor-union abuses in an election year is not to be expected.

This week, for example, on a proposal to require labor unions to conduct elections by secret ballot at least once in 4 years, only 1 Senate Democrat voted with 36 Republicans in favor of the amendment. Ten Republicans, of whom five are up for reelection next fall, voted against it.

But there is a groundswell of public opinion developing in this country for greater regulation of unions. It is not an anti-union or union-busting sentiment. Most people regard unions as necessary for the protection of workers. It is similar to the sentiment which developed against the abuses of business which resulted in the passage of regulatory legislation years ago.

Adding to this groundswell is the growing opinion that labor unions, by constantly pushing up wages and thus prices, in what economists call a wage-push spiral, are largely responsible for inflation and the current business recession. One economic analyst, Dean Charles C. Abbott, of the University of Virginia, stated recently that historians may label this recession "the first union-made depression in our history." His view is supported by others.

And the attitude and actions of labor leaders like CIO President Walter Reuther in demanding ever greater wage increases and fringe benefits—even in the face of a business slump which has hit the automobile industry hard—are adding momentum to the growing demand for remedial action against such irresponsibility. Reuther this week demonstrated his arrogant unconcern for the economic well-being of the general public, including his own union members.

It may take some time, but legislation to curb union abuses is coming. The public will demand it.

Recording Proving Red Jamming of Broadcasts Sent Soviet Ambassador

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following texts of two press releases from the American Committee for Liberation.

RADIO LIBERATION REFUTES ENVOY'S DENIAL WITH SAMPLES OF NOISE EFFECTS AIMED AT LISTENING INSIDE U. S. S. R.

NEW YORK, April 30.—Radio Liberation has mailed Soviet Ambassador Mikhail A. Menshikov a tape recording of the various sounds and noises produced by Soviet jammers, designed to prevent the anti-Communist station's round-the-clock broadcasts from reaching the peoples of the Soviet Union.

"We have mailed the tape to the Ambassador in Washington, because in a recent television appearance Mr. Menshikov had declared he had no personal knowledge of Soviet jamming, said Gene King, Radio Liberation's programing chief in New York.

Mr. Menshikov had denied knowledge of Soviet jamming when he was questioned on ABC–TV's College News Conference last Saturday.

Mr. King said the tape had been prepared at Radio Liberation's principal studios in Munich, Germany, where the noises and eerie sounds produced by farflung Soviet jamming installations were recorded specifically for Ambassador Menshikov's benefit.

"Since Mr. Menshikov, of late, has been preoccupied with learning 'bourgeois' mannerisms for use at Washington cocktail parties," Mr. King observed, "it is conceivable that the Ambassador may not be as informed about Soviet jamming as one would have supposed. Perhaps our tape recording will correct his faulty knowledge of this subject."

According to Mr. King, Radio Liberation, which is the free voice of former Soviet citizens, has been jammed 24 hours a day from the moment it began broadcasting to the Soviet Union on March 1, 1953. Today Radio Liberation, with infinitely more powerful equipment, transmits programs to all parts of the U. S. S. R. in Russian and 17 other Soviet languages via transmitters in West Germany and the Far East.

"Naturally," added Mr. King, "our engineers have been conducting extensive research on Soviet jamming operations. Our monitors have identified, through their call-signals, hundreds of different jamming stations in the Soviet Union. Undoubtedly there are many more jamming stations, but their signals are beyond the range of our monitoring equipment. For example, the so-called ground-wave jammers which cover small areas in cities cannot be heard in the West. Evidently there are several of these in each large Soviet city."

Mr. King, however, declared that Radio Liberation's round-the-clock broadcasts were getting through to the target audience in the Soviet Union.

"Despite the incredible amount of rubles expended on preventing Western broadcasts from reaching the Soviet peoples," he said, "we know that Radio Liberation's broadcasts are being heard in the Soviet Union."

Mr. King said that "positive evidence" of Radio Liberation's "ofttimes remarkable evasions of Soviet jamming" lies in letters received from Soviet listeners from behind the Iron Curtain, from testimony of defectors and from returning tourists.

MOSCOW CHARGES "FORGERY" IN REPORT ON KHRUSHCHEV'S BLAST AGAINST SOVIET JEWS—RADIO LIBERATION DISCERNS ATTEMPT TO TAKE PREMIER OFF HOOK FOR INTEMPERATE REMARKS

NEW YORK.—The Soviet Union has accused a leading French newspaper of manufacturing a "provocative forgery" in quoting Nikita Khrushchev's uncomplimentary views towards Soviet Jews.

And Radio Liberation, in disclosing this surprise development, observed that this was still another effort "to take Khrushchev off the hook for his intemperate remarks."

Moscow Radio accused Le Figaro, a widely-circulated daily in Paris, of having launched an anti-Soviet hullabaloo which, in turn, was "snapped up in Israel, where with plenty of additional spice and further slander it was published by the entire Israeli press and has served as an excuse for a further campaign of slander against the Soviet Union."

According to Radio Liberation, the free voice of former Soviet citizens which broadcasts round-the-clock to the Soviet Union in Russian and 17 other Soviet languages, Moscow Radio's latest charges were broadcast in Hungarian on its European service last Thursday (April 24).

"Once again an effort is being made by Moscow to take Khrushchev off the hook for his intemperate remarks," Radio Liberation commented. "The trouble is that Khrushchev very often says what he really thinks, no matter what the consequences. Witness his remarks to western ambassadors, 'We will bury you,' which the Kremlin soon after was forced to claim was 'misinterpreted.'"

According to an article published in Le Figaro on April 9, Khrushchev had told its Moscow correspondent in an exclusive interview on March 19 that the Soviet's 30-year experiment aimed at establishing an autonomous Jewish homeland in the Soviet Far East region of Birobidzhan had been a thorough failure. And the Soviet ruler contended the reason for the failure was the fact that the Jews were too individualistic and overly intellectual; so much so they could not get along together in collectivized projects.

Khrushchev's remarks, considered offensive by Jews in the free world, were sharply assailed in Israel by Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion and aroused considerable editorial denunciation in the Israeli press.

All of which, Moscow radio contended last Thursday, was aimed at "casting a shadow on the Soviet Union as the country of socialism, to weaken the effect of the Soviet peace policy on world opinion.

"This aim is served, among others, by that anti-Soviet hullabaloo which certain Western circles started about the falsification in connection with the so-called Jewish problem recently published in the French Figaro. This provocative forgery has been manufactured in connection with the well-known interview of Nikita Khrushchev with a Figaro reporter which was published in Pravda on March 27."

Significantly, as Radio Liberation had pointed out at the time, the Pravda version of the interview completely omitted Khrushchev's remarks about Soviet Jews. To make up for Pravda's dereliction, Radio Liberation had beamed the remarks back to the Soviet Union for the information of its listeners.

Moscow Radio's recent broadcast was bitterly anti-Israel, which, of course, was no surprise. Its broadcast assailed a "mass meeting of former Soviet Union subjects held recently in Tel Aviv organized by the Mapai administration," claiming the speeches consisted of "confused nonsense."

"The aim of every single speech was to slander the Soviet socialist state and to present in a distorted light the Leninist policy on nationalities followed by the Soviet Union," Moscow Radio contended.

The Moscow station claimed "it is well known" that Israel's leaders, "claiming to be the protectors of Jewry, have been waging for a long time a campaign for the concentration in Israel of the Jewish population of various countries, among them the Soviet Union."

Radio Liberation observed that the U. S. S. R. has traditionally refused permission to Soviet Jews to emigrate to Israel

or anywhere else. Attempts by Zionist leaders to negotiate with the Kremlin on this issue have been constantly frustrated.

However, Moscow Radio cryptically observed that "there were such people who were taken in by the Israeli-American propaganda and have emigrated to Israel. But their disappointment was a bitter one."

Apparently, this was a reference to Polish Jews who, having been permitted to return to Poland after years of forced residence in the U. S. S. R., immediately emigrated to Israel, a practice frowned upon by the Kremlin.

The Moscow Radio broadcast quoted from letters purportedly received from "misled people who became victims of Israeli-American propaganda" and had emigrated to Israel. "These people became capitalist forced laborers concealed by the figleaf of the Jewish national state," Moscow Radio declared. "These people were confronted by hunger, misery, and unemployment."

"These letters of misled people are documents which expose the dirty slanderous character of the allegations of the inspirers of the new anti-Soviet propaganda campaign on the so-called Jewish question," the Moscow station continued. "This invented problem does not exist in the Soviet Union, where the Jewish population enjoys the fruits of the Leninist policy on nationalities in the same manner as all other peoples of the Soviet Union."

Truth and Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Norman Cousins which appeared in the Saturday Review for April 5, 1958:

TRUTH AND POWER

A hair-raising situation now exists in which a small group of men who are not part of the elective process of government have nevertheless assumed unprecedented powers for shaping national policy outside their designated functions.

The group is the Atomic Energy Commission. It is the only agency of Government which can embark on programs that affect and even dominate economic policy, military policy, and foreign policy. It is the only agency of Government which can decide how much it is willing to let the American people know about its operations. It is the only agency of Government than can evaluate its own performance, exempt itself from the consequences of its own errors, and shield these errors from public scrutiny.

Some of the implications of these powers have been brought into focus as the result of a recent incident.

First, some background. The danger of a runaway nuclear arms race culminating in continental explosions is no longer a remote one. Momentum has a way of making its own decisions. The nuclear arsenals now contain weapons that have gone far beyond military requirements. The use of these weapons will produce not victory but mutual suicide. The situation is similar to what would happen if occupants of the same building decided to wage war against one another by setting fire to the building after sealing themselves in. If victory in the contest between democracy and communism is to be found, therefore, it will have to be outside a nuclear war.

Devising a policy that can achieve both peace and freedom is the most important and most complicated business in the world. Yet a start must be made somewhere. It makes sense to expect that such a start should be in the field of arms control. Not that arms control by itself will give us enduring peace. Nothing short of effective world law can create a basis for enduring peace. But arms control can at least remove some of the fuse points of a nuclear arms race. And one good place to begin on any arms control program is with a ban on further nuclear test explosions.

The Atomic Energy Commission, which manufacturers and tests the nuclear explosives, has been opposed to any ban on testing and, for that matter, to any agreement on nuclear arms control. The AEC has taken the flat position that such agreements are unenforceable. It would be difficult and perhaps impossible, spokesmen for the AEC have declared, to detect nuclear explosions if the Soviet were intent on keeping them secret. By way of proving this point, the AEC pointed to its own underground nuclear test experiment recently conducted in Nevada. Despite the devastating underground effects, the explosion could not be detected at a distance greater than 235 miles, the AEC officially announced.

If this were true, then the hope for nuclear arms control would be a dim one indeed. But congressional initiative established that the AEC statement is not true and indeed never was. The Nevada underground explosion was actually detected more than 2,000 miles away, and the AEC was so informed at the time.

Confronted with the actual evidence that it had falsified vital information, the AEC said that the error was "inadvertent." What members of the AEC did not explain, however, was why they had used information to support a public position even though the information was false. Even after the AEC apparently knew that the underground test had been detected at great distances, it continued to tell news commentators and television producers that underground tests could be carried out secretly.

Errors, inadvertent or otherwise, are understandable. What is completely irresponsible and indeed reprehensible, however, is the use of false information in connection with the advocacy of national policy. For the AEC did not merely circulate a report it knew to be false. It used that false report as the basis for an attempt to win the American public opinion over to its own point of view.

Equally serious is the fact that the AEC has been using its authority and influence to block any program for world control over nuclear weapons. And Dr. Edward Teller, who is prominently associated with the Atomic Energy Commission, has been attempting to reassure the American people that nuclear testing can go on indefinitely without danger—a proposition that the AEC's own reports do not support.

What is involved here is not merely a matter of public confidence in a Government agency. What is involved here are real and specific issues concerned with the safety of life on earth. Circumstances have contrived to make of the Atomic Energy Commission one of the most powerful agencies in our history. We should no longer delay bringing the AEC into the same framework of checks and balances within which the rest of the Government has to operate. Certainly, a separate agency should be charged with the responsibility for evaluating the results of nuclear testing, whether with respect to radioactive fallout or the question of detectability.

The fact that men of science are connected with the AEC is not by itself sufficient assurance that wisdom and sanity will prevail. The theory on which this Government was set up was that good government depends less on good men than upon good laws. Indeed, the easiest way for good men to turn bad is to give them a privileged position where their power can be used beyond their own designated functions.

Nuclear bombs are the quintessence of raw power in the modern world. They call for the severest controls—not only over the bombs themselves, but over the men who have the authority to make them. N. C.

Congress and the Bureau of the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, many of the Members of the Congress are becoming increasingly alarmed by the seemingly endless expansion of the powers of the Bureau of the Budget, and the Bureau's exercise of those powers in contradiction of the will of the Congress.

The Budget Bureau's freezing or impounding of funds appropriated and authorized to be spent by the Congress raises a serious question—a basic constitutional question—concerning the powers of the Congress and the powers of the President and his agents in the executive.

Here is a controversy that will arise time and again. It is important, and I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article, written by George W. Oakes and appearing in the Washington Sunday Star of April 20, 1958, which accurately describes the basic problem:

HOLDBACK ON FUNDS WORRIES CONGRESS

(By George W. Oakes)

Congress is becoming increasingly concerned over a conviction that the administration, through the Budget Bureau, has been withholding funds the lawmakers have voted to be spent. A power struggle on the issue has sharpened during the current session, and White House resistance to Democratic demands for large Federal spending to fight the recession may intensify it further.

Many Democratic Members of the Senate and House are making this point: Even if the Democratic-controlled Congress should pass any antirecession public works bills such as that approved last week by the Senate, and the President should sign them, recent experience suggests that the money won't necessarily be spent. During the past year especially the Executive has exercised and can continue to exercise various powers to delay the rate of spending and to withhold funds already appropriated, including those requested by major Government departments.

Among those being heard on this subject are Senators LYNDON JOHNSON and MIKE MANSFIELD, the Senate majority leader and the Democratic whip. They have cited as an example the fact that the administration, in order to live within its expenditure ceiling, last year froze $22,300,000 out of $32,300,000 in Federal funds voted by Congress for the construction of National Guard armories.

Current congressional pressure for antirecession spending is likely to bring about the

release of those particular funds, but Members claim there are other examples and that more are expected.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Congressional opposition to fund withholding has risen to the point that last month Senator MANSFIELD and Congressman HÉBERT, Democrat of Louisiana, a member of the House Armed Services Committee, introduced bills to deny any official or agency the right to prevent appropriated funds "from being promptly used * * * for the purpose designated."

Congressional critics do not question the legality of the administration's action as much as they blame Congress for having drafted legislation that gives the Executive an opportunity to carry out a method of indirect financial control over the intent of the Congress. Some of them declare that this is one way in which Congress is abdicating its constitutional control of the purse.

Currently a congressional committee is holding closed hearings on this subject in order to determine how Congress can reduce the opportunity for the Executive to hold up funds that Congress wishes to have spent.

What is this Executive control exercised by the Budget Bureau on behalf of the President? To a great extent it derives from the general powers of the Presidency and from the fact that a congressional appropriation is an authority, not a mandate, to spend up to a certain amount of money. Also many appropriation acts not only give the President discretionary power over the rate of spending of voted funds, but also provide that the money need not be spent in any one fiscal year.

There is even more specific legislation that authorizes the Budget Bureau to establish reserves and effect savings of appropriated funds in order to promote efficiency of operation on the basis, among other reasons, of "developments subsequent to the date on which such appropriation was made available."

The latitude of this law permits a broad interpretation—too broad in the view of congressional critics. Under it, the President can hold up spending of funds after they are voted despite the intent of the Senate and House. This control has been extremely effective and useful during Government economy waves such as the one the administration put into effect last year.

APPORTIONMENT PROCESS

The Budget Bureau procedure of reviewing the spending of appropriated funds is known as the apportionment process. After Congress votes the money for a certain department or agency, and the President has approved it, that agency must request the Bureau to make the money available not later than 15 days after the appropriation act is passed.

In 1933 this function was transferred by Executive order to the Budget Bureau from the various agencies. The apportionment procedure is intended to achieve the most effective and economical use of funds made available by Congress and, for appropriations available for a definite period of time, to prevent the necessity for supplemental or deficiency appropriations.

Frequently conditions change between the time the agency originally requested Congress to vote the funds and the date when the appropriations were enacted. Without some such reviewing procedure money could be spent on projects no longer required because of altered circumstances. But congressional and other critics of the Bureau claim that these powers have often been carried too far, especially during the current fiscal year when the Bureau slowed down the rate of spending in line with the economy drive.

TWO MILLION DOLLAR CUTBACK

For example, Congress voted over $250 million last summer for certain types of domestic military construction. The Defense Department in October requested the Budget Bureau to release the money. Less than a month later the Bureau made reductions totaling more than $2 million on specific items. The end of the economy wave hasn't reversed this situation for there are reliable reports that appropriated funds in the amount of several million dollars which the Defense Department wants now for military construction are being held up by the Budget Bureau.

Not only is it argued that the total amount requested by the Defense Department and authorized by Congress should have been spent but many believe that the Defense Department should be the agency to determine what military funds are required and where any necessary cuts should take place. This point of view is heard from high officials of executive departments as well as in Congress.

It is further argued that the Bureau not only holds up funds but slows down the rate of spending of "line items" in military construction appropriations after they have received congressional and Defense Department approval.

ANOTHER EXAMPLE

Here is another example being cited on the Hill: Federal housing representatives gave a Wisconsin builder the impression that he would receive Government loan insurance if Congress would appropriate $100 million for a cooperative housing program to fulfill the need for moderate rental housing. The money was voted in July but only $30 million was committed in accord with the economy program then in vogue.

The Budget Bureau contends that limitations of the debt ceiling as well as administration policy, supported by a Congressional resolution urging economy, was responsible for the withholding of the mortgage money.

Representative REUSS, a Wisconsin Democrat of the House Banking and Currency Committee protested in November the Budget Bureau's action, stating that "Budget Director Brundage asserts that he, instead of the people's duly elected representatives, should decide what the Nation's housing needs are." In December an additional $20 million of mortgage funds was released. As a result, the Wisconsin builder was finally able to go ahead with his planned construction program.

In introducing his bill to curb these powers of the Executive, Senator MANSFIELD said that Congress faces "a Constitutional problem which we will have to meet some day if we do not want to see our power steadily eroded and our Constitutional position as a coequal branch of the Government reduced still further." The current Congressional pressure for large public works spending can be expected to stimulate efforts to gain greater Congressional control over appropriated funds.

Nuclear Power for the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, the fascinating and heartening story of the development and prospects of our nuclear powered Navy has been recounted in an article in the May 1958 issue of United States Naval Institute Proceedings. The author is our own colleague and member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Honorable CRAIG HOSMER, of California. However, as noted in the byline, the Congressman writes in his capacity as a commander in the Naval Reserve, rather than as a Member of this body. He obtained much of his background material for the manuscript during a recent tour of active training duty with the Navy.

I am sorry that it is not possible to reproduce in this RECORD the informative illustration of a typical naval nuclear propulson plant referred to in Commander HOSMER's article and accompanying it in the proceedings.

The article follows:

NUCLEAR POWER FOR THE NAVY

(By Comdr. CRAIG HOSMER, USNR)

Fast becoming a reality is a powerful new nuclear-powered United States Navy—a Navy backboned by atomic-bomb-carrying 85,000-ton supercarriers, fast-striking guided-missile cruisers and destroyers, and specially designed submarines for high-speed attack, hunter-killer, radar-picket, guided-missile, and other new missions.

Already more than $2 billion have been spent or programed for research, development, and construction of such a Navy. The following table sets out what is on hand and what is on order. Another $500 million a year for at least 8 years ahead will be needed to bring it into full being.

It began in 1948 with a small but ambitious joint Navy-Atomic Energy Commission program aimed at submarine nuclear propulsion and later expanded to include design and development of a full spectrum of naval nuclear propulsion plants for new naval construction from small submarines to the largest aircraft carriers.

By early 1954 the basic question of feasibility of naval nuclear propulsion was affirmatively answered by successful completion of all critical tests of the *Nautilus* land-based prototype plant. That answer made possible continuous cruising at top speeds, unlimited crusing, radii, and practically absolute freedom from fuel logistics. It has revitalized the role of seapower and geopolitics.

At the beginning of naval reactor development 10 years ago, even the most imaginative nuclear propulsion enthusiasts hardly foresaw such a future. Nor did even the most practical amongst them envisage the full scope of difficulties ahead. Neither the technical problems nor their solutions were well understood. In fact, many of the problems were not even known.

The task was to devise a safe, reliable plant within naval space and weight limitations. It began with an examination of various possible reactor cycles. Gas-cooled reactors were discarded as involving too much space and too many technical problems. Other types were in turn rejected for various reasons. Finally left as promising to meet naval requirements were but two: a reactor utilizing liquid sodium as its coolant, or one utilizing pressurized water.

Liquid sodium seemed to offer the best approach because it permitted high steam temperatures and pressures, with consequent greater efficiency. But the physics and chemistry of liquid sodium were little known and insurmountable development problems might be encountered. Although pressurized water involved lowering steam temperatures and pressures, more was known of the characteristics of water. That could mean fewer problems of basic research and faster development of the plant.

Decision was made to pursue both approaches and preliminary design began. So dissimilar are the physics and chemistry of water and sodium that in effect two simultaneous but essentially independent projects were involved. Both were carried successfully through land prototype and shipboard installation stages.

Liquid sodium leakage problems appeared in the *Seawolf's* land prototype plant which were not in themselves insurmountable. However, they were considered in combination with other factors in an eventual decision favoring the *Nautilus'* pressurized water type reactor system as the accepted approach to practical naval nuclear propulsion.

The men who carried on the work had no experience or rules of thumb to guide them. No power reactor had ever been designed before. They had no science of reactor technology to apply to the job. They created it as they went along.

From the beginning they applied a "can of worms" description to their work, for each component and function of a nuclear power plant, from the reactor vessel through the turbine and all auxiliaries, are wholly interrelated and interdependent.

Naval nuclear ships and reactors

Ship	Purpose	Builder	Completion	Reactor [1]	Remarks
SSN571 *Nautilus*	Attack	Electric Boat	Sept. 30, 1954	S1W	Land prototype, Arco, Idaho.
				S2W	1st nuclear-powered ship.
SSN575 *Seawolf*	do	do	Mar. 20, 1957	S1G	Land prototype, West Milton, N. Y.
				S2G	Preliminary account for limited service.
SSN578 *Skate*	do	do	Dec. 3, 1957	S3W	Twin screw, conventional hull.
SSN579 *Swordfish*	do	Portsmouth	1958	S4W	Do.
SSN583 *Sargo*	do	Mare Island	1958	S3W	Do.
SSN584 *Seadragon*	do	Portsmouth	1959	S4W	Do.
SSGN587 *Halibut*	Guided missile	Mare Island	1959	S3W	Hull modification for Regulus.
SSRN586 *Triton*	Radar-picket	Electric Boat	1959	S3G	Land prototype, West Milton, N. Y.
				S4G	Twin screw and twin reactor.
SSN585 *Skip Jack*	Attack	do	1959	S5W	Single screw, *Albacore* hull.
SSM588 *Scamp*	do	Mare Island	1960	S5W	Do.
SSN589 *Scorpion*	do	Electric Boat	1960	S5W	Do.
SSN590 *Sculpin*	do	Ingalls	1960	S5W	Do.
SSN591 *Shark*	do	Newport News	1960	S5W	Do.
SSN592 *Snook*	do	Ingalls	1960	S5W	Do.
SSN593 *Thresher*	do	Portsmouth	1960	S5W	Do.
SSGN594 *Permit*	Guided missile	Mare Island	1961	S5W	Fiscal year 1958 program, Regulus.
SSGN595 *Pollack*	do	Portsmouth	1961	S5W	Do.
SSGN596 *Plunger*	do	Unassigned	1961	S5W	Do.
SSN597 *Tullibee*	Attack	Electric boat	1961	S1C	Land prototype, Windsor, Conn.
				S2C	Fiscal year 1958 program, small hull.
SSGN(P?)598	Polaris	do	1960 (?)	S5W(?)	Fiscal year 1958 supplemental.
SSGN(P?)599	do	do	1960(?)	S5W(?)	Do.
SSGN(P?)600	do	Mare Island	1960(?)	S5W(?)	Do.
CLG(N)9 *Long Beach*	Guided missile	Bethlehem (Fore River).	1960	C1W	2 reactors.
CVA(N)65 *Enterprise*	Supercarrier	Newport News	1961	A1W	Land prototype, Arco, Idaho.
				A2W	8 reactors.
DLG(N)	Frigate			D1W	AEC Knolls Laboratory assigned lightweight design.
				D2W	Not yet authorized.

[1] In naval reactor code 1st letter indicates ship type, numeral indicates precedence in design series, 2d letter indicates developer: W, Westinghouse; G, General Electric; C, Combustion Engineering. All are of pressurized, water-cooled, water-moderated types except S1G and S2G, cooled by liquid sodium and moderated by beryllium.

For example, raising turbine exhaust temperature or back pressure in a conventional plant is felt primarily in fuel economy. Such a reduction in thermal efficiency in a nuclear plant affects each of its complex components. The necessary increase in heat output requires size, capacity, and weight increases in the condensate, feedwater, and heat-generating systems and equipment. Size of the reactor, steam generator, coolant system and auxiliaries is increased. Proportionate increases in radiation shielding must follow. These in turn affect the size, design, and characteristics of the hull into which the plant is to be placed, or, as a practical matter, thrust back upon the plant designer the necessity of selecting every characteristic of design in relation, not only to each function and component of his plant, but in relation to hull space and weight limitations as well.

Development of the two original naval nuclear reactor plants, and to only a slightly lesser extent today's plants, involves creation not only of the total concept, but individually of each of its components. It demands tremendous and concurrent basic research into unexplored fields of the new science. Maximum assurance that all parts individually will work and that they will work as a unit when coupled together, and function with a high degree of safety, dictates what might otherwise be wasteful overdesign and overtesting.

Few, if any, off-the-shelf items exist which can be incorporated into nuclear plants. Canned pumps are but one entirely new concept brought into being to make nuclear power possible. Prolonged successful effort to develop as complex a component as this often has to be discarded when efforts fail to develop another, which is interdependent. Fresh starts must be made on the problems of both.

Reactor design develops the need to know undiscovered properties of common substances under conditions of reactor chemistry and irradiation. Requirements are generated for rare metals and alloys concerning which the full spectrum of chemistry, physics, and metallurgy need be researched and industries found or formed to produce them in quantities required. For example, such diverse enterprises as the Carborundum Co., National Distillers Corp., Wah Chang Corp., and National Research Corp. had to be persuaded to engage in large-scale zirconium production.

Not only has the naval nuclear reactors program faced mountainous technical problems, but it has been burdened from the beginning with a continuing necessity to seek answers to a variety of nontechnical questions affecting its ultimate success.

Wholly new and workable administrative and funding relationships, to be discussed later in detail, had to be evolved and must be continuously perfected between the Navy and the AEC, amongst naval personnel in and outside the reactors program, and between the Government reactors group and industry.

As operations expand, new personnel must be brought in; techniques must be developed for their rapid specialized training; and new facilities established for the basic research, design, and engineering functions involved in the work. Progress from design to construction of plants involves large-scale training of industry personnel. The design and construction of new ships for the new plants brings in a whole new group for specialized instruction; manning those ships brings in another.

During the process a basic philosophy on security of information had to be evolved, continuously adapted to an ever-increasing body of knowledge, and the mechanics of implementing it amongst public and private groups engaged in the program kept efficiently in motion. The approach has been to distinguish between specific designs and dimensional characteristics which are classified, and technology as such which is unclassified. Communicating the latter has involved the writing of up-to-the-minute technical handbooks by scientific personnel engaged in the work concurrently as they do it. Six such handbooks have been published and another 8 are currently in preparation.

Another essential task of those engaged in the program has been to translate difficult scientific concepts into information meaningful to the layman. It is fundamental to obtaining policy decisions from legislative and executive leaders of Government underlying financial support of the naval nuclear program. It is also vital to the public, which in a democracy ratifies those decisions at the polls.

The foregoing enumerations barely hint at the multiple technical and nontechnical problems involved in the naval nuclear reactors program from the beginning and which will continue to plague it for years ahead. Yet they are ample testimony to the outstanding devotion and qualities of the officers and civilians who carry it forward. Within 6 years from the start they produced the basic pressurized water nuclear propulsion plant illustrated on the following page which is now standard for all new nuclear naval vessels.

The plant arrangement shown approximates that developed for submarine propulsion, and it will vary only in details for the supercarrier with four dual reactor powerplants, and the cruiser *Long Beach* and submarine *Triton*, each with dual reactors.

The naval nuclear propulsion plant consists of a nuclear reactor core contained in a pressure vessel; a primary coolant system utilizing fast-flowing pressurized water to remove the heat generated by nuclear fission in the core and transfer it via a steam generator to the secondary, or steam system; a steam machinery plant for propulsion and auxiliary electric power generation; and radiation shielding.

The reactor consists of a pressure vessel housing a core of enriched uranium fuel encased in a protective metal, such as zirconium, which passes heat to the coolant; a moderator, in this case the coolant itself, to slow down neutron emissions to efficient fission speeds; and rods of a neutron absorbing metal such as hafnium, together with machinery to insert and withdraw them from

the core, to control rate of fission and thus amount of heat produced.

The primary coolant system consists of one or more loops, each having one or more coolant pumps; a steam generator (boiler); a pressurizing vessel; and connecting piping with appropriate valves.

Since the coolant water becomes radioactive in passing through the reactor core, shielding is required around the portion of the plant containing the coolant in order to protect personnel from radiation. A separate reactor shield surrounds the pressure vessel. It affords sufficient protection against radiation from the reactor core to allow access to the reactor compartment when the reactor is shut down. All shielding designs incorporate enough protection to meet civilian radiation exposure tolerances established by the AEC.

The steam produced in the separate secondary circuit by the steam generator is nonradioactive, and the steam propulsion machinery need not be shielded. This machinery and the necessary auxiliaries for electric power are arranged in a conventional way in the engineroom. However, arrangements within the reactor compartment must of necessity be strongly influenced by considerations of accessibility in relation to radiation and the continuous necessity of removing heat even after the reactor has been shut down. The latter phenomenon, known as radioactive decay heat, results from the constant breakdown of radioactive materials even under normal conditions.

Penetrating to all parts of naval nuclear powerplant design are intensified requirements for ruggedness, reliability, and easy maintainability dictated by safety, the extreme endurance of nuclear plants, and higher average sustained ship speeds.

These various special nuclear plant considerations also complicate the work of designers of hulls into which they will fit. Gone are the days when minor weight allocation errors can be overcome by pumping fuel between tanks. Crew living and working spaces must be allocated with radiation hazard in mind. Stacks are eliminated, but vertical free spaces must be arranged for removal and renewal of reactor cores. Stowage space for consumable supplies and ammunition must be enlarged to take full advantage of the ship's longer range cruising capabilities. Many other specialized considerations are involved. A byproduct of tackling them has been experimentation with novel hull configurations that may substantially increase speed/power ratios of future ships.

Another byproduct of naval nuclear propulsion has been the evolution of a unique, hybrid military-civilian research and development organization that may well set administrative patterns for successful missile research and development and any similar future large-scale Government projects. Without it, there would probably be no nuclear powered naval ships in existence today.

Its antecedents are in the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 assigning responsibility for research and development in the theory and production of atomic energy, including processes, materials, and devices related to such production, to the newly created Atomic Energy Commission.

Soon after passage of the act, Navy communications to AEC began setting out potential nuclear propulsion requirements in connection with the submarine program as defined by a small, cross-sectional group within the Bureau of Ships. AEC's response, in part, was to turn back to the very BuShips' group that generated the requirements for manpower assistance in meeting them.

By 1949 the Commission's activities in this field were sufficient to justify inclusion of a Naval Reactors Branch in its Division of Reactor Development established that year. Also by that year it had become apparent in BuShips that the activities of the cross-sectional group were sufficiently unique and unconventional to warrant special treatment. A period of organizational experimentation began, culminating in formal establishment in 1955 of BuShips Code 1500 designated as the Nuclear Propulsion Division and headed by a new Assistant to the Chief of the Bureau for Nuclear Propulsion.

Code 1500, however, did not mean a separate Navy reactors program paralleling the AEC's program, because Code 1500 had by this time also developed into the Commission's Naval Reactors Branch, unofficially referred to as the headquarters organization by both Navy and AEC. Naval officers ordered to the program report to both AEC and Bureau of Ships. Navy and AEC civilian employees are utilized interchangeably. Rear Adm. H. G. Rickover, United States Navy, is both Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ships for Nuclear Propulsion and Chief of the Naval Reactors Branch, Division of Reactor Development, United States Atomic Energy Commission. So complete is the Navy-AEC integration in this two-hat organization that neither AEC nor naval personnel need switch headgear during the course of their work.

Possibly the only persons who can distinguish the military from the civilian characteristics of headquarters organization are the Government accountants who must assess its cost of operations between the AEC and the Navy. Even here the line of demarcation is often blurred; but, in general, nuclear research and development costs, including construction of land prototype powerplants, are paid for by AEC, while the Navy pays for research and development on steam parts of the plants and construction of nuclear ships. During the current fiscal year 1958, research and development money amounts to around $86 million from the Commission and around $11 million from the Navy. The prototype aircraft-carrier propulsion plant has consumed the lion's share of these current funds.

Inherent in the headquarters organization setup is a flexibility and freedom in both administrative and funding action essential to rapid progress in complex scientific operations. This has speeded civilian as well as naval reactor development. No new group had to be organized from scratch to develop the $110-million civilian pressurized water reactor at Shippingport, Pa. Naval Reactors Branch, long experienced in that type of reactor, was assigned the job and went to work without delay. Additionally, the organization's dual nature avoids duplication of effort and facilities, such as purchasing offices, inspection groups, and so on. For example, purchase of nuclear cores on competitive bidding for which the Navy pays is done through AEC purchasing offices.

The organization is unique in a number of other respects and bears substantially the image demanded by its strong-minded chief and founder, Admiral Rickover.

In discussing the qualifications of some 90 officers and civilians assigned to headquarters, Rickover told the Joint Atomic Energy Committee:

"By qualification I do not mean, necessarily, their technical ability, but their desire to work long hours and to be dedicated to the job as well. We adopted the procedure of getting only young people. If we get in people with more experience, it takes too long to have them unlearn the bad things they know. We haven't got time for that. We don't try to get top-flight scientists. A lot are top-flight scientists by reputation only. We can't afford to have people around who have reputations who don't work hard. We would rather have people who work hard and don't have reputations."

New recruits for headquarters organization come from a number of engineering and scientific schools which recommend their best graduates. After a series of 5 interviews, about 1 in 4 is accepted. A similar procedure applies to naval officers. Some 40 engineering duty officer applicants are screened annually and 4 or 5 finally accepted. Several Naval Reservists selected have stayed on in headquarters as civilian employees on completion of their duty tours.

Once selected for headquarters duty, officers as well as civilians are given at least 6 months' special training at schools and on projects, followed by assignments on the basis of ability, not rank, and irrespective of military or civilian status. "The best qualified man gets the job," Rickover states, "and in my opinion it is the only way you can run any kind of technical organization."

The organization also operates on a principle of retaining major control rather than assigning substantial areas of responsibility to contractors. This in effect draws contractors into an integration with headquarters which expands the naval nuclear propulsion program from the "two hat" Navy-AEC concept to a "three hat" Navy-AEC-contractor concept. Headquarters control extends even as far as employment decisions on contractor personnel. "Anyone responsible for a reactor program," Rickover explains, "must take on the problem of seeing that his contractors hire the right sort of people and train them. Unless he does, he is in for trouble."

The centralized method of headquarters operation eliminates considerable redtape and memorandum writing. It permits quick decisions. But it violates generally accepted sound management criteria by overburdening key personnel with a large volume of both technical and nontechnical minor decisions. Justification for it is claimed not only from the inherently complex design interrelations within the power plant itself, but in another circumstance explained to the Joint Atomic Energy Committee by Commander R. V. Laney, United States Navy:

"Each naval reactor project has a specific end in view. It is intended to be installed in a definite ship at some definite time. Because the building time for a ship and that for a reactor and the reactor plant components are different, the ship is partly built when the reactor and reactor equipment are still being designed. Its characteristics, its length, beam, its speed—all are determined, frozen. The task is very sharply defined, and there is a very high premium on success. The reactor designer must conceive, develop, design, and produce a reactor, which, when delivered to the ship, will fit into the reactor vessel which it has never seen before. That reactor vessel is resting in a ship which is a stranger, and the reactor, the vessel, the pumps, the heat exchangers, and the intricate control equipment must, the first time they operate in unison, operate correctly, so the ship will have the necessary amount of power to produce the speed for which she was designed."

Projects such as Laney describes, together with necessary basic research, are presently carried on under close headquarters organization control at 3 development centers, 2 (Bettis Plant and Knolls Laboratory) operated for AEC by contractors and 1 privately managed.

The Commission maintains Bettis Plant at Pittsburgh, operated by Westinghouse Electric, employing some 1,300 scientists and engineers, and Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory at Schenectady, operated by General Electric and employing another 500. Combustion Engineering, Inc., operates its own center near Windsor, Conn., employing approximately 200.

The centers, together with headquarters personnel, and close to 1,000 scientists and engineers on contractor payrolls, total nearly 3,000 highly skilled technicians at work on naval nuclear propulsion. Another 250 to 300 BuShips personnel engage in closely interrelated work.

Today bringing a new reactor concept into being takes about half the 6 years needed to produce the original *Nautilus* and *Seawolf* plants. A year is consumed by preliminary analysis and design studies to fix the essential nature of the project; another year is needed for detailed design and analysis, including mock-up critical experiment in the physics, chemistry, and metallurgy of the reactor. During the third year engineering construction and installation of the core, components, and machinery completes the work.

Throughout such a project weekly lists of critical items delayed, in trouble, or needing help is submitted by the development center to headquarters for priority attention. Detailed monthly reports on each phase of the project assist overall coordination. All major design and technical decisions in a program are made by agreement among the principals, that is, AEC, the Navy, and the development center. If there is strong dissent from any party, it is talked through until essential agreement is reached. Lesser technical decisions which derive from major ones, extending even to the contractor level, are made in somewhat the same way by being referred back to headquarters, the principal technical source of direction.

This pattern of vertical relationships between the development centers, contractors, and headquarters in its capacity as the AEC's Naval Nuclear Reactors Branch, does not, however, pertain to its intra-Navy relationships as Code 1500. These are substantially horizontal, particularly with the Preliminary Design Branch and with the Hull and Machinery Design Branches of the Bureau of Ships, where discussions are informal and close.

In general, Code 1500 is responsible for research, development, engineering, and installation of an entire nuclear plant of a new type. Reactors for subsequent plants remain a Code 1500 responsibility, but repeat machinery now comes under cognizance of BuShips Machinery Branch, the same as machinery for conventional ships. This shift back to conventional from task group administrative procedures as the program progresses from its research and development to production is a wise one.

Just as the development of naval nuclear propulsion created demand for special ships to utilize it, so has it created demand for specially selected and trained men to man them. The intricacies involved inevitably drew BuShips into this field as a technical adviser to the Bureau of Naval Personnel. Large numbers of submariners have received the training and already some 200 men and 12 officers are being trained in anticipation of commissioning nuclear-powered surface ships.

Nuclear ship enlisted personnel are selected by forces afloat, but in accordance with strict standards of intelligence, ability, and conduct. So outstanding is this group that about 6 percent are further selected each year as officer candidates—20 times the overall Navy rate. Officers submit to a series of comprehensive interviews by Admiral Rickover and others before final acceptance for training.

Following selection both officers and men undergo 6 months' intensive schooling in physics, mathematics, and various nuclear subjects, followed by another 6 months' further study and practical operation of prototype plants at the National Nuclear Reactor Test Station, Arco, Idaho.

Officers are more intensely trained than enlisted men. All officers must, and a number of enlisted ratings do, qualify as nuclear plant chief operators before completing the course. Qualification establishes proficiency in all phases of reactor operation, particularly in everything pertaining to safety. It requires at least 1,000 hours practical work on a prototype plant and is said to be several times as difficult as qualifying for submarine command.

In addition to regular training, prospective commanding officers are assigned several months' duty at headquarters organization and in the development centers. Each is placed in contact with the designers and developers of the powerplant destined for his command and acquires the same intimate knowledge of its capabilities as the men who created it.

The policy of building a land prototype of each naval nuclear plant type pays dividends, not only during development, but during the careful and meticulous training program as well. Crews go aboard ship fully experienced in operating a plant identical to the one which they must safely control to protect the lives of themselves and their shipmates. These factors, as well as care in design, are responsible for the excellent safety records of presently operating nuclear submarines.

The advent of naval nuclear propulsion has, indeed, brought about as major a change in naval men, material, and methods as it has in concepts of naval tactics. It has placed on naval policy planners the difficult burden of allocating available naval funds to costly commitments for seapower in being to meet the crises of today and at the same time carrying forward the bold nuclear research, construction, and training programs needed to meet the crises of tomorrow.

But if Congress appropriates hoped for funds, by 1966 the Nation will have in being 5 or 6 superflattops, half a dozen guided missile cruisers, the beginning of a destroyer fleet, and some 45 submarines, all nuclear powered.

The substantial shift over from steam to naval nuclear power will have been made during a brief 18 years, compared to more than 50 years needed for the shift from sail to steam.

A Parable for Our Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED MARSHALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of speculation about the farmers' attitude toward the succession of profound statements on agricultural policy which have been made by the Secretary of Agriculture and the President. Some light may be shed on the subject by a parable which appeared in a recent issue of the Benton County News, of Foley, Minn., one of the leading rural weekly newspapers of my State. Under unanimous consent, I include an editorial entitled "A Parable for Our Time," from the April 23 issue.

The farmers of my district are also pleased to note that the Secretary of Agriculture is contemplating a visit to the Soviet Union. They hope that he will advise the Russians on farm policy. If he is as successful there as he has been here, it will be a real victory for the free world:

A PARABLE FOR OUR TIME

It came to pass that a scourge was upon the land.

The tillers of the soil brought forth the fruits of the earth in bounty.

The waistlines of the people bulged and users of the abundance were found wanting.

The nakedness of the people was covered with many-colored garments from the weavers of cotton and wool.

Farmers, who were given no share in this abundance, were sorely tried and left their lands to seek other labors. The happy firesides rang no longer with the joyful laughter of little children but were cold and empty. Sadness prevailed upon the land.

The great leader of the people forsook his game of golf and put out of mind for a moment the tribulation of squirrels on the putting green to take counsel with the patriarch in the Temple of Agriculture:

"I say unto you, Elder Ezra, lead us out of our despair. The people are sorely tried and their cries of anger are troubling my games and destroying my scores."

The great elder bowed his head in humility like unto martyrdom and after great deliberation spake thus:

"It is the evil Democrats in the land who have heaped this misery upon us. They gave unto the tillers of the soil laws which provided rewards for their labors. In some instances as much as 90 percent of that received by others. It is in the tents of the Democrats that these tillers have been misled.

"Verily, I say unto you, they must be brought to look beyond the dollar sign, which is the emblem of our tribe. Only then will they come to know true freedom, and to love it more than gold, and be content to leave the laws of reward to those among us who have knowledge and understanding of such things.

"It is sad that their corruption is upon us. These sons of the soil have come to believe that a fair reward is their right by law. I am sorely beset by their claims. We cannot long hope to multiply the reward to the handler and the merchandiser of the tiller's fruit, if they persist in this lack of understanding. Woe to us if they do not cease to press their claims. Then would we be sorely tired to fill the coffers of our campaign to carry on this great crusade.

"I have dreamed, but a new vision cometh not. It is wise that we hold steadfast to the course we have laid. Though the mission I have come to fulfill falters, and the spur of insecurity becomes dull, we must not weary."

Thus spake Elder Ezra, and with scarcity a pause for breath he spake again, saying:

"The freedom we have given the sons of the soil to make debts, to bear great costs, and to labor without reward has taught them not humility, but has aroused them to anger. The fierceness of their anger riseth surely, and we must cause their anger toward us to cease. We must turn their eyes to other paths.

"When the workers cry out against the great costs which we have caused to be raised against them, we must find new words to speak that our glory may again dwell in the land. Say unto them, great leader: 'Farm prices are not made in Washington. A government warehouse is not a market. Farm products have been priced out of the market. Surpluses are inevitable unless support prices are lower.

"Sing aloud these words, O Leader. Send out the 17,000 additional tongues with which I have supplied you, and make joyful noises that the people may hearken unto thee for yet another season."

The great leader of the people clapped his hands in joy, and he heaped praise upon the head of the great patriarch from the temple of agriculture. He called together the scribes of the land and spake unto them

great praise of the elder in whom he remained well pleased. Then he went back to the game called golf well satisfied, and the tribulations of the squirrels were forgotten for a time.

Days and nights passed, the rumblings of anger were heard in the land, and again the great leader was called from his games. At the other end of the wide avenue called Pennsylvania, in a citadel of strength, fashioned by the hands of the master builder Jefferson, there sat a great counsel of the people dedicated to the service of the people that they might walk in honor and dignity and freedom as befits man made in the image of God.

From this citadel there stormed spokesmen for the tribe called Republicans. Like an army of locusts they descended upon the great leader, and he was not pleased. Yet the spokesmen of the tribe Republicans were so sorely burdened that he let them come before him. And they poured out great streams of woe.

"The cries of the farmer are even louder," said the spokesmen. "In the cities great unemployment has arisen. We know that all will be well if left to thee. But the lowly worker who has no job lacks true belief, and the old ones talk of Hoover. It is the prophet Ezra who has brought these troubles. Though he has spoken true, the people have no belief in him. Cast him out, leader, lest we all are lost."

And the leader turned his ear from them, and a great rage descended upon him, and took hold of him, and shook him, and he cast the spokesmen from him. For was it not well known, even among the multitude, that he loved the patriarch of the temple of agriculture, and believed in him, and called him wise and true? And he called the patriarch before him and spake to him, saying:

"The glad words we have spoken in many slogans have failed to end the curse of abundance in the land, and have not stilled the anger in the hearts of the people. We must act in all haste to put down this disturbance among the workers in the vineyard, for, lo, this is the year of decision. It is in November, of the year of 1958, that our disciples in the citadel of the Congress must come before those who now raise their voices in protest, for an accounting."

Elder Ezra had no fear, for he knew the power he held over his leader, and he sayeth: "Verily I say unto you, great leader, these disciples belong to us in name only, for they have strayed from the true way. Thou knowest that many who have come to thee have begged that thou turn thy ear from me and cast me out. I would set an example for these and tell them that they may go the way of the wicked in November.

"It is the Democrats who are the real cause of these troubles. It was they who brought lamps to the homes of the farmers, and caused them to read, and to learn the meaning of many things. It was they who made broad highways across the land, and built temples in the cities, and caused jobs to be created and wages to be paid such as never had been known. The people have waxed fat, and have become confused, and believe that all things should be kept as before.

"O great leader, we shall burn books that do not speak the true word. We shall speak again in new words of efficiency, and of rural development, and of new markets. And we shall send forth even greater numbers of disciples from the temple of agriculture, and tell those who are unable to find sufficient employment upon the land to sell off their oxes and their asses and find work as servants in the houses of our towns and cities.

"And if they say 'What work—and servants of whom?' we shall say unto them that in our land of freedom we will not make a decree that will be imposed upon those forced from the lands of their fathers, but shall leave it unto them as to which of the city dwellers they would be servants to.

"We shall speak to the people in strange tongues that they may hear of the wonders of utilization research. We shall teach new things to which they may turn the skills of their hands and the fruits of their lands.

"Bamboo shoots and wondrous weeds from which the alchemists and healers may distill their drugs will blossom where wheat and corn are turned beneath the soil. And the Safeway stores and the other food emporiums and all those who reap the rewards from all who must eat and drink will remain and prosper to fill the campaign coffers of our true Republican disciples."

Thus spake the elder to the great leader, and he was well pleased. And he ordered done what the elder had told him, and he called together the scribes, and he told them liquidation is more priceless than solidification, and he decreed a thaw rather than a freeze. And he told the scribes and all others to go from him, for the time of the singing of the birds again had come, and the voice of the turtle was heard in the land, and the great leader showed much impatience at being kept away from his realm of golf. For was not he the great leader who is imbued with the spirit of modern Republicanism, which is to procrastinate, to delay, to remain without decision.

Law Day, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, May 1 was celebrated all across the Nation as Law Day, U. S. A. Led by members of the legal profession, this was a day of national dedication to the principles of government under laws. Special ceremonies in schools, churches, courthouses, and civic and social organizations marked this day. As a lawyer, and as an American, I applaud all who participated in the birth and promulgation of this splendid observance.

We in America are particularly aware of the contribution the rule of law has made to our social and economic and political growth. In the larger concept, peoples everywhere are coming to realize the force and influence of the rule of law on world affairs. It may very well be that worldwide adherence to the rules of law represents the sole chance for the survival of civilization.

A number of editorials from our country's leading newspapers chose the occasion to emphasize various aspects of the law and its impact on our life and progress and future. The concepts of world peace through law, of the importance of fair and equal justice in all courts of our land, the magnificent leadership of American Bar Association, Pres. Charles S. Rhyne and his coworkers in conceiving and carrying forward with Law Day—all these and other thoughts are voiced in these editorials.

Under leave previously granted, I insert at this point two outstanding editorials on Law Day, 1958.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 1, 1958]

TO WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW

"Justice is spontaneous respect, mutually guaranteed, for human dignity, in whatever person it may be compromised and under whatever circumstances, and to whatever risk its defense may expose us"—Proudhon.

"Equal Justice Under Law" is chiseled in stone above the Supreme Court Building. It is a fitting motto, not only for the court, but for the whole American Nation. For it is the law which bred us, led us, and fed us.

Today is Law Day, the first in our history, so proclaimed by President Eisenhower. He did so at the urging of Charles Rhyne, the 45-year-old North Carolinian who is president of the American Bar Association. Ever since he took office last summer, in a London meeting where he dedicated the American bar's monument to Magna Carta on the historic field of Runnymede, Charles Rhyne has devoted his time to spreading a single concept: world peace through world law.

It is a noble concept. Man has groped, imperfectly, toward it from the beginning of time. It finds expression in the Decalogue of Moses. Leviticus tells us, "Ye shall have one manner of law, as well for the stranger as for one of your own country." Three centuries before Christ, Aristotle defined it in Athens: "The law is reason free from passion." Christ himself preached it in his Sermon on the Mount. Five centuries later the Romans spoke it in the Institutes of Justinian: "The precepts of the law are these: to live honorably, to injure no other man, to render to every man his due."

From this Judaic-Greco-Roman seed came the stirrings which expressed themselves at Runnymede when the English nobles forced King John to sign this pledge: "No freeman shall be taken, or imprisoned, or disseized, or outlawed, or exiled, or in any way harmed, nor will we go upon or send upon him, save by the lawful judgment of his peers or by the law of the land." Kings were tyrants long after that, but the flames of Runnymede spread; Sir Edward Coke could fling in the face of James I these words: "The king ought not to be under man, but under God and the law."

And when other lawyers came together in a New World, to proclaim a new Nation conceived in liberty, they drew their propositions largely from Aristotle's "natural law" and from Blackstone's commentaries on the English common law. "I pray God these principles may be eternal," wrote Thomas Jefferson. And as the new Nation emerged, a great Chief Justice, John Marshall, by the force of his decisions and his strength of mind, left a legacy of living law—of growing law, adaptable to vastly changed situations—which is still today our strength as it is our refuge.

Only as the whole world comes to accept a rule of law, and agree on its common principles, will there be hope for a lasting peace. The progress is slow; nevertheless it exists. President Eisenhower himself appealed to such a concept in opposing the British-French attack on Egypt. Moreover, his use of the United Nations to stop that attack has now borne some fruit in a peaceful settlement by Egypt of the claims of the canal stockholders, embodied in a formal legal contract. The now pending United States proposal in the United Nations for international inspection of the Arctic is an attempt to extend the concept of international law. Significantly, it has such appeal that Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold momentarily stepped out of his role of impartial referee to make an eloquent appeal for the Soviet Union to accept it. The moral force of all humanity is a rising pressure for a rule of law.

Of course, the Soviet Union has a legal code of sorts, more honored in the breach

than in the observance. Khrushchev in his famous speech against Stalin's crimes talked much about the "socialist legality" which he said Stalin violated by imprisoning and executing men without trial, by decrees which bypassed the courts. No Communist has much respect for legal codes. And already Khrushchev is beginning to attack his legal opponents in Stalinesque phrases; their lives or their freedom may soon be at hazard. All this flows from the two most glaring defects in Soviet law: (1) No provision for the election and legitimate succession of state rulers, which causes an inevitable and endless power struggle; and (2) no habeas corpus to provide universal protection against arrest and punishment without jury trial.

Our own law, and the Supreme Court itself, must fight off recurring attacks. Nevertheless, as in desegregation, we continue to move toward the ideal set by Solon long ago: "That city is the best to live in, in which those who are not wronged, no less than those who are wronged, exert themselves to punish the wrongdoers."

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 1, 1958]

LAW DAY

It was a happy thought on the part of Charles S. Rhyne, president of the American Bar Association, and his associates to choose May Day as an occasion for emphasis of the importance of law in the lives of free people. The Communist world celebrates its triumphs and its military might on May 1. In many other lands the first day of May is a special occasion for revolutionaries and anarchists. In this land of stable government through law there is much to be said for using the same date to celebrate the marriage of order and liberty.

We live in a world that is desperately in need of law. General acceptance of the great idea of individual freedom under law would at once end the cold war and set at rest mankind's greatest fear of nuclear destruction. As practical men, we do not expect this concept, which means so much to us, suddenly to leave the wide gulf that separates the free world from communism. But ideas that give men promise of justice, equal rights, and freedom in an orderly society are more contagious than either tyranny or bombs. In the long reach of history the ideas that underlie "Law Day—U. S. A." may be more potent than any military force.

It is well to remember also on this occasion how far we are from achieving the hallowed concept of equal justice under law in the multifarious human relationships within our own country. The struggle for equal protection of the laws must go on in Chicago, Washington, Little Rock—throughout the Nation—ever day in the year. It is a never-ending process. The fact that human performance falls far short of the ideal only underlines the necessity of reminding ourselves of the vital role that law plays in any free society.

Milwaukee Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, no one can know the thoughts that come into the minds of millions of individual Americans, and the other peoples of the world, each time the great powers launch another missile, test another nuclear device, or add another hydrogen bomb to stockpiles already large enough to destroy civilization.

I have no doubt, however, that every day thousands more Americans, Europeans, Asians, and Africans are thinking seriously—and fearfully—about our common future, and where we are going. We all live in an atmosphere not only clouded by radioactive dust but heavy with the worry of mankind.

Some of our most respected citizens have formed the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, to stimulate public thought and discussion of these great problems which concern us all. Sponsors of the Milwaukee Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy are:

Carolyn E. Allen, Mrs. August Backus, Richard Black, Mrs. Karl Bostrum, Mrs. E. R. Droppers, Carrie B. Edmondson, Mr. and Mrs. Jack Eisendrath, Lawrence F. Giese, Rev. R. H. Huenemann, Robert Krahn, Mrs. Wallace Lee, Mr. and Mrs. Willis Leenhouts, Mr. and Mrs. Reed MacBain, Marion G. Ogden, Alfred S. Reindl, Mrs. Walter E. Rilling, Corneff Taylor, Rev. Herbert E. Zebarth, and Leonard S. Zubrensky.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I commend to the attention of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle the first of a series of statements for Americans in a nuclear age, published by the Milwaukee Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy in the Milwaukee Journal of Sunday, April 27, 1958.

The statement follows:

We are facing a danger unlike any danger that has ever existed. In our possession and in the possession of the Russians are more than enough nuclear explosives to put an end to the life of man on earth.

The same propulsion device that can send a manmade satellite into outer space can send a missile carrying a hydrogen bomb across the ocean in 18 minutes.

Meanwhile, our approach to the danger is unequal to the danger.

We have been living half a life. We have been developing our appetites, but we have been starving our purposes. We have been concerned with bigger incomes, bigger television screens and bigger cars—but not with the big ideas on which our lives and freedoms depend.

What the world expects of America is not just bigger and better intercontinental missiles and hydrogen bombs. The world is looking to us for the ideas that can make this planet safe and fit for human habitation.

Indeed, the test of a nation's right to survive today is measured not by the size of its bombs or the range of its missiles, but by the size and range of its concern for the human community as a whole.

There can be no true security for America unless we can establish and keep vital connections with the world's people, unless there is some moral grandeur to our purposes, unless what we do is directed to the cause of human life and the free man.

Just in front of us opens a grand human adventure into outer space. But within us and all around us is the need to make this world whole before we set out for other ones. We can earn the right to explore other planets only as we keep this one from becoming an atomic furnace.

There is much that America has said to the world. But the world is still waiting for us to say and do the things that will in deed and in truth represent our greatest strength.

What are these things?

First, as it concerns the peace, America can say that we pledge ourselves to the cause of peace with justice on earth, and that there is no sacrifice that we are not prepared to make, nothing we will not do to create such a just peace for all peoples;

That we are prepared to support the concept of a United Nations authorized and empowered under law to prevent aggression, to enforce disarmament and to settle disputes among nations according to principles of justice.

Next, as it concerns nuclear weapons, America can say that the earth is too small for intercontinental ballistic missiles and nuclear bombs and that the first order of business for the world is to bring both under control.

That the development of satellites or rocket stations and the exploration of outer space must be carried on in the interests of the entire human community through a pooling of world science.

As it concerns nuclear testing, America can say that because of the grave unanswered questions with respect to nuclear test explosions—especially as it concerns the contamination of air and water and food and the injury to man himself—we are calling upon all nations to suspend such explosions at once.

That no nation has the moral right to contaminate the air that belongs to all peoples, or to devitalize the land, or to tamper with the genetic integrity of man himself.

That while the abolition of testing will not by itself solve the problem of peace or the problem of armaments, it enables the world to eliminate immediately at least one real and specific danger. Also, that the abolition of testing gives us a place to begin on the larger question of armaments control, for the problems in monitoring such tests are relatively uncomplicated.

As it concerns our connections to the rest of mankind, America can say that none of the differences separating the governments of the world are as important as the membership of all peoples in the human family.

That the big challenge of the age is to develop the concept of a higher loyalty—loyalty by man to the human community.

That the greatest era of human history on earth is within reach of all mankind, that there is no area that cannot be made fertile or habitable, no disease that cannot be fought, no scarcity that cannot be conquered.

Tobacco Heading for Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the United States tobacco farmer has been reduced to an average of 4.5 acres per farm. The foreign tobacco grower is planting more and more with the aid of our Reciprocal Trade Program as presently administered. This in addition to our foreign aid which teaches them how to fertilize, cure, and market a competitive leaf.

Now is the time for the tobacco farmer and the tobacco industry to support a new foreign trade bill. We must defeat a 5-year extension of the present trade law. Next year may be too late.

Mr. Speaker, the following information is available from the Department of Agriculture:

TOBACCO—INTERNATIONAL TRADE LEVELS AND TRENDS

World exports of unmanufactured tobacco reached a new high of 1,585 million pounds in 1956. Little change is expected in 1957. United States exports in 1957 are expected to be 20 million pounds below those of 1956, while exports of foreign countries are expected to rise by a similar amount.

This downfall trend in United States exports is expected to continue, because of: (1) sharply rising production of foreign cigarette leaf, particularly flue-cured and oriental; (2) improvement in quality of foreign leaf; (3) increasing use of bilateral trade agreements; (4) recent sharp increases in import duties and excise taxes on tobacco by some countries; (5) expected continuing increases in prices of United States burley and flue-cured leaf; (6) expected continuation of dollar- and gold-reserve difficulties in some tobacco-importing countries.

The major problems facing United States tobacco exports arise from actions taken by other countries.

Over three-fourths of all foreign tobaccos (excluding United States imports) entering international trade are covered by bilateral agreements, guaranteed purchase arrangements, preferential import duties, or other controls which virtually exclude United States leaf. The use of these bilateral arrangements to cover tobacco exports of foreign countries, mostly in exchange for manufactured items, have increased greatly since World War II.

In some countries, including Japan, Australia, and the Philippines, prices of domestic leaf are well above those received for comparable qualities of United States tobaccos. Self-sufficiency policies of these areas do not permit greater imports of United States leaf. Other countries limit imports of United States tobacco through foreign-exchange controls.

An important factor in the declining United States competitive position is the recent sharp increases in prices of United States burley and flue-cured. The rises in cost of the heavier popular export grades are due chiefly to increasing United States demand for filter-tip cigarettes. These rising prices encourage both foreign production and use of lower priced foreign tobaccos.

In 1956 some of the United States flue-cured crop was undesirable varieties. To improve this situation, the United States Government took measures which practically eliminated production of these in 1957.

FOREIGN PRODUCTION INCREASING MUCH FASTER THAN THAT OF UNITED STATES

World production at 8.3 billion pounds in 1957 was the third highest on record, being slightly below the 1955 and 1956 levels. Foreign production continued its rise, reaching an all-time high of 6.68 billion pounds. During the 20-year period from 1937 to 1957, world production increased about 1.25 percent per year. United States production rose about 35 percent from 1937 to 1947 while foreign production increased 25 percent. However, since the 1947–51 period United States production has decreased and foreign production has expanded 30 percent.

FOREIGN EXPORTS CONTINUE TO RISE AS UNITED STATES EXPORTS DECLINE

During the 1947–51 period total exports of foreign countries were about the same as prewar, while United States exports were about one-sixth above prewar. Since 1950, international trade in tobacco rose about 400 million pounds. All of this increase was due to larger foreign exports. In 1957, United States exports were about 490 million pounds, or one-sixth above the prewar level. Total exports of other countries are estimated at 1,095 million pounds, or 52 percent above prewar. This increase was due to greater exports of flue-cured and oriental tobaccos. Nearly all of the increase in flue-cured exports came from the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, India, Canada, and China mainland. Practically all of the exports of oriental were from Turkey, Greece, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia.

The United States tobacco export problem is not a new one. It started before World War II, but recently has become more acute. United States leaf tobacco prices have long been above foreign prices. Superior quality of United States flue-cured and burley delayed the day of reckoning. However, recent increases in United States prices have made the competitive position worse.

The unfavorable competitive position of the United States is further shown by the fact that foreign tobaccos are available for purchase without using scarce dollars which are often used primarily to buy United States manufactured items rather than tobacco and other agricultural products.

The important unpredictable element in the future of United States exports is the change in cigarette blends resulting from shifts in consumer demand.

Most flue-cured tobacco from foreign exporting countries is more or less neutral in regard to flavor. Nearly all neutral leaf has been used in cigarettes; however, with the increasing use of filter-tip cigarettes, there is greater demand for tobacco with more flavor.

Nearly all of the recent increases in foreign exports of flue-cured except from Mainland China have been from British Commonwealth countries. A high proportion of this has been sold under preferential tariffs to the United Kingdom, Australia, Union of South Africa, and British territories. Recently there has been a decline in use of straight, oriental-type cigarettes. Demand has shifted to blend cigarettes except in a few countries of East Europe.

Import duties and excise taxes in some countries have always been serious deterrents to United States tobacco exports. Duties increased in some importing countries in recent years, particularly in 1957. Impediments to United States tobacco exports have increased sharply since World War II. Bilateral trade agreements, preferential import duties,[1] licensing arrangements, and foreign exchange controls are among the most important. In many countries the policy of reducing the expenditures of dollars for the purchase of tobacco has encouraged foreign production and exports.

The United States is now feeling the full effects of these factors and foreign production is rising faster than foreign demands. United States cigarette leaf is still superior in quality, but United States prices are higher than those for foreign growths. Many foreign importers have a wider choice of areas from which to buy leaf and are willing to buy and use the lower quality foreign leaf to keep down manufacturing costs.

[1] Import duties that are lower on tobacco from dependent territories or members of special currency-clearing arrangements.

Law Day, U. S. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert an article which appeared in the Allentown, Pa., Morning Call, under date of May 2, and which is a very excellent résumé on our laws and the lawyers' responsibilities to the same:

LAW DAY, U. S. A.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Following is substantially the text of the principal address, delivered yesterday by Attorney Orrin E. Boyle before members of the Lehigh County Bar Association, at their first annual observance of Law Day, U. S. A.)

At no time in the modern world in which we live has it been so important that we pause, even if it be for a single day, to nationally and rationally evaluate the tremendous importance and effects of the law upon the life, liberty, happiness, and property of every American.

Until 1958, this day, May 1, has only been celebrated as the advent of spring, a day of joyful celebration with dance and song around a Maypole, or a time when the distorted ideas of communism were displayed with the military might with which the Soviets seek to conquer the world.

Tomorrow we are certain to read about such repeated celebration around the Red Square of Moscow and in other cities behind the Iron Curtain.

But today we in America and the free nations of the world will come to better understand that the God-given concept of law and human justice shall and will ultimately prevail against the tyrannies of men, as they have always in the whole history of mankind.

The progress of government by law has been slow, but it has been sure in securing us in our lives, our liberties, and our properties. In America these guaranteed possessions are not merely ideals. They are realities we have enjoyed as blessings for 170 years; and which we have undertaken in many ways to vouchsafe for the rest of the world.

The Founders of Our Republic, many of them colonial lawyers, were well aware of the unbridled tyrannies to which they and countless millions for centuries before them had been subjected. Being wise and determined men they for the first time in human history designed a Constitution with its amendments as a Bill of Rights, that fundamentally made the seemingly most obscure and unimportant citizen the equal of every other person before the law in securing his rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

This may have been an experiment in free government under constitutional law in 1789, but in 1958, it is no longer an experiment. It is today the most valuable heritage of 170 million people born out of the bone and sinew of almost every race, and nation of the world.

Freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom against unreasonable searches and seizures, the right of trial by jury and the right of assembly and the right to freely elect those who are to govern us. These are but a few of the rights assured us under both our Federal and State Constitutions. There are many more which command the respect and adherence of every citizen and resident in the United States.

Because these rights are an almost sacred ever present possession of every man, woman and child we have come to take all of them for granted.

But let us be keen enough on this first nationwide observance of Law Day, U. S. A. to realize that the parchment upon which these constitutions have been written, the books in which our laws have been printed, and the countless volumes in which judicial opinions have been reported are not enough to protect the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness they are intended to preserve. These are destructible. Their votaries are expendable.

One of the greatest, if not the greatest

achievements of our experiment in free and representative government during the past 170 years has been the fulfillment of these needs by our courts, our lawyers and our citizens.

That we may retain inviolate this priceless heritage for ourselves and posterity it is important that we as lawyers constantly remind ourselves and our fellow citizens of the manner in which our Government of law has been attained and how it can best be preserved. Our schools, colleges, and universities must place greater emphasis upon teaching our youth the history, civics, and political and social sciences of the United States. The cynics, debunkers, and political crackpots will need to be submerged more than ever with the logic and realities of what we have and what we are here in America.

The armed forces which are today marching before their Soviet masters in the streets of Russia and its satellites, the masses that may be gathered there to watch their threatening spectacle; not one of them not even the tyrant masters themselves, possess a single one of the rights vouchsafed us here in America under our constitutions and our laws. Not one of them is clothed with the dignity and individuality which their Creator designed for them. Everyone of them is the fearful, cringing, servile victim of a brutal tyranny more vicious than even a Romanoff Czar imposed upon his subjects.

Ponder your condition in a nation such as the Soviets have fashioned for their millions, and you will better understand the solemn duties imposed upon you as lawyers. To our profession and our practices, as to no other, the people of America must and will look for the fair and impartial administration of their laws. To our interest and zeal in defending their freedoms they will look with increased anxiety as the sinister gloom of Soviet slavery threatens them.

As lawyers, our duties now, more than ever before in the history of our Nation are not only to represent our individual clients in their individual problems under the law, but to stand up courageously as the champions of our constitutions, our laws, and our courts in administering them.

Doing so, I am confident that we and our fellow citizens will continue to enjoy the blessings of freedom under law as we have for more than a century and a half; and that "government of the people, by the people, and for the people will not perish from the earth."

Know Your Congressman—Legislative Record, Duties and Responsibilities of Congressman Gordon L. McDonough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, it is the desire of all Members of Congress to become intimately and personally acquainted with all of the people they represent and likewise for the people they represent to know their Congressman.

This is not always possible as much as the Congressman and the people he represents try to become personally acquainted.

However, through correspondence, the press, radio, TV, and other means of communication, all Congressmen try to inform their people what they are doing; the bills they sponsor, introduce and promote; the committees they are assigned to; the major issues they have voted for; and their duties and responsibilities.

In order to properly inform the people of the 15th District, I am submitting the following summary of my legislative record, my duties and responsibilities, and some of the important bills I have introduced and promoted.

MAJOR ISSUES CONGRESSMAN M'DONOUGH HAS SUPPORTED AND VOTED FOR

The McDonough record speaks for itself. But the record of achievement in legislation initiated by McDONOUGH is but a small part of the total record of accomplishment built by the consistent and vigorous efforts of the Congressman from the 15th District in behalf of his constituency.

McDONOUGH has supported legislation to establish a strong adequate national and civilian defense to meet any enemy attack.

He has urged legislation to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States and to combat communism both within the United States and abroad.

He stands firmly opposed to the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

He has consistently supported new and improved veterans' hospitals and necessary increases in pensions for service and non-service-connected veterans and war widows and dependents.

McDONOUGH has supported lower downpayments on new homes and liberal loans for alterations and repairs of existing homes, and for slum clearance under housing legislation.

He has supported increased social security payments that would provide adequate pensions to our senior citizens.

McDONOUGH believes in economy in Government through elimination of waste, extravagance, and duplication of services. He also believes in providing maximum service to our citizens for every dollar spent by Government.

He believes in tax eduction, if such reduction can be achieved while we at the same time maintain our national defense and meet the technological challenge of the Soviet Union in the field of scientific achievement.

LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF CONGRESSMAN GORDON L. M'DONOUGH

The record of achievement attained by Congressman GORDON L. McDONOUGH during his term of service to the people of the 15th Congressional District is outstanding. It is a record of action rather than words—of accomplishment rather than promises. It is the result of his consistent efforts to act and work in the best interest of all the people in his district as well as for the Nation.

During the six complete Congresses in which McDONOUGH has served, McDONOUGH has introduced the following major bills which have resulted in ultimate action and public law in each Congress.

Now let's have a look at the McDONOUGH record.

California ownership of tidelands: A bill to establish the title of the States to tidelands areas was introduced by McDONOUGH in the 79th Congress. McDONOUGH's fight to establish California's ownership of tideland property which is so important to the citizens of our State culminated in enactment of Public Law 31, 83d Congress, which recognized California's ownership of tideland property.

Los Angeles post office expansion: A bill for the expansion and remodeling of the Terminal Annex Post Office was introduced by McDONOUGH in the 80th Congress. The improvement and extension of facilities at Terminal Annex which included an additional floor on the building was necessary as this post office handles the bulk of ingoing and outgoing mail for the Los Angeles area, and the tremendous population increase in the Los Angeles area since World War II resulted in a corresponding increase in the mail load handled at Terminal Annex. The expansion and remodeling of Terminal Annex has been completed as a result of Public Law 238, 81st Congress, and efficient mail service in the Los Angeles area has been maintained.

Federal buildings for Los Angeles: Congressman McDONOUGH introduced a bill in the 80th Congress for the constuction of a new Customhouse and Federal Office Building to meet the increased need in the Los Angeles metropolitan area, and to afford greater service and convenience to the public. Congressional action providing approval of this building was completed July 19, 1956, and construction on the new Los Angeles Customhouse and Federal Office Building will soon be underway.

Los Angeles harbor improvements: Los Angeles Harbor is one of the largest harbors in the United States, and with constantly increasing commerce, facilities for the loading and unloading of vessels must be expanded with channels extended and enlarged to provide more space for vessels and to assure adequate channels for larger vessels to make port at Los Angeles.

Congressman McDONOUGH introduced bills to improve the east basin of Los Angeles Harbor by dredging and enlarging, and to improve the west basin including the removal of a drawbridge, and these harbor improvements were authorized in Public Law 641, 84th Congress.

McDONOUGH also obtained reimbursement to the city of Los Angeles for funds which had been expended on the East Basin Harbor improvement for necessary immediate work prior to the congressional authorization.

Air pollution control—smog: Recognizing the serious threat of smog to the health and welfare of every citizen of Los Angeles, McDONOUGH introduced a bill in the 84th Congress to provide for research by the Federal Government into the causes of air pollution, its control and prevention.

The Federal program for research on air pollution now in progress under the direction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was inaugurated with enactment of Public Law 159, 84th Congress.

Marina Del Rey project: The McDonough bill introduced in the 83d Congress provided for authorization of the Marina Del Rey small craft harbor, a project

urgently needed to supply a base for the the United States Coast Guard Air-Sea Rescue Unit, and which also will provide additional small-craft facilities and a useful recreation area. Authorization for this project was included in Public Law 780, 83d Congress. Congressman McDONOUGH's vigorous efforts also obtained the following appropriations for the Marina Del Rey project: $25,000, Public Law 163, 84th Congress; $355,000, Public Law 641, 84th Congress.

Repeal of taxes: Congressman McDONOUGH introduced legislation in the 80th Congress to repeal the excise tax on theater admissions. Partial repeal of the admission excise tax was enacted under Public Law 324 of the 83d Congress and Public Law 1010, 84th Congress.

Veterans: In the 79th Congress, McDONOUGH introduced a bill to extend National Service Life Insurance for 5 additional years thereby assuring life-insurance benefits for all men in service which otherwise would have terminated. The extension of National Service Life Insurance was established under Public Law 118, 79th Congress.

McDONOUGH introduced a bill in the 83d Congress to extend the 3-year presumption of service connection to veterans in all types of tuberculosis. This bill was designed to bring relief to many veterans with types of tuberculosis other than pulmonary, which were contracted as a result of service. The 3-year presumption of service connection was extended to veterans in all types of tuberculosis under Public Law 241, 83d Congress.

Armed services: The McDonough bill introduced in the 82d Congress fixed the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps to assure full efficiency of the corps, and also gave the Commandant of the Marine Corps a place on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This was accomplished with the enactment of Public Law 416, 82d Congress.

Air Force Academy: A bill to establish an Air Force Academy to provide the highly specialized training necessary to provide competent and efficient officers for the United States Air Force necessary for the defense of our Nation was introduced by McDONOUGH in the 81st Congress. The United States Air Force Academy, now located in Colorado, was authorized with enactment of Public Law 325, 83d Congress.

Post graduate Naval Academy in California: The McDonough bill to establish an additional Naval Academy in California and McDONOUGH's fight to improve and extend facilities for the technical training of officers for the United States Navy resulted in establishment of the Post Graduate Naval School at Monterey, Calif., December 22, 1951.

United States flag: McDONOUGH introduced House Joint Resolution 167 in the 80th Congress to assure that the flag of the United States always shall receive proper respect and be placed in its proper position by providing that no foreign or supranational flag shall be displayed in a superior position or in place of the flag of the United States.

This protection of the flag of the United States was established with enactment of Public Law 107, 83d Congress.

Scientific research: In the 80th Congress, McDONOUGH introduced a bill to provide a research program to develop economical methods to convert sea water to fresh. This program is of vital importance to Southern California, as a practical economical method which will convert sea water to fresh for industrial, agricultural, and domestic use would help solve the all important problem of contniuous adequate water supply to meet continuing needs of an increasing population and industry. The McDONOUGH bill also provided for establishment of demonstration plants.

The research program now in progress by the Federal Government to convert sea water to fresh was initiated under Public Law 448, 82d Congress.

McDONOUGH also introduced a bill in the 80th Congress to provide for Federal research into the causes and treatment of multiple sclerosis. This program was initiated under Public Law 835, 84th Congress.

Recognition of the American schoolteacher: A bill introduced in the 82d Congress by McDONOUGH provided for the issue of a special postage stamp honoring our American schoolteachers who receive so little recognition for the service they render to our Nation.

The special stamp honoring the American schoolteacher was issued July 1, 1957.

Equal rights: A bill introduced by McDONOUGH in the 82d Congress provided naturalized citizenship rights to all immigrants having the right to permanent residence in the United States, and provided quotas for Asian and Pacific peoples. The provisions of this bill were included in Public Law 414, 82d Congress.

M'DONOUGH BILLS UNDER CONSIDERATION BY 85TH CONGRESS

House Joint Resolution 61: A resolution to revise the status of forces agreement regarding jurisdiction of foreign nations over American servicemen stationed within those nations, or the withdrawal of the United States from the status of forces agreement.

H. R. 1193: A bill to increase the pension of Federal and postal employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

H. R. 4797: A bill to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise.

H. R. 1176: A bill to exclude from gross income for income tax purposes all amounts up to $2,400 per annum received as annuities, pensions, or retirement benefits.

H. R. 4403: A bill titled the Self-Employed Individuals' Retirement Act which will extend social security retirement coverage to attorneys, dentists, and other self-employed individuals not covered by the present Social Security Act.

House Joint Resolution 4: A proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide that no treaty or international agreement shall nullify or abrogate any of the civil rights guaranteed to citizens of the United States by the Constitution.

House Joint Resolution 62: A proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee equal rights for women.

H. R. 3635: A bill to allow certain small business corporations an exemption of $25,000 for income-tax purposes, and to provide that the combined normal tax and surtax rate of 38 percent shall be applicable to corporations having taxable incomes of less than $50,000.

H. R. 331, H. R. 1175, H. R. 1177, H. R. 1178, H. R. 1182, H. R. 1198: Bills to repeal the excise tax on admissions to rodeos held for charitable purposes; the excise tax on purses, handbags, and certain other leather articles; the excise tax on admissions to motion pictures; the excise tax on cosmetics and toilet preparations; and the tax on certain other events conducted for charitable purposes.

H. R. 1195: A bill to permit the taxation by local, State, county, and city governments of the private interest in personal property and work in process, and inventories of material acquired by the Federal Government for military security and the national defense but in possession of contractors with the Federal Government. This bill is of vital importance to Los Angeles County tax revenue.

H. R. 5391: A bill to provide that the Secretary of Commerce shall furnish weather reports to certain air pollution control agencies. These weather reports would assist in the important research now in progress to determine the causes of smog and methods for its control and elimination.

H. R. 6459. A bill to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by a taxpayer for the higher education of a dependent.

H. R. 9686: A bill to create a United States Foreign Service Academy to provide an efficient trained force for the Foreign Service of the United States.

H. R. 10179. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind.

H. R. 12312: A bill to amend the Social Security Act to allow a person receiving State old-age assistance to earn $50 per month without any reduction in the amount of assistance received.

H. R. 12313: A bill to provide Federal funds up to 98 percent of the cost of cooperative housing projects to be occupied by elderly persons only at low rents under a cooperative nonprofit plan, and authorizing the FHA Commissioner to advance up to $100 million on 50-year mortgages for this purpose.

IMPORTANT DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CONGRESSMAN GORDON L. M'DONOUGH, CHAIRMAN OF CALIFORNIA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

Congressman McDONOUGH is chairman of the 30 member California congressional delegation in which all the Congressmen from California work together in behalf of many issues of great importance to our State. California's congressional delegation is the second largest—New York is first—in the House of Representatives.

Very few of the larger State delegations meet together as bipartisan bodies

to consider and act upon problems of general interest to their respective States. The California delegation, however, has done so for many years, and acting as a unit, the delegation has made notable contributions to the solution of California problems.

As chairman of the delegation, Congressman McDONOUGH appoints committees of the delegation to deal with problems of particular interest to California. Committees have been appointed by McDONOUGH on agriculture, air-pollution control, forest-fire prevention, resource development, and California industry.

A successful undertaking of the delegation under McDONOUGH'S chairmanship was that relating to the granting of permission by the Mexican Government for service by an American airline between Mexico City and Los Angeles. It had been agreed by the two governments some years ago that such service would be introduced, but the necessary formal permission as contemplated under the agreement had never actually been granted by the Mexican Government. In February 1957, the California delegation conferred as a group with officials of the Department of State and the Civil Aeronautics Board concerning the matter and expressed strongly its desire that energetic steps be taken to complete the matter. Within a few weeks, the granting of the necessary permission was announced.

An important problem which also engaged the attention of the delegation was the proposed closing of the naval hospital at Corona, Calif. The proposed closing would involve a severe limitation on the availability of medical care for service personnel, and with the delegation interest in the matter, the closing was postponed.

Among other duties as chairman of the California delegation, Congressman McDONOUGH appeared before the House Committee on Appropriations when it held hearings on public works matters in the 1957 session to introduce the presentation by California witnesses of the California requests for appropriations for flood-control projects.

Besides his duties as chairman of the delegation, McDONOUGH is also active in district affairs, and is regarded as an effective representative of his constituency. For several years he has sought the construction of a new customhouse and Federal office building for Los Angeles, and this project has made progress in the face of many difficulties, and should be under construction this year.

He has also been for many years an energetic supporter of general Los Angeles and southern California interests such as forest-fire prevention and flood control, and played a major part in the creation of the Playa del Rey small-boat harbor and recreation development, as well as in the initiation of Federal aid for air-pollution research and the conversion of sea water to fresh water.

BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

McDONOUGH is a ranking member of the powerful and important Banking and Currency Committee which has jurisdiction over the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Export-Import Bank, the International Bank for Reconstruction, the International Finance Corporation, all legislation concerning the financing and rehabilitation of homes, and military housing.

HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE

He is also a ranking member of the House Subcommittee on Housing which has made a specific and detailed study of the need for all types of housing throughout the United States, which includes multiple housing, individual homes, slum clearance, and rehabilitation, and reconstruction of blighted areas in the cities throughout the Nation.

JOINT SENATE AND HOUSE COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

He is also a member of the Joint Senate and House Defense Production Committee, which has the responsibility of making a continuous study of the programs authorized by the Defense Production Act and of reviewing the progress achieved in the execution and administration of these programs for the defense of our Nation.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ASTRONAUTICS AND SPACE EXPLORATION

He is a member of the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration, a new committee of the House which has the duty and responsibility to pioneer the study of interplanetary travel and communication, and outer space exploration. This committee will conduct a thorough and complete study and investigation with respect to all aspects and problems relating to the exploration of outer space and the control, development, and use of astronautical resources, personnel, equipment, and facilities.

VOTING RECORD AND ATTENDANCE

With the multiple duties and responsibilities required by the foregoing committee assignments and delegation responsibilities, Congressman McDONOUGH has one of the best records for being present and voting on important and vital issues debated and voted upon in the House of Representatives.

He is also a member of the Inter-Parliamentary Union by appointment of the Speaker and approval of the House.

He was a United States delegate to the 46th conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, which was held in London in September 1957, which 700 delegates from 46 countries attended.

Hon. Thomas J. O'Brien

SPEECH

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that our friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] has called attention to the fact that this is the 80th birthday of our beloved colleague, the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN. His is a unique career and such a notable one that we should not let this milestone pass without expressing our profound appreciation for his friendship and for his contribution to the public service. In his quiet, but remarkably effective, way he has served his district, his city, his State, and his Nation over a long period, and we, his friends, are happy that his health and vigor have been preserved. Paraphrasing an old saying, TOM O'BRIEN can't grow old; time only decorates him.

Restore Sound Money and Conversion—Stop Inflation and Further Dollar Depreciation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House will be interested in a speech made on April 30 before the Denver Mining Club by Mr. Merrill E. Shoup, president of the Golden Cycle Corp., of Colorado Springs. Mr. Shoup is an outstanding industrial leader of Colorado. In addition to being interested in the gold mining industry, Mr. Shoup is president of the Holly Sugar Corp., and of several banks in our State.

In this speech Mr. Shoup calls attention to the importance of gold in the world economy. He states that Russia is preparing to back the ruble with gold. He feels that the time is here when the United States should take steps to raise the price of gold, which would encourage the production of gold in this country and cause many of our gold mines to reopen.

Mr. Shoup urges that the price of gold should be raised to $100 an ounce, from the present price of $35 per ounce. He also advocates that the restrictions on the ownership of gold should be lifted, and Americans should once again be permitted to own gold.

Mr. Shoup has given a great deal of study to this subject and is recognized as an authority on gold. His speech is thought provoking, and will no doubt precipitate a great deal of discussion. I am happy to include his remarks herewith:

RESTORE SOUND MONEY AND CONVERSION—STOP INFLATION AND FURTHER DOLLAR DEPRECIATION

HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF

Since the dawn of mankind, history has always repeated itself. There are five distinct steps in the economic cycle which every nation at some stage has passed through, and the United States is no exception. Steps are:

1. Currency debasement.

2. The issuance of irredeemable paper money which is followed by great government and consumer credit expansion, leading to higher prices, higher costs, spiraling inflation and a steady decline in the purchasing power of money.

3. When inflationary forces become too great to be controlled, a collapse of the economic structure built upon inflated prosperity.

4. Depression.

5. The return to sound currency which brings a drastic shakeout with attendant misery and suffering.

Today we are well into the fourth step—depression. The United States is confronted now not only with a depression but spiraling inflation and further dollar depreciation.

WHAT TO DO

To add to all of our other problems, reports persist from informed sources that Russia is preparing to get back her ruble with gold and get the jump on us by launching a "Golden satellite." Our Nation cannot ignore the possibility of a gold-backed ruble and must immediately take all steps necessary to cushion and prevent any shock which would result from Russian initiative, since, if the ruble is established as a basic currency with the dollar and the pound, it will have far-reaching effects not only in our Nation but all the world. Our position abroad would quickly be undermined, our prestige delivered a shattering blow, and our Nation caught without gold as Russia caught our military and airplanes without missiles. This must not happen. Such patriotic and thinking citizens as B. F. Pitman, of San Antonio, Tex., interested in our Nation's welfare have proposed the following program, which has already been sent to outstanding Members of our Congress.

Reiterating again, the Russians are planning to get the jump on us again by launching a "Golden satellite." Persistent reports from informed sources state Russia is preparing to get back her ruble with gold. This would be a blow more devastating to our economic and financial leadership than sputnik, and we cannot brush this threat off lightly. While we have been foolishly discouraging gold production in the United States, Russia has been putting forth a herculean effort to increase it. If the ruble becomes a hard currency backed by gold, it is entirely possible, if not probable, that it will be on a parity or better with the United States dollar through all he world.

The wholly inadequate gold reserves backing the United States dollar have already created grave misgivings as to strength in international monetary circles. Many people consider both the Swiss franc and the West German mark as sounder currencies than the United States dollar, and the premium that persists on the Canadian dollar indicates that it, too, is held in more esteem than the almighty United States dollar. Moreover, gold denied the United States citizen is readily obtainable in unlimited quantities in Switzerland, Germany, and Canada, as well as other parts of the world thereby encouraging at least a mild "flight from the (United States) dollar" into currencies deemed stronger.

To thwart Russia, and at the same time arrest the depression, the United States dollar should be promptly devalued and restored to full convertibility. What will be accomplished?

1. Hundreds of closed and marginal gold mines in the United States will be quickly reopened, thereby putting back to work thousands of miners thrown out of work by the closing of the lead, zinc, and copper mines or curtailing their operations. There is no reasonable possibility that unemployed men formerly engaged in nonferrous mining will otherwise get off the mounting unemployment rolls in the visible future.

2. An official devaluation of the United States dollar, fixing the price of gold at $100 an ounce would strengthen the sagging price of all commodities, particularly farm products and nonferrous metals.

3. The high cost of labor has priced our manufactured products, and to a large extent our farm products, out of world markets. Devaluation of the dollar would quickly restore our competitive position in world markets, clear out our astronomical surplus of farm products, and stimulate manufacturing, conceivably to boom proportions.

4. Corporations are struggling with inflexible costs and diminishing volume, which are apparently gaining momentum on the down side. A devaluation would quickly cause a resurgence of buying, with the result that capacity operations would be resumed, improving profit margins. As a corollary, the diminishing flow of taxes to the Treasury would swell back to former levels and could even exceed them.

5. Buying in the United States by foreign countries has been alarmingly reduced. A devaluation of the dollar would permit foreign countries, particularly the so-called backward nations, to step up purchase in the United States, which in turn would permit a sharp reduction in the billions of giveaway money which we have been capriciously squandering.

6. The intolerable burden of the gigantic national debt (and taxes) would become bearable.

7. A new price of $100 per ounce on gold would create a surplus of around $41,000,000,000, which would permit a sharp reduction in taxes for many years to come.

8. If deemed advisable, the increment created by the new gold price could be used, at least in part, to reduce our national debt rather than treat it as nonrecurring income.

9. There is probably not a single informed economist in the world who believes the United States can measurably reduce its national debt, let alone pay it off in full, unless and until the dollar is devalued in terms of gold. Ultimate devaluation is as inevitable as night following day. Why not do it now?

10. Restoration of full convertibility, both internally and externally, would block the Russians in what apparently is their scheme to replace the United States dollar with the ruble as the foremost world currency.

11. The hysterical grasping for straws to arrest the downward plunge in our economy suggests a repetition of ineffectual cures tried in the early 1930's. The one move that was ultimately successful in the last depression again holds more promise than all other economic nostrums put together—a long overdue price increase in gold.

The threat of forced devaluation hangs over our head like the sword of Damocles, and the thread holding it is getting thinner by the moment. Foreigners have claims which could be converted into gold to the extent of an estimated $14 million to $16 million. Any day the apprehension which foreign countries have with regard to our ability to redeem in gold may start a run on our Fort Knox reserves. If, for example, Germany should convert some of its United States Government obligations into cash and demand $1 million in gold, a run of catastrophic proportions might be immediately started. Now that the bill rate is down from around 3½ to 1¼ percent, the inducement to foreigners to keep dollar balances in short-term bills is much less impelling.

Now is the crucial time—economically and politically.

This program may seem extremely revolutionary and will cause much controversy. Despite the "prosperity just around the corner" emissions from Washington, we either are in a drastic recession or a depression, depending upon the school of economists consulted, which can easily spiral downward. Frantic efforts to stimulate the economy by renewed profligacy in Washington may arrest the downtrend temporarily, but a revival of lasting confidence cannot be generated with the Government engaged in an irresponsible spending spree.

We expect to have introduced in the Congress a bill to increase the $35 statutory price of gold to $100, permit Americans to own gold, and to do all necessary to place this program in effect. If you agree with us, you can help by—

1. Furnishing press releases to newspapers and periodicals.

2. Working with radio and TV stations to carry this message to millions of listeners and viewers.

3. Writing your Senators, Congressmen, friends, and stockholders urging them to write their Senators, Congressmen, friends, and stockholders urging them to pass on this message.

4. Initiating a broad letterwriting campaign to anyone who can help the campaign to goin momentum.

Action is necessary now.

This Is America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. S. WALTER STAUFFER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. STAUFFER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to submit for the RECORD an editorial by Frank E. Masland, Jr., which appeared in the March edition of The Shuttle, a publication of C. H. Masland & Sons, Carlisle, Pa.:

I stood at the corner of 42d and Broadway, where every square inch had been trod by millions of feet, where no bare land was visible, where people walk solely on an artificial surface. Around me were stores and places of entertainment and restaurants. People jostled each other, and automobiles screamed and moved bumper to bumper. Men in uniform, possessing authority, directed vehicles and herded people like sheep. Just below me in the canyons of Wall Street, the fiscal affairs of the world were pondered and decided.

A week before I had stood on Hill 5014. It has no other name. It is called 5014 because that is how high it is. With me were 2 white men and 3 Indians. In all probability we were but the second group of persons ever to make the climb. To the north our eyes beheld a barren wilderness of rolling rock that extended for mile upon mile. We were in northeastern Arizona, in the land of the Navaho, in a country so wild it is unmapped. The sun-baked, wind-polished land that lay before our eyes was so bare and barren, so difficult of entrance that, insofar as the Indians knew or we knew, no man, red or white, had ever entered.

This is America.

We are a new Nation, a young land. We are but 4 generations from the day of discovery, but 2 generations from the carnage of conquest.

The land we inherited was pure and undefiled with a wealth of resources far beyond the dreams of a conquistador, a God-created treasure chest held in trust through the millenniums for the advent of intelligence and the miracle of the hand of man. What have we done about it? Shall we admit first that we lied and cheated, tortured or murdered to attain it? We should, for that is the inescapable foundation on which we built whatever we have. Our Founding Fathers, annihilating with one hand the in-

digenous culture, with the other laid the cornerstone for a civilization built on the concept of individual freedom of equal opportunity.

From the ashes of an ecology, in which man was a part of the pattern and in tune with all things, animate and inanimate, there arose a way of life built upon the earth but not of it, artificially created in its every fiber, changing the nature of man and leaving but few of the vestiges of nature.

With seemingly inexhaustible resources, with more land than people, with adequate reward for effort expended, with a need to conquer or be conquered, a tough, God-fearing, restless race of have-nots created overnight a way of life that affords the highest standard of living the world has ever known and where now, to find a "have-not," we must needs return to "Hill 5014" and the guides who took us there. Or do we find them there? Only by our standards, not by theirs, and which are the standards that are best and true and steadfast.

In that land, humble hogan homes are still the family castle, doors remain unlocked, murder unknown, and children, who spend the day tending their flocks in the field, present no problem of delinquency.

I suppose it is not the form that matters. It is what we do with it. And what we do with it is determined by the conceits we have acquired. Therein I think lies the cause that has destroyed past glories and is a very present threat. Forty-second and Broadway is what it is because of Hill 5014. We are what we are because we were a race of have-nots in a barren land of plenty. We possessed no superior technological mentality. We conquered to live and achieved to enjoy the reward. Have we modestly and objectively evaluated our achievements?

During the 200 years in which we built our western empire, those of our contributions, which will take their place in the library of the ages, are few indeed. Might we perhaps limit them to one and one alone—the concept of mass production. Is that too cynical? In medicine and the law and the sciences, we have done no more than keep abreast. With unlimited resources at our disposal, we conceived and utilized and endlessly developed the process of mass production. From that concept, all that we have has sprung. On that foundation rests, uncomfortably at times, our boasted "standard of living." Is it rock or is it perishable?

What to date are its products? Among them we must list leisure, softness, mature irresponsibility and juvenile delinquency, rackets, political corruption, atheism that builds a church a day but avoids the atheistic fray, yachts, and atom bombs.

And what we like to call the spirit of America. What is it? Is it 42d and Broadway or Hill 5014? It is both. Will we be able to preserve it? Not unless we reappraise the material and accent the spiritual. Not unless we preserve the wilderness—as well as the city.

Hon. Will M. Whittington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleague, Hon. FRANK SMITH, and other Members, in paying tribute to Hon. Will M. Whittington, former Congressman from Mississippi. I join with them in wishing him a most happy 80th birthday, and for both him and Mrs. Whittington many years of happiness.

Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Will M. Whittington is an outstanding man. His long years of service in Congress were devoted to hard work which, coupled with real ability, made him not only an outstanding representative from Mississippi but a national figure. While a specialist in the field of public works, by reason of his ability and his industry, Mr. Whittington was well informed on all matters in the Congress, as much so as any Member it has been my privilege to know.

Congressman Whittington ranks with the great men in Mississippi history who have served in the Congress. Truly, whatever our local, national and international problem may be, improvements to our own country which were brought about largely through his efforts are a monument which will last through the centuries.

Mr. Whittington is blessed with a wonderful wife and fine family, all of whom have many friends here. Mrs. Whittington, a most charming, intelligent and capable person in her own right, has been a great and major factor in the success that this fine couple has achieved in life.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to join in these expressions of appreciation to Congressman and Mrs. Whittington; and we join in wishing them many happy years to come.

The New Encirclement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following text of an article by George E. Sokolsky which appeared in the May 2 issue of the Washington Post and is entitled "The New Encirclement":

THE NEW ENCIRCLEMENT

(By George E. Sokolsky)

In a significant interview with Le Figaro, Khrushchev, as usual, made many side statements of far-reaching significance. We Americans tend to oversimplify the Russians and their development until we are caught short by some stride that they have taken.

In the Le Figaro interview Khrushchev raises the question that few of us are willing to recognize, but which some of our thinkers such as Herbert Hoover and Hugh Gibson spoke of even when World War II was in process, namely that the United States could be isolated involuntarily.

I quote from the Tass report of the interview; that is, the official Russian report:

"Speaking about the possibility of building communism in the U. S. S. R. in the conditions of capitalist encirclement, Khrushchev called the interviewer's attention to the circumstance that at the present time the very concept of 'capitalist encirclement' needs serious qualifications. Now it is hard to tell, Krushchev said, who encircles whom. Is it the capitalist countries that encircle the Socialist countries or vice versa? The Socialist countries are inhabited by one billion people out of the 2.5 billion total world population; with the establishment of the world system of socialism the world situation has changed radically and not in favor of capitalism. Consequently capitalist encirclement in the old meaning of this word is out of the question."

The most recent techniques employed by Soviet Russia are economic and might be regarded as capitalistic. They have to do with the movement of goods, the use of gold as a common denominator of currency and the substitution of Russian for American economic and military aid to countries which cannot stand on their own. The most recent economic invasion by Soviet Russia is into Latin America.

From the standpoint of the United States the most dangerous operations of Soviet Russia are in Brazil and Chile. Brazil is suffering economically from an excessive coffee crop, dependent upon an American market which is appalled at the high and even unreasonable cost of the commodity. By a pulverizing method the various "instant" brands have come into existence, have been popularized and are in wide use. Economically, the importance of the "instant" coffees is that it is possible to get more cups of coffee out of a pound this way than by cooking ground beans.

Be all this as it may, the United States cannot absorb all the coffee that Brazil wishes to send to this country or at the prices that Brazil wishes to charge. Therefore, the Russians, who do not drink much coffee, preferring tea, drunk hot in glasses, are ready to buy the Brazilian surplus on a barter deal.

Obviously, the Russians cannot consume this surplus coffee crop, but would ultimately dump it either among coffee-drinking satellites such as the East Germans, the Czechs or the Hungarians or would dribble it into the world market slowly enough not to ruin the price. The Russians can undoubtedly make a profit on this transaction.

Another deal involves Chile copper. This has become a political issue in Chile. Chile is one of the world's greatest producers of copper. On the other hand the copper market in the United States has slumped.

These conditions seriously affect the economy of Chile and there is talk of Soviet Russia buying the Chilean copper production.

Again the point must be made that Soviet Russia could accumulate stocks of surplus copper, could pour it into world markets, thus affecting the price.

The use of the economic tool is rather recent in the Soviet's effort to control the world.

It Is Time for Congress To Act in Order To Curb the Southern Bombings and Other Interstate Criminal Conspiracies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a very serious situation has recently been spotlighted in our Nation which demands the urgent attention of Congress. That is the dire threat posed to many of our citizens as a result of the concerted crimi-

nal conspiracy which in recent weeks has resulted in six vicious bombings or attempted bombings involving Jewish centers and synagogues in the South.

Our information concerning these outbreaks of lawlessness is sketchy and incomplete. But a certain pattern is emerging, which indicates there is at work a coordinated interstate effort to intimidate Jewish citizens and others concerned with upholding the law of our land.

We do know that within the last 6 months there have been bombings and attempted dynamitings in 6 cities. A synagogue in Charlotte, N. C. A synagogue in Gastonia, N. C. A Jewish center in Miami, Fla. A Jewish center in Nashville, Tenn. A center-synagogue and public school in Jacksonville, Fla. And a synagogue in Birmingham, Ala.

It is significant to note that the latest outbreak of violence—the dynamiting of a Jewish center and a Negro school in Jacksonville—apparently followed the exact pattern of earlier incidents in Nashville and Montgomery.

In addition, it is significant that the abortive attempt to dynamite the synogogue in Birmingham, had it succeeded, would have coincided with the blast at the center and school in Jacksonville.

These are not coincidences. They are evidences of an interstate conspiracy to coerce and intimidate those who are in good faith and honesty attempting to carry out the Supreme Court's decision concerning school integration. Leaders of the "Confederate Underground"—the group apparently behind the campaign—have boasted in their threatening phone calls that they are members of a widespread conspiracy. It is my opinion elements of the Ku Klux Klan form the hard core of this nefarious organization.

It is commendable that local authorities have taken stern and vigorous action in an attempt to round up the hoodlums perpetrating these dastardly deeds. It is commendable that the great majority of the local citizenries in these communities and their vocal leaders have spoken out against these outbreaks. But that is not enough. The interstate nature of the plots—the ability of the bombers to flee swiftly across State lines—prevents an effective crackdown. For example, the only witness to the Jacksonville bombing reported seeing a car with Georgia plates pulling away from the scene of the blast. Jacksonville is close by the Georgia border.

It is, therefore, incumbent upon the Federal Government to step in and crumble this pattern of lawlessness. I have been in touch with officials of the Justice Department, inquiring as to what can be done to assert the interstate powers of Uncle Sam to curb this conspiracy. Right off the bat comes the suggestion that the FBI step in and conduct one of its famous and effective investigations. Unfortunately their hands are tied, under the status of our laws today.

Upon the evidence thus far presented to the Justice Department, there simply are no indications that Federal laws are being broken. The bombings break only State and local laws, in spite of the conspiratorial overtones involving several States. The FBI therefore cannot exert its considerable investigational powers, and enforcement must be left entirely to local and State officials.

The answer to this problem lies in bringing our laws up to date to meet the challenges posed by interstate conspiracies of this type. With the advent of modern transportation and communication facilities, the day of the merely statewide criminal organization is pretty much gone. In their place have come clever and well-heeled conspiracies operating across State lines in order to avoid effective investigation and prosecution by officials of any one State.

By making full use of State jurisdictional barriers, these conspiracies, which cover a wide range of activities from black market babies, narcotics, and gambling to bootlegging, have in many cases been allowed to operate with impunity, free from direct checks on them from any source.

A bill which I have introduced, H. R. 258, would close the gap in our Federal laws and permit the FBI to step in whenever interstate conspiracies were working to break State felony laws. The terms of this measure are simple. They would be effective in curbing a wide range of conspiracies across State lines. Particularly, enactment of this bill would give the FBI the green light to put an end to this dynamiting conspiracy in the South.

Simply stated, this measure would make it a Federal offense for two or more persons to conspire to commit any organized crime offense against any State if any facilities of interstate commerce were used in furtherance of the conspiracy. Any violation of a State felony law threatened by such an interstate conspiracy could come under the scrutiny of the FBI if this bill were enacted. It is the single most effective means for curbing these vicious criminals.

If this law had been on our statute books when these bombings took place, investigative powers of the Federal Government could have been brought to bear immediately. The hoodlums involved could not run and hide behind State jurisdictional lines, as they are apparently doing now.

In the past, efforts to have Congress pass such a measure have lacked the support of the Justice Department, which has felt it would place too great a burden on their agents and facilities. To my way of thinking, this admission that there would be a great deal of work to be done is the strongest argument possible for enactment of such a bill.

My conversations with Justice Department officials last week, in the wake of the spate of bombings in the South, indicate there may be a change of attitude within the Department. I am hopeful they are coming around to my way of thinking and that they will soon support my proposal or a similar one which would achieve the same ends. If the Department will support such a measure, I am confident the Congress will respond speedily in passing it.

We should, without further delay, put such a law on our statute books. It would enable the FBI to do what local officials simply cannot do—step in and prevent and prosecute bombings such as we have witnessed in recent months. It would prevent intimidation of citizens whose only fault is that of trying to carry out the law of the land. It would put an end to the utter disregard for law and order with which a few hoodlums have infected certain areas of the South.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, the Ninth Congressional District of Michigan, which I have the honor to represent, includes thousands of fine Americans of Polish descent. I am very pleased to join with them and with my colleagues in Congress in observance of the 167th anniversary on May 3 of Polish Constitution Day.

The Polish Constitution of 1791 was designed to reduce the autocratic powers of the monarch without impairing the necessary authority of the central government. Under that document, the Polish Government was transformed to a limited, constitutional monarchy. The constitution eliminated certain class distinctions and class privileges and added guaranties of religious freedom for the Polish people.

Down through the years, the Polish Constitution has remained a cherished declaration of belief in justice and free expression.

Despite almost constant encroachment and domination by hostile powers, Poland has a long and glorious history. It outlasted the rule of czarist, Hapsburg and Hohenzollern empires, and it will also outlast enslavement by Soviet international communism.

Although Poland still is a prisoner of the Soviet system, the Polish people have proved during the Poznan uprising in June 1956, and in the bloodless revolt of October 1956, that they are not willing prisoners of Soviet communism. The spirit of freedom and liberty continues to burn brightly in the hearts of the Polish people.

More than 7 million Americans of Polish descent throughout our country are joining with Polish people all over the world in the observance of Poland's Constitution Day. The people of Poland have a right to be proud of their tremendous achievements against great odds, and of their recent progress along the difficult path to liberty.

It is our sincere hope and prayer that the brave Polish past will be a source of constant encouragement which will lead to a brighter Polish future.

Two Polish heroes, Pulaski and Kosciusko, helped America to win our own

cherished freedom, and our Constitution later became a model for the Polish constitution. Throughout all the years of our freedom, Polish brain and brawn have contributed mightily to our literature, science and art, as well as to our farms and factories.

In 1939, after just a few years of independence, Poland made the world's first stand for liberty against the onslaughts of naziism. Shortly after Poland was overrun by war machines of Germany and Russia, Winston Churchill said, "The heroic defense of Warsaw shows that the souls of Poland is indestructible and she will rise again like a rock."

For the long-suffering people of Poland, Constitution Day is a day of hope. For us in America, it is an appropriate occasion to pay tribute to the freedom-loving people of Poland who continue their brave and determined effort to lift the heavy yoke of Communist oppression and to restore their proud mantle of freedom.

The Columbus Boychoir of Princeton, N. J., Was a Distinguished Good-Will Ambassador to South America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1958

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Columbus Boychoir of Princeton, N. J., recently toured 17 countries of South America and distinguished itself as a good-will ambassador. Led by its director, Donald T. Bryant, the 26 boys of the choir sang to more than 40,000 people, not counting radio and television audiences. The great artists of Europe and South America come to the United States, and our own artists, such as Marian Anderson, Jascha Heifetz, and the young American pianist, Van Cliburn, have enraptured audiences overseas in a people-to-people program of cultural exchange. The Columbus Boychoir, like the Westminster Choir before it, carried to other nations the true story of America's cultural and artistic triumphs, just as our greatest individual artists have.

Former Senator Herbert H. Lehman warned recently of the danger of mankind becoming "enamored of technological progress." Aside from the obvious danger that "we will abuse our new technological knowledge, and in a single error destroy the world," Mr. Lehman said, we should also be concerned about technological progress that has no humane direction. Our newly discovered technological potential must be related to our eternal hopes and dreams of a better world, a world which will utilize all available human resources toward peaceful ends. Surely this world will someday be at peace, and music and the arts will exert their healing influence over the hearts of men and women everywhere. Viewed from this long-range perspective, it is clear that the Columbus Boychoir and the Westminster Choir have made major contributions to our country's foreign policy and have served our Nation well. I include some material on the South American tour of the Columbus Boychoir for the information of my colleagues:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D. C. April 29, 1958.
The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: In answer to your letter of April 17, 1958, requesting that a letter of commendation be presented to the Columbus Boy Choir for its tour of South America in the fall of 1957, I am pleased to send you herewith a copy of such a letter, which has just been forwarded to Mr. Donald Bryant, the director of the Boychoir, at Princeton.

The Columbus Boychoir did indeed make a fine contribution to the feeling of good will between this country and the South American nations that it visited, and the Department of State is glad to acknowledge its gratitude for the choir's services during this tour.

The enclosures which you sent with your letter are return herewith, as you requested.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D. C.
Mr. DONALD BRYANT,
Princeton, N. J.

DEAR MR. BRYANT: The Department of State is pleased to commend the Columbus Boychoir for the contribution it made to good relations between the United States and the South American countries it visited during the fall of 1957, under the auspices of the President's Special International program.

The purposes of the President's program were carried out in a very effective manner by the group. Many of our Foreign Service posts have commented in enthusiastic terms on the favorable impression the boys made, both personally and professionally. The Department is grateful for their services to this program and to their country.

Please accept our very best wishes for the Boychoir's continued success.

Sincerely yours,
ANDREW R. BERDING,
Assistant Secretary.

COLUMBUS BOYCHOIR IN SOUTH AMERICA

From the Trinidad Chronicle, October 4, 1957, Port of Spain, Trinidad: "The Columbus Boychoir under the direction of Donald Bryant came to Trinidad, saw and conquered. The concerts given by this choir of 24 boys, who were joint in the two one-act operas by some talented adults, were a tremendous success * * * and played to packed and enthusiastic houses. This is an exceptional choir, drilled and disciplined to the nth degree."

From La Nacion, San José, Costa Rica: "An opportunity to hear a musical miracle * * * to understand the infinite capacities of the human voice under intelligent direction."

From El Tiempo, Bogotá Colombia: "These boys possess most notable individual aptitudes and above all a sense of teamwork which it would not be just to attribute merely to discipline."

From El Siglo, Bogotá, Colombia: "The discipline that is sensed through the gesture, the emphasis, the attention to the director, the manner of bowing * * * shows gracefulness, character and the most through understanding. These boys won for themselves, in addition to the public's love and sympathy, interminable and warm applause."

From a dispatch from the American Embassy, Quito, Ecuador: "The Columbus Boychoir visit to Ecuador was one of the best attractions which have come to Quito and to Guayaquil, from the point of view of audience appeal, artistic excellence and general public relations impact."

From La Nacion, Santiago:

LITTLE MESSENGERS OF PEACE

"These children sing joyfully and with youthful enthusiasm. They sing indissoluble pacts for the future peace of the world."

From El Colombiano, Medellín: "One of the most magnificent musical events presented in this city in many years (and) one of the most extraordinary and exciting experiences of our musical life."

From El Independienti, Bogotá: "It was something divine; something I never would have believed existed."

Geneva Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 13, 1958

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House who represent congressional districts with coastal areas and fishing and seafood industries, will find the following editorial hits the nail on the head in regard to the recent Geneva Conference on the Law of the Sea. This is an observation of the Seattle Times as of April 29, 1958:

SEVERAL BLUNDERS WERE MADE

From the point of view of Pacific Northwest fishermen, it was a good thing the Geneva Conference on the Law of the Sea broke up without reaching an agreement on the controversial question of territorial waters.

The 12-mile limit proposal of Canada which was supported with variations by the American delegation would have deprived American fishermen of historic fishing rights. The proposals of other nations defining territorial waters and exclusive fishing rights ran against the same deadlock.

It was less fortunate that the conference failed to decide a still larger and more important issue. It did not affirm the abstention doctrine originally promulgated by the United States State Department. This principle holds that when a Nation and its fishermen have developed, conserved and utilized an ocean fishery historically, the fishermen of other nations must abstain from invading it.

The affirmation of this doctrine by the Geneva Conference would have strengthened the hand of the United States in its dealings with Japan over the Bristol Bay and other Alaska salmon fisheries.

From this distance and on the basis of information supplied by news dispatches, it is possible to note several blunders that were made at Geneva.

It may be necessary eventually to reach some inclusive international agreement on fishing rights in territorial waters. At Geneva, that proved to be impossible. It is possible, however, for neighboring nations to settle these questions by mutual agreement on a regional basis, as has been done successfully by the United States and Canada in the past.

We think it was a mistake for the conference to attempt a worldwide code when it has been demonstrated that regional agreements work so well.

Allowing the conference to get all snarled up on the controversy over territorial waters, before attempting to secure affirmation of the abstention doctrine, was putting the cart before the horse. In our view, the State Department and the American delegation were less than attentive to this country's interests when they did not insist on the priority of the abstention principle.

The original American support of the Canadian 12-mile limit proposal was another incomprehensible giveaway blunder made at Geneva. When the United States delegation at the 11th hour switched around without notice and reintroduced a 6-mile variation of this proposal, even the Canadian delegation was angered. The United States was accused of "underhand methods" by both Canadian and Russian delegates.

What effect all this futile disputation will have on the future fishery relations of the United States and Canada remains to be seen. Perhaps an even more important speculation is what effect the failure of the conference will have on fishery relations with Japan.

If, as seems evident here, the official United States representation made a botch of this phase of the Geneva proceedings, it should be noted that the Pacific coast was not represented on the delegation. This region's representatives were there only in an advisory capacity, without votes or seats in the committees. On many important issues it is obvious their counsel was disregarded.

TVA: Democracy at High Tide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, this month will mark the 25th anniversary of one of the most significant policy decisions ever made by the Congress. At this time, 25 years ago, the Congress sent to the President the bill to establish the Tennessee Valley Authority. The wisdom of that action has been spectacularly demonstrated in the intervening years not only by the history of the TVA's achievements but in the influence the TVA has had on our Nation and on the people of the entire world. In its May issue, the Progressive magazine reviews the accomplishments and significance of the TVA in a series of articles and in a cogent editorial which latter I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD herewith under unanimous consent and commend to the attention of my colleagues. The editorial follows:

DEMOCRACY AT HIGH TIDE

We are devoting nearly all of this May issue of the Progressive to commemorating the 25th anniversary of the social achievement that represents, for us, the high tide of democracy in our century—the Tennessee Valley Authority.

It will be 25 years ago May 18 that President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in those first, frenzied days of the New Deal, signed the TVA Act that was not only to tame a wayward river and regenerate an ailing valley, but was to become celebrated the world over as a shining example of democratic planning.

The extension of the TVA idea, in our judgment, is an indispensable ingredient in any program for a resurgent progressivism in America. The middleway TVA idea makes a shambles of the doctrinaire nonsense of both Karl Marx and Adam Smith. It has come to symbolize a deeply democratic alternative to both the law of the jungle and the tyranny of totalitarianism. The TVA idea, with its concept of national planning, regional administration, local participation, and individual freedom, has brought us a giant stride closer toward fusing two of the great goals of the American Constitution as expressed in the preamble—individual liberty and the general welfare.

The very essence of the TVA idea is the partnership of the Federal Government with the people of a great river valley to plan the unified development and maximum use of all the resources for the benefit of all the people. Countless experts from almost every country on earth have come to study TVA's extraordinary record of achievement. It isn't the dams that attract them, for there are bigger dams elsewhere. It isn't the public development of power, for this is the rule rather than the exception abroad. Nor is it TVA's remarkable record in flood-control navigation, reforestation, soil improvement, the minerals program, and the development of recreational facilities that draws them to the valley.

It is the unity of these in one all-encompassing planning operation that captures and parallels the oneness of nature—this is what has beckoned so many visiting statesmen and technicians hunting for new and creative methods of resource development. Mostly they come to see and study the physical plant, but they stay to be inspired by the unprecedented extent to which planning is possible without the surrender of freedom to an all-powerful bureaucracy.

For this is one of the glories of TVA—that it achieved so much by demonstration and inspiration, and not be command and regimentation. The seven States of the TVA basin, and the countless communities within them, have found their rights and privileges undisturbed by the Federal agency planted in their midst 25 years ago, although many were fearful at first that TVA might be sent them from Washington as a superstate. As a matter of policy, TVA has worked closely with State and local agencies and has encouraged them to assume new duties and responsibilities. Again and again TVA officials have seen clearly what needed doing, and have had the legal power to do it, but they have preferred to wait until the idea caught on with the local people who then went ahead and did it. This is democratic planning in action.

Stuart Chase, in an article in the Progressive more than a decade ago, wrote: "A commercial civilization throws on the scrap heap the most constructive element in human nature: the instinct to cooperate with one's fellows in building up the community. The biological fact that man is a social animal is neglected, and a great storehouse of energy and enthusiasm wasted."

TVA has reversed this cheerless characteristic of commercial civilization without in any way undermining the system itself. Far from throwing cooperation on the scrap heap, it has made cooperation the heart of its way of doing things. Far from wasting energy and enthusiasm, it has recognized man for the social animal he is, or can be, and proceeded to harness his neglected instinct for cooperation in a great program of community building.

TVA was an experiment in its infancy. Never before in American history, or the history of any other nation for that matter, had a public agency been assigned the task of developing all the resources of a great river system. How successfully that experiment has proved itself is clearly presented in the documented articles that make up this special issue of the Progressive. They tell a graphic story of physical achievement and material success, but they emphasize, too, how it was done—which is part of the spirit of TVA.

From its very beginnings TVA was blessed with unusually able and dedicated officials and staff who caught and kept alive the vision of a great human enterprise. Their task has not been an easy one. They were faced from the outset with the relentless opposition of the power trust, which continues even now. During the past 7 years they have been obliged to contend with the ill will of the Eisenhower administration, which has made their task doubly difficult and has taken its toll of able personnel and struck at the morale of those who stayed on.

But TVA, we are confident, will ride out the present storm, just as it has fought its way over rough waters so many times in the past. When inexorable events lift this Nation out of the swamps of conventional conservatism and put us on the highroad to a progressive program of democratic planning, TVA will be there to provide guidance and inspiration for the unified development of the other great river systems of America.

Navy Secretary Thomas S. Gates, Jr., Explains the Navy's Position on the National Defense Team

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, this month, May, Navy, the Magazine of Sea Power, official publication of the Navy League of the United States, the civilian arm of the Navy, came into being. The lead article of volume 1, issue 1, was written by the Honorable Thomas S. Gates, Jr., Secretary of the Navy. Secretary Gates lucidly defines the Navy's position on the national defense team as follows:

THE NAVY'S POSITION ON THE NATIONAL DEFENSE TEAM

(By Thomas S. Gates, Jr., Secretary of the Navy)

Everyone feels the urgency of the times.

Action is needed—especially in the field of missiles, in the realm of space and in scientific development. But the action must be related to our national military needs.

Our national policy and the compelling requisite that the United States be strong demand that we build and maintain power sufficient to make it unthinkable to any aggressor to risk all-out war, power sufficient and of the right kind to deter limited military aggression (if necessary, sufficient to fight successfully any limited war), and power and prestige sufficient to support our foreign policy and the civilization of the free world throughout the long, difficult struggle toward peace with justice.

Our Nation is not confronted with the problem of deciding whether we should have an adequate deterrent or sufficient limited war force or the capability of winning the cold war—the problem is how to have all three.

Nor are we faced with the question of whether it is better to have adequate forces for today or to make sure that we will have

the forces required for tomorrow—the problem is how to do both.

This is the background with which the Navy approaches its decisions about the advanced weapons and programs of the future.

Our country must be able to use the seas for two paramount purposes: First, to link together all the free nations of the world and, second, to use the high seas as a springboard for offensive operations and as a vast maneuver area for the defense in depth of ourselves and our allies. Exploitation of this potential of the sea will remove any enemy hope that our ability to strike back could be eliminated by a surprise attack.

We must be able to use mobile naval power to protect our interests in areas where we do not and cannot maintain permanent bases.

We must have the power of choice which naval power gives us. Our Government needs a choice of action when confronted with a dangerous international situation. It is as true today as ever that military forces with many capabilities are an absolutely vital tool to provide needed alternative methods to protect United States power overseas in cold, limited, or all-out war.

Many bases from which the Pacific war was once fought, today lie abandoned or dismantled. They are in the wrong places for today's problems. But we have World War II mobile base aircraft carriers, though old, standing guard today at new frontiers in the western Pacific and in the Mediterranean.

New importance is attached to bases which can themselves move, hide and disperse over the surface of the globe. The nature of the enemy threat demands a change in emphasis—a deployment of much more of the national striking capability from land to the high seas—on, over, and under.

Carriers were constructed for preatomic warfare—and they can still fight it or deter it. But they have seen the H-bomb come, and their planes can deliver it; they have seen supersonic aircraft come, and they have adopted them. Missiles of all types are being incorporated in task force ships which continue to stand ready today, and will for years to come.

These are some of the fruits of a flexible posture. The same posture is inherent in our antisubmarine forces, and in our amphibious forces and marines. Today's Navy is not—nor should it be—designed for only one type of war, to be fought in one predetermined arena.

This flexible approach matches the reality of the Communist threat—a threat that is total, across the board, not solely a menace of a hydrogen weapon shower on the United States on some given Sunday morning.

Whatever kind of power you look for in the Soviet armed forces, you discover it easily. You see powerful armies with the most advanced equipment, large air forces of modern jet aircraft, and large naval forces. There are highly modern surface fleets, and the largest submarine fleet in the world. And we must assume that they are developing atomic submarines with guided missile capabilities.

Communists at home and abroad are constantly reminded of this. Only recently at Moscow during the celebration of the Soviet armed forces' 40th anniversary, Defense Minister Marshal Malinovsky emphasized that the Soviet Union has the most modern naval forces capable of destroying enemy naval forces on the high seas and of delivering powerful blows against targets inside continents. The free world cannot for a moment ignore nor underestimate such capability.

The Soviet Union also had a growing merchant marine—any nation's lifetime on the sea in time of war. There is now even a Soviet fleet of oceanographic research ships busily surveying all the earth's oceans. The forces of other Communist countries are similarly expanding on land, in the air, and at sea.

If this threat is total—across the board—as it most definitely appears, then it also is total up and down. There is no scale of warfare—from guerilla and local brushfire of every size up to all-out war—for which the Soviet bloc nations do not have formidable and growing capabilities. They also have powerful machinery for establishing political climates favorable to the particular scale of limited aggression they may wish to employ. It is most erroneous to assume they have but one type of war in mind.

In our own Navy, we see four major areas in which action for improvement must be continued: Sea-based striking power, antisubmarine warfare, advanced research and development, and combat readiness.

We need also to accelerate the submarine ballistic missile systems, and to improve the carrier striking forces with their integrated aircraft and surface and airborne missiles.

Antisubmarine warfare is a Navy responsibility with which we live 24 hours a day. We have made great progress, but it would be false to say we have the problem licked.

Many weapons are required to work together against enemy undersea craft—it takes surface ships, our own nuclear submarines, aircraft (including nuclear aircraft) and advanced detection systems, as well as weapons yet to be developed.

We need to undertake many projects in connection with combat readiness. We expect the Navy and Marine Corps—operating on the sea, on land and in the air—to always be faced with the task of providing an immediate force necessary in world trouble spots, as they have in the past. And we must be prepared in other naval tasks. Al though the Navy believes in strong-armed services, in a strong economy, and in a strong country, we are mindful we must not default the goal of peace while building and maintaining that strength.

It is especially necessary that we continue and broaden research and development of things we know about—missiles, electronic warfare, undersea warfare, nuclear propulsion—and at the same time search out and develop many other things we do not know about, but of which we must and will learn.

The Navy has a long tradition of imaginative leadership in military science. It has played a foremost part in the age of steam, the ironclad, the screw propeller, oil burning, diesel power, computing machines, radar, and advanced electronics, nuclear propulsion—atomic energy itself.

But the Navy has no ambitions to go it alone. We do not pretend to know all the answers, and we look for them openmindedly. The Navy is an integral member of the defense team of this Nation. Its responsibilities are worldwide in scope. Its tasks are thoroughly coordinated with those of the Army and Air Force. And the Navy has an excellent working relationship with those services—we use their research, they use ours; we adopt their developments when they meet our requirements, and they adopt ours.

In missiles alone, for example, we will supply the Sidewinder, Talos, and Polaris to the other services.

How does all this apply to the conquest of space?

Some people regard exploration of space as mankind's greatest adventure. Surely, space vehicles potentially have tremendous military significance for reconnaissance, communications, weather forecasting, and innumerable other purposes of which we have not yet thought. We certainly have some specific naval requirements in this field and a good deal to offer to the national program.

Technological development is a long, hard business. Behind each spectacular achievement are years of painstaking and at times frustrating work. We are but at the beginning of a long series of tries in a field of applied science that has hardly been touched. In such pioneering, failures are normal and to be expected, but we benefit from all endeavors, whether successful or momentarily unsuccessful. No important scientific achievement has ever been consummated without more failures than successes.

We in the Navy take considerable pride in our scientific record. We have not been last to recognize and support advanced science in the national interest. We have long supported and have recently greatly expanded in the technical education of officers and especially of young enlisted men.

Dedicated young officers and men, young scientists and technicians, young sailors, Marines, soldiers and airmen are in fact our greatest military resource. It is imperative to the future of our Nation that all aspects of military service be raised to and sustained at a level sufficient to induce such personnel to make the Armed Forces their career.

We have projected our future Navy forces, for long-range planning purposes, based on our present estimates of technology and threat.

Our fleets will be agumented by new and modernized ships, aircraft and weapons systems incorporating the latest technological developments, which will contribute significantly to our readiness and offensive capability.

Our plans follow the principles of maximum flexibility against all manner of threats, and maximum use of technical advance.

By following these principles we can contribute to the future by continuing to support national policy with strength based on the sea.

We can make great strides in missile warfare, in antisubmarine warfare, and in control of the seas. We can improve naval power and readiness.

The Navy, in the national interest, must play its position on the defense team to utmost capacity.

California State Senate Unanimously Adopts Resolution Relating to Air Space Control and Memorializes Congress To Take Necessary Action

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present to your attention and of my other distinguished colleagues, the text of a resolution adopted by the senate of my native State of California:

"Senate Resolution 10

"Resolution relating to air space control

"Whereas in recent months the Nation has been shocked by a series of tragic aircraft accidents resulting in the loss of many lives, culminating in the collision on April 21 of a military jet plane and a civilian airliner near Las Vegas, Nev., with the loss of 49 lives; and

"Whereas these accidents are apparently due to the concentration of air traffic within the narrow confines of air lanes; and

"Whereas the problem has been made more acute by the appropriation of large areas of the air space for the operation of military aircraft; and

"Whereas the problems caused by the great increase in air traffic, both civilian and mili-

tary, and in the speed of aircraft have not been met by our present methods of air space control and regulation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the members of this senate respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to consider the subject of air space allocation and control and take whatever action is necessary to alleviate this problem; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to send copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Civil Aeronautics Administration."

I hereby certify that the above resolution was unanimously adopted by the Senate of the State of California at the 1958 second extraordinary session of the legislature.

F. A. BECK,
Secretary of the Senate.

Porkless River and Harbor Bill Is Favored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the Portland Oregonian, one of the most substantial and influential newspapers on the Pacific coast, favors enactment of a river and harbor flood-control bill by the present Congress, but it wants one with the pork omitted from it.

A recent Oregonian editorial said:

GET THE PORK OUT

The congressional dilemma among Democrats is whether to separate the pork from the beans in the omnibus rivers and harbors bill vetoed by President Eisenhower, or to let the veto stand so they can denounce the Republican administration in the coming elections.

Only a major revolt against the President by Republicans would assure repassage of the same bill over his veto. This is unlikely.

The $1,500 million authorization bill, similar to one vetoed last session on about the same grounds, contains many items which have been studied and approved by the Army Corps of Engineers, including the Yaquina and Siuslaw Harbor projects in Oregon. These, the President would approve.

But it contains others slipped in by Congressmen without adequate fact-finding. Some pork was put in the bill in exchange for members' votes for other projects, hence is difficult to delete. But the dirty work should be done, and the bill redrafted.

It is first necessary to authorize projects before funds can be appropriated. These projects are not recession stoppers. But they are sound, long-range investments which should not be tied up by congressional politicking another year.

Mr. Speaker, the river and harbor-flood control bill recently passed by Congress and vetoed by President Eisenhower authorized 140 new river and harbor-flood control and beach erosion projects. These 140 projects, it was estimated, would cost $13,409,000.

The President objected to 28 of the 140 projects on the ground that some had not been adequately surveyed, that others had been declared economically unsound by the United States Army Engineers, the Secretary of the Army and the Budget Bureau and that some others did not provide for adequate local cost sharing where heavy benefits went to private landowners instead of to the public.

The President in his veto message recommended that of these 28 objected-to projects that 10, estimated to cost $179 million, be deleted from the bill entirely and that the other 18 be modified to conform with recommendations of the Army engineers, the Budget Bureau, or the Secretary of the Army with a saving of about $25 million to taxpayers.

The recommendations made by the President in his veto message thus would eliminate the "pork" from this bill with a saving of about $201,635,000 to taxpayers.

I have introduced in the House a "porkless" bill that conforms to the President's views. If enacted by Congress, my bill is assured of the President's approval.

My bill and the vetoed bill in addition to the specific new projects carries an additional authorization of $913 million for river basin developments to which no objection has been made.

The total cost of all projects in by bill, therefore, is about $1,473,874,000 compared to about $1,675,000,000 in the vetoed bill.

Situation of Retail Gas Dealers in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an item, published as release number 401 of the National Federation of Independent Business, dealing with the situation of retail gas dealers in Oregon, under the heading "Washington and Small Business."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON AND SMALL BUSINESS
(By C. Wilson Harder)

Some economists hold that 1 out of 7 jobs in the United States are based on some phase of the automotive industry.

If such be true, then a good share of the present business decline can perhaps be traced directly to the machinations of big oil in making it unprofitable for independent operations to succeed in this industry.

Aspects of this situation are brought out in the recently published report of the hearings held in Oregon by the Senate Small Business Committee with Senator EDWARD THYE and Senator WAYNE MORSE present.

J. S. Baker, partner in a service station operating firm in North Portland, Oreg., and representing the Oregon Gasoline Dealers Association, gave some very interesting testimony.

Among other things, he said in 1950 he was paying 22.2 cents per gallon for gasoline, and selling it for 27.9 cents per gallon, or a gross profit of 5.7 cents. At the time of his testimony, he was being forced to pay 27.4 cents per gallon, and sell it for 29.9 cents.

What does this mean? he asked. Merely that the consumer is paying 2 cents more per gallon while the service station made 3 cents per gallon less profit.

He also pointed out that the major oil companies are making millions from forcing the sale of specified brands of batteries, tires and other accessories through the stations.

"Today," he said, "I could sell you a battery at retail price from which I would make a reasonable profit and have this price be below the wholesale price of an equivalent battery by my major oil company supplier. Under what conceivable justification is it that last year one tire manufacturer paid one major oil company a kickback of tens of millions of dollars for sales of tires the oil company had never handled and never had a cent invested in, but merely provided a more or less willing chain of retail outlets with the practices I have just described?"

He said there is no doubt major oil companies realize it is illegal to insist on exclusive contracts, yet through financial coercion applied indirectly, they keep the station operators in line.

Some of the other witnesses reported that the major oil company representative has complete control over setting the prices in any station.

If competitive situations of a price war make prices necessary that are lower than the station can operate on without a loss, a subsidy will be granted.

But these subsidy agreements are never in writing, always given verbally, and often operator waits for long periods for payment while in meantime his family is in want.

All in all, the testimony taken by the Senate Small Business Committee did not present a very pretty picture of how things are going in the land of the free.

As a result, it is quite possible that this session of Congress will vote extra money to carry on intensive investigation and possible prosecution in the sphere of major oil. It very much appears the situation cannot be permitted to continue.

The Slump in Our Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send to the desk an Associated Press article, originating from New York City, which shows that the so-called slump our economy is now faced with is much more serious than some administrative spokesmen would lead people to believe.

This article shows that net profits after taxes for nonfinancial businesses, large and small, are running 33 percent behind similar earnings of 1 year ago. Three out of four corporations are falling behind, and more and more such firms are now using red ink.

Such a situation cannot be allowed to continue to exist. The administration should stop using pretty phrases to cover up the economic mess, and had

better start getting down to the business of doing something about conditions.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EARNINGS DECLINE 33 PERCENT IN QUARTER

NEW YORK, May 2.—The limp in business profits is more pronounced today as big and little companies report on how they are making out in comparison with last year.

About 3 out of 4 are falling behind. And the total of net profits after taxes is trailing the booming first quarter of 1957 by 33 percent.

The number operating at a loss instead of a profit is rising. Of the first 580 nonfinancial corporations to report on their January through March quarter, 57 are using red ink as against 20 last year.

Some industries go counter to the trend. Tobacco company earnings are up 32 percent over last year; utility profits are up 66 percent; food and beverages up 2 percent; and drugs are up by about the same. The telephone and telegraph companies and the shipping industry are breaking about even with a year ago.

The hard-hit auto manufacturers and their suppliers were down 88 percent; farm equipment off 64 percent; steels down 58 percent; airlines 51 percent; mining and metalworking firms off 47 percent; textile and apparel down 45 percent; machinery and tools off 40 percent; rubber companies off 33 percent; and oils down 32 percent.

Of the total of 580 companies to report, 404 show declines: Combined they made $1,997,654,000 in the first 3 months, against $2,985,375,000 the year before.

Cut the Tax and Aid Rails and Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial, Cut the Tax and Aid Rails and Coal, which appeared in the April 30, 1958, issue of the Madisonville Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

CUT THE TAX AND AID RAILS AND COAL

Beyond question, the railroads of America are in difficulties, and one of the fears of some of the top economists and business analysts has been that a collapse of the railroads—or some similar financial tragedy—might plunge this Nation into a depression similar to the 1929 collapse.

Anyway, a number of eyebrows were lifted when the Eisenhower administration asked Congress to underwrite with the public Treasury $700 million in loans to railroads. The thought is held by many, inside and outside the railroad industry, that more borrowing is not the solution to the railroad question—an angle which has a lot of commonsense to support it.

Not long ago the Messenger published an editorial on the subject of the excise tax on freight and passenger traffic and the need for removing this wartime impost. The excise tax was put on in the first place as a means for discouraging use of overcrowded railroad facilities, but now the need is to encourage such use, and the lifting of the tax would work in that direction.

Our recent comment had to do with the effect of the tax on the coal industry, for the cost of shipping coal over railroads has increased so much in recent years that coal's markets have been shrunk seriously thereby. Shrinkage of coal's markets means less running time at the mines, of course, and this means less take-home pay for men who produce coal. So the question of an excise tax on freight traffic comes close to home to Hopkins countians and their fellow employees in the coal industry in our part of the State.

As far as the $700 million of loans to the railroads are concerned, they would have to be paid back within 5 years, and it is a thousand-to-one shot that they would be paid back by increasing freight rates still further, which would shrink coal's markets again, affect the coal industry adversely, and reduce the tonnage of coal hauled by the railroads.

Would it not be wiser to kill the 3 percent tax on freight and the 10 percent tax on whatever passenger tickets are sold these days, and thus stimulate use of rail transportation?

There are other proposals for the railroads, such as revising rate-making policies, allowing roads to drop services which are unprofitable, and to bring truck competition under rate regulation on the same basis as the railroads. These are under study, but first things should come first.

Senator SMATHERS' committee investigating the crisis in the railroad industry heard from railroad men and shippers and public witnesses that repeal of the World War II taxes on freight and passenger traffic would do more than anything else to promote use of rail transportation.

It is so simple it is a wonder that there should be so much hesitation about it. A big loan to a railroad is nothing more than a crutch—a crutch which later will be financed by soaking the shipper—the coal industry, for example—still more.

Seapower and Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, writing in the initial issue of the Navy League's new magazine, appropriately entitled "Navy, the Magazine of Seapower," Adm. Arleigh Burke, USN, Chief of Naval Operations, tells why our naval forces are so vital to the Nation's security. The Burke article is as follows:

THE SEA CARRIES SECURITY ON ITS BACK

(By Adm. Arleigh Burke, USN, Chief of Naval Operations)

Ever since the dawn of civilization the sea has grown progressively more important in the affairs of mankind.

As the world has grown more populated, as the economic resources of the world have been developed, as world commerce has enriched the lives of progressive peoples, as free nations have become more interdependent economically and militarily, the sea has played an increasingly vital role in world affairs.

Today the importance of seapower is still growing as the world enters the age of ballistic missiles. The unity and strength of the free world depends, as never before, upon freedom of the seas.

The continuity of peaceful international endeavors and the integrity of combined military operations in war depend upon keeping free nations tightly tied together by the only ties that can do so—the ties of the heavy tonnages of cargo ships, transports, and tankers.

Mutual support between free nations is essential to the survival of freedom. This support can be provided only by the use of the sea. The flow of massive quantities of material and manpower, so essential in war, cannot be maintained in any way but by sea.

It is the Navy's job to insure that these ties remain strong, that the seas remain clear of predators in the air, on the surface, and beneath the surface of the seas.

The story of seapower is ageless. It will not become less important by man's probings toward the outer reaches of space. On the contrary, its importance will continue to grow as the world shrinks by the advancements of science and technology.

This is the reason why the Navy has held its course hard toward the future, probing the heights of space and the depths of the sea in basic research programs to improve naval strength. The overriding objective has consistently been to make the Navy a more effective element of American military power.

This is the reason why the Navy has worked energetically, developing a whole family of guided missiles, applying nuclear power to ships, developing new weapons systems, and adapting new technologies to the needs of naval warfare.

These things the Navy has done, and will continue to do, because it is essential that the United States exploit the seas to their fullest advantage in meeting the threat of Soviet aggression.

These efforts are paying off for the United States and for the free world. The United States Navy is uniquely adapted to operate effectively in all levels of modern war. Its aircraft carriers are presently an important part of the all-out nuclear war deterrent posture of the United States.

With the coming of ballistic missiles, the Navy's contribution will be the fleet ballistic missile system Polaris, a system which has been enthusiastically suported throughout the free world as one which can be kept hidden and moving, virtually immune to surprise enemy attack.

The integrity of this system may well make general nuclear war obsolete as a means of achieving national objectives. Today the Soviets realize that should they venture to launch a general nuclear attack upon the free world, the combined forces of free nations would destroy the Soviet Union.

With the coming of ballistic missiles, when the Navy has Polaris deployed at sea, this capability will remain intact. The situation will continue to be a stalemate, a standoff.

Therefore the United States must also continue to be ready for aggression on a more limited scale. Naval forces are uniquely adapted to deal effectively with limited wars throughout the whole spectrum of possibilities.

The United States Sixth and Seventh Fleets backed up by the First and Second Fleets, can concentrate military power quickly anywhere around the entire periphery of the Eurasian land mass.

They can assemble massive power, or they can apply a pinpoint jab where necessary to give pause to a potential aggressor.

They can be moved into an area and kept there merely by the issuance of an order. When such forces are no longer required in the area, they can be withdrawn, again by a simple order, and placed somewhere else where they are needed. The same forces can

be used over and over again in widely separated locations throughout the world.

It is inherent in the characteristics of naval forces that they are particularly effective in cold war as active, progressive and dynamic instruments of American goodwill in foreign ports throughout the world.

Naval forces can visit foreign lands to show not only the power of the United States—but demonstrate the good will and friendliness of our people. This they can do in the seaports where ships of many nations come and go, where the flags of many nations may be seen every day.

American naval ships are a most effective means of showing the power of the United States because it is not provocative.

Port visits are often an occasion for local celebration, with courtesies exchanged, and with open-house abroard our warships during which hundreds of local people are able to visit our ships, talk to our men, and become acquainted with the friendly spirit of Americans.

The American public can indeed take great pride in the manner in which American sailors represent our country in the foreign lands they visit. Naval visits are an integral part of the President's people-to-people program in many instances.

The Navy is thus an active service, in war and in peace. It is constantly on patrol, a visible sign of American determination to defend the right of freemen to stay free, and at the same time a positive instrument of international goodwill, active every day of every year throughout the world in bringing the American viewpoint to faraway places.

The Navy has many different jobs to do. It is essential that the Navy remain capable of performing these jobs effectively, for the United States has large maritime interests throughout the world.

It is important, therefore, that the public remain always aware of the maritime position of the United States and of the importance of American seapower that represents the power of peace, prosperity, and progress.

Odd Fellows Annual Pilgrimage to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, May 4, 1958, the Odd Fellows made their annual pilgrimage to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington Cemetery. Sovereign Grand Master James M. Elliott, of Alliance, Ohio, delivered an inspiring address to the assembly, in which he called for a revival of the four faiths which made us a great Nation of free people. The four faiths are faith in God, faith in ourselves, faith in our fellow man, and faith in our country.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I incorporate the address in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ADDRESS AT THE TOMB OF THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER, MAY 4, 1958

In memory of the dead, in honor of the living, and for the inspiration of our children, we pause in our activities of life to pay a richly deserved tribute to the one who gave his life that we might be here today. Although we know not who sleeps beneath the tomb, we do know that he sacrificed his life for us all. Once in a while a cause forces itself upon our attention so tragic and so important, that it transcends any consideration of creed or race. We know not the race or creed of the one whom we honor, and as Odd Fellows we care not. We are here because we recognize that through his sacrifice, and many others who gave their lives, we can have such organizations as ours, which stand for the richer and nobler things of life.

We gather here as members and friends of this great fraternity of Odd Fellows, to recognize a patriotism that was demonstrated by this unknown soldier, to the point of sacrificing his life for his country. We have had many demonstrations of sacrificing that we might be free. He may have come from any one of millions of American homes; some mother gave him her love and tenderness.

The Nation bows in grief over the body of this man, born to live, but who died for us. We do not known his station in life, for from every station came patriotic response.

We do not know the eminence of his birth, but we do know the glory of his death. He died for his country and greater devotion hath no man than this. He died no doubt with faith in his heart and hope on his lips, that this country should triumph, and his civilization survive. If America is to ever again lift the sword against another nation; it should be a righteous cause, and with a pure heart, for he who takes up the sword must see that his own cause is just. We in this country need a new wave of patriotism, not necessarily for a righteous conflict, but for other duties demanding our wholehearted patriotism of country. How often we see men in high places who, when put to the test, compromise or surrender. We have on the other hand seen brave men do noble deeds for the betterment of our country and communities. We must have leaders, men who will resist temptation, who will refuse to take the easy path of complying, and will fight for honesty and purity in our public affairs. We have inherited a country, the greatest in the world.

It is a country with endless shores, washed by waters of both oceans, majestic mountains and plains, great lakes and rivers, diversified climate, corn, cotton, and wheat fields, inexhaustible mines and herds as it were on a thousand hills.

It is our great factories, our highways threading our valleys, tunneling, or scaling our mountains. It is the genius in invention, and our skill in engineering. It is our respect for labor, the accounts in our savings banks, the unparalleled opportunity in every direction for all, no matter how humble the roof under which they were born. It is the American homes, our churches, complete freedom of worship, separation of church and state, our schools, our many benevolences, great fraternities such as ours, and, finally, it is the love of freedom that keeps and will keep these things for us, if we will only appreciate and maintain that love and faith in our country.

Today we live in a land of plenty, in a land of mechanical miracles and great achievements. We are the best fed, best clothed, and best housed people in the world. Our vast natural blessings have no equal in the history of civilization. The products of our farms, our factories, and our mines are the envy and future hope of other countries of the world, yet with all these things we find ourselves beset with fears, doubts, and uncertainties. Our situation is almost a frightful one. We are in a struggle with a philosophy of life which seeks to destroy everything we hold dear. We are in a struggle between slavery and freedom, and it is worldwide, thus we stand at the crossroads in our country. We badly need today the great faiths our forefathers had, and which we, too, must have if we are to survive.

I want to give you the four great faiths of our forefathers: The first is faith in God. When our forefathers landed on the shores of New England, there was practically nothing to give them aid and comfort, except their faith in God. So strong was that faith, that they caused to be stamped on our coins the words, In God We Trust. Recognition of a supreme power and dependency on that power for guidance is contained in our Declaration of Independence and in our State constitutions. What about us today? Do we have faith in God? Do the words, In God We Trust, guide us, inspire us, strengthen us? If we are worried about our future, then we should do as our forefathers did, turn more strongly to that faith that made our Nation great.

Between America of yesterday and the America of tomorrow stands our generation, to us has fallen the duty to preserve our Nation, and we must be guided by this faith if we are to survive. Many peoples of the world have a firm faith in God, and so far it has withstood the efforts of dictators to stamp it out.

The second is faith in ourselves. The Bible tells us that "As a man thinketh in his own heart so is he." We therefore cannot think in terms of failure and succeed, in terms of weakness and then be strong, in terms of fear and then be brave, in terms of doubt and have faith. Our forefathers had faith in themselves, and believed that the Lord helps those who help themselves.

The history of our country is a history of a people who had faith in themselves. It has paid off in richer, happier, and fuller lives. It has brought us the greatest outpouring of goods and services the world has ever known. Recently we have started to leaning on the Federal Government for the solution of personal and community problems. If this condition of dependence upon our Government continues to exist and grow stronger, we shall surely destroy one of the basic faiths that made our country free, strong, and prosperous, namely, faith in ourselves.

The third faith is faith in our fellow man. I believe it naturally follows, faith in God and in ourselves. Again our forefathers possessed this faith, they lived by it, fought for it, and died for it. Again the Declaration of Independence has these words, "With a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledged to each other our lives, our fortunes, and sacred honor." These are words coined by men who faced the future with firm faith in their fellow man. When we read the newspapers, listen to the radio, and hear the many things that are being done today, it almost shakes our faith, but we still have many good people in this country who have faith in their fellow man and unless we do we cannot have the last faith of the four I want to mention, and that is faith in our country. We are the preservers of our country and the freedoms we hold dear. Again our forefathers certainly had faith in this country, they established the freedoms we enjoy. Because we have freedom is why we have been richly blessed, more than any other peoples of any other country, our country gives us so many freedoms, to work, to save, or spend, to gain power, honor and trust, to rise from rags to riches, to enjoy the fruits of our own labors, to worship God according to the dictates of our own conscience. In order that we can continue to enjoy these blessings and freedoms, we must have faith in God, faith in ourselves, faith in our fellow man, and faith in our country.

Amid such a scene as this our thoughts today alter between defenders dead and defenders living. A grateful Republic will be worthy of both. Our part is to atone for the loss of our heroic dead by making a better country for the living.

May this day mark the dawn of a new and lasting era of peace on earth, good will among men.

Tax Cuts or Tax Fraud?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the content of the following editorial taken from this morning's Wall Street Journal makes clear why I insert it in the RECORD. No introductory statement is required except to say that I endorse it wholeheartedly:

TAX CUTS—OR TAX FRAUD?

All this talk of a tax cut, it seems to us, is bound to put all reflective minds in a cruel dilemma.

It is undisputable that the present tax load upon the American people is far too high. Fully one-third of the whole economic effort of the people is consumed by the Federal, State and local governments. A vast proportion of this is plainly sheer waste; that is, it goes to support governmental activities having nothing to do with the essential national defense or with the real welfare of the people.

It seems to us also indisputable that this weight is economically oppressive. There is much talk today of a recession, and one need only reflect on what the people could buy and enjoy for themselves if they had even a small part of these taxes to put to their own use. Beyond this immediate effect, although perhaps not so obvious to everyone, the weight of this tax load is a drag upon the future. Every dollar Government consumes now for nonproductive purposes is a dollar subtracted from the future economic strength of the country.

Nor is the weight of the tax burden the whole of the matter. Its structure is a jerry-built mish-mash that distributes the burden inequitably and unwisely. The excise taxes are a crazy quilt; the design is not only senseless but is an actual penalty on many lines of business and many consumers. The rules for amortizing capital investment results in a distortion of investment and, coupled with inflation, sometimes amount to a hidden capital levy.

The method of levying direct taxes upon individuals is, if anything, worse. This is not altogether a matter of the inconsistencies, injustices and complicatoins in the law, although these abound. The steeply graduated income tax is fundamentally unjust because it multiplies the penalties upon the citizen the harder he works, the more he produces and the more he earns. It is economicsally unsound because it takes its biggest bite out of the future—the savings which must provide the capital tomorrow for a growing America.

So plainly, tax reform which would both reduce and redesign the tax structure is more than overdue. The words "tax cut" which now echo in the corridors of the Capitol are thus bound to have an appeal to the mind as well as the emotions.

And yet, few of these politicians are talking about tax reform. They are talking about tax gimmicks. Some excise taxes, so we are told, must be cut on certain products just to help boost sales of these particular products; this is not reform but more political inequity. The plan is not to revamp plant amortization rates to make economic sense for all; it is to give temporary fast writeoffs in certain areas somebody thinks needs a little stimulation.

Some of these gimmicks are blatantly so. We have heard proposals to forgive a month's taxes or more, to have a 1 year's increase in the tax exemption, or otherwise to juggle the rates just to put a few more dollars briefly in people's pockets in the hope they might spend them fast. It would make as much sense for Congress just to pass a law and pass out $40 to everybody out of the Treasury.

This, by itself, is enough to put the stamp of fraud on most of the current tax-cut talk. But there is something else that makes it a dangerous fraud.

The simple fact is that the Government is now running a deficit of more than $3 billion. There is no plan whatever to reduce the Government's spending. Rather it is being increased, again under the guise of helping us out of this recession. And with this increased spending, the so-called tax cuts would increase this deficit many billions more. Some politicians have talked blithely of a $12 billion to $15 billion deficit—each year.

And on this we had best not kid ourselves. If this is what a tax cut means it means no tax cut at all. It simply means that for the political effect of 40 pieces of silver for the taxpayers to jangle in their pockets they will pay many times over not merely in future taxes but in the theft from all values.

For it is a harsh fact, an unhappy fact, a discouraging fact, but a fact nonetheless that the Government has no way of creating the real money to pay for this tax cut it would bless us with. It can give the people dollar bills all right but in the end it must carve them out of the people's hides.

This newspaper has been a constant pleader for tax reform and tax cuts. So it may seem strange now when some politician talks of cutting taxes, or of making some adjustment in a structure we have long complained of, that we should not rush to it eagerly.

Well, we plead no less than before. We are still convinced that the size of the tax burden upon the people, and the way in which it is levied, does the country an injury that is no less grievous because its effects are hidden and slow. But we are also convinced that the tax burden cannot be removed until people are aroused enough to throw off some of the weight of Government spending which makes that burden so oppressive.

The people cannot have it both ways. We would welcome tax reforms and tax reductions. We can hardly welcome tax frauds.

An Editor and a Congressman Discuss the Length of the Term of a United States Representative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable discussion these days concerning the length of the term of a United States Representative. In light of this, and under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following April 17, 1958, editorial which appeared in the Eugene, Ore., Register-Guard, an outstanding State daily, and my letter of April 29, 1958, written in reply:

MORE LEGISLATION, LESS FENCE MENDING

Fifteen months ago 435 United States Representatives were sworn in as Members of Congress. Last week, during the Easter recess, Congressman CHARLES O. PORTER, 1 of the 435, was touring this district, fence mending, sounding out his constituents and otherwise preparing for his reelection campaign. Other Members were touring other districts, but all with the same purpose in mind—campaigning. For no sooner does a Representative take office than his attention must be diverted from his legislative responsibilities to the first chore of the successful officeholder, getting elected.

The problem in the Senate is less acute. Senators, 96 of them, are elected for 6-year terms. A Senator, sworn in when Mr. PORTER was, need not run for reelection until 1962. Last year and this year and for the next couple of years he is free of the worry that he might be fired by the voters. He can, in theory at least, devote himself fully to legislative matters. For 4 years out of his 6 he can play the role of statesman, reverting to politician only in the months before election.

Would it not be better, some have asked, if the terms of Representatives were extended, perhaps to 4 years? Do not Members of the so-called Lower House need opportunity for reflection, study and statesmanlike attitudes as much as Senators in the other wing of the Capitol? Several times it has been proposed that terms be so extended.

Such a change would require a constitutional amendment, for the Nation's basic law specifies the 2-year term. To understand why, we must understand the nature of the conglomeration of independent States that got together to form the new nation 170 years ago. States were equal in sovereignty. But some were more populous than others and demanded proportionately greater representation in the new parliament. A compromise was struck. The upper House was to represent the States, with each State having two Members, Senators. The lower House was to represent the people, with seats distributed according to population. The Members of the upper House were to be chosen by State legislatures, Members of the lower by popular vote. This was the lower House to be the people's House, responsible to the people and quickly responsive to popular will. The Senate, in the thinking of some of the Founding Fathers, was to be a brake that could prevent the popular will from being put into law too quickly. This pattern was followed by most States, including Oregon, in the establishment of two-house legislatures, an upper house with long-term members and a lower house that could be turned out every other year.

The Nation has come a long way since 1787. In theory we are still a federation of equal States. But the reality is not with us the way it was in our national infancy. Senators are no longer elected by legislatures. Suffrage has been extended far beyond that envisioned by the Founding Fathers. Both Houses now are people's Houses. Experience has shown that changes in sentiment, even in the lower House, are usually small with the balance of power rarely shifting heavily in only one election. So close is the usual division in the Senate that changes in the popular mood are reflected there as readily as they are in the House.

In the view of this newspaper the American people would be well advised to think about changing their basic law to provide longer terms for House Members. We'd get more service from them if we permitted them to tend to their knitting instead of to their fence mending. Yet the prospects for such a change are not bright, if only because the initiative must come from the Central Government and not by individual State action as was the case with direct election of Senators.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1958.

To the EDITOR, EUGENE REGISTER-GUARD,
Eugene, Oreg.

DEAR SIR: Naturally I was interested in your thoughtful editorial of April 17 entitled "More Legislating, Less Fence Mending." I do not deny for a minute that I was fence mending or campaigning while I toured the fourth district during the Easter recess. However, I believe that I am a better legislator by reason of my getting around the district and as long as I have the honor to represent southwestern Oregon in Congress I intend to make myself available for consultation and questions throughout the district when Congress is not in session.

A 2-year term does keep a Congressman alert to the fact that he must win and hold votes if he is to be reelected. Doing your job as a United States Representative, both in the legislative and in the errand boy functions, is the best kind of campaigning an incumbent can do.

The real trouble with the 2-year term, in my view, is not that fence mending takes time from legislative responsibilities but that campaigning costs so much money.

The Federal Government is a huge organization with tentacles reaching out and grasping each individual many times. A citizen feels better about a situation if he knows he has a Congressman who will go to bat for him if he needs help. He also likes to feel that he can make his opinions and ideas known to his elected Representative. So these trips a Representative makes around his district, whether they be fence mending or campaigning, are also an essential part of a Congressman's duties in that they overcome in part the impersonality of our Federal Government and thereby make our Union the stronger.

I personally would like to have a 4-year term, not because I dislike getting around the fourth district, but because of the financial burdens of a campaign. You are right when you say that the prospects of extending the 2-year term are at this time remote. There has been considerable talk among my colleagues of providing an additional assistant for each Congressman. This would be a tremendous help in assisting us to serve our constituents both in connection with mail and direct legislative duties. However, this being an election year, the prospects for this are not bright.

Sincerely,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
Member of Congress.

No More Than Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal in regard to the flood-control omnibus bill:

NO MORE THAN FAIR

The White House has indicated that President Eisenhower is still opposed to the Greenville Harbor project but is willing to approve the Boeuf-Tensas project and that for the White River backwater area if administration recommendations are accepted. We assume he means the Budget Bureau's recommendations to him.

The Mid-South's congressional Members ought to be able to convince their colleagues of the manifest inequity of the local interest requirements which have been set. The Boeuf-Tensas project is 90 percent complete and the same rule should be applied to the last 10 percent as was followed for the rest. The White River backwater project, we understand, involves a transfer of 5,000 acres of land to the Government.

The Greenville Harbor project involves a total expenditure of less than 3 millions—a minor amount as flood control and navigation expenditures go. It has been approved by the district and division engineers. The barrier to Presidential (Budget Bureau) approval is lack of local interest participation to a degree greater than that demanded for the Memphis and Vicksburg Harbor projects, both of which are under way.

Greenville has a right to the same treatment as Memphis and Vicksburg and Mid-South Members in the Congress are right, in turn, in demanding that she be given it. An authorization act from which the Greenvill project was omitted would be grossly unfair.

Russia Presses United States as Coal Producer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include herewith an editorial, "Russia Presses United States as Coal Producer," which appeared in the April 15, 1958, issue of the Madisonville Messenger of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

RUSSIA PRESSES UNITED STATES AS COAL PRODUCER

Using modern methods and giving top priority to mining, Russia is catching up to the United States in coal production, reports Coal Age, a publication devoted to the mining industry. The story goes like this:

Last year the Russians scooped about 509 millions tons of coal, while the United States netted around 514 million. The Russians claim that by the end of 1958 they should be producing 535 million tons of coal while the United States will turn out only 460 million.

Since 1952, Russia's coal production has jumped at an average close to 10 percent a year while the United States' production has averaged an increase of only one-half of 1 percent. What's more, America's coal production sank about 2.7 percent in 1957 from the 1956 level. Experts assert that if the trend continues, Soviet coal production will shoot ahead of the United States for the first time in modern history.

The U. S. S. R., it is reported, extracts 15 metric tons of coal every second, or more than the combined yield of Great Britain, France, India, and Japan. Almost 30 percent of this coal is lignite as compared to 1 percent lignite in the United States' tonnage.

Russia estimates its reserves to be around 8 billion metric tons, claiming it has the coal-richest belly in the world. Recently, the Russians announced that in the Lena Basin alone in eastern Siberia there are 2½ times greater coal reserves than in the rest of the world.

One of Russia's richest coal basins is the Karaganda, said to contain 51.2 billion metric tons of coking coal and other high quality coal. The Donets Basin in the Ural Mountain region is a top producer along with the Ukraine in the west and the Dolinsk region far to the east.

Everywhere in Russia, coal-mining experts check new techniques. Some of these are:

Bringing coal to the surface through a pipe system. Liquids of higher specific weight than that of coal are injected and the coal is floated to the surface.

Hydraulic transport of coal to washing and screen plants.

Remote control mining. One operator will control all coal-cutting machinery from a single panelboard while watching the entire process on a television screen.

Still, Russian scientists are not content to stay within their own country. Teams of experts are constantly inspecting the coal gasification plants of other nations.

El Portal Acquisition for Yosemite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most populous places in my State, and certainly the most populous in my district, is not in a city as you might expect, but in the upper end of Yosemite Valley, in the heart of Yosemite National Park. As many of you know, it is a beautiful valley of green meadow and forests surrounded by mile-high cliffs and waterfalls unequaled anywhere else on earth. It is a jewel in the crown of our scenic resources. I think it is the most valuable piece of real estate anywhere. The price does not matter because it is not for sale. It was set aside for all the people for all time back in 1864, by President Abraham Lincoln.

Although we are happy that Yosemite Valley is within the exterior boundaries of the State of California, I am not saying what I have said merely to praise my State, for Yosemite Valley belongs to the world. A million people come each year to visit this place. Future years are going to bring still more. If these future visitors are going to get anything like the experience we have the opportunity to enjoy in that valley today, we must be very careful about how we use the vital 7 square miles of the floor of that valley. Nothing much is likely to happen to the cliffs and waterfalls, but these cannot mean much if we let harm befall the place where people will want to drive, walk, rest, and look in the course of their Yosemite days and nights.

The National Park Service is greatly concerned about retaining the park experience in Yosemite Valley, and in not letting the lure of the valley, and the throngs that lure brings there, destroy the very thing the people came to see. The Park Service, and conservation groups outside the Government, have been studying long and carefully the means of rescuing for the Yosemite visitor the meaning of Yosemite Valley to

that visitor, and of relocating certain facilities and activities that will get in the way of the people who come there to see the valley, and to experience something they can find nowhere else on earth.

Theirs is an enormous task, beset by many difficulties, and I believe they have found the answer. The solution is to make sure that a very minimum of their most valuable real estate is preempted by the machinery of running the park. Warehouses, garages, shops, heavy trucking, and housing for the employees who operate them—and who year in and year out are but a few minutes from a chance to see Yosemite Valley almost anytime they want to—should make way for the park visitors who are coming in increasing numbers.

If this machinery is to be relocated, it needs a place to go. Not an isolated place, but space accessible to the main artery of transportation that must serve these facilities. The National Park Service now has the opportunity to acquire and develop just such space at El Portal, 14 miles down the all-year highway from the present location. With this property acquired, an orderly movement of this machinery can be begun, and a major conflict for space will be resolved.

I believe, the key to the solution is the acquisition of this property at El Portal, to be used and administered by the National Park Service in accordance with the program I have outlined to assure the protection and enjoyment of our world-famous Yosemite Valley.

Accordingly, I have introduced herewith H. R. 12281 and hope that it will move forward as promptly as possible, before this long-sought and widely supported opportunity is lost.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following weekly newsletter of May 3, 1958:

Legislative activity January 7 through April 30 in the House totals 217 hours of debate, 2,488 pages of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD proceedings, 3,045 measures (bills) introduced, and 348 measures passed.

The transcript of the S. M. U. meeting of John Gates, former Communist Daily Worker editor, and Herbert Philbrick, former FBI counterspy, is now a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Members of Congress and people throughout America should enjoy the questions and answers.

Some unanswered questions remain. For example, (1) How does an atheist tell right from wrong? (2) How can democratic socialism retain the features of our constitutional form of government, as Gates says (the mixing of oil and water)? (3) Do others besides Gates believe the American labor movement to be the home of new American radicalism? (4) Is the American labor movement, whose leaders push liberal, free-spending, even unconstitutional legislation, now the result of earlier Socialists who think like Gates? (5) By what philosophy of government are now justified the many legislative bills sponsored by the AFL–CIO (as, for example, this week's socialized dole)? In AFL–CIO pressure on Congress can be found the answers to (a) the refusal of the House Democratic leadership to even hold hearings on labor legislation, long pending and pigeonholed, and (b) the Senate's refusal last week to pass any legislation curtailing labor's monopolistic position. Will success crown Senator BILL KNOWLAND'S valiant efforts to lead the fight for a workingman's bill of rights? The extortion of money from union workers' pay checks by the power-hungry labor leaders, he labeled an example of collective bludgeoning.

Maybe the dilemma in Congress is best expressed by David Lawrence in summarizing labor's monopolistic position and legislative influence. "It looks now as if only by the election of enough new Members of Congress—committed to legislation that abolishes the labor-union monopoly—will there ever be any chance of getting relief from the wage-price spiral and inflation?"

The Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 was a real shocker, but this story had a happy ending. It had two parts: Title I, "To authorize temporary unemployment benefits for individuals who exhaust their benefit rights under existing unemployment compensation laws;" and title II, "For individuals who were employed in noncovered employment." Background (to digress): Employers pay a 3 percent tax on each employee's first $3,000 of income, 2.7 percent going to the State, 0.3 percent to the Federal Government (for administrative expense). The State pays benefits (determining amount and number of weeks) to those covered when they are unemployed. When the States' funds build up, the respective States usually limit the further payment by employers into the fund; but the Federal Government continues to receive its 0.3 percent. So the Federal fund built up to almost $900 million. The money was being spent on general expenses. Congress then limited the fund to $200 million, the rest then being returned to the States. The bill brought to the House was quite different from the administration's recommendation on which hearings were held. In title II States would be given money outright to distribute to all unemployed a sum equal to 16 times whatever the State law permits if the person was covered by unemployment insurance. Argument for was simply that the unemployed need money and should be paid by the Government. Arguments against were: (1) No bearings on substitute bill; (2) no "need" formula for dispensing money—anyone could receive it, millionaires or hobos; (3) outright "socialized dole;" (4) "temporary" legislation is seldom temporary; (5) States have $9 billion unemployment compensation on hand, the Federal only $200 million; and (6) complete violation of States' rights. A substitute bill as an amendment to strike out title II precipitated the crucial vote. A coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats passed the House, 223 to 165 (40 not voting), this joining of conservatives a most heartening development. The substitute bill made borrowing optional to the States and permitted repayments in three ways. In final passage, the vote was 370 to 17 (42 not voting). I opposed it because I think this field is and should remain a State matter.

Urban renewal, the cleaning up of slum and rundown areas, is a problem throughout our Nation's communities. No one, surely, can disapprove the rehabilitation. It's just a matter of how best to do it to get the job done. Numerous cities are busily engaged in urban renewal right now—some on their own, some with Federal aid. Dallas' current interest has prompted my preparing a rather thorough study for the use of the mayor, city council, Downtown Businessmen's Association, and others interested in how best to solve this difficult problem. It is my hope that a careful study of the facts will be made before the referendum. Dallas received nationwide recognition in its "Little Mexico" project, the first major urban renewal propect in the Nation without Federal aid.

Churchill's Paintings Speak to United States From Heart of an Old Campaigner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1958

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Smithsonian Institution is to be congratulated for its good sense in presenting the magnificent collection of paintings by Winston Churchill. A self-styled amateur, Mr. Churchill's paintings are brilliantly done. As someone said, if he had devoted himself to art as he has to statecraft he would be the greatest painter the world has known.

I include here a moving tribute to Winston Churchill from the Evening Star of Washington, D. C., written by William S. White who, until recently, reported the activities of the United States Senate for the New York Times:

"OLD MASTER" OF THE 20TH CENTURY: CHURCHILL'S PAINTINGS SPEAK TO UNITED STATES FROM HEART OF AN OLD CAMPAIGNER

(By William S. White)

On a wet May day in Washington people were circling with wary respect around 35 pictures arranged in a sort of rotunda in the Smithsonian Institution.

The paintings were strong in execution. They were stoutly traditional in form; here there was no nonsense about impressionism and all that.

Their titles were mostly both clipped and gentle—"Rock Near Cannes"; "Black Swans at Chartwell." But one title, though certainly clipped, was not especially gentle. "Bottlescape," it said, with forthright satisfaction.

And a correspondent who long ago in wartime had occasionally trailed along behind the painter in some of his missions could imagine now the gleam in the Old Master's eye when he put his brush to these works.

For this was a painting of rich bottles; brandy here, champagne there, by the look of it, and in the foreground a brimming glass if what just might have been whisky.

Nearby was mounted a chaste blue and white card announcing the name and rank and serial number, so to speak, of the artist: "The Right Honorable Sir Winston Churchill."

"Old Master" is used here of Sir Winston in awareness that some experts may reject the description as it applies to painting.

Indeed, only recently there was a grave proclamation that the Art Institute of Chicago had declined to show his pictures on the ground that he was not a professional.

Professional in the art world, maybe not; but professional in the greater world of all men—of course he was, and is.

For his painting not only looked good; they were good. Among other things, they

brought together, in 1 place and at 1 time; 1 of a dozen aspects of the personality of, perhaps, the most extraordinary whole man produced since—whom? Benjamin Franklin, perhaps, and in a way.

But Franklin, for all his versatility and charm, surely could hardly match this man of the 20th century. Franklin knew how to say what he had to say; yes. But who could possibly compare it with the unforgettable eloquence, half in lisp and half in snarl, that Churchill flung against the heart and conscience of the chaste blue and white card all but broken House of Commons back before Pearl Harbor or Stalingrad?

And here so many years later, down at the Smithsonian, was Churchill again, back in America. This time, of course, he was back only in his paintings. But these, above their lines and tints, spoke to America for him. They were the calling cards of a man who understands this country better than it understands him.

Is this piece, then, designed to suggest that all the world really needs is a bigger and better English-speaking union? No; it is mainly to recall another spring. This—14 years ago this very month—was a spring in England in which the grass was unbelievably green, as it is today in Washington.

The distinguished painter now represented here by his 35 works was busy then with more urgent affairs than landscapes. He was stumping about the British Isles—which at that time seemed to tilt a little at the water's edge under a mass of war machines.

He was smoking furiously and poking his head with his funny hat into everything. He was putting all in order, as he would have expressed it, for an invasion across the Channel that was to come on June 6, 1944.

He was quarrelsome, and he was kind. He was, in the language of some parts of our country, an ornery old cuss without the slightest self-doubt in his mission and wisdom.

He pushed everybody around. But then, in the figurative sense where the literal act would never have been possible to him, he patted everybody on the back.

He was the patriarch, The Old Man, to English-speaking assault forces gathered from everywhere.

He was sending them out to die, many of them. And, God knows, he never sentimentalized them or visibly agonized over them. Rather, his line was more or less the "Hey, hey, first of May, good hunting," kind of thing.

But he was looking after his troops—and in his grand way all of them were his troops, whether American, Canadian, or Anzac, or United Kingdom—the best he could.

This was the time when he was truly the master painter—the painter of a design that some will not forget in this or many another spring.

Hardwood Plywood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 24, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER] took the floor and for a solid 40 minutes took after my distinguished colleagues from the Pacific Northwest, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. NORBLAD] on the problem created by the imports of plywood. I took the floor to advise the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER] of the difference between fur and hardwood plywood. In so doing, I mentioned the Friday shutdown of the Roddis Plywood Corp., a large producer of hardwood plywood in my district. The very next day one Tom Blake called the Roddis Plywood Corp. and talked to Mr. Don Gott, Marshfield sales manager of the Roddis plant. Mr. Blake was very mysterious in identifying himself to Mr. Gott. He asked if the plant was being shut down on Friday and if the company used or sold imported plywood. Mr. Blake was told that the company was shut down on Friday, April 18, the cause being the lack of orders. Mr. Gott immediately called me and informed me of the call and his concern over Mr. Blake being unwilling to properly identify himself. I decided to find out just who Mr. Blake was and what interests he represented. I found that Mr. Blake is associated with the law firm of Sharp & Bogan. Sharp & Bogan are the attorneys for the Imported Hardwood Plywood Association, the Japanese Plywood Trade Promotional Committee, of Tokyo, Japan, and other groups which are interested in increasing the imports of plywood from Japan. Quite obviously, Mr. Blake was representing the importers and the members of the Japanese Plywood Trade Promotional Committee when he called the Roddis Plywood Corp. It seems that the lobbyists for the plywood importers and this Japanese committee, are worried about the situation and will employ any means to obtain information which they hope they can use for the purpose of injuring this American industry. An industry by the way which has been adversely affected by an increase of Japanese plywood shipments of over 6,000 percent since 1952.

Mr. Speaker, I read into the RECORD at this point a letter received from Mr. Don Gott of the Roddis Plywood Corp.:

RODDIS PLYWOOD CORP.,
Marshfield, Wis., April 25, 1958.

The Honorable MELVIN R. LAIRD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MEL: Confirming our conversation of this morning the Marshfield mill did close down Friday, April 18, for the 1 day. It is quite obvious that when shipments exceed a slowup of orders received, adjustments must take place to have the flow of orders coincide with the flow of shipments. This is true in any business.

While there are a few other elements besides the Japanese import situation which create this readjustment the information which I obtained from Philadelphia this morning is certainly considered the present and future problem. If you recall, I indicated that our manager of the Philadelphia operation told me by phone this morning that Japanese three-fourths inch full-length basswood lumber core, 1–1 grade, in select red birch, is delivering Philadelphia at 41 cents per square foot. This compares to our delivered price for rotary natural birch at 63 cents, Philadelphia, and select red birch at 76½ cents, Philadelphia. This, plus the influx of cheap Lauan from Japan, will create more serious conditions, if allowed to continue, than shutting down for 1 day last week. Lumber core plywood, as you know, is our bread and butter at the Marshfield mill in the plywood field. I shall keep you advised as to future developments on price and product information from Japan.

With sincere regards, I remain,

Cordially,

RODDIS PLYWOOD CORP.,
DON GOTT,
Marshfield Sales Manager.

On April 28 the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER], with no prior notice to me, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a correction of my remarks of April 24. This is, of course, not in accordance with normal House procedure. The House on April 29 gave me unanimous consent to correct the RECORD and I will insert at this point the statement I made on April 29.

SHUTDOWN OF RODDIS PLYWOOD PLANT

(Mr. LAIRD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, on page 6408 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 24, 1958, in the exchange between the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER] and myself, an error was made. In the paragraph on the top of the page, I stated:

"The largest hardwood plywood plant in the world is going to be shut down on Friday."

This sentence should read:

"The largest hardwood plywood plant in the world was shut down last Friday."

I regret very much that the error was made in the day of the shutdown of the Roddis plywood plant as the plant was shut down on April 18, 1958, and not April 25, 1958.

I did not have the many letters which I have received about this shutdown before me on the floor of the House on April 24, 1958, and I had assumed the shutdown was to take place on April 25, but in reading over the correspondence in my office, the shutdown date was April 18, 1958. Irrespective of what Friday the plant was shut down, it remains that the management has informed me that it was necessary to reduce hours in this plant because of a reduction in orders. I am advised that these orders have been reduced not because of the lack of consumption of hardwood plywood but because of the increase of Japanese imports. In correspondence from the management of the plant, it is impossible to estimate with any degree of finality whether additional shutdowns will be necessary. However, it is important to bear in mind that several of the plants in my district are operating on a regular schedule of reduced hours.

I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

This statement would have been made on April 28 if it were not for the fact that I was speaking in Wisconsin on that date.

Sharp & Bogan, lobbyists for the plywood importers, are mailing out some very interesting propaganda these days. In a letter dated April 20, 1958, they spell out their high-powered lobby technique very thoroughly. Mr. Sharp in his letter urges the recipients to write their Congressmen but tells them emphatically not to send any of his canned material. Under unanimous consent I insert at this point in the RECORD the letter of Mr. Sharp dated April 20, 1958, and the attached enclosures:

SHARP & BOGAN,
Washington, D. C., April 20, 1958.

GENTLEMEN: As you know, our firm represents the Imported Hardwood Plywood Asso-

ciation in its effort to defeat the enactment of the hardwood plywood restrictive quota bills now pending in Congress. These bills would cripple the import trade and require serious curtailment of the operations of many manufacturers who utilize imported plywood in the manufacture of doors, furniture, and other products.

One of your suppliers of imported hardwood plywood has asked us to furnish you with copies of a communication which, if you see fit, is for the information of your employees. The purpose is to induce them, if possible, to write letters to their Senators and Congressmen in opposition to the plywood quota legislation. Enclosed you will find copies of the communication and we should be glad to furnish additional copies if you can make use of them. If you need additional copies, either call, write, or wire us and we will dispatch them to you immediately.

The House Ways and Means Committee is now in executive session on the Reciprocal Trade Act and various quota bills, including plywood. It is important that as many letters as possible be sent to the Members of Congress within the next 2 to 4 weeks.

You will undoubtedly realize the importance of immediate action. Adoption of this legislation will have a direct effect upon the business of your company and the welfare of your employees, as well as the importers on whose behalf we are acting.

Yours very truly,

SHARP & BOGAN,
JAMES R. SHARP.

If you are employed in a door plant, furniture plant, or any other place of business that uses, ships, or handles imported plywood, your job is being threatened by import restrictions.

What's happening in Washington right now is more than just a general news item to you. It will determine whether you and your fellow workers can continue to hold your jobs, because those jobs are being threatened by what Congressman PORTER, of Oregon, has called a campaign of massive misinformation.

The well-heeled lobby that is trying to throttle plywood imports is threatening the very existence of your company—which means the very existence of your job. One California door manufacturer with his Congressman said that if these imports are stopped, "We are out of business." A Tennessee distributor wrote that if these imports are stopped, "We lose 40 percent of our business." Furniture makers, boat manufacturers, trailer-body producers, home-construction companies, and many others have said that if imports stop "our costs go up and our sales go down."

And what they are all talking about is your job.

Of course, to the Nation as a whole, this problem of imports is more important than your job. President Eisenhower and all the Democratic leaders have said that increased trade is vital to our own economic growth, to the strength of our alliances, and to the defeat of the Soviet economic offensive. Increased trade is not charity—it is good United States business, it is buying and selling that helps us as much as it helps our friends.

So, remember that in protecting your job you are also protecting the national interest, the peace and prosperity of America and the free world.

But these imports which are so essential to your job and so beneficial to the Nation, are they hurting other American workers? The powerful propaganda lobby fighting imports says they are. But the facts say no. And the unbiased Government experts who have investigated the effect of these plywood imports have ruled that they are not hurting the American plywood industry. (If you want more details, see the attached fact sheets.)

How can you protect your job? You are being threatened by a powerful and well-financed lobby, but you have the power to beat them.

YOU HAVE THE POWER OF THE PEN

1. Write your Congressmen and tell them to vote for a liberal trade bill and against any plywood import restrictions. Tell them, in your own words, how important this trade is to your job, your company, your community, the Nation. Don't send any of the attached material, but use any of the facts or arguments that are of interest to you.

Your Representatives should be addressed:

The Honorable ———, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Your Senators (remember there are two for your State) as:

The Honorable ———, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

And if you can, send a carbon copy of your letters to the Washington representatives protecting this trade and your job:

Sharp & Bogan, attorneys, 1108 16th Street, NW., Washington 6, D. C.

2. Write a letter to your local newspaper, explaining the importance of this import trade to you and your community. Public interest and newspaper support are powerful weapons on the side of the truth.

YOU ALSO HAVE THE POWER OF ORGANIZATION

1. If you are a member of a union, tell your union officials to support this fight against import restrictions.

2. Your local clubs (Kiwanis, Lions, others) should be enlisted in the fight.

3. Don't forget your wife's organizations, such as the League of Women Voters, which can be most effective.

If you want to keep your job, to grow with the company, to share in its prosperity, you're going to have to fight to protect that job. And you're going to have to fight now. The next month will be decisive, because Congress is now drafting the trade program for the next few years.

Write your letters now. Get your organizational support now. Protect your job and the national interest, now.

THE PLYWOOD HOAX

The propaganda program of the Hardwood Plywood Manufacturers Committee has been described by at least one Member of the Congress as a campaign of massive misinformation, an economic hoax.

This well-financed lobby has sought congressional support for plywood import quota bills by claiming that:

1. Plywood imports are hurting the Douglas-fir plywood industry.

2. Plywood imports are made with Soviet lumber.

3. Plywood imports have shut down 28 hardwood plywood plants.

4. International diplomacy has denied relief to the United States industry.

These statements are not true. They are, at best, economic nonsense, and at worst, malicious distortion.

A summary of the facts should prevent any Member of the Congress or the public from being taken in by this plywood hoax.

THE TRUTH ABOUT PLYWOOD IMPORTS

Over 98 percent of the plywood imported into the United States is made from hardwoods, less than 2 percent from softwoods. All the plywood from Japan, the principal supplier, is hardwood plywood. More than 80 percent of the United States plywood industry, on the other hand, produces only softwood plywood, chiefly Douglas-fir.

There has been a substantial increase in imports of hardwood plywood over the past 7 years. Between 1951 and 1955 total imports of plywood increased by almost 900 percent, from 74 million to 628 million square feet. Imports from Japan alone increased almost 3,300 percent from 13 million to 429 million square feet.

Yet in 1955, after an exhaustive investigation, the United States Tariff Commission found in a unanimous opinion that imports of hardwood plywood were not injuring the United States hardwood plywood industry, or even threatening any injury to that domestic industry.

Since 1955, the increase has continued, but at a much slower pace. Total imports rose from 628 million feet in 1955 to 847 million feet in 1957, an increase of only 35 percent. Japanese plywood increased from 429 million feet to 686 million feet in 1957, an increase of about 60 percent.

Why did the unanimous Tariff Commission find no injury, in the face of such a great increase in imports? Because, in the Commission's own words, the imports were "supplemental to the domestic supply of hardwood plywood"; because "the availability of imports has helped to develop new markets" for plywood of all kinds; because "the great expansion in the production of flush doors would not have been possible if producers had been dependent entirely on domestic plywood"; because "domestic supplies would not have been adequate."

With this brief background, let's examine the newest claims in the great plywood hoax, which are for the most part the same claims already investigated and rejected by the Tariff Commission:

I. The softwood plywood hoax

The claim is made that the current economic difficulties in the Douglas-fir plywood industry are caused by imports. This is not true, it cannot be true. Douglas-fir is a softwood, used principally for cement forms and subsurface construction in homes, buildings, and furniture; while imports are of hardwood, used almost primarily for natural-finish decorative surface doors and panels. The Tariff Commission in its report pointed out that softwood plywood and hardwood plywood are not competitive, but are used for entirely different purposes.

Moreover, imported plywood costs at least $35 more per thousand square feet at the wholesale distributors' level than Douglas-fir plywood, despite the lower wages paid abroad. While one-fourth inch, AD-grade, Douglas-fir plywood has been selling from $64 to $72 per thousand square feet at the wholesale level, imported Japanese plywood of the same grade has been selling for between $101 and $112. To say that Douglas-fir plywood, used for forming and subsurface construction purposes at $72 a thousand feet, can be displaced by imported exotic panels selling for more than $100 is pure economic nonsense.

This cold fact, that imported plywood is substantially more expensive than Douglas-fir plywood of similar grade, is met by the domestic propagandists with the claim that the average price of all imported plywood, f. o. b. Japan, is lower than the price of Douglas-fir plywood. This not only ignores the costs of ocean freight, 20 percent duty, etc., that go into the United States price of imported panels, but also compares an average of dissimilar products. It is like averaging the price of Fords, Edsels, Mercurys, and Lincolns to prove that Lincolns are cheaper than Cadillacs. Comparing similar products, of the same grade and thickness, imported plywood panels are at least 40 to 50 percent more expensive than Douglas-fir.

Every year from 1951 through 1957, Douglas-fir plywood production has shown a steady growth from 2.9 billion square feet to 5.8 billion square feet in 1957. In the first 12 weeks of 1958, Douglas-fir plywood production increased 14.1 percent over the same

period in 1957, reaching the highest levels in history.

II. The Russian lumber hoax

The report that the Japanese are using Soviet lumber in producing their plywood originated with a union official on the west coast and has been repeated by several Members of the Congress. Basis of the story was no more than a news report that Japan had agreed to purchase a quantity of Russian coniferous logs. Coniferous, of course, means softwood, and no one has attempted to explain how the Japanese can convert Russian softwood into hardwood. Moreover, the news report itself explained that the logs were to be used in Japan for pulp and construction.

Not 1 foot of Russian lumber goes into any of the hardwood plywood shipped to the United States from Japan. This has been certified by the United States Embassy in Japan after a carefully conducted investigation. It has also been certified by the Japanese Government and the Japanese Plywood Manufacturers Association, and the United States customs officials have reported that they have found no Japanse plywood shipped to the United States containing Russian softwood or any other kind of softwood.

This Russian lumber story was made of whole cloth. It is being continuously repeated as another aspect of the plywood hoax, although proven utterly false.

III. The hardwood plywood hoax

When the plywood import quota bills were introduced in the Congress last year, the principal claim offered in support of the legislation was that 28 named hardwood plywood plants had allegedly been shut down by import competition, since the time of the Tariff Commission report.

This was the original plywood hoax. An investigation of these 28 mills, conducted in large part by former employees of the FBI, most of them former special agents, revealed that 9 plants among the 28 named had not shut down at all but were still operating, 3 had been demolished by fire, 3 had never existed, 2 were named twice on the list, at least 1 produced container plywood (a type which is not imported at all), 1 was closed before there were any significant imports, 4 were consolidated with their parent companies resulting in greater production, 2 failed because of undercapitalization, and the few remaining were closed for a variety of reasons, including labor trouble, depletion of timber stands, etc.

Hardwood plywood sales were down in 1957, as they were in the recession of 1954. This is a natural consequence of a sharp decline in housing starts and in industrial production, including furniture and other finished items using plywood. Hardwood plywood is also facing intensive competition from the mushrooming particle board industry in the United States and from increasing uses of hardboard and other sturdy but inexpensive building boards. Yet despite this, over the past 3 years, 1955–57, United States hardwood plywood shipments were 15 percent higher than in 1954, and at least 13 percent higher than the prior 3-year period 1952–54.

In an industry dominated by a few giants, as is the United States hardwood plywood industry, it is inevitable that some of the small marginal producers will be unable to keep pace with the large integrated manufacturers. Many of the smalls are losing out to the bigs, and the financial reports of the bigs show that they are not only competing successfully but are expending their hardwood plywood capacity to fill growing demands in this market.

IV. The injury hoax

The claim has been made that international diplomacy has denied the United States hardwood plywood industry the relief it needs from import competition. This is not true. Imports have not been curtailed simply because the Tariff Commission unanimously found that plywood imports were not injuring the domestic industry.

There are some cases where a domestic industry, having proven its claim of import-caused injury before the Tariff Commission, has been denied relief because of what the President believed to be the broader national interests. It is at least understandable that such an industry might be heard to complain. But the United States hardwood plywood industry has not been denied relief because of diplomacy or Executive discretion in the light of broad national policies. Instead, the Tariff Commission found the industry was not being hurt by imports. Unless and until such injury can be shown, there is no basis for any kind of import restriction, either legislative or executive.

THE NEED FOR PLYWOOD IMPORTS

Imports of hardwood plywood have created more American jobs than they ever could conceivably threaten. As the Tariff Commission reported, domestic supplies not have been adequate to permit the growth in the United States door manufacturing industry. Many door manufacturers have written to tell their Congressmen that if these imports are stopped, we are out of business. Substantial segments of our furniture, boat-building, trailer-body and other industries would be similarly affected. These represent thousands of American jobs directly dependent on imports of the industrial raw materials processed and consumed in American plants.

In addition, since these imports provide dollars that make Japan a major market for United States goods, and the world's best cash customer for the products of America's farms, additional thousands of jobs in our export industries and on our farms are likewise dependent on maintaining this flow of imports.

CONCLUSION

It is a sound and an established principle that import restrictions should be avoided except where congressionally established procedures have been followed and a clear need for relief has been shown. The facts here show no need for import restrictions, whether by quota or otherwise. The expert body created by the Congress to investigate such claims has found no injury caused by imports. If circumstances have changed since that decision, there is no warrant for legislative action until the domestic industry has first established its case before the Tariff Commission in a new investigation.

This letter of Mr. Sharp's, with the enclosures, is of particular interest because an examination of Mr. Sharp's statement conclusively demonstrates the source of the material for the speech of April 24 of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER]. Indeed, Mr. Sharp and the gentleman from Oregon use the same similes, as in the mention of averaging the price of Fords, Edsels, Mercurys, and Lincolns in making a point relative to the softwood and hardwood plywood prices. This statement leads me to believe that much, if not all, of what the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER] had to say, must come from Sharp & Bogan, the Washington attorneys who represent the Japanese plywood users and Japanese producers. The insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD of April 28 clearly comes from these lobbyists.

TVA: Partner of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in this month, which marks the 25th anniversary of the establishment by the Congress of the Tennessee Valley Authority, it is appropriate that we review the history and achievements of this great national agency and particularly that we try to look at it without prejudice. In this connection, one of the things about the TVA which is not as well appreciated as it should be is the fact that the TVA is more than just an agency of the Government. In a very real sense, and to a perhaps unprecedented degree, the TVA represents a partnership between various levels of Government and the people themselves. This phase of the TVA is well recalled by Mr. Barrett C. Shelton, publisher of the Decatur (Ala.) Daily in an excellent article contributed to the May issue of the Progressive. Under unanimous consent I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article follows:

TVA: PARTNER OF THE PEOPLE

(By Barrett C. Shelton)

In this, the 25th anniversary year of TVA, many could point to its spectacular achievements—its system of great dams and unified control of a river system, its towering steam plants, the development of the largest electric generating system in the world, its tremendous contributions of power to atomic development and the national defense. My story concerns itself with people—the people of the TVA region and what they have accomplished in a quarter century of working partnership with TVA.

Years ago, in 1943, my paper, the Decatur Daily, editorially summed it up this way: "We can write of great dams * * * of the building of homegrown industry, and of electricity coming at last to the farms of thousands of farm people in the valley. Yet the significant advance has been made in the thinking of a people. They are no longer afraid. They have caught the vision of their own powers."

The best place to start a story is at the beginning and at home. For years before TVA, the progressive citizens of Decatur had tried to improve conditions, to establish a sound economy for the city and for its surrounding trade territory. The assets, the resources for growth were here, but we couldn't take advantage of them. Our agriculture was based on one cash crop—cotton, which drained soil of fertility and opened it to erosion. Past our door flowed the Tennessee River, majestically broad but largely useless. Its power was untapped, its navigation chiefly a local affair of no significance, its waters often dangerous in flood. Industry came hard, and it came for the wrong reasons—subsidies and low wages. Then came the great depression. Cotton was down to 5 cents a pound. The railroad shop, our major industry, closed down, putting 2,000 men and women out of work. Another industry, brought to the city in earlier years with a considerable subsidy, went bankrupt. Most of our banks were closed.

Then came TVA. In the beginning I was against it. Perhaps I feared the superstate which some people, mostly outside the val-

ley, had tried to call it. I knew I wanted no government control over me or my people. Others felt the same way. Into this almost frankly hostile atmosphere walked David Lilienthal, one of the TVA directors, one mid-winter afternoon. When we met in conference, our attitude was: "All right. You were not invited, but you're here. You are in command. Now, what are you going to do?"

Lilienthal's answer took us by surprise: "I'm not going to do anything. You're going to do it."

TVA had no intention of taking command. It had no powers beyond those traditional functions exercised elsewhere by the Government through other agencies. It would, Lilienthal explained, provide the tools of opportunity—a navigation channel, protection from floods, low-cost power, better fertilizers, and farm test demonstrations to show how they could be used. "What you do with these tools is up to you," he said.

Dr. Harcourt Morgan, another director, brought us the same word. He talked of the relationship of people to the land, of the need for building the soil with phosphate, lime, and legumes, of the need for farm markets and processing plants, of making the most of our own natural resources rather than reaching out into other regions for industry.

Here was a new insight into our problems and how to solve them. We looked about us, and we started to chart new courses. We saw we needed agriculture with a stable year-round income, and we induced the local ice company to install packing plant facilities to provide a market for livestock, a step toward more diversified agriculture. We scraped together the capital for a small milk plant, not hoping for a profit but simply to provide a paycheck every 2 weeks for farm families in our section. The plant was a success almost from the start. It paid substantial dividends to its rather surprised stockholders.

As the dams went up, navigation became a reality. Taking advantage of it, Nebraska Consolidated Mills Co. established Alabama Flour Mills at Decatur. Besides bringing in Midwest grain, the mills provided a market for local grain—$2 million worth in 1955. Grain barges now ply the length of the Tennessee, to mills and elevators at Guntersville, Ala., and Chattanooga and Knoxville, Tenn. Tennessee Valley Fertilizer Cooperative established a fertilizer-mixing plant serving 10 counties. The possibility of selling seed commercially led to establishing a modern seed-cleaning plant. Other industry has found the city attractive, and today, instead of a single major industry, there is a diversity of plants producing many products. The city has doubled in population, from 12,000 to more than 24,000. It feels it on a stable foundation, confident of its powers.

In all this development, the TVA has been a helpful adviser, never the dictator. It has provided technical services and facts about our resources, or about the requirements of industry, that we needed to know. "Here are the facts," has been its attitude, "and what you do with them is up to you."

That has been the story, all up and down the valley, in almost infinite variety. Far from taking the prerogatives of States, counties, cities, and citizens, the TVA has persistently urged them to take more and more responsibility to themselves. Its fertilizer and agricultural development activities has been channeled through the State extension services. TVA has operated in the confidence that once the facts and the tools were placed in the hands of the people, they would know what to do with them.

How well this yeast has permeated is perhaps epitomized by the comment of a mountain preacher who attended an agricultural extension meeting for farmers and ministers in a North Carolina county. "From now on," he said, "I'm going to preach less hell-fire and brimstone, and more phosphate and limestone."

About 50 miles upstream from Decatur, another small Alabama city, Guntersville, faced what at first seemed to its citizens an insurmountable problem. It was a trading center for surrounding farmers. When TVA began the construction of Guntersville Dam, 10 miles downstream, the people of Guntersville learned that the rising reservoir waters would cover much of the farmland on which their trade depended.

For many of the 3,000 people in the town, there seem to be only one answer to this dreary prospect. Town officials, businessmen bankers, and just ordinary citizens appealed to the TVA to buy the entire town, so they could take the cash and move.

Instead, TVA suggested the formation of a local planning commission to take a hard look at the problem and see what steps the town could take. TVA provided funds to the Alabama State Planning Commission to finance expert assistance to the local commission, and it cooperated by providing detailed maps and other data. The studies indicated that the town's income might be reduced as much as 30 percent. How could this be replaced? The answer was found in the new reservoir itself.

The commission set to work on a scheme to make the new reservoir an asset rather than a liability. It saw possibilities of industrial development and trade resulting from the new navigation channel, along with the opportunity of making the town a recreation center for a wide area. This called for detailed and careful planning in order to make the most of the waterfront. The town, after filling of the reservoir, would be on a peninsula, surrounded on three sides by water. A deep and navigable embayment on the east side of the town was set aside for commerce and industry; instead of purchasing and flood low-lying land on this side of the town, the TVA built a protective dike. West of the peninsula, a shallower embayment was planned for recreation.

When an oil company approached TVA for use of a small level area created by the dike at the north end of the town, jutting into the lake, of a bulk storage terminal, the decision was referred to the planning commission. The land, the commission decided, should be developed as a waterfront park, but it did not stop at this point. It worked with TVA and the oil company to find a suitable site on the industrial embayment for the terminal. Other similar decisions on detailed, practical matters were made.

The real test was yet to come, when Guntersville Dam was closed and the reservoir encircled the town. The doubts of all skeptics were soon resolved. In connection with the dedication of the dam, the town sponsored a program of motorboat races. It was hoped that several thousand people would be attracted to the event. More than 50,000 came. By 11 o'clock in the morning, all food and soft drinks were gone, highways were blocked with parked cars. None could miss the point of the demonstration. Guntersville's future as a recreation center was assured, and shortly its citizens were improving eating and housing facilities for guests and embarking on the sale of fishing tackle and boating gear.

Today Guntersville is a busy river port and recreation center. What seemed like impending ruin has been transformed into a prosperous present and a promising future. Huge three-deck automobile barges regularly flood the town's docks and automobiles for distribution through the southeast. An elevator receives midwest grain. Far from withering away, the town has doubled in population.

The case of Guntersville was typical of the way TVA enlisted the talents, energies, and resources of State and local agencies and of citizens. Wherever communities were faced with readjustments because of the building of dams and reservoirs, TVA urged the responsibility on State and local planning commissions, using the money it would otherwise have had to spend doing the job itself. The TVA funds helped set up the agencies. In 1933, there were no State and only two city planning agencies in the Valley. Today there are 6 State planning bodies and 65 local agencies, all operating independently and supported by State and community funds.

The same with libraries. Instead of setting up its own libraries at construction camps, TVA contracted with existing city libraries to provide service which was also open to nearby communities. When the construction jobs closed down, and TVA's support was withdrawn the libraries remained, supported by State and local funds. Moreover, they provided the seeds for expansion. Figures from Tennessee tell the story. In 1942–43, the State provided no funds for regional library service; TVA funds amounted to $13,800 and local funds a little over $4,000. Ten years later, TVA provided no funds, the State contributed $170,000 and local sources $125,000—a total of $295,000. Library service spread out to new territories.

Why this opportunity was seized is illustrated by the statement from one county facing the loss of library service when TVA support ceased: "We have 6,000 people—no telephones, no railroad, and no newspapers. The bookmobile and the grapevine are the only means of communication. Talk about country people not reading? In this county we read 4,000 books a month."

Take the forest resources. Forest and woodlands cover half the valley-land area. But in 1933 they were neglected, burned over, sometimes abandoned and eroded, seriously depleted. State forestry agencies were virtually inactive, no reforestation was going on, and protection against fire, except on Federal- or State-owned land, was practically nil. TVA moved in all these fronts. It began supplying seedlings for planting. It helped States and counties set up effective fire-prevention organizations. It made periodic and systematic inventories of forest resources.

State and local agencies pitched in. More than nine-tenths of the forests now have fire protection. Nearly 300,000 acres have been reforested. Today TVA, which once was the only source of seedlings, produces less than half of those planted by landowners each year. State forestry agencies have grown and the scope of their activities has been enlarged. Where they expended only half a million dollars in forest work in 1939, the same seven States invested nearly $15 million last year in promoting forest improvement.

This activity has paid off in better forest management and more forest income. New wood-using industries are appearing. Landowners are eager to plant trees and local bankers and businessmen are eager to help them by buying and loaning mechanical tree-planting equipment.

Full use of the forest resource also depends on other developments. The location of a multi-million-dollar paper and pulp plant by Bowaters Southern Paper Co. illustrates how the various phases of integrated development mesh together to promote industry. When Bowaters became interested in a southern location in the 1940's, TVA statistics showed that the forests and woodlands could supply a large plant in addition to the existing use. Pine plantations had reached the stage of thinning for pulpwood. Interest in forest management was gaining momentum. Electric power was available. Due to the multiple-purpose op-

tem of dams, a flood-free plant site could be found on the Hiwassee River arm of Chickamauga Reservoir, upstream from Chattanooga. Ample water was available for processing. The navigation channel offered opportunities for transportation of raw materials and finished products. In 1953, Bowaters had completed a $55 million plant which has since been expanded. It provides a market for wood over a 300-mile radius and, to round out the circle, this promotes more intense interest in forest development on the part of the Valley people.

Local pluck and perseverance, plus the tools provided by integrated resource development, have paid off in the past few years for Calvert City, a town of some 300 population in west Kentucky. The town and its trading area fell into decline after World War I, when the market for dark tobacco, the only kind that would grow well on its lands, disappeared. In 20 years, the county lost 5,000 population.

The Draffen brothers, Luther and Art, operators of the general store, kept pushing for something to be done about it. Resources were there: the Tennessee and Ohio Rivers, the Cumberland, and only 70 miles away the Mississippi formed a network of waterways for transportation and potential sources of power. Power was needed for industry to balance agriculture, but Calvert City couldn't even get electric lights until local citizens set up a generator in a flour mill. From the 1920's on, the Draffens and their fellow citizens sought, through Federal and State and private sources, for the kind of power they needed, and they plugged away at pointing out the advantages their area could offer industry. In the late 1940's, their dreams were realized. The Pennsylvania Salt Co. built a plant to be near the fluorspar deposits it had acquired in Kentucky and to take advantage of the power available from TVA. It was followed a few years later by the Air Reduction Co., and the National Carbon calcium carbide and acetylene plant. B. F. Goodrich Chemical Co. set up a plant to make basic vinyl chloride for its polyvinyl plastics from basic materials provided by the other plants.

Today Calvert City is struggling to keep abreast of the new industrial development, based on a chemical manufacturing complex it had sought so long, and it looks forward to a population of 10,000 by 1960.

So it goes, all up and down the valley region. Is it any wonder that we are sometimes astonished to learn, from outside critics, that we are obviously under the heel of an autocratic government agency, or at best, are the wards of a paternalistic socialism?

The real story of the past 25 years is a practical demonstration of the way the combined cooperative work of a forward-looking Federal agency, State and local agencies, educational institutions, and private citizens—farmers, labor, business, and professional men—can make the most out of the basic resources of a region. No State, no city, no county, no private enterprise could have developed the Tennessee River in a unified way to capture all the multiple benefits it offered, from its sources in the mountains to its mouth. Only the Federal Government, through the TVA, could have done it. At the same time, our experience over this past quarter century has shown that huge planning and engineering tasks can be undertaken and carried out without a loss of democratic values or freedoms. Quite the contrary; the combined efforts of the Federal Government and the people have opened up new and wider opportunities, have given scope to individual talents, intelligence, and enterprise. The result has been a richer, more productive region, and a richer, more productive Nation.

You Auto Buy Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the city of Cleveland, Ohio, not only is, but has long been advertised as the best location in the Nation. Its citizens are among the most civic-minded and progressive people in the United States. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is always a source of pride to those of us from the Cleveland area to see continuing evidence that our business, commercial, and industrial leaders are determined to keep Cleveland as the best location in the Nation.

Of late, we are particularly proud that the "you auto buy now" promotional campaign, which was just recently carried on in Washington, D. C., originated in Cleveland, and because of its profound and unusual success there, it spread rapidly to over 22 other main marketing areas in the Nation, as well as Canada and Hawaii.

The 138 members of the Cleveland Automobile Dealers Association started the "you auto buy now" campaign in an effort to battle the declining sales in automobiles. They commenced their campaign late in February with the overriding theme that by buying automobiles, Clevelanders would be doing their part in giving our economy a monetary shot in the arm.

The dealer group estimated that 3,300 new cars and 3,500 used cars were sold between February 23 and March 1. The 3,300 new cars sold topped by almost 800 total new-car sales—2,565—for the first 3 weeks in February.

All of us realize that keeping high prosperity going in this country is a job for many, diverse groups, all working together. Instead of trying to make political hay of an economic downturn, it seems to many individuals that if political and business leaders would emulate the Cleveland auto dealers, there would not be any economic hesitation in the coming months, but a steady drive toward top prosperity in all fields.

A most appropriate editorial which appeared in the Fort Lauderdale Daily News, Fort Lauderdale, Fla., follows:

IMPRESSIVE EXAMPLE

Advocates of the "Let's stop whining and start selling" remedy for licking our current business slump have a real impressive example of what can be accomplished under this philosophy from what happened in Cleveland, Ohio, recently.

Like a lot of other cities across the Nation, Cleveland has been suffering from a drastic slump in automotive sales. And since a major slump in new automobile sales invariably heralds a big slump, also, in other types of sales, a group of Cleveland businessmen and civic leaders decided to see if they couldn't pump some new life into the sagging automobile business.

These businessmen and civic leaders knew that Cleveland's dragging economy wasn't due to the fact that people didn't have money to spend. There was plenty of money stashed away in Cleveland banks and savings institutions. The big problem, therefore, was enticing some of this money out of the banks and into the retail trade channels.

So what these business people decided to do was to launch a massive selling campaign to get people who needed new cars, and who had the money available, to buy them. The entire last week of February was devoted to this selling campaign and all the automotive dealers, newspapers, radio, and TV stations and other business interests joined hands to put the campaign across to the people.

During that week Cleveland's 138 automobile dealers tripled their promotional and advertising outlays. Cleveland's 3 TV stations and 8 radio stations carried thousands of announcements on the campaign and the Cleveland newspapers published 5 editorials and 27 articles on the drive.

The whole theme of the campaign was based on the point that people who were working and who had money in the bank should stop worrying about the business slump and buy a new car if they needed one. By so doing, they would not only help themselves but they would give the city's overall economy a big shot in the arm.

How did Clevelanders react to this campaign? The results were quite astounding. During this 1 week they bought approximately 7,000 new automobiles. And, proving the point that there was no shortage of money behind the business slump, some 40 percent of the new-car sales were for cash while the downpayments on the remainder were exceptionally high.

So successful was this effort and so well did it shake the Cleveland people out of their pessimistic attitude toward buying things they needed that a similar "Auto Week" campaign has now been scheduled in 20 other cities.

What's the moral to all this? Simply that we don't have to sit around and wait for the Federal Government and the politicians to bail us out of our economic troubles.

A lot of businessmen in this Nation seem to have forgotten during our many years of peak prosperity that there might come a time when customers wouldn't be knocking down their doors wanting to buy their products. We have had so many years of "easy selling" that now that it is time to shift over to "hard selling" tactics many of our business institutions just simply can't get used to the idea that sometimes it takes more than a store or a showroom full of fancy, new products to get people in a buying mood.

People today are holding onto their dollars a good deal tighter than they were in past years. This means that to get them to turn loose of their dollars they not only have to be convinced they need a product, but that they will gain by buying it now instead of waiting until some future date.

In other words people have to be given some inducement to buy and whether it is given in the form of price cuts, more and better service, or simply more attention and courtesy extended to potential customers, it is the businessmen who are prepared to give these inducements who will be making sales while their less adaptable brothers continue moaning about hard times and keep demanding the Federal Government and the politicians come to their aid.

The Cleveland example has well proved that where businessmen are willing to go to work and help themselves there's still plenty of buying power to be tapped. This Nation is far from being broke. Plenty of people still have money stashed away to purchase things they need, but unless they are encouraged and induced by good salesmanship they aren't apt to part with their money.

The vast amount of money the American people have available to them today in the form of savings accounts, Government bonds and other liquid assets of all types is the greatest protection we could have against a serious depression.

But let the Federal Government and the politicians jump in and start another disastrous round of inflation with their anti-recession remedies and soon this big "savings cushion" against a depression will begin to be evaporated.

The people can buy themselves out of this business slump far better and faster than the Government can do it. And they will do it if our businessmen will just stop whining and start selling.

JACK W. GORE.

Why Not Send Food Instead of Dollars?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD an article from the Progressive Farmer by Matthew J. Kust. As pointed out in the preface to this article, "America is getting short of dollars. But it has warehouses bulging with Government-owned food. Everyone would benefit from our using more of this food in helping needy nations."

The article follows:

FOR MORE OF OUR FOREIGN AID—WHY NOT SEND FOOD INSTEAD OF DOLLARS?

(America is getting short of dollars. But it has warehouses bulging with Government-owned food. Everyone would benefit from our using more of this food in helping needy nations.)

(By Matthew J. Kust)

After a recent trip through rural India, I had to admit to myself that the land was as poor, the roads as bad, the villages as dilapidated, the people are undernourished and poorly dressed, and the animals as scrawny as they were when I first went through India 5 years ago. Since India has just completed her first 5-year plan—to which America has contributed $400 million—You might ask: "Why doesn't rural India show more improvement?"

Underemployment or unemployment is the answer. That's the reason the people in India and other underdeveloped countries have such a low standard of living. Many of them don't have a chance to work full time and earn enough money to feed and clothe their families.

India can't employ all of her people fully for the construction it needs so badly because the country doesn't produce enough food and fiber. A fully employed worker would spend most of his new wages on food and cloth. And since these things are so scarce, there would be runaway inflation. At least 25 million people in India are unemployed. It would take $1.5 billion in wages, at India's average pay of unskilled labor of 21 cents a day, to fully employ this manpower for the building and construction the country needs.

Families working on farms in India spend 85 cents of every $1 they take in to buy food. Yet these workers don't get enough to eat. They lack about 25 percent of getting the 3,000 calories that make up a normal diet. In India, 60 percent of all money spent by consumers is for food, compared with 35 percent in the United States. Two-thirds of any newly created wage incomes in India would be spent on food and cloth—about 50 percent or more on food and about 15 percent on cloth. The nation couldn't safely attempt full employment of her people unless she was assured of about 15 million tons of additional food a year. As for cloth, India is already importing raw cotton to meet her present needs. She is already troubled with sharply rising food prices, despite her unemployment. During the last year of India's first 5-year-plan, food prices rose 35 percent. Price of rice went up 38 percent; wheat, 46 percent; and jower, a coarse grain consumed by the poorest people, 186 percent. This inflation has continued ever since.

While India and many other underdeveloped countries are handicapped by lack of food and cloth, America and some other nations have a surplus of food and cotton. We're already giving the underdeveloped nations assistance through our vitally important foreign-aid program. Why not send them—for a larger part of this assistance—farm products instead of money?

Foreign aid with agricultural surpluses would supply the underdeveloped countries with the food and cloth they need for full employment. An assured supply of food and cloth should be promised then, for at least 5 years, with the plan to be continued, if successful.

Ideally, a plan of foreign aid based on agricultural surpluses would involve all the countries of the free world. The advanced countries would transfer their agricultural surpluses to the underdeveloped countries on a grant basis, while the underdeveloped countries with agricultural surpluses would have to be offered something in exchange. Burma and Egypt, for example, wouldn't join such a program unless they could exchange their present rice and cotton surpluses for something they need. Countries of the free world might establish a commodity exchange union which would operate to absorb and reallocate the agricultural surpluses of the underdeveloped countries. American wheat could be exchanged for Egyptian cotton and the cotton delivered to India. In this manner, Egypt would receive a greater supply of wheat, which she must normally import, and India a greater supply of cotton.

Raw cotton could be supplied by us to Japan to be manufactured into cloth for Burma. Japan could take Burma's rice in payment for her manufacturing services. The raw cotton would be furnished free of cost to Japan under the foreign-aid program. Triangular arrangements of this sort could form the basis of the commodity exchange union.

The free world could well get rid of its existing agricultural surpluses before fully meeting the needs of all the underdeveloped countries wanting to take part in the program. Rice might get in short supply. It is also possible that the supply of cotton might become scarce. Foreign workers would eat better food and wear better clothes as the underemployed earned larger incomes. India would require at least $1 billion worth of food and fiber a year from abroad to permit full employment of her manpower.

How long can an aid program based on agricultural surpluses be expected to last? Its objective would be met when the underdeveloped country has (1) created full and permanent employment for its people; and (2) developed its agriculture to supply the food and cloth they need. Tremendous population growth would make this a long-range-goal. But in most underdeveloped nations, these objectives should be achieved within 25 years.

Using more food in our vitally important foreign aid programs could in time solve our problem of farm surpluses. And it would make our economic assistance to underdeveloped countries more effective. Surely this plan is worth a try. Boost it all you can, won't you?

United States Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following Summation of Conflicting Views on United States Trade Policy, written by Mr. A. U. Fox, treasurer, American Thread Co.:

A SUMMATION OF CONFLICTING VIEWS ON UNITED STATES TRADE POLICY

The House Ways and Means Committee concluded hearings on March 26, 1958, on the administration bill, H. R. 10368, to extend for a further period of 5 years the authority of the executive branch of our Government to change tariff rates. The bill, as proposed, authorizes further substantial tariff reductions and would commit us to OTC, a policing agency for General Agreements on Tariff and Trade, an international agency consisting of representatives of 37 nations dedicated to reducing tariffs. The time for decision draws near, for the discretionary authority of the executive branch over our tariffs and trade under existing laws expires June 30, 1958, unless renewed. It is time to take stock of the situation and assess the merits of the respective positions of those in favor of the administration bill and of those opposed to its enactment in its form proposed.

Proponents of continuing the trade policies of the past 10 years seem to predicate their position on fear and emotion, rather than on a reasonable interpretation of economic and historical facts.

Proponents say they are for trade. So are all of us—but the right kind of trade that does not endanger our national security and deprive our workers of jobs. Only a small portion of our trade requires regulation, and it is that part of our trade which is of concern to those who oppose H. R. 10368.

Most of our trade—all of our present export trade and from 60 to 70 percent of our import trade needs no OTC, GATT, or arbitrary authority abdicated to the executive branch by Congress. Why? First, because our present export trade is either jumping the many barriers imposed by foreign countries, or is needed by them, and such barriers as do exist do not impede its movement. Second, because 60 to 70 percent of our imports enter the United States essentially free of duty.

The kind of trade opponents of H. R. 10368 object to is the kind of trade which deprives our workers of jobs and endangers our national security. This is a small portion of our total trade. Let us open our eyes and recognize that many of our industries—essential to our welfare—simply are not and cannot be competitive with foreign produced goods when manufacturing equipment and processes are comparable, raw materials are available to others at equal or in many instances at lower prices than to our own manufacturers, and the cost of labor is a tenth to a half what it is here. Creative ingenuity and mass production methods can do much to offset these terrific handicaps, but the fact is that the productivity

gap between the United States and the rest of the world is disappearing. If we wish to avoid massive adjustments to our complicated industrial complex and if we wish to maintain—let alone raise—our standard of living, the time has come to face the cold facts of international industrial competition.

We all agree we have got to have the good will of the free world. Some of us, however, do not seem to realize that the best of good will is as nothing without national strength.

Proponents of these bills also say we must further reduce our tariffs or else suffer the inevitable alternative of increasingly high barriers against our own commerce. Well, the facts are that we have reduced our tariff rate drastically in the past 10 years, and foreign nations have responded by increasing their barriers against our trade, or have made very much smaller reductions. Also, foreign countries employ many, many measures other than tariffs to prevent us from selling our manufactured goods to them—quotas, import licenses, currency restrictions, advance deposits, exchange restrictions exchange taxes, multiple exchange rates, preferential exchange systems, preferential trade systems—and many others. All in all foreign nations have found dozens of ways to impede the entry of our manufactured goods other than by resorting to tariffs—but these other measures are equally if not more effective than tariffs.

We are assured by proponents of the legislation that minor modifications in escape procedures will provide quicker relief for United States industries faced with injury and possible extinction. This protestation is specious. The record of the executive branch speaks eloquently that this assurance is without substance. During the past 10 years, the executive branch has ignored or reversed two-thirds of the escape-clause recommendations of the professional experts of the Tariff Commission. The pangs of industry death and worker joblessness will be no less painful to those industries and workers arbitrarily selected for sacrifice because the end may come a month or so sooner. The claimed benefit is illusory, the damage and injury real.

Proponents plead for the 4,500,000 jobs they allege are dependent on continuation of the unwise trade policies followed in recent years. First, this figure is of questionable reliability according to the Randall staff papers and Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Affairs, Samuel W. Anderson. Second, is it a singular coincidence that immediately following the end of the year in which United States exports reached their highest level in history, and the year in which our imports were their greatest, our unemployment also rose to its post-World War II peak? Even were the 4,500,000 figure correct, these jobs are not dependent on continuation of the trade policies followed by the executive branch in recent years. The fact is most of these jobs are dependent on the kind of trade which does not require OTC, GATT, or arbitrary authority of the executive branch over our trade and tariffs.

Our own Government experts tell us more than 15 million persons directly or indirectly derive their living from the cotton textile industry. In the apparel and textile mill products alone, more than 2 million are employed. The welfare of this important segment of our population should not be trifled with. And this is one one of many industries.

Peculiar results have come from this arbitrary authority so zealously sought by the executive branch. Since World War II, in respect to one industry alone, our Government has made available to the textile manufacturers of foreign countries $130 million worth of the most modern textile machinery. How much additional such equipment has been obtained as an indirect result of our grants, loans, and aid is incalculable. What has been the result? Under the unwise policies followed by the executive branch, the number of cotton-spinning spindles in the United States in the last 2 years has decreased 1,051,000 or 5 percent of the total spindles in place in our country. And what has happened in foreign countries in this respect? Well, in this industry of known worldwide excess productive capacity, the number of cotton-spinning spindles in Asia in the same 2 years has increased by 4,738,000 or 16 percent. Can anyone believe that our workers are not affected by massive changes of this kind?

It is claimed by supporters of the Trades Acts program that if we do not continue present trade policies, Russia will be able to wean friendly countries away from the free world to the Communist orbit. This appeal to fear carelessly overlooks the obvious fact that any time we wish we can resume bilateral trade negotiations with any friendly country with a view to establishing reciprocal—truly reciprocal—trading arrangements. We don't have to rely on 36 foreign nations, members of GATT, to do this for us. And the proof of this is the so-called voluntary self-imposed Japanese quota on textile exports, negotiated by the executive branch.

This horrendous mirage of fear over the inevitability of Soviet success is presented in torrid prose as a solid fact despite the fact it is well known that Soviet promises are ephemeral, their reliability always questionable, their goods shipments poor in quality, late in delivery, and often surprising in content. All nations wooed by the Soviet know the risks of matrimony with the tiger; the broken pledge, the bartered commodity, dumped in the world's market, to undermine the deluded wooed one's economy. All seem to know this except our own executive branch and the proponents of a continuation of the foolish policies of the past 10 years. The world of friendly nations cries out for bilateral negotiation and trade agreements with the United States. Of this all are aware except those who will not see. Nations of the friendly world well know the United States can do better for itself, for them, and for the free world when it looks to its own interests itself, instead of delegating this preeminent responsibility to 36 foreign nations—many not so friendly, some even Iron Curtain satellites.

The temporary legislation introduced by Cordell Hull known as the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, subsequently extended 10 times over 24 years, had as its objective the bilateral arrangement of commercial agreements with foreign countries for the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States. During the first 14 years of the trade agreements program, 33 such bilateral agreements were negotiated by the executive branch. Since 1947, however, not one single admitted such arrangement has been entered into. Instead, the executive branch without the authority of our Congress, shifted to a multilateral system of arranging trade commitments, and since 1947 GATT has dominated our trade and tariff policies. It is during this period the most drastic reductions in our tariffs have occurred. But foreign countries have not reciprocated. Why should they? They are judge and jury, and outvote the United States 36 to 1, in the international conclave to which we have delivered the national security and welfare of the United States. Despite all of this our commercially paid for exports to foreign countries have declined steadily as a percentage of our gross national product since the enactment of this program in 1934.

As administered, the trade act program has not been productive of reciprocity. With our trade and tariff adjustments determined by those with conflicting interests contrary to ours, how could it be otherwise? Reciprocal arrangements, truly reciprocal, can only be the product of bilateral negotiations when we are on one side of the table and the other party to the contract is on the opposite side of that table.

Equally hollow are claims we cannot protect ourselves against the adverse economic effects of the European common market unless we continue the control GATT now has over our trade and tariff policies for another 5 years. How in the name of commonsense can we expect foreign nations, some of them the very common market countries we are concerned about, to protect our national interests better than we ourselves can in bilateral negotiations? The claim is so specious as to need no refutation.

We should and we do want friendly countries to be strong. We should do everything we can to be sure they are strengthened. But it is not sensible to weaken ourselves while trying to strengthen them. Other ways exist to help our friends abroad and they should be used for the purpose—grants, loans, technical know-how, private investment, military equipment, are examples. The burden of helping other countries should be borne by all Americans—not by just a few groups of workers or communities. Merely because the executive branch has found it difficult to obtain funds for foreign aid, it should not by its trade policy endeavor to obtain by indirection what it is reluctant to try to obtain directly. If we made a mistake originally in not surrounding the aid with adequate safeguards to prevent unwise use being made of it, let us not compound that mistake now by making another.

Finally, the case for a continuation of recent policies and procedures has become an emotional appeal to give the executive branch a blank check over trade policies and tariff rates, else dire results will ensue. Dire results will ensue if this program is continued in its present form. No valid factual case to the contrary has been made. Citation of imports and exports of the electrical machinery, chemical, and textile industry products is patently an attempt to obscure the facts. These are large industries with many segments, related, but independent in their struggle for survival. What we export is not the same as what we import, neither are the goods sent to or received from the same country. Small segments of our industries have been and can be all but obliterated. A continuation of the policies of the past 10 years has potential for irreparable further damage to our national welfare.

The time has come for a change. The executive branch has demonstrated no capacity to wield this great power over trade wisely. It should be withdrawn and returned to the control of our elected representatives, acting administratively through an adequately staffed and strong Foreign Trade Board.

Democrats Playing Politics With River-Harbor Bill, Says Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Longview Daily News, one of the leading daily newspapers in western Washington, thinks the Democrats are playing politics with the river and harbor-flood control bill that was vetoed by the President.

The Longview editor thinks the Democrats expected a Presidential veto, and now that it is vetoed that they will not override the veto and will take no action to pass a bill minus the wasteful projects.

Of the river and harbor-flood control bill situation, the Longview News says editorially:

President Eisenhower last week vetoed a $1½ billion flood-control authorization measure because some of the projects in the bill would have been wasteful or unnecessary. He has said that he will sign the bill if Congress will simply take out the wasteful projects.

Will Congress do this? Reports from the Capitol today say probably not. The reason is that the Democratic majority is more interested in allowing the veto to stand, thereby letting the blame for a lot of hometown projects not being approved rest on the White House.

Congress had a chance to make the corrections before the bill was passed originally, but refused to do so. It passed the bill fully expecting a veto, and that is just what was forthcoming. Now it could override the veto, inasmuch as the Democrats have a clear majority, but instead of doing that or amending te bill, it is expected that the veto will be left alone with the result that no new flood-control projects at all will be approved this year.

Bombings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement issued by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith:

The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith on April 30, 1958, placed before United States Attorney General William P. Rogers a record of 45 bombing outrages that have occurred in the South since January 1, 1957, showing "that the Federal authorities do have jurisdiction in the matter and that Federal action is evidently needed."

Henry Howard Schultz, national chairman of the league, appealed for Federal intervention "to prevent further bombing outrages" in a letter and memorandum to the Attorney General after a meeting with Assistant Attorney General W. Wilson White on Monday, April 26, immediately after the Jacksonville synagogue bombing. Mr. Schultz stressed that although local authorities have basic responsibility for prosecuting the criminals, the situation involves numerous Federal violations and calls for action by the Department of Justice to avoid "loss of life in addition to the considerable losses of property that have been sustained up to this date."

He pointed out that of the 45 bombing incidents against religious institutions, public schools, community centers and other property," 6 were upon places of Jewish worship, all occurring since November 1957. An examination of the facts in all of these instances, we believe, bears out our contention that the Federal authorities do have jurisdiction in the matter and that Federal action is evidently needed."

Mr. Schultz emphasized that "the number to which these incidents has grown indicates the probability that they are not unrelated events. Indeed, in our view, there is clear evidence that there is a virtual Southwide conspiracy of lawless elements. For example, after some of the explosions, persons who knew of them before they became matters of public knowledge telephoned to say that the bombings were perpetrated by an organization described variously as the Confederate Union or the Confederate underground.

"In other instances, before the bombings occurred, telephone calls were received by newspapers and others stating that the attacks were part of a concerted plan to warn against the continued use of religious institutions for the promotion of equal rights. Those involved were threatened with violence and death."

The operations of this terrorist conspiracy, the league added, "have crossed State lines, in itself a Federal violation. In the most recent bombing in Jacksonville, Fla., on April 28, an automobile observed at the scene of the crime bore a Tennessee license plate. In the March 16 Nashville and Miami bombings, the similarity of the dynamiting techniques justify the inference that they stemmed from the same source."

The league told Attorney General Rogers that "the 45 incidents—their elements of similarity coupled with the threatening statements—demonstrate a plot to overthrow established constitutional order by force and violence. This is a violation of the Smith Act."

Further, the league said, "the purpose of this conspiracy is to intimidate its victims into abandoning their federally secured rights to vote, to freedom of assembly and to freedom of religion. This, in our considered opinion, violates the Federal civil rights law."

Mr. Schultz declared that "these bombings in different areas of the South may well involve interstate transportation of explosives in common carriers. If this is so, the United States Criminal Code was violated. This, too, would seem to call for careful investigation of the entire matter by Federal law enforcement authorities."

The league also pointed out that "a number of the telephone calls made in connection with the Nashville bombing of March 16 included threats of violence against a Federal judge. This is a Federal crime in and of itself. If any of the telephone threats made to private persons were effected through any medium of interstate commerce, this would also be a violation of Federal law."

The foregoing facts, the league concluded, make out a clear case for Federal investigation and for Federal intervention to bring the criminals to judgment. "We urgently submit," it said, "that the cause of law and order in the South will be served by such action on the part of the United States Department of Justice."

BOMBINGS OF RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS, SCHOOLS, AND OTHER PROPERTY, 1957 TO DATE

1. January 7, 1957, Beaumont, Tex.: Bomb went off outside home of Dr. Ed Sprott, a Negro physician and former NAACP official.

2. January 7, 1957, Mobile, Ala.: Bomb did little damage to the home of Walter Johnson, a Negro.

3. January 9, 1957, Montgomery, Ala.: Bombs caused damages at 4 locations:

4. (a) Home of Rev. Robert Graetz, a Negro minister.

5. (b) Home of Rev. Ralph D. Abernethy, a Negro minister.

6. (c) Rev. Abernethy's First Baptist Church. (d) Hutchinson Street Baptist Church.

7. January 9, 1957, Beaumont, Tex.: Bomb was set off under the home of Mr. and Mrs. Grover Lee Myles, a Negro couple residing in a mixed neighborhood.

8. January 1957, Americus, Ga.: Koinonia Farm's roadside market was blasted by dynamite.

9. January 27, 1957, Montgomery, Ala.: Attempt to blow up the home of Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., Negro minister, misfired.

10. January 27, 1957, Montgomery, Ala.: A bomb was tossed between a Negro home and a filling station, caused damage to both buildings.

11. January 28, 1957, Beaumont, Tex.: A bomb blew up the body of a truck parked near the county courthouse and owned by State Representative Rufus Kilpatrick.

12. January 28, 1957, Beaumont, Tex.: A blast damaged the entrance to St. Michael's Orthodox Church.

13. January 28, 1957, Beaumont, Tex.: Windows in a home near the First Christian Church were damaged by a blast.

14. February 14, 1957, Clinton, Tenn.: A suitcase of dynamite exploded in the heart of the Negro section, injuring a woman, an 11-month-old baby, and wrecking property over a wide area including a nearby restaurant.

15. February 18, 1957, Mobile, Ala.: The home of Walter Johnson, a Negro, was again damaged by a bomb.

16. February 19, 1957, Knoxville, Tenn.: Dynamite explosion reverberated through Municipal Building where Negro Louis Armstrong's band played to a segregated audience.

17. February 1957, Americus, Ga.: Second bombing of Koinonia Farm's roadside market.

18. April 29, 1957, Bessemer, Ala.: Blast at Allen Temple A. M. E., a Negro church.

19. April 29, 1957, Bessemer, Ala.: Explosion at the home of Asbury Howard, a Negro and international vice president of the United Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers.

20. May 25, 1957, Chattanooga, Tenn.: House of R. H. Craig, Negro attorney, dynamited.

21. September 9–10, 1957, Nashville, Tenn.: The new Hattie Cotton Elementary School was virtually destroyed by dynamite.

22. October 2, 1957, Greensboro, N. C.: Explosion at Negro man's home 2 blocks from white school his children now attend—Elijah Herring.

23. November 1, 1957, Bessemer, Ala.: A dynamite blast damaged the home of a Negro attorney, David Hood, Jr., who is attempting to open Bessemer's 2 public parks to Negroes.

24. November 11, 1957, Charlotte, N. C.: Bombing attempt at Temple Beth-El failed.

25. November 5, 1957, Charlotte, N. C.: Police investigating 3 dynamiting incidents in Negro section since Oct. 27; latest explosion in vacant house practically destroyed.

26. November 16, 1957, Gaffney, S. C.: Bomb failed to go off at the home of a white woman, wife of Dr. James H. Sanders, who had written an article advocating a moderate approach in racial relations.

27. November 19, 1957, Gaffney, S. C.: Another attempt to bomb the home of Mrs. Sanders failed.

28. November 20, 1957, Gaffney, S. C.: This time a blast went off at the home of Mrs. Sanders, causing some damage.

29. November 20, 1957, Cherokee County, S. C.: Blast rocked the home of a Negro tenant farmer, Lewis Ford.

30. November 26, 1957, Ringgold, Ga.: Attempt to dynamite the home of Philip Higgins, a Negro, failed.

31. December 7, 1957, Birmingham, Ala.: Two dynamite blasts shattered a home into which a Negro family (Robert Greer) was preparing to move.

32. December 31, 1957, Birmingham, Ala.: Home of Negro family which moved into white neighborhood—damaged by bomb explosion—home owned by Otis Flowers.

33. December 31, 1957, Little Rock, Ark.: Mrs. L. C. Bates, Arkansas president NAACP reported an attempt to bomb her home.

34. January 1, 1958, Charlotte, N. C.: The marquee at a drive-in theater that admits both Negro and white patrons, was dynamited.

35. January 19, 1958, Chattanooga, Tenn.: An explosion damaged Howard School for Negroes.

36. January 19, 1958, Tulsa, Okla.: A crude bomb did little damage to a home occupied by a Negro family (that of Johnny Gamble) who had moved in 2 months before.

37. February 9, 1958, Gastonia, N. C.: Bombing attempt at Temple Emanuel also failed.

38. February 15, 1958, Charlotte, N. C.: Five men arrested for attempting to dynamite a county Negro elementary school.

39. February 17, 1958, Atlanta, Ga.: A dynamite blast damaged a Negro's home in a white section.

40. March 16, 1958, Miami, Fla.: Dynamite blast did at least $30,000 worth of damage to Temple Beth El's school-recreation annex.

41. March 16, 1958, Nashville, Tenn.: Dynamite blast ripped the front of the Jewish Community Center building.

42. March 17, 1958, Atlanta, Ga.: Dynamite damaged an unoccupied house recently sold to a Negro in a predominantly white neighborhood.

43. April 27, 1958, Jacksonville, Fla.: Dynamite blast at Jewish Center.

44. April 27, 1958, Jacksonville, Fla.: Bombing damaged the entrance way of a Negro school, the James Weldon Johnson Junior High School.

45. April 28, 1958, Birmingham, Ala.: Dynamiting of Temple Beth-El misfired.

Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958

SPEECH
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12065) to authorize temporary unemployment benefits for individuals who exhaust their benefit rights under existing unemployment compensation laws, and for individuals who were employed in noncovered employment.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I think most of us agree that unemployment compensation is a necessity at this time in helping to check the recession and in aiding the more than 5 million who are unemployed. It is over the degree of extension of these benefits that we do not see eye to eye.

The bill, as reported out by the Ways and Means Committee, seeks to provide temporary unemployment compensation to those who have already exhausted these benefits to which they are entitled, as well as to those who are not covered under the unemployment insurance law. Figures just issued for the month of April show that unemployment has not decreased to the extent as expected by the administration. Within a few weeks many college and high-school graduates will be entering the labor market, perhaps as many as 1½ million young men and young women.

It is quite clear that unless there is a successful effort to halt the current recession and to expand the economy of the country, we may shortly be faced with an unemployment of some 6 million persons. The bill reported out by the committee is such an attempt and will accomplish that purpose, namely, help to halt the recession and add to the purchasing power of the unemployed.

The cost of this program, as we already know, is estimated at $1.47 billion. I think it is erroneous to consider it a dole, as some of us unfortunately do, but rather to look upon it as an investment in an economy whose recovery we are seeking in the best and quickest way. Economic depression has a way of feeding upon itself. If we ignore the plight of the 5 million unemployed, we may be confronted with a much more serious situation in the near future which will require much more drastic steps.

By substituting the so-called Herlong amendment to the committee bill we are ignoring the plight of the unemployed in two major respects. In the first place, the unemployment compensation benefits are more limited as to the number of weeks and also because of the fact that the funds are in the nature of loans to the States, and some States will hesitate to proceed with this program if the funds are to be repaid.

The second and perhaps greater objection is the fact that under the Herlong amendment nearly 2 million unemployed workers will not be entitled to unemployment compensation because they work or have worked in noncovered or uninsured industries. In accepting this amendment we are actually discriminating against these 2 million unemployed and their families, which may mean perhaps as many as 8 or 10 million individuals. Is their degree of suffering any less than that of the other unemployed? This, to me, constitutes a clear case of gross discrimination.

Mr. Chairman, I am strongly opposed to substituting the administration bill for the much more liberal committee bill. The former is entirely inadequate. It is merely another holding act, a wait-and-see attitude. It will be of little help and it will solve nothing. Our failure to take adequate action now may cost us a great deal more later. I urge you to vote against the amendment and to support the bill, H. R. 12065, the measure as reported out by the committee.

The Dole Is Defeated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to a most excellent editorial that appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on Saturday, May 3. It is encouraging to note that at least some of the activities on the floor of the Congress are deserving of editorial praise:

THE DOLE IS DEFEATED

The defeat in the House of Representatives of the Democratic-inspired measure to pay a Federal dole to everyone without a job, regardless of need or whether he had ever worked or had ever been covered by State unemployment compensation laws, should go a long way toward removing the fear that Congress might go haywire in its efforts to deal with the recession. And the removal of this fear should strengthen confidence in the soundness of our economic system, which in itself might prove to be a good antidote for the recession.

In place of the dole, the House accepted and passed the administration bill to extend unemployment compensation for 50 percent of the normal period to those who have exhausted or will exhaust their State benefits, but under State laws and regulations. In most States this would mean a continuation of unemployment compensation for 13 weeks, or a total of 39. As always, it is up to the States to make provision for the needy unemployed who are not eligible for unemployment compensation.

The Democratic measure almost certainly would have led to the destruction of the State unemployment compensation system, for once the precedent was established of paying a Federal dole to everyone out of work, it would have become virtually impossible to rescind the procedure.

State unemployment compensation funds have been amassed through a tax on payrolls paid by employers. The theory is that the funds are built up during good times and are then available to alleviate distress during bad times. Under the administration plan, the money to extend the payments would be advanced by the Federal Government and repaid later either from State funds or higher payroll taxes.

Advocates of the Federal dole evidently think a money tree grows in Washington and that it can be shaken every time a vote-catching device to spend money is proposed. What they don't realize is that the Federal Government has no money of its own to spend, but must first extract it from the taxpayers.

The West Indies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to attend the inauguration of the Parliament of the new West Indies nation on April 22 as a member of the official delegation from the United States Congress consisting, in addition, of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DIGGS], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

On our return from the ceremonies at Port-of-Spain, Trinidad, we dispatched the following letter to West Indies Prime Minister, the Honorable Sir Grantley Adams, K. T., C. M. G., Q. C.:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

The Honorable SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS,
K. T., C. M. G., Q. C.,
Prime Minister, the West Indies,
Red House Port of Spain, Trinidad.

DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER: We, the undersigned, wish to express our deep appreciation of the warm reception and the honor which you accorded in receiving and introducing us to the members of your cabinet on that historic occasion when you were first convening. On our return to Washington, we felt called upon to report in detail to the House of Representatives our vivid impressions with regard to the West Indies and its leaders. We enclose herewith a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 24 recording these remarks which are to be found on pages 6416–6419. We are sending additional copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to Mr. Walter Orebaugh, the American consul general, in order that he may make them available to the members of your cabinet and legislature.

The remarks which we have made for the RECORD reflect our appreciation of the reception accorded us as representatives of the United States and our own impressions of the statesmanship so evident to us while we were in your beautiful country. They do not, however, reflect fully the warmth of friendship which we each and everyone feels as the result of this experience.

We understand that an invitation has been transmitted to the West Indies to send representatives to Washington to explore ways and means wherein the United States may assist in meeting some of your economic needs. We look forward to that visit and trust that when the delegation is here, we shall have the pleasure of becoming better acquainted.

We look forward to watching the political and economic development of the West Indies and shall read with interest the progress of your government within the next few months as well as in the years to come.

You and your people have many close friends in our country. Therefore, you may rest assured that we welcome you to Federation status and will follow your progress toward democratic statehood.

Most sincerely,

CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr.,
Congressman from Michigan.
JOHN M. ROBSION, Jr.
Congressman from Kentucky.
CRAIG HOSMER,
Congressman from California.
ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr.,
Congressman from New York.

An informative article regarding the beginnings of self-rule in the West Indies written by Robert R. Brunn appeared in the Christian Science Monitor shortly following the inauguration. It was as follows:

SELF-RULE BEGINS IN WEST INDIES

(By Robert R. Brunn)

PORT OF SPAIN, TRINIDAD.—Government by the people of the West Indies became a reality April 22, and they stood massed along the streets of Port of Spain under a scorching sun to cheer.

Great Britain in the person of a radiant Princess Margaret inaugurated the newly elected Parliament. She drove through exuberant crowds to the Red House, the legislative chamber.

And from now on, the representatives in the federal assembly, headed by Prime Minister Sir Grantley H. Adams, who were jammed into the tiny chamber with scores of visiting officials, are in the driving seat.

PEOPLE PREPARED

They expect to move forward although it will take courage. Yet this has been shown before in the formation of this newest of all nations to be. It took 10 years of what Sir Grantley described, in replying to the Princess, as "patient study, negotiation, conference, debate, and action."

It is argued by many here that the people of the new island federation have only the haziest notion of the implications of their political move away from colonial status. This may be so in terms of political sophistication.

But standing in front of the Red House, bespangled and bannered in white, blue, and orange before the ceremony, this seemed unimportant. For the boys perched like crows in the saman trees and gaudily dressed ranks of citizens under bright umbrellas on the sidewalks were cheering one thing—the twin ideas of national entity and freedom and racial equality. They know what these are.

And inside the Red House, symbolically enough in one row of visitors, sat Aly Khan of Pakistan, Boahene Yeboah Afari of Ghana, and two American Negro Congressmen, ADAM C. POWELL, Jr., of New York, and CHARLES C. DIGGS, of Michigan.

CABINET SELECTION

All eyes were on Princess Margaret with her diamond tiara and shimmering white gown studded with gold and crossed by a dark blue order ribbon. But on this national holiday minds were on the future. A senate has been established with representatives from each island. Elections have chosen the senators.

Next comes careful policy in choosing a cabinet. Sir Grantley, himself from Barbados, apparently took meticulous care to have a wide geographic spread. Last weekend 4 ministries were assigned to the Windward Islands, 2 to the Leeward, 2 apiece to Jamaica and Barbadoes, and 1 to Trinidad. These last three are the big islands, the leaders of the federation, if you will.

But if this nation, plunked into the blue-green sea covering thousands of miles, is to be federated, all must be valued as the Trinidad Guardian put it: "The main thing was to get together the best working and supporting team that was possible in the circumstances."

Sir Grantley had no easy task in forming his government. The most prominent West Indian politicians, such as Norman Manley, Sir William Alexander Bustamente of Jamaica, and Eric Williams of Trinidad were not interested in federation office. He was naturally limited to his own Federal Labor Party. Considering the tight division in the senate with the Federals having a probable 24 seats to the opposition Democrats (Democratic Labor Party) having 20, some wonder if a coalition government might not have been better. But it was too late and Sir Grantley moved ahead.

TIME ELEMENT LOOMS

This political split in the senate raises the question whether the government will be able to stand for the 5 allotted years after which the federation will become a full-fledged dominion.

Sir Grantley has an unsafe margin, even if all the members lived on the same island.

As it stands, ministers and senators traveling out of the West Indies for any period of time put the government in political danger. Moreover, there are two fluid Federal votes nominally pledged to Sir Grantley but quite uncertain over the long pull. Another question facing the senate will be that of amendment of the federal constitution. Already the vague nature of Governor General Lord Hailes' role, as outlined, is being criticized.

The cry is going up that these powers must be clearly specified so that this 5-year interim period will test the federation. It will be the usual struggle facing any new union—how much power to give the central government. And when the constituent states are islands, some of them mere specks in the Caribbean, the problem is further complicated. Yet the hurrahs that drifted through the Red House's open windows were promising that nationalism is a resistless force.

A sample of the hopeful reception giving the newest of the world's legislative bodies by the press of the United States was found on the editorial page of the Washington Post and Times Herald on inauguration day. The editorial said:

PARLIAMENT IN BIRTH

The sun is shining with special brightness today in Port of Spain, Trinidad. This buoyant little island is the seat of government of our newest neighbor, the West Indies Federation, and today marks the formal opening of the federation's first legislature. Presiding at the festive occasion will be Princess Margaret, whose last visit to the island of calypso in 1955 was a rousing success. Thus, amid pomp and playful song, the long-cherished dream of federating the 13 British-administered islands in the Caribbean will draw close to full realization.

The Federation's first prime minister will be Sir Grantly Adams, an Oxford-educated moderate from Barbados, who was chosen by a narrow margin last Friday. (Barbados, incidentally, is an island which has boasted its own representative institutions since 1627). Sir Grantley, a member of the Federal Labor Party, will need all his energy and skill to knit into union the widely separated and proudly individual cluster of islands. Some of the immediate problems facing the new government will be the forging of a customs union and the development of a common citizenship which will permit free movement between the islands. The long-range challenge will be to meliorate the poverty which afflicts so many of the islands and to develop fully the rich resources of the area, which include bauxite, asphalt, cocoa, sugarcane, bananas—and many enviable lures for American tourists.

To be sure, the federation is not yet fully self-governing. But according to the timetable set in London, the 3 million subjects in the West Indies will arrive at dominion status in about 5 years. Surely the birth of a new parliament is a proud moment for Great Britain and for the hemisphere. Strong ties of legend and history link the United States to the West Indies—an area which Columbus explored, George Washington visited, and in which Alexander Hamilton was born. The progress of the new federation will be followed with affection and interest in the United States.

Don't Sell This Country Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution, daily newspaper of Atlanta, Ga., made a wise editorial comment recently. It said:

Perhaps we can't talk our way out of the recession. But we can talk our way in deeper.

The editorial scores the crepe hangers and prophets of gloom "who can make the patient much worse than he is." The Constitution editorial follows:

DON'T SELL THIS COUNTRY SHORT

If enough people repeatedly tell a fairly healthy person he looks sick, pretty soon he is apt to become convinced he is quite ill and will govern himself accordingly.

To a certain extent, the same can apply to the economy.

That does not mean the current recession is a figment of the imagination. On the contrary, it is quite real. Unemployment has shot upward and industry has become quite jittery.

Prophets of gloom can make the patient much worse than he actually is. Some of the results they have achieved is reflected in findings of a survey which showed that consumers express declining confidence in business and plan to reduce their own outlays. But in the same survey very few consumers expected their own incomes to diminish. Then why do they plan to cut their expenditures? The answer to a great extent (is) they have been listening to the crepe hangers. * * *

Perhaps we can't talk our way out of the recession. But we can talk our way in deeper.

If it takes a little pump-priming to chase away the recession let's have it—and let's have it administered judiciously. At the same time, let's banish fear and place more confidence in the tremendous potential of this Nation which still is the most prosperous in the world. Let's not sell it short.

THE BRIGHTER SIDE

On the brighter side, even in the midst of the recession, there are many signs that an upturn is on the way. We should talk at least as much about the good things which are occurring in the economy as the bad.

One newspaper which is doing this is the Aberdeen Daily World, of Aberdeen, Wash., which while reporting factual information daily about the recession also, at the top of its front page, each day carries a two-column box that reports an encouraging development that will add to people's optimism and faith in the future. These two-column news boxes are headed "On the brighter side." During the past 10 days these front page boxes in the Aberdeen Daily World, a city of 22,000, have reported such items as:

Contract is to be let within 3 weeks for a new $1,500,000 Aberdeen community hospital.

Aberdeen city council to open bids May 7 for $1,500,000 sewage disposal plant.

Five big construction outfits, supplied by equal number of pipe and foundry companies, will build Hoquiam's new $1,700,000 pollution and drainage control project now entering its third week of construction. (Hoquiam adjoins Aberdeen.)

May 6 is red-letter day for Aberdeen and the Twin Harbor's area for on that day four major road projects are to be let for this area at an estimated cost of $1,955,000.

Nearly $500,000 of dredging and navigation and port facilities improvements are planned by the Port of Grays Harbor for the next 20 months.

Hopes for fuller employment by Grays Harbor Chair & Manufacturing Co. are being based on a new assembly plant to start operations in Philadelphia June 1, President W. H. Schuh said today. With the new Philadelphia assembly plant in operation, Schuh said, Grays Harbor Chair hopes to keep its three plants here on a full-time basis. The firm has 350 employees here.

Four new motels will be opened this summer to tourists at Westport, oceanside resort town, 20 miles west of Aberdeen, and five other motels there are expanding facilities. New houses continue to go up.

A new alder-faced cabinet product, some retooling and additions to its crew, is in line for Major Line Products Co., Manager Gordon Goheen announces. Goheen said Major Line is bringing back some of its former crew members and will have a working force of 50 men within 3 weeks.

The State game department is spending $75,000 to redo its Lake Aberdeen fish-rearing pond and will double its capacity.

Newspapers elsewhere would render, as does the Aberdeen World, a public service by giving as much prominence to the good things that are occurring in their town as to the recession.

How a Former Page Sees Congress at Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting series of short articles by a former page in the House of Representatives, Kenneth Warner, has come to my attention and I feel other Members of this House and our pages would like to read them. Kenneth served as a page in the summer of 1957. His articles were published in the Beacon, of Forest Hills High School, in Queens, N. Y., which he now attends.

The articles follow:

I WAS A CONGRESSIONAL PAGE

(By Kenneth Warner)

As I look back on them now, my 2 months as a page in the House of Representatives proved to be the most exciting and rewarding summers I have ever spent.

My interest was awakened by an article I read in Life magazine which described the life of a congressional page. I made inquiries and learned that every boy who is an American citizen between the ages of 15 and 18 is eligible to become a page in either the House of Representatives or the Senate. I learned also that appointments are made by Members of Congress from among boys living in their own States.

Much to my surprise, I found that, although many people were interested in the subject, very few really knew how to go about getting the appointment. Although a page may be appointed for a number of years, most Congressmen and Senators follow the practice of appointing a series of boys, each one to serve for several months, so that the wonderful experience and training may be shared by as many as possible.

Some Congressmen make appointments after personal interviews and inquiries into a boy's background, activities and scholarship. Others, including our own Queens Congressmen, make their choice after giving to all applicants an examination in which the youths explain why they would like to go to Washington as a page.

I was very happy at the thought of going to Washington, but I must admit that I was also a little scared. I had always lived at home, except for the summers spent at camp. Now I was away from my family—to be precise, 250 miles away, completely on my own, without any organized duties or activities. It was a very strange feeling. I had to live with total strangers, arrange for my own housing, transportation, meals, laundry and medical care with no supervision and without knowing anyone to whom I could turn for advice. All of my friends at home were either going to camp or hotels where their board and lodging were taken care of, and they worked full or parttime. This was anything but the case with me. In all of Congress, there were only two other pages who came from the City of New York. I knew neither one of them, nor did I know anyone else in the city of Washington.

The Congressional authorities believe that if a boy is old enough to be a page, he is old enough to take care of himself. Fortunately, I found that all of the Senators, the Congressmen, the pages and the Congressional officials were very friendly and helpful.

On their recommendation, I moved into a boarding house where seven other pages also lived. By chance, these boys were all from the Deep South, and they found my northern twang very amusing. I, of course, could not even understand what they were saying. They were all pleasant and sociable, but their ideas and beliefs were very strange to me. I developed a much broader understanding of their problems, but cannot say that I agree with their views.

On July 1 I reported for duty at the House of Representatives to the Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, where I was sworn in as a page.

At the very beginning it was made clear that my duties as a page had to be strictly carried out in every way. No more chinos or unpolished shoes: pages must at all times wear the official uniform—white shirt, black tie, blue trousers and black shoes.

Immediately after being sworn in, I reported to the House Chamber and was given my seat upon the pages' bench. There are two benches—one at either side of the House, where the pages sit while waiting to be called.

HISTORICAL SHOT

As soon as I took my seat, the other pages showed me a hole in the wall in back of the bench at about the height of my head. It was the bullet hole caused by a shot fired by the Puerto Rican nationalists at the time they made an attempt to kill a number of Congressmen. This hole resulted from one of the shots which went wild, and it would have struck and killed a page sitting on the bench, except that at that percise moment he bent forward to pick up a paper which had dropped to the floor. Needless to say, the pages always kept the floor in front of that bench spotlessly clean. Of course, since that date, all visitors to the House gallery are cartfully searched for weapons, but, as one page was heard to remark, "You never know."

On my first day, I was given a book which contained the picture of every Congressman, together with details concerning his State, district and length of service. As part of our duties, we had to learn to recognize on sight every one of the 435 Congressmen and to know the basic facts about each one.

Our duties were regulated by the pages' call board. This is a large rectangular board with indicators showing which Congressman is calling.

ELEMENT OF SURPRISE

No matter how often I saw the call board light up, there was always an element of excitement when my turn came. I never knew just where I would be called, whom I would see, and what I would be asked to do. It might be a routine call to carry a message to the Speaker of the House or to the floor of the Senate. It could be a request to obtain information from the Library of Congress, cr from one of the Cabinet officials, or from the Supreme Court. It would

often involve an assignment to one of the very important House committee meetings which was being televised; and then again we were very often asked to escort visitors through the Capitol.

Everything I did contributed to my feeling that I was playing an active part in assisting the Congress in making the laws for this country. When the bell in the House rang summoning Congressmen to vote, I, too, would be required to be present. When debate on a bill began, the pages were especially busy. A hundred indicators would light up at once as Congressmen called for copies of the bill, the committee reports and a great deal of other material which they intended to use.

During the debates and the votes, we always had to be on our toes (although to avoid being counted, we did not get out of our seats when a standing vote was being taken).

Life as a page in Congress was always interesting, but it became even more stimulating when bills covering controversial issues were being considered.

During my service as a page, there were a number of matters which aroused the attention and emotion of the whole country. Segregation and civil rights; federal aid to education; the President's foreign policy, and other matters were all taken up and vehemently discussed on the floor of Congress, in the cloakrooms and throughout Washington.

At those times, everything was centered around the particular bill under consideration. Everybody became involved, not only politically but personally as well. For example, when the bill to increase Federal Aid to Education was reported to the House, it seemed as if all of the visitors in Washington descended on Congress at one time. Long lines of people, interested parties and tourists, jammed the House galleries and waited for hours to get a glimpse of the proceedings. All of the members received mountains of mail, which they and their staffs carefully read and analyzed. In fact, one Ohio Congressman, who offered me a lift to work one morning told me about a 96-page handwritten letter which he had received in connection with the bill.

We felt that we were a integral part of the whole proceeding. Although we were only aids, with no part in making any decisions, we naturally, had our own personal opinions on the bill which so strongly involved discrimination and civil rights. Very often the members of Congress would discuss their own views with us and hear what we had to say, representing, as we boys did, every section of the country.

AVERAGE CONGRESSMAN

After close observation, I formed a very distinct impression of the average Member of Congress. Before I went to Washington, I had heard of Bismarck's epigram: "To retain respect for sausages and laws, one must not watch them in the making." Today I know that there is more wit than truth in that remark.

Practically every Congressman is deeply interested in the legislation which comes before him. During the 3 hours before each session began and for at least an hour after the session closed, when we pages were required to be in the Capitol, the Members of Congress were in the building hard at work. I have seen Congressmen come in to vote on an important bill when they were ill enough to be in bed. I will never forget the sight of Representative Bowler, of Illinois, who died during the session, being carried into the Chamber in a wheelchair, while wracking with arthritic pain.

Congressmen are not, as most people think, merely politicians. Listening to their conversations on the floor of Congress, in the cloakrooms, and elsewhere, we learned how much their congressional duties are a real part of their lives. They are especially interested in the views of their constituents. Any letter, if it is written by someone who shows a genuine interest, is given the greatest attention. It makes no difference whether the letter comes from an important community leader, a housewife, or a teenager; these legislators conscientiously try to discover the views and wishes of the public.

A suggestion to anyone who is going to visit Washington: look up your Congressman, and you can be assured of a warm welcome which will make the visit much more informative and inspiring. Congressmen, as I have found out, do not resent being called upon to assist citizens in their dealings with the Federal Government and in other ways. Indeed, they are glad of the opportunity to get closer to their constituents. Of course, like everyone holding public office, they wish to be reelected, but, in addition, they have a genuine feeling for the job they are called upon to do.

And among my most pleasant memories of my stay in Washington is the recollection of these very prominent and influential men of all parties, from every State in the Union, who, in the midst of their difficult and concentrated work in the last months of the session, were always courteous and considerate.

The Congress is divided along the lines of the two major parties, Democratic and Republican. For example, the House is divided into the Democratic and Republican sides. On all official lists, Democrats are indicated by Roman type and Republicans are always in italics. There are majority and minority doorkeepers (who, in spite of the title, are important officials in the House) and majority and minority Sergeants-at-Arms.

Of course, as you probably know, very important work is done in committees. There, a vast amount of research is conducted, public hearings are held at which witnesses are heard, and committee members, among themselves, hammer out a workable bill. Pages are on constant call and actively assist in the Committees' work.

CLOAK-AND-DAGGER ROOM

Actually, however, the real accomplishments of the House take place in the cloakrooms. There are Republican and Democratic cloakrooms. This is where the respective Congressmen mingle with the members of their own party. They speak freely, and discussions sometimes get very heated. The atmosphere in the cloakrooms is similar to that of a private club. Food is served and facilities for relaxing are available. The private telephones are constantly used. The pages in the cloakrooms relay confidential messages and perform other duties.

In the House itself, the atmosphere is entirely different, and strict formality is maintained. There is no institution in the world where rules are more rigidly observed. One of the most important officials in the House is the Parliamentarian, whose function it is to advise the Speaker on every question involving points of order. The Congressmen, who, in many cases, have been in the House for more than twenty years, are very quick to raise parliamentary questions on important issues.

The Congressional day begins promptly at noon, when the Speaker calls the session to order. There is an opening prayer which is sometimes offered by the House Chaplain, but is most often given by different clergymen representing the different faiths in America.

I found the work of the official reporters really fantastic. These men are so skilled that they are able to record every word spoken and can identify every one of the 435 Congressmen by the sound of his voice. Since they do not lift their heads and cannot see who is speaking, the strain on these men is so great that they work on 5-minute shifts.

Although the work of Congress is of vital importance, and the Congressmen are well aware of it, there is also a lighter side. This is most apparent as the day of adjournment approaches. Then everyone, regardless of party, joins in merrymaking and well-wishing; impromptu quartets spring up all over the House, and the atmosphere is charged with gaiety and good feeling. The pages join in the spirit of the occasion with a little entertainment of their own. I will never hear Home on the Range without seeing the Congressmen as they applauded our final number, while they ended by singing Auld Lang Syne.

Other interesting breaks occurred, too, when, for example, foreign dignitaries would be given the privilege of the floor, and well-known guests would be seen in the gallery. I remember the visit of the Prime Minister of Pakistan and his pretty daughter. The business of the House was suspended and moving pictures were taken of all the proceedings. They were subsequently shown throughout the country and overseas. On other occasions, attention was temporarily distracted from the debates when Jayne Mansfield, Sophia Loren, and Kim Novak came to the galleries. A page was always assigned to take the visitors on a tour of the Capitol, and they would give us autographed pictures, which together with those of the Members of the House and Senate now cover the walls of my room.

Many of my friends have asked me about my life in Washington aside from my activities as a page.

The first thing I can say is that it was a very different life for me there from life in New York. Of course, for the first few weeks I was like everyone else—a visitor.

My spare time, at first, was spent in seeing the sights I had always read about. I climbed the 555 feet to the top of the Washington Monument; used my amateur radio license to broadcast over the Pentagon radio station; and made the complete tour of the FBI, several of us competing on the FBI machinegun practice targets. Together with the other pages, I also visited almost all of the well-known Washington landmarks, while on weekends we made tours of neighboring Maryland and Virginia.

FINANCIAL ASPECT

I have often been asked about the financial aspect of being a page. The salary of a page is $306 a month. Since the average cost for room and board in a Washington boarding house is $60 per month, my experience as a page was not only interesting and instructive; it was also a happy one from the financial point of view.

The most complete change in my social life was the absence of my friends here at home. However, I found very quickly that the people in Washington were very hospitable. Social life there was completely different from that in New York. Although it is a large city, Washington has the atmosphere of a small town. There were no big affairs, but instead there was a great deal of visiting and general sociability.

Of course, our evening activities were limited to a considerable extent because on many nights the House would remain in session, sometimes as late as midnight. However, people in our age group in Washington understood the pages' position, and it was never considered a breach of good manners to call at the last minute and say that we could not keep an appointment.

My stay in Washington was a happy and profitable experience, and my last thought on the DC-6 flying home to La Guardia Airport was that there could be no more stimulating way for any American boy to spend a summer than by serving as a page in the United States Congress.

Crucial Issues in World Perspective, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 1, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, a correspondent, Mr. William T. Genth of New York City, has called attention to an address made by the chairman of the National Planning Association at the annual meeting on March 31, 1958. Mr. Genth says:

I consider Mr. H. Christian Sonne's appraisal of present conditions under the heading "Crucial Issues in World Perspective, 1958" so illuminating that I believe you will welcome the opportunity of reading it.

I did indeed find the report illuminating and therefore ask permission to insert it into the RECORD so that many more persons will have an opportunity to read his objective discussion of these issues.

CRUCIAL ISSUES IN WORLD PERSPECTIVE, 1958

(Report of H. Christian Sonne, chairman, NPA Board of Trustees, to the annual joint meeting of the board of trustees and the agriculture, business, labor and international committees and the National Council of the National Planning Association, Washington, D. C., March 31, 1958)

In the face of the many complex and grave problems that confront our Nation, we must pursue—without recrimination—a steadfast course toward our common goal, which NPA defines as:

I. Peace in a world in which each nation is free to choose its own form of government.

II. Employment opportunities sufficiently broad to enable citizens to retain their self-respect and living standards; coupled with an economy sufficiently stable to prevent recessions from turning into depressions or millions from suffering as a result of inflation.

III. Proper appreciation of the consequences of the exploration of space.

I. PEACE AND DEFENSE

To secure peace and eventually eliminate a costly and destructive armaments race, the United States certainly would welcome constructive and sincere disarmament negotiations.

Doubt has been expressed that under modern technological conditions armaments control is feasible in practice. For these reasons, NPA appointed a special project committee on security through arms control under the chairmanship of Col. Richard S. Leghorn. From the first report of the committee and Colonel Leghorn's talk today, it appears that with goodwill the technological problems eventually can be solved—but that, for the present, it is wiser not to rely on an early result. It seems clear, therefore, that for the time being we must continue to develop military strength. The extent of our increase in armaments and military proficiency must be determined mainly by foreign policy and defense strategy. At the same time, NPA feels called upon to repeat:

First. In view of our serious and important commitments spread over wide areas of the globe, it would seem irresponsible if—while concentrating on new and modern armaments—we neglected to make increased efforts also in the development of highly mobile conventional weapons.

Second. Our civil and nonmilitary defense must be greatly improved—indeed, if well organized, it could prove to be one of the greatest deterrents to war.

It is important to note that the many constantly increasing tasks, which we are called upon to perform for the maintenance of peace, face us at a time when we have over 5 million unemployed. We should, therefore, now recognize that we have ample reserves of plant facilities and manpower to increase our efforts in both the domestic and the foreign field.

With the productive capacity of the West and with determined efforts, we should not lose the armaments race.

If, therefore, it is decided that adequate military and nonmilitary defense requires a certain level of expenditures—be it $45 or $55 billion—the preponderant majority of our citizens would undoubtedly urge that we spend that amount, and in addition 5 or 10 percent more to err on the safe side.

Adequate armaments, however, are only part of our needs. Forthcoming economic developments will be among the major factors that determine the new system of world order which will emerge in the next decade or two.

To meet the natural aspirations of the free world, the gap between our living standards and those of the lesser developed countries must be narrowed and not widened over the next decade—lest we invite disaster.

Support for international economic and social development must become a continued long-term policy of the United States.

The need for action along these lines seems now to be better understood, as evidenced by current discussions in Congress. At best, however, foreign aid or loan facilities are less important to the outside world than regular trade with the United States, which is at the same time the world's largest exporter and largest importer.

A depression in the United States might, therefore, severely cripple the economy of the free world. Hence, it is of great importance for American national interest that, in deciding on measures to counteract the recession, we avoid fumbling and act promptly and with determination. This, however, is primarily part of our domestic economic problems.

II. DOMESTIC ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

The current recession has proved more serious than those of 1949–50 and 1953–54.

We have today over 5 million unemployed, or about 7 percent of our labor force. Moreover, 2 million are working at involuntarily reduced hours.

Quite apart from the moral aspects, such large unemployment represents fundamental waste at a time when we can ill afford the paradox of unfulfilled social and economic needs on the one hand, and substantial amounts of unemployed production resources on the other.

NPA has just prepared a joint statement, entitled "The Cost of Unemployment," which points out that the current low level of economic activities is depriving our Nation of $25 billion of annual output. The statement suggests that at least $10 billion of this could be used to increase Government defense or nondefense programs.

Judicious increase in defense and certain nondefense Government programs are urgently needed regardless of whether we have a recession or not. At the same time, such measures would have a stimulating effect on employment.

Another means of stimulating employment would be tax reductions, which would also offer an effective and probably quicker way of assuring increased spending and consequent additional employment.

These two measures are not mutually exclusive.

Those who object to Government programs are apt to overlook the fact that our social and economic system, based on self-responsibility and respect for the individual, is challenged by a system based on authoritarian regimentation.

In order to meet this challenge successfully, much greater efforts are needed to encourage economic growth.

This requires increased Government action and cooperation in such fields as education, public health, conservation of natural resources, urban redevelopment, highways and skyways, and other types of what we may call social capital. These cannot nowadays be developed by private enterprise alone. A great increase in social capital expenditure is needed also because of inadequate investments over the past 17 years resulting from the priority given to national defense, industrial modernization, and residential construction, and because of our rapidly growing population.

Such Government programs, if well planned, are productive—indeed, it is as a result of social capital that private enterprise is able to function as efficiently as it does.

In practice, both approaches can be recommended to counteract the recession:

Well conceived public programs—not as a substitute for private spending but to encourage it. These programs may be relatively slow in stimulating employment but should result in strengthening the competitive capacity of our country. Failure to undertake them in the face of the Soviet challenge may jeopardize our very survival.

Tax reduction—because quick, intermediate action is needed. In this case, we should aim at such tax reductions as are useful and overdue, or would leave us with an improved tax system. Such tax reductions may be made in excise and individual income taxes. In a joint statement now agreed upon, the NPA will recommend that practically all excise taxes—except those imposed on alcohol and tobacco as well as on motor fuel, etc. (largely allocated to the highway trust fund)—should be eliminated.

Most of these excise taxes from which the Federal Government collects about $4.5 billion—were imposed during the war years for the purpose of restricting consumption and lessening the pressure of inflation. It seems logical, therefore, to abolish them now.

The statement also recommends a prompt reduction in the individual income tax—particularly in the lower income brackets.

Tax reduction is more pleasant for the taxpayer than an increase in needed public programs, but it is less beneficial for the country and for ultimate victory in the competitive world struggle.

A recession will unavoidably bring us deficits in the Government budget even if the Government would not increase expenditure programs and reduce tax rates. A deficit resulting from a deliberate increase in expenditures and/or a reduction in tax rates is preferable because it renders effective aid in overcoming such a recession.

We must move promptly and adequately, but in ways that will not lead to excess demand and inflation.

To appraise fully this problem, we must be aware that there are two kinds of inflation.

There is the well-known type of inflation resulting from too much spending power chasing too few goods. That is called the demand-pull inflation.

That kind of inflation can still be effectively met by the orthodox formulas of monetary and fiscal policy. With our abundance of modern plant facilities and labor, demand-pull inflation—except in emergencies—could not appear overnight. One would, therefore, expect to have ample time to deal with it.

The other kind of inflation is a relatively new phenomenon which results from or-

ganized upward pressures on wage rates and on prices of materials even though neither of the two are in short supply. This is often called cost-push inflation. The increase in costs of labor and materials should not, however, be confused with the increase in costs in those industries which have fixed overhead expenses and decreasing turnovers.

These two kinds—demand-pull and cost-push inflation—are likely to run side by side. However, during the last year, we have experienced higher prices in spite of slackening economic conditions. This may be due in part to an increase in the cost base of products resulting from a reduced turnover. But, we have undoubtedly also seen the cost-push inflation at work.

We have learned that monetary policy alone is not able to cope with the latter kind of inflation—not even if combined with fiscal policy.

If wages, or the prices of raw materials or semifinished products, are increased at a greater rate than warranted by advances in productivity, no increase in interest rates will or can in the long run result in lower prices of finished products. Misplaced monetary policy may have contributed to the present recession. But, the measures we take to cope with the recession are not apt to have much influence on this kind of inflation.

Turning first to demand-pull inflation, it is important to note that we have large reserves of production resources available to combat such a possible inflation that might develop in case we should overstrain our estimated productive capacity.

The manpower reserves—apart from the approximately 7 million workers who now are unemployed in whole or in part—consist of millions of people at retirement age but still able and eager to work—and also the handicapped.

Since all these people, in varied degrees, already to some extent are consumers, a large percentage of their production would constitute an addition to our available goods and services. Thus, the supply would increase more than the demand.

We can, therefore, afford to err on the safe side and spend a little too much rather than too little in our effort to cope with the recession. Any resulting inflationary pressure would be of the demand-pull type which our reserve of production resources could take care of.

The cost-push inflation—in contrast—raises more serious and complicated issues.

Two years ago, in discussing the reasonable success—until then—of the Employment Act of 1946, the NPA emphasized that America could not rest on its laurels and questioned whether monetary and fiscal policies could curb price rises that originate primarily from the cost side of production—and, if so, whether it could be done without in time creating considerable unemployment. The statement concluded, "We have not yet developed the machinery for formulating wage and related policies that are best fitted to serve the twin objectives of a reasonable approximation to sustained full employment, and a reasonable stabilization of prices." This is still true today.

It requires great statesmanship both on the part of business and labor to solve this stabilization problem which, next to peace and high employment, is the most important issue that democracies have to face.

Recent developments have persuaded me that it would be in the national interest if Congress made clear in some form or other that, while its interest in high employment remains unchanged, it has decided that the continuing policy of the Federal Government will be to aim also at a reasonable stabilization of prices; and that it is prepared to implement this objective with the necessary legislation.

A clarification of the policy of Congress would merely confirm, in itself, the views now often accepted. However, I believe the time has come when this often-stated objective must be implemented with proper legislation.

In view of the complexity of the matter, such legislation should be preceded by very careful study on the part of Congress, the executive branch, and private groups.

In the course of such study, Congress would have to look into the admittedly difficult problems confronting the trade unions and business in collective bargaining and in the determination of what may be considered as fair profit for capital and for risk taking.

Congress would also have to take a new look at such issues as tariffs, import qoutas, agricultural price supports, stockpiles, etc., from the point of view of price stability.

NPA feels that adequate economic growth and effective price stabilization must be the two major objectives of our domestic economic policy if we are to improve our living standards and cope successfully with world events.

III. THE EXPLORATION OF SPACE

It has been truly said that 1957 was the year when the Soviets put a couple of satellites up into orbit and pulled the rest of their satellites back into orbit. It seems to me, however, that at the same time they caused a bomb to explode over America containing antidotes against complacency and self-satisfaction.

The event may be fortunate for us even though we have had to face the humiliation that the Soviets were ahead of us in planning and launching a series of small artificial satellites during the International Geophysical Year.

It is not the deed itself, but the technique and scientific skill connected with it, that should cause us concern. They tend to show that in science and technology, and perhaps even in their educational system, the Russians are our equal and maybe ahead of us.

This has led to a renewal of the frequent discussions during the last few years of the shortcomings of our educational system.

We seem more likely at long last to do something about its quantitative deficiencies (more schools, scholarships, teachers, higher salaries, etc.). But qualitative problems may be even more important.

Let me mention three main aspects:

First. We must correct the mistaken interpretation of the fundamental democratic right of equal opportunity for education. This right means that everybody should have the same opportunities and facilities to acquire an education. It does not mean that everybody should learn the same things and be expected to perform equally. Children differ in their capacity for education. We must cease to hold back our brightest youths to the pace and level of their more limited classmates.

Ways must be found of giving the former a richer curriculum and better teachers if we are to develop leaders in science, the arts, and political and social life.

Second. Not only the salaries but also the standards of teachers must be raised, so that pupils can learn much more subject matter than in the past rather than taking "life adjustment courses." It is all very well to learn how to think but you must also have something to think about!

Third. It is important to achieve a proper balance of the various branches of knowledge. Today, everyone is concerned about the neglect in the past of science and mathematics. We must guard against going too far in the opposite direction. We will continue to be deficient in basic or theoretical science—upon which applied science depends—unless our scientists are better acquainted with philosophy, the social sciences, and the humanities.

Some years ago, an NPA committee on education came to the conclusion that the subject is so vast and important that it should not be tackled haphazardly. Instead, an independent group of outstanding citizens should be selected to prepare, after careful deliberation, a comprehensive reexamination of the whole American system of education.

We hope that the recent impetus given to the reevaluation of education will result in the appointment of such a top-level committee of outstanding private citizens.

The best armor in this new age of space is a good education.

New vistas begin to open up with unlimited possibilities for gaining interesting and useful knowledge and technique.

It is essential to the future peace and progress of mankind that, from the beginning, the United Nations should play a significant role in the exploration of space. Initially, the United Nations should at least be a supervisory agency to ensure that the future space exploration programs of the various nations do not become military threats.

It is not beyond the realm of possibility that some day—in the course of exploring our own or other solar systems—we may face the supreme challenge of encounters with other forms of intelligent life.

Whether that be so or not, the new impressions of the Universe and its hazards and difficulties are apt to be so overwhelming that many of the present problems and rivalries on both sides of the Iron Curtain may seem relatively small and be forgotten like the snow that fell last year.

But for a long time, we will have many difficulties to face here on earth. However, this new era is rapidly teaching us that we must not only think anew but act anew. This, and the fact that America has an extraordinary ability to respond to crisis, prompts me to summarize what NPA hopes will become increasingly apparent:

The present recession will not develop into a depression. Our builtin factors of stability, such as Federal deposit insurance, stock-exchange regulations, social-security system, etc., will prevent a crisis. Moreover, due to our understanding of and readiness to use the proper fiscal countermoves, we shall succeed in coping with the recession, with the result that world trade can rely on a satisfactory measure of stability and our foreign-investment program will continue—probably on an enlarged scale.

We have ample reserves of plant facilities and manpower to face any emergencies, and we have the additional reserve of short working hours that can and will be prolonged when necessary.

We have a pool of admirable scientists and engineers—but their energies need channeling. That is a relatively short-term problem which we shall succeed in solving pending the long-term strengthening effect of a greatly improved educational system.

Ours is a sportsmanlike nation that salutes and congratulates the Soviets on their sputnik performance. At the same time, we do not doubt that America can measure up to the challenges that history places before us.

The Errors of Hawaiian-Alaskan Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the bill proposing statehood for Alaska is pres-

ently scheduled to be acted upon in the House on May 14.

On February 14, 1955, I made a statement on the subject of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

This statement contains a summary of most of the arguments on this complex problem. It is inserted for the purpose of reference and to give the Members of Congress an opportunity to more fully and leisurely examine into the facts and validity of the statehood bills.

THE ERRORS OF HAWAIIAN-ALASKAN STATEHOOD

The controversial problem of statehood for the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska continues to challenge the wisdom of this Congress. My remarks shall pertain to bill, H. R. 2535, which proposes to grant statehood to both Territories and is now under consideration by this committee.

THE IMPORTANCE AND THE FINALITY OF STATEHOOD

This momentous issue of statehood compels us to give our most serious attention to its consequences. We are confronted with a measure that has vast implications relating to the internal affairs of this Union. We must also concern ourselves with the finality of whatever decision we may make.

No other problem will, as vitally, affect and shape our future as statehood. The seriousness of this subject is transcended only by our struggle to survive the Communist holocaust.

The various domestic and foreign problems of this Congress which relate to finance, defense, health, and foreign aid, are of extreme importance. Yet, if we find ourselves in error, our mistakes can readily be rectified by congressional action or by the flexibility of executive power. With one exception, even our Constitution and its amendments may be amended to conform with changing conditions or attitudes. The most recent example of this change is the repeal of the 18th amendment.

The one exception to the right to change our Constitution applies to the present proposal. Article V of our Constitution provides that no amendment may be made to this clause: "and that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

The principle that no State can secede from this Union is established. The corollary principle that this Nation cannot divorce any State from this Union or restore it to the status of a Territory is equally accepted. Thus, the grant of statehood becomes an irrevocable act.

The finality of our decision as to statehood gives us cause to approach this matter, not with a lighthearted generosity, but rather with a somber realization and precaution that any mistake will burden us for the life of this Republic.

THE EMOTIONAL, IRRELEVANT, AND MINOR ISSUES

There have been so many issues injected into this debate that it has become difficult to see the forest for the trees. Almost every conceivable argument has been presented pro and con to a degree that has confused and confounded rather than enlightened those who may be interested.

This appears a suitable time to attempt to clarify and place the arguments into their true political perspective. The leading arguments in favor of statehood which are grouped together here as being either emotional, irrelevant, or of minor consequence are (a) Americanism and military service, (b) the psychological impact of statehood upon the Asiatic peoples, (c) the references to precedent in favor of statehood, (d) partisan political considerations.

THE EMOTIONAL APPEAL OF AMERICANISM AND MILITARY SERVICE

Every informed person will acknowledge the courage and sacrifices of the Hawaiian veterans in both World War II and the Korean conflict. This Nation is eternally indebted to them and in an equal degree to all other American veterans who fought so gloriously in those wars.

The proponents of statehood have cited individual cases of heroism on the part of Hawaiian soldiers. They have made comparisons of the Hawaiian casualties and the numbers in military service as against the casualties and the number of servicemen from the United States as a whole.

The Alaska Statehood Committee has published this claim:

> In two World Wars and in Korea they have fought in number exceeding the national per capita average, and by so doing have written a war record second to none in the Nation.

The Library of Congress has furnished the following table of inductees for World War II:

State	Population, 1945	Draftees in World War II
New Hampshire	459,000	32,430
Montana	477,000	38,453
Idaho	507,000	38,612
Hawaii	460,000	28,008
Alaska	79,000	3,482

Hawaii had 8,769 additional enlistees. No figures are available for other States.

These figures do not substantiate claims of superiority in the number of citizens from Hawaii and Alaska who served in World War II.

The statements regarding casualties and bravery cannot support the inference that these soldiers were more loyal and more brave than the veterans from the other areas of this country. I defend all segments of this country from the innuendo that any group or area of our people have a monopoly upon patriotism or bravery. There is no scientific thermometer that can measure the warmth of devotion for this great country.

The sacrifices on the battlefield do not constitute legitimate political, economic or social premises for the admission of these territories to statehood. These highly emotional appeals could have been, most properly, left out of this debate.

THE IRRELEVANCE OF FOREIGN PSYCHOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

The proponents of statehood claim that statehood would create good will for the United States in the Pacific area and would avoid for us the stigma of colonialism.

The question of statehood is solely and wholly a domestic problem of our internal affairs. It is a strange theory that would permit foreign opinion to influence or decide the conduct of our domestic affairs. The Communist line of charging us with colonialism cannot be increased in volume nor will it be softened by any act of compliance.

We should not fear to disappoint those enemies. Our foreign friends need no explanations.

The psychological impact of statehood upon foreign peoples is irrelevant and deserves no consideration here.

The height of irrelevancy was attained by a former Governor of one of the Territories. He advanced as an argument in favor of statehood the delectation of visitors, the sweetness of Hawaiian music, and the rhythm of its dance. Certainly, the muscular gyrations of the hula dance is far afield from the crux of the statehood problem. This sentimentality borders upon the frivolous.

THE PRECEDENTS FOR STATEHOOD

The proponents for statehood rely extensively upon the use of precedent to lend validity to their claims.

The Northwest Ordinance was adopted under the Articles of Confederation in 1787. This act, providing for the admission of that territory to statehood, is cited as precedent and as the source of the inherent right to every Territory to become a State. This precedent is invalid for the following reasons:

First. The Articles of Confederation has been superseded completely by the constitutional provisions relating to the admission of new States.

Second. The Northwest Ordinance was limited in its application to the Northwest Territory.

Third. The framework of the confederacy, the division of powers, and the scheme of representation was totally different from our present constitutional government.

References by the Supreme Court to incorporated Territories as inchoate and embryo States are mere dicta and an attempted intrusion into the field of congressional legislative authority and responsibility.

The admission of other States is referred to as precedent for the admission of Hawaii and Alaska upon the basis of equal representation in the United States Senate. The last State to be admitted was Arizona on February 14, 1912.

Following the admission of this 48th State, the 17th amendment was adopted by final ratification on April 8, 1913. The mode of selection of Senators was altered from that of choice by the State legislatures to that of election by popular suffrage. This change of election of Senators has resulted in representation by the Senators of the people of the States as individuals in substitution for representation by the Senators of their

respective States collectively and in their corporate capacities.

The 17th amendment created a new concept of senatorial representation. No State has been admitted under these fundamentally altered conditions.

Thus, the admission of other States furnishes no valid precedent for the admission, today, of Territories upon the same basis of representation in the United States Senate.

PARTISAN POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS

The Democratic Party platform contains a plank favoring immediate statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska. The Republican Party platform favors immediate statehood for Hawaii and statehood for Alaska under an equitable enabling act. However, no responsible Republican Party spokesman has, as yet, given us an adequate detail explanation of the meaning of the term "equitable enabling act."

In the 1952 elections, the Republican Party retained control of the Hawaiian Territorial Legislature by the election of 8 Republican Senators to 7 Democrats. In the House there were 19 Republicans elected to 11 Democrats.

In the same year, Alaskan Republicans won the Alaskan Senate by seating 11 Republicans and 5 Democrats. In the House, there were 20 Republicans elected to 4 Democrats.

Based upon these returns, it was predicted that in the event of statehood, Hawaii would elect 2 Republican Senators and that Alaska would possibly elect 1 or 2 Republican Senators.

Two years ago the Republican administration attempted to pass the bill giving statehood to Hawaii and kill the Alaskan statehood bill. This writer opposed the immediate admission of these States either severally or jointly. The Republican Party subjected itself to the charge of attempting to gain partisan political advantage in its attempt to support the Hawaiian statehood bill alone.

In 1954, the political picture reversed itself. The Hawaiian legislature was won by the Democratic Party for the first time in the history of that Territory. The Democratic Party swept both houses overwhelmingly. The Democrats won a 9-to-6 majority in the Senate and a 22-to-8 majority in the House.

A similar sweep was gained by the Democrats in the Alaskan Territorial Legislature. There, the Democrats gained control of the Senate by winning 12 seats to 4, and in the House 21 seats to 3.

Another political factor is the successive drop in the plurality of the Republican Delegate from Hawaii. The Republican pluralities for that office are as follows:

Year:	*Republican plurality*
1948 (approximate)	52,000
1950 (approximate)	31,000
1952 (approximate)	9,000
1954 (official)	890

Based on the 1954 election returns, it appears that, in the event of statehood, Alaska would surely elect 2 Democrat Senators and Hawaii would be likely to elect 2 Democrat Senators.

It is most obvious that the passage of the joint Hawaiian-Alaskan statehood bill by the Congress would place the Republican Party in a difficult position. The President would be placed in a political dilemma. By approving statehood for both Territories, he would risk the probability that these 2 Territories would return 4 Democrat Senators. If he vetoes statehood, he assumes the political onus of defeating a measure of popular favor.

Partisan politics is a transitory consideration. This issue ought to be decided upon American principles having a true political validity. The solution should pass the test of what will be permanently just for the peoples of both majority and minority parties of the whole Nation.

GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE REJECTS STATEHOOD

At the hearing before this committee on February 4, 1955, the impression was left that the Governors' conference endorses statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska. This is not so.

Resolutions were adopted by the Governors' conferences, for 6 years from 1947 to 1952, favoring statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

On March 2, 1953, the writer addressed communications to each of the 48 Governors indicating the prospective loss of voting power for the people of each State in the Senatorial and Presidential elections upon the grant of statehood to Hawaii and Alaska. No claim is made that the subsequent failure to endorse statehood is due to these communications.

At the 1953 Governors' conference, a resolution favoring Hawaiian statehood was presented. This resolution failed to receive a favorable report. No resolution for either Hawaiian or Alaskan statehood was presented at the 1954 conference. The Governors, perhaps, perceived the prospective loss of representation to the people of their respective States. Failure to approve statehood resolutions, under these circumstances, can be fairly construed to constitute rejection.

COMMUNISM, A MAJOR CONSIDERATION IN HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

The extensive communistic influences in Hawaii continue to present an alarming condition for both Hawaii and the United States. A careful study of the facts does not give hope that communistic power is on the wane. Communism remains a potent force permeating the economic, political, and social structures of this Territory.

The New York Herald Tribune of June 23, 1953, reported a labor strike by the ILWU on June 22, 1953, in Hawaii. The facts, as reported there, are as follows:

Twenty-four thousand employees on the island went on strike in a mass protest against the conviction of Jack Hall and six other conspirators convicted of plotting to teach and advocate the violent overthrow of the United States Government.

Two thousand of these employees are stevedores, members of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union—ILWU—who refused to load military cargo for Korea. Eighteen thousand out of nineteen thousand ILWU union workers on the sugar plantations joined in this strike. One thousand of these men refused to strike. Four thousands out of five thousand pineapple workers also joined the strike. One thousand of these men refused to strike.

Now, these men went on strike, not because of any legitimate labor dispute, but in protest against the conviction of these Communists for the advocacy of treason and revolution.

The fact that 1,000 men in the sugar industry and 1,000 men in the pineapple industry refused to join this strike is proof that it was possible to refuse to join in this dastardly demonstration of Communist close order drill.

Those who refused, a pitiful minority of 2,000 demonstrated their courage and Americanism. The same cannot be said for the other 24,000. The refusal to load military cargo for Korea borders upon sabotage.

If these men went on strike because of threats or pressures, then a condition exists in Hawaii, so dangerous, that Hawaii should not be granted statehood at this time. If they went on strike willingly because of their sympathy for the Communist convicts and the Communist movement, then this type of citizen does not deserve statehood. This country can well do without their voice and their vote in Congress.

This same union, ILWU, called another strike as recently as last December 1954, while members of this Territorial Subcommittee were attending hearings in Hawaii.

The International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU) has a membership of 25,000 and dominates unionism in that territory. Its president is Harry Bridges who is one of the top three Communist leaders in this country. Jack Hall is the Hawaiian spokesman for Harry Bridges and the leader of that union there.

The unions in Hawaii controlled or infiltrated by Communists have a membership of about 30,000. The names of the Communists and those persons closely related to the Communist Party who occupy positions of power in the unions, union locals and the top organization of the ILWU are contained in the hearings of the House Un-American Activities Committee for the year 1950.

These hearings regarding Communist activities in Hawaii are contained in 3 volumes and contain a startling revelation of the infiltration of communism into both the ranks of unionized labor and in the political parties. These volumes are proof that the Communist Party controls the ILWU, lock, stock, and barrel.

By means of union devices such as closed shops, union stewards and grievance committees, it is possible for the Communists to control the employment, layoffs, firings, and hiring of labor. This control, and the use of cadres of union officials and Communist stooges to propagandize, persuade and coerce, gives the Communists a tight control over the ideology and political action of its members. The individual laborer does not have a chance to earn a living or to keep

from being maimed by a premeditated industrial accident unless he complies.

It is a political axiom that each employee can be counted upon to deliver 3 votes in a political election. If the ILWU can order 24,000 men to go out on a Communist sympathy strike sabotaging United States military transport, can there be any doubt that they can deliver 50,000 votes to their political choice?

These political objectives of the Communist Party are reported in these hearings. They are:

First. Communists support statehood, page 1559, part 2 of the hearings.

Second. Development of a following in the Democratic Party to back Communist causes, page 1570, part 2 of the hearings.

Third. Establish legislative caucus to act as pressure group on Democratic Party for Communist objectives, page 1570, part 2 of the hearings.

The fact that statehood for Hawaii is supported by the Communist Party and the ILWU does not per se make this cause wrong or undesirable. However, one can be sure that their support for statehood is not actuated by the same motives for good government as those who sincerely believe that statehood is a just cause. The support of the Communists is based upon their self-interest in advancing the Communist cause and that cause alone.

Can there be any doubt that the Communist Party and the ILWU would not make an all-powerful drive to elect two United States Senators in the event of statehood? And it makes no difference to them whether they bear the Republican or Democratic label. By statehood, we not only open the door for 2 Communist influenced United States Senators, but we actually invite 2 Soviet agents to take seats in the United States Senate.

On June 19, 1953, Jack Hall, ILWU regional director and Communist Party leader was convicted of violation of the Smith Act along with 6 other defendants. A 1954 publication of the Hawaii Statehood Commission cited these convictions as proof of the unalterable and aggressive opposition of the people of Hawaii to communism. The record of the 1954 election completely refutes this statement.

In the race for the office of mayor of the city of Honolulu, Frank F. Fasi, the Democratic candidate was opposed by Neal Blaisdell, the Republican candidate. During the campaign Frank Fasi charged that Blaisdell was courting ILWU support.

On October 15, 1954, the leading newspapers carried the charge by Frank Fasi, the Democratic candidate, that the big issue of this campaign is whether a candidate for mayor can be elected without the support of the Communist leaders in Hawaii.

The Honolulu Star-Bulletin, which is an outstanding newspaper of the highest standards, reported on November 1, 1954:

He (Fasi) has struck out at Governor King and the ILWU leadership.

On November 3, this same newspaper carried the following front-page headline:

ILWU sample ballot supports Blaisdell.

During this campaign, the Republican candidate did not once deny these charges or repudiate and reject ILWU support. The following legal maxim certainly applies to this situation:

When one owes a duty to speak, silence implies consent.

The electorate of Hawaii answered Mr. Fasi's issue by proving that a mayor cannot be elected without the support of Communist leaders. Perhaps, the ILWU support was unsolicited. However, there can be no question that the ILWU support was given with Mayor Blaisdell's knowledge and was accepted without repudiation by him of the ILWU leaders or the Communist principles.

The Honolulu Star-Bulletin made a survey of the Hawaiian election of November 1954 and reported its findings as follows:

The ILWU endorsed 71 candidates. Of these, 58 won, a batting average of 81 percent.

In the senate, 5 ILWU candidates won out of 6 candidates endorsed in contests for 7 seats. There are a total of 15 seats in the senate.

In the house, 22 ILWU-supported candidates won out of 28 endorsed. There are 30 seats in the house.

In the county, 32 ILWU-supported candidates won out of 38 contests which includes Neal Blaisdell, Republican mayor of Honolulu.

The 1954 election was a complete victory for the ILWU and the Communist Party. They can now exercise either control or a considerable influence over both houses of the legislature and the mayor of Honolulu. This victory is made more impressive by the fact that the ILWU political influence can be exerted in both Republican and Democratic Parties.

Mr. Jack Hall not only directed the ILWU political activities but also claimed full credit for the victories of the Republican mayor of Honolulu and the Democratic victory in both Houses of the Hawaii legislature. Mr. Hall even offered his advice for the full use of the political power gained by that election.

The secretary of the former mayor made a practice of greeting Harry Bridges at the Honolulu airport when that distinguished Communist arrived there. He sent the Honolulu municipal band to money-raising affairs held to defray the legal defense of the Communists.

The Hawaii Statehood Commission claims that statehood would enable Hawaii to deal more effectively with communism and the ILWU. On the contrary, statehood would free the Communists and the ILWU from United States control and jurisdiction. They now have the power and could immediately proceed without Federal interference to socialize and communize that state.

The atmosphere in Hawaii is one of tolerance, appeasement and encouragement for communism. The burden of proof that it can eradicate communism properly rests with the people of Hawaii. That proof has not been presented. If there is a reasonable doubt as to an extensive communistic economic and political control in Hawaii, then the party to suffer thereby is the United States. The people of the 48 States are entitled to the benefit of possible doubt. Statehood should be rejected now and deferred for an appropriate time when communism no longer threatens the well-being of either Hawaii or the United States.

The 1954 election issues, the political maneuverings and the election results serve as a stop, look, and listen warning to us.

THE POLITICAL POWERS OF STATEHOOD

Man's struggle for liberty never stops. That goal is gained in the degree of acceptance of the proposition that all sovereign power rests with the people. Constitutional government is an instrumentality for carrying out this concept of freedom.

Under our system of constitutional representative government, sovereign power can be placed into three broad categories. First, the power inherent to the people. This power can be generally described as all sovereign power that remains after constitutionally conferring such political powers to the States and the Nation as are needed for the attainment of their purposes. Second, the power granted to the Federal Government. In a broad sense, this power is limited to the enumerated political powers granted to the Federal Government under our United States Constitution. The third category is the power reserved to the States. This consists of all the residual political power constitutionally conferred by the people and not granted to the Nation.

In the present discussion, we are concerned with the second and third categories of political power. An analysis of statehood reveals a dual concept.

First. Statehood would grant to the Territories the same sovereign and political powers as possessed by other States to conduct the affairs of these areas without Federal supervision or control.

Second. Statehood would grant to the proposed States the power of representation in the Federal Government.

THE POLITICAL POWER TO CONDUCT THE AFFAIRS OF THE STATE

Statehood is not essential for the grant of power to the Territories to enact laws relating to its property, affairs, and government. Congress has entire dominion, National and local, over Territories. It may transfer full legislative powers with respect to local affairs to legislatures elected by the Territories.

Both Alaska and Hawaii now possess general legislative power for these purposes. The major exception in Alaska is the power to legislate over public lands, fisheries, and subsurface resources. Although Congress has reserved the right to disapprove Territorial legislation, no law passed by either Territory has ever been disapproved by Congress.

The executive power could very well be transferred to the Territories. There could be no serious objection to any necessary extension of judicial powers for these Territories.

However, neither of these Territories appears to seriously want these powers. No reasonable proposal or request has been made to Congress for the reorganization or an extension of the jurisdiction of the Territorial courts.

There appears to be no sincere desire upon the part of the Territories to elect their own governors and to assume executive power.

While this committee has, over the course of years, considered many bills relating to the control of fisheries, minerals, and public lands, it has not yet approved any overall proposal to grant such power to Alaska. On the other hand, neither Territory has ever presented to Congress a comprehensive bill of particulars for an extension of legislative power to enable it to govern its own affairs.

The complaints made by these Territories of a lack of power to administer Territorial matters can be interpreted in either of two ways. Either this committee has failed to give adequate consideration to their needs for additional power or the Territories have failed to present and press for a comprehensive program designed to obtain for them the necessary power to govern. This writer believes that the latter alternative prevails.

It would appear that the concern of the proponents of statehood lies not in their desire or need for additional power to conduct the affairs of the Territories but rather in their drive for representation in Congress and in the election of a President.

THE POLITICAL POWER OF REPRESENTATION IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The history of government is, in essence, a recital of the distributions of power. We are concerned here with an equitable apportionment of legislative and executive power. Statehood would transfer a share of these powers to the proposed States. Their participation in the Federal Government would consist of (a) the right to be represented in the United States Senate by two Senators, (b) the right to participate in the election of a United States President, (c) the right to be represented in the United States House of Representatives.

ORIGINAL BASIS FOR SENATORIAL REPRESENTATION

The problem of equitable representation in the United States Senate continues to plague this country since May 1787, when the Constitutional Convention convened.

The historical struggle has been between the smaller States desiring representation on a basis of equality for States, as corporate sovereign entities, and the larger States seeking representation in proportion to population. The plan of giving each State two Senators conforms to the pattern of a federation of States while representation in proportion to population conforms to the frame work of a national government.

We are concerned, today, with the question of the political justice and wisdom of equality of representation for newly admitted States in the United States Senate. The plan of equality of Senatorial representation by States was adopted for the protection of the States from encroachment by the Federal Government. In furtherance of this purpose, the provision that the Members of the United States Senate be chosen by State legislatures was enacted.

I cite the following statement made in the Constitutional Convention by delegate Wilson of Pennsylvania:

The leading argument of those who contend for equality of votes among the States is that the States as such being equal, and being represented not as districts of individuals, but in their political and corporate capacities, are entitled to equal suffrage.

Alexander Hamilton, supporting the adoption of the Constitution, stated in the Federalist Paper No. 62:

It (referring to appointment of Senators by State legislatures) is recommended by the double advantage: of giving to the State governments such an agency in the formation of the Federal Government as must secure the authority of the former and may form a convenient link between the two systems.

It seems clear that the plan of representation in the United States Senate was implemented by the provision that the States in their corporate capacities as States and as an organic whole be secured in that right of equality by the grant to them as States to choose their Senators by vote of the State legislatures. The provision for election of Senators by the State legislatures was an integral part of the compromise by which two Senators were provided to the States. The convention would never have agreed upon this principle of Senate representation if that right had not been secured by this mode of selection, that of choice by legislatures.

The 17th amendment of our Constitution, ratified on April 8, 1913, destroyed the reason for the provision that each State shall be entitled to two seats in the United States Senate.

STATEHOOD BASICALLY SHIFTS SENATORIAL AND PRESIDENTIAL REPRESENTATION FROM THE 48 STATES TO HAWAII AND ALASKA

Reduced to fundamental terms, statehood for Hawaii and Alaska grants representation in the United States Senate and in the election of the President. In the Senate, they would be represented by 4 Senators out of a prospective total of 100 Members. In the electoral college, they would be represented by 7 votes out of a prospective total of 535 votes.

The representation proposed for these Territories will be taken from the present representation possessed by the people of the 48 States and shifted to the people of these 2 Territories. This transfer of sovereign power seriously and correspondingly reduces the right of suffrage of the peoples of the 48 States in the United States Senate and in the election of the President.

REDUCTION IN THE SENATORIAL REPRESENTATION OF THE 48 STATES

The admission of Hawaii and Alaska under the present constitutional provision will entitle their residents, 628,437 combined, to 4 seats in the United States Senate. The average representation would be 1 Senator for each 157,000 inhabitants. The people of the 48 States, having a population of 152,572,000 represented by 96 Senators, today enjoy the average representation of 1 Senator for each 1,589,000 persons. Thus, Hawaii and Alaska would become entitled to representation in the United States Senate 10 times greater than the average representation of the people of the 48 States. Each voter will have approximately 33 times the power of the vote of the people of California in the United States Senate, 27 times the power of the vote of the people of Illinois, 32 times the power of the vote of the people of Pennsylvania, and 47 times the vote of the people of New York.

A comparison of the voting power of the voters of Hawaii and Alaska combined, with that of the people of the 48 States in the election of United States Senator is contained in schedule A of the accompanying table:

TABLES COMPARING THE PROSPECTIVE VOTING POWER OF THE AVERAGE HAWAIIAN-ALASKAN VOTER IN THE ELECTION OF UNITED STATES SENATORS AND A UNITED STATES PRESIDENT WITH THE VOTING POWER OF THE VOTERS OF THE 48 STATES

METHOD OF COMPUTATION

Schedule A: Population of Hawaii and Alaska (combined) is 628,437 with 4 Senators; 1 Senator for 157,000 residents. Population of Alabama is 3,061,000. One Senator for 1,537,500 residents; 1,537,500 divided by 157,000 equals 9.8 representing the average voting rights of the residents of Hawaii and Alaska as compared to 1 vote for the voter in Alabama in the election of the United States Senate.

Schedule B: Presidential electors for Hawaii and Alaska (combined) will be 7, or 1 for each 89,700 residents. Presidential electors for Alabama is 11, or 1 for each 278,000 residents; 278,000 divided by 89,700 equals 3.1 representing the average voting rights of residents of Hawaii and Alaska as compared to 1 vote for the voter of Alabama in the election of a United States President.

State and Territory	Population 1950 census	Number of presidential electors	A	B
			Voting power of average Hawaiian-Alaskan voter versus 1 vote for voters of other States for—	
			United States Senate	United States President
Alaska	128,643	3		
Alabama	3,061,743	11	9.8	3.1
Arizona	749,587	4	2.4	2.1
Arkansas	1,909,511	8	6.1	2.6
California	10,586,223	32	33.7	3.0
Colorado	1,325,089	6	4.2	2.4
Connecticut	2,007,280	8	6.4	2.8
Delaware	318,085	3	1.0	1.1
Florida	2,771,305	10	8.8	3.0
Georgia	3,444,578	12	10.9	3.3
Hawaii	499,794	4		
Idaho	588,637	4	1.9	1.6
Illinois	8,712,176	27	27.8	3.0
Indiana	3,934,224	13	12.5	3.4
Iowa	2,621,073	10	8.3	2.9
Kansas	1,905,299	8	6.1	2.6
Kentucky	2,944,806	10	9.4	3.3
Louisiana	2,683,516	10	8.5	3.0
Maine	913,744	5	2.9	2.0
Maryland	2,343,011	9	7.5	2.9
Massachusetts	4,690,514	16	15.4	3.3
Michigan	6,371,766	20	20.3	3.5
Minnesota	2,982,483	11	9.5	3.0
Mississippi	2,178,914	8	6.6	2.9
Missouri	3,954,653	13	11.3	3.4
Montana	591,024	4	1.9	1.6
Nebraska	1,325,510	6	4.2	2.4
Nevada	160,083	3	.5	.6
New Hampshire	533,242	4	1.1	1.5
New Jersey	4,835,329	16	15.6	3.3
New Mexico	681,187	4	2.2	1.9
New York	14,830,192	45	47.2	3.6
North Carolina	4,061,929	14	12.9	3.3
North Dakota	691,636	4	2.2	1.9
Ohio	7,946,627	25	25.2	3.6
Oklahoma	2,233,351	8	7.1	3.1

State and Territory	Population 1950 census	Number of presidential electors	A	B
			Voting power of average Hawaiian-Alaskan voter versus 1 vote for voters of other States for—	
			United States Senate	United States President
Oregon	1,521,341	6	4.9	2.8
Pennsylvania	10,498,012	32	32.8	3.6
Rhode Island	791,896	4	2.5	2.2
South Carolina	2,117,027	8	6.7	2.9
South Dakota	652,740	4	2.0	1.8
Tennessee	3,291,718	11	10.5	3.3
Texas	7,711,194	24	24.5	3.5
Utah	688,862	4	2.2	1.9
Vermont	377,747	3	1.2	1.4
Virginia	3,318,680	12	10.5	3.0
Washington	2,378,963	9	7.6	2.9
West Virginia	2,005,552	8	6.3	2.8
Wisconsin	3,434,575	12	10.9	3.1
Wyoming	290,529	3	.9	1.1

The representation in the United States Senate for Hawaii and Alaska is acquired by a corresponding reduction of the present power of representation of the people of the 48 States in that body today. The right of suffrage equal to that of 6,356,000 persons is taken from the 152,572,000 residents of the 48 States in varying percentage amounts and is transferred to the 628,437 residents of Hawaii and Alaska.

Statehood will give Hawaii and Alaska 4 votes in a Senate of 100 Members, or one twenty-fifth of the membership, although their combined population is only one two-hundred-and-forty-seconds of the population of the 48 States. This grant of one twenty-fifth of the membership in the United States Senate dilutes and diminishes by that fraction the representation in that body of the people of the 48 States.

POLITICAL POWER IN THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION, A MAJOR CONSIDERATION

The disproportionate advantage of Alaska and Hawaii would also apply in the presidential elections. Upon admission, these States would have a total of 7 electoral votes, an average of 1 electoral vote for each 89,776 inhabitants. The 152,572,000 people of the 48 States with a total of 531 electoral votes are entitled to 1 electoral vote each for an average population of 287,300. Thus, the voter in Hawaii and Alaska would have an average voting power in the election of a United States President 3.2 times greater than the average vote of the voter in the 48 States.

The comparison of the voting rights of the voters of Hawaii and Alaska combined with that of the people of the 48 States in presidential elections is contained in schodule B of the accompanying table.

The electoral vote of 2,011,100—7 electoral times 287,300 average population for 1 electoral vote—persons will be taken from the 152,572,000 residents of the 48 States and transferred to the 628,437 residents of Hawaii and Alaska. The disfranchisement of the residents of the 48 States applies not only to the executive branch but also applies to the judicial branch of our Government because the appointing power to the judiciary lies with the President.

The total electoral vote will be temporarily increased to 538 by the 7 electoral votes of Hawaii and Alaska. After the 1960 census, the House of Representatives would be reapportioned to reduce the temporary membership of 438 to 435. With the Senate increased to 100 members, the electoral college would be permanently increased to 535 members.

Although the combined population is only one-two hundred forty-second of the population of the 48 States, Hawaii and Alaska combined would enjoy one-seventy-sixth, or seven-five hundred thirty-fifths of the total voting strength of the 48 States in the election of a President. The right of suffrage of the 48 States in this respect is diminished by that fraction.

THE DILEMMA OF STATEHOOD

Congress is confronted with the unpleasant alternatives of continuing to withhold statehood and Federal representation for the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii or to grant statehood under terms that would unduly reduce the Federal representation of the people of the 48 States. Under present provision of the Constitution, a difficult choice must be made between the following alternatives:

A. By the denial of statehood:

First. Shall 499,794 citizens of Hawaii and 128,643 citizens of Alaska continue to be denied representation in the United States Senate and be limited to representation in the United States House of Representatives by a nonvoting delegate? and

Second. Shall these citizens continue to be denied representation in the executive and judicial branches of the Federal Government by the lack of suffrage in the election of a President? or

B. By the grant of statehood:

First. Shall the citizens of the 48 States be disfranchised to the extent of one-twenty-fifth of their representation in the United States Senate and shall that share of representation—possessed on an average by 6,357,168 citizens of the 48 States—be transferred to the 628,437 citizens of Hawaii and Alaska? and

Second. Shall the citizens of the 48 States be disfranchised to the extent of one-seventy-sixth of their electoral college voting rights in the election of a President and his appointment of the judiciary and shall that share of representation—possessed on an average by 2,011,100 citizens of the 48 States—be transferred to the 628,437 citizens of Hawaii and Alaska?

It is my conviction that neither alternative can wisely and justly solve this subverting dilemma.

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS IN PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

There have been a number of joint resolutions introduced in the House of Representatives proposing constitutional amendments to deal with the problem of statehood.

One group proposes to empower Congress to determine whether the newly admitted State shall have either no representation in the United States Senate, or 1 Senator or 2 Senators. While the intent of this resolution is laudable, the political pressures upon Congress would probably prevent a nonpartisan consideration of this determination.

The second group would provide for the admission of States by the same procedure that is required for an amendment to the United States Constitution. This proposal appears to be a procedural and not a substantive amendment. It would serve to erect an almost insurmountable barrier to statehood. The proposal has the advantage of placing the final decision of statehood in the State legislatures which represent the people affected more closely than either House of Congress. It offers no cure for the weakness of disproportionate representation.

The third, a resolution, House Joint Resolution 208, introduced by this writer, proposes a limitation upon representation in the United States Senate for newly admitted States. It would establish an inflexible standard of representation in the United States Senate on a basis proportionate to population. By its provisions, any State hereafter admitted, upon attaining a population of one-half of the average population represented by each Senator—1950 census: 794,646—would become entitled to 1 United States Senator. Upon attaining a population of 1½ of the average population represented by each Senator—1950 census: 2,383,938—it would become entitled to 2 United States Senators.

JUSTIFICATION FOR HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 208—PROPORTIONATE POPULATION REPRESENTATION IN UNITED STATES SENATE FOR NEWLY ADMITTED STATES

The Senate, today, in terms of power derivations, accountability and representation, constitutes another House of Representatives. Since the reason for equality of senatorial representation no longer exists, there is no further need for this constitutional provision. The only other tenable apportionment for the exercise of senatorial power is that of representation proportionate to population.

The proponents for statehood contend that Hawaii has a larger population than a number of States. They contend that it would be unfair to limit their senatorial representation as a condition to statehood. An adequate answer to this contention is that while article V of the Constitution prohibits depriving any State of its equal suffrage in the Senate, this protection does not apply to Hawaii and Alaska since they are not States and cannot be deprived of a power they do not now possess. It has been suggested that the present senatorial representation be rearranged. This is neither practicable nor constitutionally possible, since this protection of Senate suffrage is not amendable.

The farsighted statesmen who drew our Constitution were very careful to make this Constitution flexible enough to allow an amendment for the admission of States without the representation of 2 Senators.

The clause of article V of the Constitution, that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate, carries a double connotation.

First. The Constitution cannot be amended to deprive any State of equal suffrage in the Senate, without its consent.

Second. The Constitution cannot be amended to deprive a State of its power to consent to be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

The farsighted vision of a possible gross inequality of representation in the Senate is confirmed by a study of the deliberations of the Constitutional Convention. In the considerations of the provision of article IV, section 3, that new States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union, the Convention deleted, by a 9-to-2 vote, a proposal to the effect that new States be admitted on the same terms with the original States.

The Constitution affords ample authority to justify an amendment to equalize, per population, senatorial representation for States to be admitted.

STATEHOOD POSSIBILITIES FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, PUERTO RICO, GUAM, VIRGIN ISLANDS, SAMOA

No one can accurately foretell what lands and peoples may seek statehood in future decades. The holdings of the United States, in addition to the trusteeship of the trust islands in the Pacific, are the incorporated Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, the vague Commonwealth status of Puerto Rico, the unincorporated but organized Territories of the Virgin Islands and Guam, and the unincorporated and unorganized possession of American Samoa.

The residents of these Territories all enjoy United States citizenship excepting those in Samoa who are classified as nationals.

The people of each of these possessions, and the people of the District of Columbia aspire to statehood. The Virgin Islands hints for a delegate to the House of Representatives. Delegates to both Houses of Congress have been proposed for the District of Columbia.

Each of these political entities are edging toward statehood. In the coming half century, Congress will be called upon to decide their fate without any principle to guide it in relation to representation in the Senate and the electoral college. Certainly, the determination should not rest upon the political expediencies that may exist at that time.

House Joint Resolution 208 would provide Congress with an equitable basis for the consideration of statehood and remove the problem of representation from the strains of party politics. It would establish a just and inflexible standard of equal application to all States hereafter admitted. It would lessen the clamor for statehood where it is sought primarily for the political powers inherent in two seats in the United States Senate.

OTHER ASPECTS OF STATEHOOD—ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The proponents of Alaskan statehood claim that statehood would advance the economic development of Alaska. This hope does not conform to historical fact.

Hawaii and Alaska have had territorial status for about the same length of time. Yet, Hawaii has progressed at a far more rapid pace, economically, than has Alaska. Hawaii's economy compares quite favorably with that of the states. It is not the political status that accounts for the differential in the rate of their economic growth. The growth of Hawaii can be principally ascribed to favorable physical characteristics, the temperate climate and her arable lands.

THE VOTE IN ALASKA

The office of Delegate is the highest elective office in Alaska. The total vote cast for that office in the 1954 election was 26,999. This compares with the latest estimate civilian population of 132,000. No attempt will be made to analyze the reason for the meager ratio of vote to that of population.

When compared to congressional districts which cast from 150,000 to 200,000 votes, the voting differential is startling. This vote sharply and clearly shows up the fantastically excessive disproportionment of allowing 2 Senators to be elected by the choice of 27,000 voters.

LOSS OF INDIVIDUAL LIBERTIES, THE GROWTH OF NATIONAL POLITICAL POWER, THE REDUCTION OF STATES RIGHTS

The past 25 years, can be noted for the vast and alarming growth and concentration of power in the national Government. A parallel concentration continues to take place in the executive branch of our Government. These increasing concentrations of power coincide with a reduction of powers of the States, the loss of sovereign rights and liberties of the people and the deprivations of the legislative powers and responsibilities of Congress.

Statehood for these territories would accentuate the inequalities of senatorial representation. It would tend to strengthen the national concept and weaken States rights. It would increase the pace of nationalization of local government services and concentrate power in the federal government and in the executive branch.

There is no standard of measurement of political power. There is however a standard for the measurement of the exercise of power. This standard is the percentage of the national product siphoned off by our Government. The following table illustrates the increase in the Federal absorption of our national production:

Government expenditures and gross national product

[Dollars in billions]

Calendar year	Gross national product	Government expenditures					
		Amount			As a percentage of gross national product		
		Total	Federal	State, local	Total	Federal	State, local
1929	$104.4	$10.2	$2.6	$7.5	9.8	2.5	7.3
1930	91.1	11.02	2.7	8.2	12.1	3.0	9.1
1940	100.6	18.4	10.08	8.3	18.4	10.0	8.3
1950	285.06	61.2	40.9	20.2	21.5	14.4	7.1
1953	364.8	102.5	78.05	24.4	28.1	21.4	6.7

The above table indicates that Federal spending of our national production increased from 2.5 percent in 1929 to 21.4 percent in 1953. An increase of more than 8 fold. In the same period, the spending by States decreased from 7.3 percent to 6.7 percent of our national production.

The founders of our Constitution envisioned a Government of limited national power. The residuary power of the States was conceived to be far greater quantitatively than the powers granted to the Federal Government. The grant of two Senators to each State was based upon these assumptions. Appointment by legislatures was devised to safeguard this objective.

The above table proves that the exercise of Federal power, 21.4 percent of production, is more than 3 times the exercise of State power, 6.7 percent. This shift from State power to Federal power coincides with the alteration of our mode of selection of Senators from that of the legislatures to that of popular suffrage.

The equitable measure of representation for a dominant National Government is that of representation in proportion to population. That is the only possible protection of the majority of the people against the preponderant power of a minority of the people.

Statehood, by increasing the power of the minority, will tend to break down our two-party system. It leads to blocs and coalitions based on sectional and popular interests. The function of party organization to compromise between sectional and national interests is bypassed.

Instead of considering legislation in accordance with sound principle, excessive power encourages the consideration of legislation by political expediency and the pressures of the electorate. Theories are evolved afterwards to accommodate acts of political expediency.

The senatorial powers to be assigned by H. R. 2535 will not lie dormant. The powers of senatorial representation granted to these two Territories invite their abuse by reason of the fact that these powers are not coupled with corresponding and balancing accountability and responsibility.

For example, Alaska, with 2 Senators,

would possess one-fiftieth of the power to determine the expenditure of more than $60 billion per year. That share of power to spend is $1,200,000,000. Yet Alaska's responsibility for the collection of the amount to be spent, $60 billion, as represented by her Federal taxes, is only $48 million, or more than 1000 times less than the total national expenditure. Alaska's 2 Senators would be accountable to a population of 132,000—27,000 votes—although her 2 Senators would enjoy the senatorial power possessed on the average by about 3 million people of the Nation.

REPRESENTATION IN THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

This problem poses a number of unpleasant alternatives. The present bill would increase the members of the House by three seats allotted to the Territories. The membership of the House is increased from 435 to 438 Members. Although the membership of the House is to be increased, the increase is made not because of any advantages or need to increase the size. In fact, the present limitation of 435 Members was a careful decision as to the maximum desirable membership. The proposed increase by three seats is provided in this bill for the purpose of accommodating the proposed new Members. It is intended to anticipate the necessity for reducing the Representatives from other States if the membership is permanently limited to 435 Members.

Hawaii bases her claim to 2 Representatives upon the United States census population figure of 499,794. The latest estimate of her population would indicate that after 1960 her representation would probably be reduced to one Representative. Yet the membership of the House is being permanently increased by 2 seats to accommodate Hawaii's proposed Representatives and 1 seat to accommodate Alaska's Representative although, as of today, Hawaii is only entitled to 1 Representative.

If H. R. 2535 is amended so that the increase of membership in the House is temporary and will be reduced to 435 after the 1960 census, then the additional representation from Hawaii and Alaska will be included at the expense of representation from some other State. That reduction will probably be at the expense of those States who have failed to increase their population in pace with the national rate. The States that have shown a loss of population between the 1950 Census and the July 1, 1952 estimates are:

State:	*Loss in population*
Maine	22,000
New Hampshire	1,000
Vermont	7,000
Iowa	13,000
North Dakota	17,000
West Virginia	36,000
Tennessee	32,000
Mississippi	15,000
Arkansas	65,000
Oklahoma	9,000

If the membership of the House is retained at 435 by an amendment in the House or Senate, then we commit ourselves to reducing the representation of other states by either 2 or 3 seats to be allotted to these territories.

The Federalist Paper No. 58, warns us against a multitudinous representative assembly. Excessive numbers leads not to democratic processes but, on the contrary, to government by the few.

The latest United States census population estimates—1954—for these Territories are:

Alaska, civilian	132,000
Alaska, military	50,000
Alaska, total	182,000
Hawaii, civilian	467,000
Hawaii, military	55,000
Hawaii, total	522,000

Due to our military bases, the ratio of military personnel to the civilian population is far greater in these Territories than exists in the other states. The military personnel consists of citizens and inhabitants of the 48 States. Yet, the census makes no differentiation but adds the military population to the civilian in computing their entitlement to representation. This method violates the intent of amendment 14, section 2 of our Constitution.

Article II, section 2 of the proposed Hawaiian Constitution provides:

> No person shall be deemed to have gained or lost residence simply because of his presence or absence while employed in the service of the United States.

Thus we find that both Federal civilian and military personnel are excluded from the right of suffrage by this section. Yet their numbers are added to establish a base for Hawaii's entitlement to representation in the United States House of Representatives.

This section would appear to constitute an abridgement and denial of the right to vote. If so, then amendment 14, section 2 provides that the basis of representation shall be reduced in proportion. This writer suggests the desirability of congressional action to conform the apportionment of representation in Hawaii and Alaska with the requirements of amendment 14, section 2 of the United States Constitution.

The Alaska Statehood Committee reports that Alaska is politically impotent in Washington because it has no voting representative in either House of Congress.

During this writer's short tenure here, both Hawaii and Alaska have had the benefit of the finest, most capable, and diligent Delegates. They would bring honor to any constituency. They have distinguished themselves by outstanding service to this Nation and to the Territories they represent.

Most Representatives are limited to serving on one standing committee of the House. These committees very considerably in the volume and importance of the legislation referred to them. The distinguished Delegates from Hawaii and Alaska enjoy the unique advantage of membership on three major committees: Agriculture, Armed Services, and Interior and Insular Affairs. The Delegate from Alaska, in addition, serves on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Their service on these committees gives them the advantage of an association with fellow committee members which no other Representative enjoys. This opportunity enhances their influence and power.

The great mass of decisions made by Congress are made without a vote. The influence upon legislation in Congress cannot be measured by the right to vote. It is not a pleasant task to vote in opposition to measures which have adverse political repercussions for a fellow member of the House. It is not conducive to political good fellowship. The distinguished Delegates are saved from this necessity. When balanced out, the disadvantages of the lack of a vote are far outweighed by the advantages accruing to the delegates.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following conclusions and recommendations are respectfully submitted to this committee as an equitable disposition of this problem:

First. Statehood for Hawaii ought to be deferred until she has unquestionably eliminated communistic influences in her political, economic, and social structures.

Second. Statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska should be deferred pending the adoption of an appropriate constitutional amendment to provide for representation in the United States Senate on a basis proportionate to population.

Third. If statehood is to be granted upon the basis of equal representation in the Senate, then admission should be approved by three-fourths of the States pursuant to a constitutional amendment providing for the admission of States by the same procedure that is now required to amend our Constitution.

Fourth. Congress should immediately grant to each Territory the autonomy of statehood with full power of self-government in such form as may be recommended by the Territories.

The autonomy would include (a) complete executive power with the right of election of Governor; (b) full legislative power over all Territorial affairs, including public lands, fisheries, and subsurface resources; and (c) exclusive judicial jurisdiction.

Fifth. The enactment into Federal statute of such reasonable restrictions, comparable to limitations in their proposed constitutions, as may be recommended by the Territories to safeguard individual liberties and to insure a republican form of government.

Sixth. The immediate and outright grant to Alaska of specifically described public lands to be selected by the Territory from vacant, unappropriated, and unreserved lands, not to exceed 20 million acres.

Seventh. Grants of $7 million each year for a period of 5 years to defray the cost of governmental services assumed from the Federal Government.

This solution would strengthen and unify this Nation in the years to come. It would help preserve the rights of the States and the liberties of our people. The cause of justice and freedom would be advanced.

Foreign Aid as Seen by the National Federation of Independent Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, we have more than 4 million small and independent business men in the United States and these are the first to feel a depression. Out at the crossroads of America they wait and watch as buying declines and inventories mount, so they too stop ordering except such items as are needed from a day-to-day basis. Many of these small-business men are members of the National Federation for Independent Business with offices in various parts of the United States, including one here in Washington which is headed by Mr. George J. Burger, national vice president.

The National Federation for Independent Business polls its membership on every important economic issue including such things as foreign aid, fair trade, and the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements act. Recently Mr. George Burger appeared as a witness before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and testified as to the results of the poll on House Joint Resolution 66 which I had the privilege of introducing. Mr. Burger's testimony before the Senate committee follows:

FOREIGN AID

(Statement of George J. Burger, vice president, national Federation of Independent Business, Washington, D. C., before Senate Foreign Relations Committee, April 2, 1958)

I am George J. Burger, vice president and Washington representative of the National Federation of Independent Business. I am appearing here solely for the membership of the federation.

We represent independent business and professional people in all vocations from all parts of the country. We have the largest directly supporting membership of any business organization in the country.

Our position on legislation is dictated directly by our membership. We poll our members on all important issues, and are committed by their majority vote. No officer or group of officers is permitted to speak or act officially for the federation until our entire membership has been polled.

Our members were polled through mandate No. 229 (official publicat'on of the federation) on House Joint Resolution 66 introduced by Congressman RALPH W. GWINN, a bill to amend the Constitution to prevent our Government from giving or lending money or materials to countries which still owe us money. The result of this poll, as it appears in mandate No. 230 shows: 70 percent for, 21 percent against, and 9 percent no vote.

It is to be noted on the mandate the instruction is given to the members: "Before voting, see arguments 'for' and 'against.'"

Within the past 60 days we polled our members through mandate No. 236 on President Eisenhower's proposal that Congress vote an increase in foreign aid this year. The result of this poll as it appears in mandate No. 237 shows 17 percent for, 77 percent against, and 6 percent no vote.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I ask the privilege to have placed in the record of this hearing mandate bulletins Nos 229 and 236, which present the arguments for and against each proposition. Based on these votes expressed by our nationwide membership, the National Federation of Independent Business is opposed to further aid to countries who still owe the United States money and is against any increase in foreign-aid spending this year over last.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, bear in mind these views, coming from the grassroots of our Nation, all small-business and professional men, certainly should be noted by the Congress before any further action is taken. If the Congress deems otherwise, then it would be our opinion, in the best interest of small business and large business, that definite instructions be given by the Congress, as it relates to the operations of the International Cooperation Administration during this lull in our domestic economy, that all authorizations of ICA be channeled through American industry. Why do we say this? In reviewing the releases from ICA, we note quite frequently the source of supply is worldwide.

Here's a good example: Release from ICA dated March 24, 1958, authorizes supplies for Iran:

Iron and steel materials: $1,000,000; source, worldwide.

Motor vehicles, engines, parts: $3,999,000; source, worldwide.

Tires, tubes, repair material: $4,470,000; source, worldwide.

Mr. Chairman, we understand that Iran is one of the oil producing countries in the Middle East and it's hard to believe that that government would be in need of this aid from our Government at the expense of the American taxpayers. Further, we believe that this business, in these three commodities, accruing to American industry during this temporary recession would be a very helpful action upon the part of our Government.

As to the overall action of the International Cooperation Administration, I would like to have the privilege to file with the committee at the completion of my statement the complete text of a letter I directed to Mr. James H. Smith, Director of International Cooperation Administration, on February 12, and a letter received in answer from the ICA under date of February 24.

I quote in part from my letter of February 12:

"I am just wondering, at this time, in view of the recession in our domestic economy, as reported in the press, whether any consideration is being given by the agency as to diverting the source of supply from World Wide to our domestic producers."

I quote in part from the answer I received from ICA:

"In response to your inquiry whether this agency has under consideration a change in the source of supply from World Wide to our own domestic producers in view of the condition of the domestic economy as reported in the press, it should be mentioned that the policies of this agency are under continuing review. However, it is not anticipated that a change will be made in our policy regarding the source of supply for the reasons outlined below."

"A number of segments of United States industry have expressed the opinion that since the American taxpayer is paying the bill, American industry should be given priority on all procurement. The Mutual Security Act was not intended as a support for domestic industry. To make it such, even if only as a byproduct of our mutual security program, will not only make it more expensive for the American taxpayer, but in some measure defeat the purpose and objectives of much of the economic aid given since 1948."

Mr. Chairman, it is reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 11, 1958, Appendix page A2255, remarks of Congressman RALPH GWINN, and I quote:

"A check of the records indicates that during the period of World War II and in the postwar period to June 30, 1957, the American taxpayers have supplied more than $134 billion in aid to foreign governments and their peoples."

We put the question to the Congress, How long can the American people be "lady bountiful to the world?"

We continually read in the press that unless we continue this foreign-aid program that the Soviet Government will master the world. We wonder.

In this, it is interesting to note that only a short while ago a retired businessman, in conversation with me and others, stated that during his recent visit to the Middle East, Egypt, he mentioned to the Egyptian, "What was the reaction in Egypt when our Government failed to go through in building the dam?" The Egyptian replied, "Well, if we don't get it from your Government we will get it from Russia." He said to the Egyptian, "I am giving you a self-addressed envelope and will you drop me a line when the Egyptian Government gets that aid from Russia." He remarked that he is still waiting to get a reply.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the American people as a whole would never deny aid irrespective of where the aid is needed that is where starvation, etc., is prevailing within a nation, but on the other hand, we are wondering whether under the subterfuge of necessary aid we may be building up the economy of nations throughout the world all at the expense of the American economy and if such action may act as a boomerang to us.

At least a correction should be made in the operation of the International Cooperation Association if foreign aid is to be continued. This in itself would be some relief for the American taxpayers and American industries.

A Businessman Evaluates Our Trade Development Missions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Thomas P. Collier, one of my constituents, is a businessman with 20 years of international experience and world travel. He has served his country with distinction as a member of a trade development mission, meeting businessmen of foreign countries for the purpose of promoting better commercial relations with the United States.

By unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include an interesting and informative letter from Mr. Collier relating his experiences and observations as a member of the United States Trade Mission to the Netherlands in the spring of 1957. The letter follows:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I have a feeling that many of our Congressmen, including our people back home, do not have an understanding or even an appreciation of the tremendous value in the United States participation in international trade fairs

and on the economic trade missions. I would like to have the opportunity of relating some of my personal observations in this connection.

International trade fairs are a well established means of displaying and marketing merchandise in many areas of the world. They have been going on for hundreds of years. These are very important commercial functions attended by millions of people and also have high political and social, as well as economic value. Public Law No. 860 has established permanent authorization for participating in these fairs, and from every aspect, as far as I have been able to determine, results to date have been outstanding.

United States trade missions are an integral part of this program, providing American information and counseling services at the fairs and similar commercial service in other selected countries offering opportunity for increased United States trade and investment. These economic trade missions have been outstandingly successful and have made great contributions to American foreign trade as well as to our international relations.

As you know, Congressman O'HARA, the trade mission itself is made up of American industrial and commercial leaders whose success within the framework of the United States free-enterprise system has shown them to be exceptionally well qualified to accomplish the mission's objectives. Further, these business members are chosen from the American business community on the basis of their proven ability in fields in which the host country is known to need practical guidance and counsel. The mission is headed by a career Department of Commerce official who has devoted many years to trade promotion functions and who is well versed in United States international commercial policies.

I think that everyone will agree that the Netherlands has always been a very close and friendly ally of the United States of America. They are an equal partner in NATO. They have consistently supported us in our overseas endeavors. They are very grateful, and have used extremely well the funds made available to them under the Marshall plan. However, there were many misconceptions as to American trade policy, American governmental policy as regards the restrictions of imports into America, our quota systems, our complicated customs laws, our tariff systems, our pure food and drug laws. Consequently, our objective, as a group, was selling. We were selling our Government's sincerity and interest in promoting two-way trade. We were also selling the democratic philosophy of our Government and our people; we were selling the free and competitive enterprise system.

On many occasions, we were told by Dutch business leaders and people in many walks of life that they were amazed that businessmen, such as we, would be willing to take away 5 or 6 weeks from our business, at no salary, and in some cases at considerable personal sacrifice, in order to come over there to help them solve a business problem or to give them a better understanding of how America does business abroad as well as at home. This person-to-person relationship of American businessmen meeting their counterparts in the Netherlands has a terrific effect of bringing about a better understanding and a mutual respect for the aims and ideals of the country that we represented.

We spoke before members of the local chambers of commerce, industry federations, manufacturers' organizations, export and import groups, trade associations, and engaged in many private discussions with individual businessmen who had specific problems which they wanted solved on the spot.

Here is a program that virtually costs the United States Government nothing. Competent businessmen whose services could not be bought at any price, or whose experience could not be made available in any other manner, are freely offering their talents, experience, and good will in order to make better friends for America abroad and to increase their understanding and appreciation of the American way of life.

Many of us who have gone on our first mission have come back so enthusiastic for this type of a program, and the accomplishments that we were able to make, that we are willing to volunteer for another assignment abroad even though it represents considerable personal sacrifices and hardship on our part and the company that we work for.

I hope that Congress will never see fit to decrease its interest or funds in the international trade fairs and the United States trade missions; on the contrary, I hope that this can be expanded, as it is a demonstrable way to prove that we are sincere and that we, unlike the Russians, don't give promises of help but actually go out and do a job with no personal or self-interest involved.

I thank you for your considerations, Congressman O'HARA, and the fine support that you have always given to sound programs that will be beneficial to our international relations.

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS P. COLLIER.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Appendix

Congratulations to Minnesota on Its Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to convey my warmest felicitations to the government and people of the great State of Minnesota on the occasion of the celebration next Sunday, May 11, of its 100th anniversary of statehood.

We of Wisconsin, next-door neighbors to this great commonwealth, know from firsthand experience the beauties of the State, the friendliness of its people, the diversity of its contributions to America.

We of Wisconsin share with Minnesota a great many features, and that is why we feel particularly close to her in ways both spiritual and geographic.

We share her balance in industry and agriculture. We share her enjoyment of the Great Lakes as a mighty artery at our doorstep. We share her liberal tradition. We share her tradition of progress in human relations and of clean government.

We share here interest in tourism as a great industry.

We share peoples of common ancestry from abroad.

But mostly we share the bedrock traditions of the Middle West, of which we are both proud—part and parcel of the American way of life.

The eloquent words which have been spoken here on the floor by legislators from that great State do not need much amplification on the part of her friends and neighbors.

Ten years ago we of Wisconsin celebrated our centennial. We know that now, as Minnesota blows out the 100 candles on her birthday cake, she enters on her second century, as we of Wisconsin did, with hope high and confidence in the future.

During the coming weeks and months a great many visitors will be gathering in Minnesota. I know that they will enjoy their stay there. I know, too, that many of them will, no doubt, want to extend their visit to the Midwest by taking in the Badger State, as well.

A little later on, this month, it will be my pleasure to comment a bit about my own State, and what it has to offer to visitors from other States.

For the present, however, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a brief article which describes three of the attractions of my State which opened last Thursday, May 1, and which I know many visitors to the Minnesota centennial will want to take in, as well.

These sights, too, are part of the great Middle West tradition which our sister State celebrates.

I send to the desk, therefore, the text of this article from the April 30 issue of the Janesville Gazette. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN'S BIG THREE HISTORIC SITES TO OPEN FOR SEASON THURSDAY

The village blacksmith no longer stands under the spreading chestnut tree; the rough-and-ready days of the fur trader are gone; and the era of stagecoach travel is over (with few to mourn its passing).

But the flavor and history of these three periods is still alive. It is captured and preserved for modern generations at Wisconsin's big three historic sites: Stonefield Farm and Craft Museum, elegant Villa Luis, and colorful Old Wade House.

Opening day for all three sites operated by the State Historical Society of Wisconsin is May 1. They will remain open until November 1.

SHOES FOR THE VILLAGE BELLE

New projects are under way at Stonefield, the spacious Mississippi plantation estate built by Wisconsin's first Governor, Nelson Dewey. The site, located just outside Cassville, Grant County, will soon open a complete 19th-century village.

The Stonefield Village will have board sidewalks and old-fashioned street lamps; it will have a working telephone system of 1890 vintage, and it will have full-size stores and shops—a doctor's office, pharmacy, barber shop, general store, and printshop.

Already on display in the Stonefield Farm and Craft Museum are the life-size, working model shops of yesterday's skilled craftsmen: the shop of the blacksmith whose hammer and sparking anvil once attracted throngs of small onlookers; the harnessmaker who supplied graceful buggy whips for the carriage trade; the village butcher and the cooper; and the cobbler who tapped out high button shoes for the village belle.

Now this year is a miniature working model of an early lead mine, an industry once vital in the Stonefield area.

Thousands of pioneer farm implements and household goods (12,000 items have been catalogued this year and the job is not yet completed) are also on display at Stonefield, presenting a picture of early settlement along the middle border during the last century.

VELVET IN THE WILDERNESS

Less than an hour's drive from Stonefield is Wisconsin's elegant symbol of Victorian life and culture, the nationally famous Villa Louis at Prairie du Chien.

Built by an early fur trading agent, Col. Hercules Dousman, the mansion was outfitted with the finest furnishings of the period: marble, crystal, delicate china, fragile stemware, deep Brussels carpeting, and ornate velvet upholstered sofas.

Little has changed within the villa during its 115 years of existence: The lavish interiors are as brilliant today as they were in 1843, when the villa was completed. The plush home had no peer on the Prairie du Chien frontier during its heyday of hospitality and it is still considered a site of major historical significance.

Tours of the villa include a visit to the adjoining icehouse (which provided summertime air conditioning for the villa 100 years ago), the wine cellar, business office and the Museum Prairie du Chien.

PATCHWORK QUILTS AND PEWTER

The third member of Wisconsin's big three sites is located in eastern Wisconsin, halfway between Fond du Lac and Sheboygan—Old Wade House, the century-old stagecoach inn.

Attending the dedication of Old Wade House 5 years ago, Chicago poet Carl Sandberg termed it "an outstanding restoration. * * * There is nothing to compare with it in the Middle West."

The Wade House has been impeccably restored down to the last wooden peg, pewter pitcher and handmade patchwork quilt. Its first floor waiting room, dining hall and taproom appear today as they did back in 1852 when pioneer Sylvanus Wade opened the inn for stagecoach trade.

Upstairs the colorful rooms with small iron stoves (many of them rare collector's items), bright quilts, cornhusk mattresses, and butternut woodwork reflect the life and times of mid-America during the last half of the 19th century.

Located in a small but beautifully landscaped State park, Old Wade House today is receiving thousands of guests who arrive in the comfort of modern automobiles instead of the careening Concord stages that once rattled up to the inn's entrance.

Guided tours are available daily, from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m., at each of the sites. Admission is 15 cents for children and 60 cents for adults.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner Address by Dean Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by former Secretary of State Dean Acheson at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner held in Detroit, Mich.

In the course of this address, Mr. Acheson raises some important and stimulating considerations in the new economic challenge of the Soviet Union. Moreover, he points to the need for the free world to pull together its resources and combine its vigor in the task of economic development which the next decade and generation imposes upon us. He points effectively to the importance of achieving greater economic liquidity

within the western alliance and to the increase of capital export, private and governmental, over the next years. He also illustrates how capital exports are not mere giveaways but also can add growth and balance to our own economy.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE DEAN ACHESON AT JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER, DETROIT, MICH., MAY 3, 1958

Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners are times of celebration. This is not only because Democrats are happy and optimistic people who like to celebrate. It is also because they have had plenty to celebrate.

Of the last 14 national elections, the Democrats have won 11½. The one-half represents the 1956 election, in which the Democratic Party won the Congress but lost the White House. Curiously enough a good many Republicans think that they lost it too.

At any rate, 11½ wins out of 14 contests is a pretty good record anywhere. It shows that Democratic leadership and administration were strongly approved by the people they served. And such a long record of popular approval strongly suggests that Democratic performance was good.

Once again the prospects of victory look most promising. This time the performance to be judged by the voters will be that of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration, and this time the record is one of incompetence, lassitude, and failure, at home and abroad. These failures have affected every one of us. We are caught at home in steadily worsening economic conditions; and face abroad growing Soviet strength relative to our own, at the same time that inept and foolish actions have impaired the confidence of our friends and weakened our alliances.

Politically we Democrats have cause for optimism. We had better enjoy it, because it is about the only cause for optimism I can see. Everything else desirable is, we are told, just around the corner—as, for instance, business upturn; or just about to go up—as at Cape Canaveral; or just about to come down—as with taxes. We seem to be long on prophets, just at present, and short on performers.

So it would be pleasant at this time, when the anguish and sweat of the campaign is still a little distance away, to sit and enjoy the prospect of victory, or, at most, to recount lovingly the more luminous follies of the present administration.

But, unhappily, life does not stand still. There is much to be done in Washington; and no virile leadership from the executive branch. The Democrats control the Congress and, hard as it is for Congress to initiate, not only without executive help, but often over executive opposition, it must do so. No one else will; and both our livelihood and our security depend on prompt and vigorous measures by the Government.

The next 3 years seem to me very critical years. Within this time continued execution of our military and foreign programs in the feeble and absent-minded manner of the past 5 years could leave us practically disarmed in a nuclear world. For the drift into the position where our nuclear striking power could be destroyed, is to permit ourselves to be disarmed. Furthermore, to dilly-dally with this recession, as was done between 1929 and 1933 with another, could produce disaster for us and for the economic system of the whole free world.

A good deal of our present trouble—aside from the fundamental do-nothingism of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration—comes from regarding the problems we face, at home and abroad, as a series of isolated and unconnected pains. Nothing could be more wrong. They are all evidence of the state of health, or lack of health, of the great community of free and non-Communist peoples. Also what needs to be done at home and abroad is all one policy needed to keep this great area economically expanding and militarily secure.

We are faced by a comprehensive task. It is with others to fashion a workable and working system of free nations from societies shattered by two World Wars—to enable these nations to pursue their own ends in their own way, and to become secure against the domination of the Soviet Union.

This requires economic, military and political policies which will make this free, non-Communist society a desirable one to live within. By desirable we mean that it should offer to all who have the will, and can develop the skill, the opportunity for economic improvement, without the necessity of adopting the autocratic methods of communism or accepting Soviet overlordship. We mean, further, that this free world shall contain within it the military strength to defend itself. And we mean, also, that the nations of the free world shall follow political policies which so far as possible—man being what he is—will bring to the free world system harmony, mutual respect, and opportunity for diverse development.

This is, you may say, a pretty tall order. And, indeed, it is. But nothing short of it will do. The Soviet Union is a dynamic, powerful, and ruthless state. If the non-Communist nations should fall apart from lack of leadership, strength, or confidence in themselves, they could easily come within the domination of the Soviet Union. In that case, the scales of power would be so weighted against us that the problem of maintaining national and individual liberty within this hemisphere would be quite unmanageable.

Furthermore, to strengthen and develop the free world is quite impossible unless the United States continues to grow in strength and productive capacity. An American Government which cannot keep our own country in healthy growth will not succeed any better abroad. We are seeing this unmistakably demonstrated today.

The United States is the most powerful economic unit in the free world. The volume of its exports, imports, and overseas investments carries far-reaching consequences to every country of the free world. Whether or not the free world will have a workable economic life, offering hope to the millions who control governments throughout the world, depends, first, upon the state of affairs in the United States, and, secondly, upon whether the United States will provide loans to finance the export of capital and will make possible international trade by which other countries can earn dollars.

This concerns us deeply because, if nations in Europe and Asia cannot find economic progress and development within a system which our sheer bulk dominates, their peoples will demand other decisions which may be disastrous to them and to us. It would be sheer stupidity for us to force these decisions.

The issue will be determined in the next 3 years by a Government in which the Democrats will control Congress, and no one, apparently, will control the executive. If the decisions are wrong, the blame will be placed on the Democratic Party by the Republican candidate, Mr. NIXON. President Eisenhower, he will canonize as a martyr—and forget.

Moreover, there is a degree of rough justice in holding a party responsible which has sought and obtained responsibility for legislation, knowing the magnitude of the problems and the absence of Executive leadership. We cannot object to being judged by the manner in which the party discharges this responsibility.

We shall be judged first by how the Democrats in Congress deal with the depression. Or rather, not so much how they will deal with it, but when and how vigorously. For there seems to be a great area of agreement about what needs to be done. The economists and Democratic leaders who have appeared before the Congress speak pretty much the same language as the conservative and diversified panel of the Rockefeller brothers fund which reported 2 weeks ago. Some of the measures so uniformly recommended—a highway program, urban renewal programs, Federal aid in unemployment compensation, and so on—have already been put on the way to action by the Democratic majority in Congress. Others, such as tax reduction, which seems to be recommended almost universally, are—so the President indicated on April 23—under discussion between the Democratic leaders and officials of the executive branch.

We can all appreciate the importance of getting the agreement and cooperation of the officials who must carry out whatever measures Congress may enact. But too high a price can be paid for it.

The best measures lose their potency in geometric proportion to the delay in applying them. Public confidence, so large a factor in the battle, is lost as the procession of depressing statistics is accompanied by the chant that we have reached the bottom, the downtrend is flattening out. Next month, so the refrain goes, always next month, will see the upswing. If things get really bad, we are told, then the economy will be given powerful injections. I can think of no talk more likely to give the patient heart failure at the sight of the hypodermic. When it appears, he will know that he must, indeed, be in dreadful shape.

So it is sound economic and governmental policy to act with promptness and vigor. I submit, also, that the minimum political safety requires it. For, if delay in recuperative measures deepens the depression, it will be the party in control of Congress which will get the blame. Of course, we must expect the reverse, also. When the economic situation is saved by vigorous Democratic action forced upon a reluctant administration, all the massed choirs of Madison Avenue will sing hallelujahs to Republican doctrine. But we are a sorry lot of debaters if we allow a singed public to be taken in by this.

What is difficult is not to decide upon the measures needed to stop the economic downtrend and restore the forward movement. The hard task is to summon the resolution to act now and vigorously. Let us all support to the full our fellow Democrats in Congress in doing this.

To stop the economic decline and start a strong recovery is only a beginning. The greater task is to increase the rate of growth of American productive capacity and production. This has been Democratic doctrine for 25 years. Now for five we have been relearning that to achieve the rate of growth demanded requires managerial leadership, brains, and energy in Government. Business and finance left to themselves will not produce it.

The Rockefeller panel reports that, even with full employment and the highest rate of growth attained in recent years, "our capacity would be far below our desirable objectives." These objectives include, as they must, our defense requirements, our foreign-policy needs, other governmental purchases of goods and services for all sorts of needs, private investment to support growth, and the expanding individual consumption needed for rising standards and rising population. We simply cannot meet these needs unless our capacity to produce is greatly stimulated—and this stimulation must spring from a government that believes in it.

It will not come from a government whose leader takes as his text, as General Eisen-

hower did last week, the immortal words of Mr. Conway, the Cadillac dealer from Cleveland, "What we need now is more and better salesmanship and more and better advertising of our goods."

The great increase in Soviet productive power—perhaps the most spectacular in history—has made this growth an imminent necessity. More conservative estimates than mine would be have placed essential needs over the next decade, apart from individual consumption, at about double the amount of the national product which is going into them today. This could not be met out of a national product the size of last year's without a sharp cut in consumption. Even if our present rate of growth continues, we could not meet these needs and still allow for our present consumption standards applied to an increased population. Unless we achieve an even higher rate of economic growth, "we shall," in the words of the report, "have to hold back otherwise desirable expenditures in the Government field and keep the growth of private expenditures below a level commensurate with our aspirations."

To achieve America's aspirations has been Democratic Party doctrine since its foundation in 1792. Our task remains to give opportunity and stimulation to the dynamism and enterprise of our people. Today the growth of Soviet power and the drive to extend the scope of Soviet overlordship is, perhaps, the most pressing reason for swift economic recovery in the United States, for a quickening of our rate of growth, and for policies which will make possible a vigorous and expanding free-world economy. Only the Democratic Party can summon the will and capacity to do this. The test of the party will lie in whether it does.

At present the economic system of the free world is not in good shape. Without vigorous and imaginative action it is likely to get worse rather than better.

If we ask why this is so, the answer must begin with two central facts. The first I have just given you. The productive capacity of the United States—and the same is true of Europe—is not great enough without stimulated growth, to perform the tasks which lie ahead.

The second lies in defects in national economic policies and in the institutions for providing credit internationally. Today nearly half the total exchange resources of the world are held by the United States and Germany. Neither the United States nor Germany is behaving like a creditor nation. I shall come back to this.

On the other hand, the United Kingdom's reserves are half those of Germany and less than 4 percent of the total, despite the fact that sterling finances 40 percent of world trade. The need for increasing the United Kingdom's reserves runs directly counter to the need for extending credit for the export of capital, the essential means of industrialization in underdeveloped countries.

In these dry and obscure economic facts could lie the epitaph of the free world. Peoples everywhere demand an expanding life. Khrushchev promises the faithful and the uncommitted that Communist economics will produce this result. Only a blind man can doubt that it is turning out an impressive performance.

Only a blind man can also doubt that the free world is not doing the job. The job will not be done unless we—and the Germans, too—awake to the urgent necessity of three drastic steps.

These are, first, a substantial increase in the export of capital, both governmental and private, from North America and Western Europe; then, a substantial increase in imports into dollars areas, chiefly the United States; and, finally, an overhauling of our international financial institutions, principally the International Monetary Fund, to make possible the expansion of world exchange reserves and the provision of more credit where it can be most effective. This last must await an administration more alive to the world in which we live. I shall not discuss it further here.

These do not sound like words to inspire men to charge barricades. But, if the barricades to expansion remain, there are bad days ahead for the free world, already ringed about with troubles.

The export of capital means the production and shipment abroad on credit—or, in the postwar years, as gifts—of plant and equipment for industrial use. This has two important consequences. Producing these goods uses and expands the heavy industry and employment of the developed creditor country which does the producing. It enables an undeveloped country, which has skilled labor and management, to get plant and machinery for its industrialization. This is the way our own country and others were developed in the 19th century.

Another way of development, if a country has the natural resources, is the way Russia developed in the 20th century; that is, by having dictatorial power restrict the consumption of the people to the minimum and then use the rest of the national production for new plant and equipment. If a country does not have large natural resources as, for instance, China, it may have to adopt this latter course and, also, be dependent on the Soviet Union for exports of plant and equipment.

The Soviet Government is well aware of this. Since 1953 it has put out $1.6 billion of capital export commitments in 19 countries under the supervision of over 2,000 Soviet technicians. This could be the course of such countries as India, Brazil, the Philippines, and others, if the free world economic system should not operate effectively.

Governments which do not respond to the economic needs of their countries do not stay in power. The Republicans are finding this out in the United States today.

The development-loan-fund provisions of the mutual-security bill now before Congress meet some of this need for export of capital. The administration is asking $625 million this year. In my judgment the amount should be at least twice, and probably, three times as much.

These funds, with private investment added, represent what the economic giant of the free world makes available to expand production abroad. An idea of the seriousness of our concern with our responsibilities may be gathered by two other statistics. The amount asked from Congress to develop the free world is one-sixteenth what we in this country spend on tobacco and liquor. The other figure is that, if the same proportion of United States resources were invested abroad as the amounts Britain devoted in 1913, the entire Marshall plan would have to be carried out twice a year.

Figures of his magnitude are neither necessary not possible. But our present program is inadequate because so many of our people have been led to believe that the production of goods for export on credit is, in some way, at the expense of the American worker. But does anyone in this State seriously doubt the vast benefit its citizens have received from the purchase and export by foreign aid programs over 9 years of $3.1 billion of motor vehicles, iron and steel items, machinery, and chemicals, not to mention $9 billion of other industrial and agricultural items?

In 1955, the last year for which we have figures, over 30,000 workers in this State were employed on manufacture of goods involved in this program, which should be 2 or 3 times as large. Here is one policy which happily combines the expansion of employment and plant in our own and other developed countries with the expansion of employment and plant in undeveloped countries. It happens also to be essential to the development of free world power, stability, and a sense of common interest.

All this is true also of an increase in world trade by means of an increase of imports into dollar areas. There is no question about the need and desire of foreigners for goods from the dollar areas. People everywhere are eager for all our manufactured goods and farm products that they can pay for. But what people can pay for and the loans they can service depend on the number of dollars they can earn.

People can earn dollars only by selling us something. They want dollars only to buy from us. Here, then, is an economic exchange which is essential to the health of the free world and can bring us nothing but good. Since the money of foreigners who want to buy from us is not legal tender in the United States, and since counterfeiting is frowned upon, they have to earn dollars. So they propose to sell us something. They can only do this if what they offer is different from, or better or cheaper than, domestic products. Here the American purchaser cannot lose.

But, some of our producers argue that foreign wages are lower than American and that imports will ruin us. This is not only an odd argument in view of the acknowledged superiority of American productivity, but it is a demonstrable absurdity. Foreigners sell to us in order to buy. The annual value of what they buy is greater than what is spent on all home building in the United States or on new automobiles, or for farmers' crops or livestock. It has been estimated that if there were no tariffs at all on industrial products—which is not proposed—about 140,000 workers would be affected.

Furthermore, if we want to preserve an uneconomic venture for military reasons, we should subsidize it. We would then know exactly what we are doing, how much it costs, and not be undermining the economic foundations of the free world we are seeking to defend.

The application—I should hope the enlargement—of these essential measures for the strengthening of the free world economic system, recovery, growth, capital export, and increased trade, are before Congress now. They provide immediate opportunities and tests, not only for Democrats in Congress, but for all of us Democrats on the voting front. If we are fortunate enough to have representatives in the House and Senate who understand and will fight for these principles, let us encourage and support them with all our power. If we are so unfortunate, as I am, not to have representatives of this kind, let us get out and work for different and better ones.

1958 is going to be a Democratic year. We are going to increase the Democratic majorities in both Houses of the Congress. We are going to have more Democratic governors and give them more support in their legislatures. But, remember, we must have quality in this increased quantity. An isolationist or—if I may use a word which a well-known gentleman says he did not use—a squirrel-head is not much better for carrying a Democratic label; and sometimes he is worse. He may bring trouble on all of us.

So choose carefully, think carefully, and then go to work. We have a great and difficult task before us in these next 3 years. It is the task of saving the country and the international situation, despite the paralysis of the executive, and of insuring that in 1960 the people will return administration of affairs to those who will go forward once again with vigor and understanding.

Good performance will not necessarily insure Democratic victory in 1960, but it is an indispensable condition to any moral right to ask for it, or reasonable expectation of achieving it. Then, and only then, will our

party have the right to say to the present incompetent and irresolute drifters who occupy, but do not fill, the executive offices in Washington, in the contemptuous words of Cromwell to the Long Parliament:

"You have sat too long here for any good you have been doing. Depart, I say, and let us have done with you. In the name of God, go."

Improvement of Unemployment Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as the current recession continues, the extension of unemployment benefits becomes one of the major issues before the Senate. This is particularly true in view of the recent action by the House in adopting legislation in this field, although I fear the House-passed bill is neither adequate nor fair in many of its essentials.

Because of the urgent importance of this entire issue of unemployment compensation, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a comprehensive article on unemployment insurance by Mr. George Brown, who is director of the political education department of the Oregon State Labor Council, AFL–CIO. Mr. Brown is also a member of the National Advisory Council on Unemployment Insurance, appointed by the United States Department of Labor.

I regret to add that Mr. Brown has intimate personal experience with the urgency of this problem, because our State of Oregon has been more hard hit by unemployment over a longer period of time than almost any other State in the Nation, due to the adverse impact of the housing slump on Oregon's vital lumber industry. Therefore, Mr. Brown's observations in this field are not merely academic, but spring from the grassroots where many workers in Oregon have already exhausted their unemployment benefits.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by Mr. George Brown, entitled "We Need Stronger Jobless Insurance," as published in the Oregon Labor Press of May 2, 1958, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE NEED STRONGER JOBLESS INSURANCE

(By George Brown)

(This is the first in a series of articles on unemployment insurance by George Brown, director of the political education department of the Oregon State Labor Council, AFL–CIO. George Brown is exceptionally qualified as an expert on unemployment insurance because of his long and careful study of the subject and because he is a member of the United States Labor Department's National Advisory Council on Unemployment Insurance. In this and subsequent articles he will discuss the urgent need for a stronger unemployment insurance program in Oregon and in the Nation as a whole.)

The seriousness of the recession confronting the entire United States at the present time has pointed up the need for improving and strengthening our unemployment insurance laws.

Several bills have been introduced in Congress which provide for either temporary or permanent relief from the present inadequacy of State unemployment insurance laws and which attempt to correct that condition.

The administration has made one proposal of relief, and it is strictly a relief measure, not permanent correction of our law. The administration proposal simply provides for a temporary extension of benefits equal to 50 percent of the total number of weeks of benefits which an individual claimant would be entitled to.

The proposal provides further that this shall be a loan to the individual States and not an outright grant on the part of the Federal Government.

The proposal is not a sound one; first, because the extension of benefits is upon an inequitable basis and adds to the disparity between individuals drawing unemployment insurance. Under Oregon law, claimants are entitled to benefits for a period of a little more than 12 weeks as a minimum, and 26 weeks as a maximum. Under the President's proposal, this would mean an extension of benefits of 6 weeks to one individual and 13 weeks to another.

It is further an unrealistic proposal because the State of Oregon had to borrow $14 million from the Federal Government to prevent the suspension of experience rating under Oregon law, which would have resulted in further harm to our economy had the $14 million not been obtained. This money will have to be paid back in 4 years, and the administration proposal would simply add to the indebtedness of the State of Oregon and make it extremely difficult to repay the entire loan.

KENNEDY BILL IS BEST

There are several bills in Congress which provide for a temporary extension of benefits of 13 weeks as an outright grant of the Federal Government. That approach is much more realistic than the one the administration has proposed, but still provides for only temporary relief.

Students of unemployment insurance have strongly endorsed the establishment of permanent Federal minimum standards, such as those contained in the Kennedy bill, Senate bill 3244, and the McCarthy bill, House Resolution 10570. These bills, which are companion measures, provide for permanent improvement and minimum standards to be established. These standards would go into effect 60 days after the date of enactment of such legislation, and, until July 1 of 1959, the cost of the additional program will be paid by the United States Government. After that time it shall be the responsibility of the States.

The general terms of the Kennedy bill provide for an increase in maximum unemployment benefits to two-thirds of the average weekly wage of the State, or one-half of the individual's average weekly wage, whichever is the lesser.

It provides for a uniform duration of 39 weeks. Uniform duration means that any individual qualified for unemployment insurance shall be entitled to a potential of 39 weeks regardless of his base year earnings.

FEW DISQUALIFICATIONS

The bill also provides any payment under supplementary unemployment benefit plans will not be cause of a reduction in unemployment benefits provided by the States.

The measure provides further that a claimant will not be denied unemployment insurance when a strike results from the failure or refusal of an employer to conform to Federal or State laws pertaining to collective bargaining, wages, hours, or other conditions of work, or the failure of an employer to maintain for his employees wage rates, weekly earnings, hours, and other conditions of work substantially less favorable than those prevailing for similar work in that locality.

It provides for a 1-week waiting period within the benefit year, a flat period of 4 weeks of disqualification for voluntarily leaving work, refusing to accept suitable work, or discharge for misconduct. It provides a maximum penalty of 12 weeks for any cause.

Uniform provisions are established for eligibility as determined by the individual State law. Where the State law requires a multiple of the weekly benefit amount, the maximum of such multiple is set at 30 times. Where State law requires a high quarter formula as a standard of eligibility, the maximum shall be 1½ times the high quarter earnings. Where State law provides for flat number of weeks to determine eligibility, the maximum shall be 20 weeks of employment.

MORE WORKERS COVERED

Finally, the Kennedy bill provides for extended coverage to groups not now covered, and for coverage of all employees (one or more) in those categories that come under the law (an additional 1.8 million workers).

The New York Times has stated that the establishment of Federal standards in the unemployment insurance field is long overdue. Recently a panel of 19 of our leading university economists from Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Minnesota, Duke, Cornell, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and others, have concluded that failure to establish Federal standards for minimum contributions has resulted in the steady deterioration of the many State systems because the States have competed in reducing benefit rates rather than attempting to carry out the essential purposes of the unemployment insurance law.

These experts also declare that the long-standing lack of Federal standards has resulted in defects in the unemployment insurance systems today and cannot protect our citizens in times of heavy unemployment.

COVERAGE WEAKENED

They traced the downgrading of unemployment insurance to interstate competition which has resulted in inadequate benefit scales, inadequate duration of payments, arbitrary eligibility requirements and arbitrary disqualifications. These defects have seriously weakened our unemployment insurance system as a first line of defense against protracted unemployment and as an element of stability in our economy.

Finally, they give this warning in relation to the administration's inadequate proposal of a temporary relief measure: "Without Federal standards, the United States is ill-prepared for recurrent recessions. A hasty and plausibly generous gesture of Federal relief payments under the guise of insurance benefits does not make up for essential weaknesses in the established program."

Democrats and Labor Racketeers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Democrats and Labor Racket-

eers," written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Evening Star of April 29, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATS AND LABOR RACKETEERS

(By David Lawrence)

The Democrats in the Senate voted almost unanimously to prevent the enactment of legislation that would prohibit labor racketeering. They won the vote this week, but they may have cost themselves the 1958 elections.

For the Democrats, in control of both Houses of Congress, have refused to allow remedial laws to be passed to rid the country of abuses of power by labor unions. This means that, in the campaign this autumn, in the big cities and particularly where the high cost of living hurts most, the Democrats who are candidates for Congress will be confronted with the argument that they aided the forces which have brought on the present recession. People with fixed incomes—and there are from 15 million to 20 million of them throughout the country—will be hearing speeches, mostly from Republicans, telling how the monopolistic power of labor unions has forced the present trend of inflation in America.

Within the last few days Charles C. Abbott, dean of the Graduate School of Business Administration at the University of Virginia, declared before the Senate Finance Committee:

"If the current recession deepens, I would raise a question whether economic historians may not label it the first union-made depression in our history."

Dean Abbott said that this spring a group of the most distinguished economic analysts to be found in our universities has been invited to lecture at the University of Virginia and that 10 of the guest lecturers have already appeared. He added:

"I have been impressed by the extent to which they ascribe many of our present economic difficulties to the exercise of monopolistic powers by trade unions. There is general agreement on the process through which these difficulties are generated. Under threat of strike, unions extract wage increases and other benefits from the economy that are in excess of increases in productivity. These wage increases inevitably push up prices when, as is the case in this country, there is a flexible money supply. That is why the kind of inflation we have today is increasingly referred to as a wage-push inflation and, incidentally, this type of inflation cannot be solved through monetary and fiscal policies alone."

Many Members of Congress of both parties feel something should be done to curb the monopolistic power of unions, just as the antitrust laws prevent corporations from exercising price-fixing powers. But the political strategy of the Democratic leadership has been mistakenly based on a belief that the issue is not very important and that the efforts of men like Senator KNOWLAND of California, Republican, to get something done about it do not have nationwide support.

It is significant that, on the question of requiring labor unions to conduct elections of their officers by secret ballot, at least once in 4 years, only one Democrat—Senator LAUSCHE, of Ohio—voted with the 36 Republicans who wanted such an amendment adopted. It is significant also that 10 Republicans—5 of whom are up for reelection this autumn—went along with the Democrats.

The excuse given, as Senator KNOWLAND rightly labels the strategy of the majority, is that the bills had not had adequate study in committee. Hence, promises were broadcast by the Democratic leaders that they would bring out a bill later on in this session. The betting today is that, if the Senate passes a bill, the Democratic leaders in the House will kill it. For the truth is the alliance of the Democratic Party in Congress with the labor-union bosses is still very strong. Even the southern Democrats, it is reported, felt they had to go along with the northerners this time, largely because of a belief that the Democratic Party control of Congress and their own committee chairmanships could only be retained that way.

The battle between the conservatives and the so-called liberals in Congress, many of whom depend on labor-union money to win elections, is going to be vigorously waged this autumn in several places where the Democrats hitherto have thought they could win easily. The sentiment of the Nation today, especially among the fixed-income groups as well as among housewives generally, is against those who are responsible for the union-made recession. There are many homes, too, where the union worker finds his wife wondering whether his union dues are being misused or embezzled, as the recent exposures have shown.

It looks now as if only by the election of enough new Members in Congress—committed to legislation that abolishes the labor-union monopoly—will there ever be any chance of getting relief from the wage-price spiral and inflation.

Opposition to Right-To-Work Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD the joint statement of the Montana congressional delegation, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Representative LEE METCALF, Representative LEROY ANDERSON, and myself, in opposition to right-to-work legislation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We unalterably oppose any so-called right-to-work legislation.

We do so for the following reasons:

1. The real purpose of right-to-work laws is to weaken unions and reduce the effectiveness of collective bargaining, thus decreasing even more the income of workers who already, particularly in our State of Montana, are suffering from the effects of the recession.

2. Imposition of right-to-work laws hurts farmers, small-business men, professional people, and other unsuspecting victims as well as members of labor by reducing workers' purchasing power and volume of business they create. These groups have been hurt badly already by the administration's devastating farm and hard-money policies.

3. Under democratic procedures the will of the majority should prevail. In 46,000 plant elections conducted by the National Labor Relations Board, on approval of negotiated union shop agreements, 97 percent of the workers voted for the union shop. This overwhelming endorsement led Congress to the conclusion that further elections on this issue were a waste of time and money and so it removed a requirement that they be held.

4. The union shop does not restrict the right to work of those willing to share in the cost and effort of working together for mutual benefits.

America's prosperity—Montana's prosperity—rests in good measure on the gains agreed to by employers and employees bargaining together. Let's keep it that way. Let us all, instead of tearing down labor's and the Nation's gain, join in redoubled efforts to achieve full employment for American workers, develop our resources, expand our industries and thus create an abundance in which all America may share.

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY.
Senator MIKE MANSFIELD.
Representative LEE METCALF.
Representative LEROY ANDERSON.

A Wage Program That Could Stop Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, an article by Mr. Harold J. Ruttenberg in the current Reader's Digest proposes some ingenious and constructive measures to encourage economic growth without inflation. The problem of keeping our cost of living within bounds while pushing our standard of living and our military strength full speed ahead is a prime economic problem of our time. This is why I have introduced a resolution calling for an investigation that may help the Congress establish policies that will foster growth and stability. Mr. Ruttenberg makes an unusually helpful contribution to this objective. In proposing productivity wage increases, however, he still leaves us with a problem which the great economist Sumner Slickhter called to my attention at Harvard 12 years ago: Would not such wage increases provide a disproportionate benefit to those workers who happen to be in industries which are enjoying technological advance, and heavy gains in productivity, while workers in industries in which technology plays little part could receive no corresponding benefit from the national improvement in productivity?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WAGE PROGRAM THAT COULD STOP INFLATION

(By Harold J. Ruttenberg)

During the 1930's, when wage inequities were being eliminated, working conditions modernized, wages raised and hours shortened, I asked my elders in the labor movement a simple question: What do we do when these failings of management have been corrected?

The answer was direct, simple, and continues as union policy to this day: "We shall keep right on asking for more. Our job is to get as much for our members as we can squeeze out of the companies. It is an easy job, as, once we get a new and better con-

tract, we have no further responsibility. It is entirely up to management to find the means to pay the rising wage bill every year."

This program of more pay for less work, already obsolete in the late 1940's, is today untenable.

Many of the increases in labor costs during the 1930's and early 1940's were made possible by the full utilization of productive capacity that was underutilized before the war. But after the war the constantly rising basic wage rates and fringe-benefit costs could be offset in only three ways:

By increasing productive efficiency.

By the efficient and full utilization of new capacity.

By increasing prices.

Each time wage increases not justified by productivity are followed by price rises, the unions are plundering every American who lives on a fixed income; that is, all the millions who do not enjoy the privilege of having the increases in their cost of living automatically covered by cost-of-living wage increases. I do not believe that the companies and unions in the basic industries can long sustain their positions of insulation while the rest of the 173 million Americans are exposed to the ravaging effects of spiraling wages and prices.

More than a decade ago I felt that unless the unions' program was modernized, the labor movement would become the victim of the sterile, intellectually bankrupting influence of its own great power. And so it has come to pass.

The next big step forward, therefore, must be initiated by the leaders of industry. A new and fundamental program for collective bargaining is the answer.

Industrial leaders should propose the following to their employees and unions:

To pay higher wages for more production.

To provide maximum capital for the purchase and installation of equipment to increase production.

To organize practical means for all employees to cooperate with management to increase production.

To enlarge existing, and create new, training schools for the dual purpose of operating new equipment at maximum production, and retraining for new positions those managerial and operating employees whose jobs have been replaced by new equipment or methods.

To negotiate a practical measurement of increased production so that productivity wage increases can be made semiannually to the extent that production has been increased, such increases to be paid one-half in direct wages, one-half in a separate fund to increase fringe benefits.

This proposal would increase employees' real purchasing power, enable management to absorb productivity wage increases through increased production, provide customers with products of higher quality at existing or lower prices, and let stockholders enjoy a portion of the benefits of increased production through higher dividends.

Isn't this a program worth considering?

Veterans' Hospital for South Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the 14th and 15th Congressional Districts of Texas, with a population of approximately a million people, embrace 32 counties and a total of 34,168 square miles. Yet in all of this area there is not a veterans' hospital, and some veterans needing medical attention must travel over 400 miles to get it.

Two bills have been introduced in the House on this subject and I have introduced a bill in the Senate. My bill would provide for construction of a 300-bed Veterans' Administration hospital in this area. Such a facility is badly needed.

Recently the Veterans' Affairs Commission of Texas, meeting in Austin, passed a resolution endorsing the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital in south Texas. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of this resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE CONSTRUCTION OF A VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL IN SOUTH TEXAS

Whereas the need for a Veterans' Administration hospital in south Texas has been established and proven by the fact that many veterans have been denied hospitalization benefits as it is impossible to travel the distance now involved and on several occasions veterans have died en route to other Veterans' Administration hospitals; and

Whereas south Texas veterans are being hospitalized in State and county hospitals and required to pay hospitalization where adequate facilities and doctors are not available; and

Whereas two bills are now in the United States House of Representatives, Veterans' Affairs Committee, and a similar bill is also before the United States Senate in respect to building a 300-bed Veterans' Administration hospital in south Texas; and

Whereas the South Texas Veterans Alliance is composed of all-veteran organizations and organized for the purpose of securing a Veterans' Administration hospital for south Texas; and

Whereas the Veterans' Affairs Commission of the State of Texas is vitally interested in any program of assistance to veterans and working in close conjunction with the service organizations, is well aware of the inadequate hospital facilities in south Texas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Veterans' Affairs Commission in meeting assembled in Austin, Tex., this 23d day of March 1958, go on record as endorsing and giving full support to the efforts of the South Texas Veterans' Alliance in their attempt to secure adequate hospitalization for the veterans of south Texas.

E. L. JACKSON,
Chairman, Veterans' Affairs Commission of Texas.

Attested by:

CHARLES L. MORRIS,
Executive Director, Veterans' Affairs Commission of Texas.

Dwindling Assets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dwindling Assets," from the May 5, 1958, issue of Barron's, National Business and Financial Weekly.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DWINDLING ASSETS

From the frozen Yukon to Africa's sunbaked Rand, one of the oldest and most valued of all commodities, gold, lately has been much in the public eye. At home, as the United States struggles through its most severe postwar slump, mining of the yellow metal, the so-called contrary industry, has begun to prosper. Producers such as Homestake in this country and Giant Yellowknife in Canada recently have watched their shares scale new heights. Kaffirs like West Driefontein and President Brand also show buoyancy. Unfortunately, the news about the precious metal is not all cheering. Some disturbing shifts, in fact, have begun to show up in its international flow. Specifically, thus far in 1958, gold has been pouring out of the United States Treasury in quantity, steadily depleting the vast hoard in the vaults at Fort Knox.

The significance of this trend, however, seems to have been lost on most observers. Even such an authority as Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin last week shruggest it off as inconsequential. Surely, though, it should not be ignored. For America's sudden loss of gold sounds a clear warning. On the one hand, it demonstrates that quite a few foreign nations are in much better shape economically than often is supposed. The celebrated dollar gap which hampered their trade in the early postwar years—and again during the Suez crisis—now has been closed. The United States, on the other hand, is revealed to be less robust financially than it usually is pictured. Indeed, the gap now is starting to yawn in the opposite direction. This sharp turnabout brings forcibly to mind Lord Keynes' caustic phrase describing the United States, as a "high-living, high-cost" nation. It's time, then, to recognize that today's open-handed economic policies, at home and abroad, fast are becoming luxuries which the country no longer can afford.

The record of what has been happening is clear enough. For the past 25 years, the flow of gold into the United States has been so nearly constant as to produce an occasional embarrassment of riches. Only a few times has the long-term trend been interrupted, notably during World War II and the Korean conflict, when the United States drew down its gold stock rapidly in the scramble for raw materials and other supplies. The recent shift, then, represents a conspicuous departure from previous peacetime experience. Yet there is no disputing the evidence. During January 1957 the United States gained $310 million in gold; in March of this year, it lost nearly $250 million. Indeed, in the first 4 months of 1958, the outflow already exceeds $750 million. For the year as a whole, it easily could run as high as $2 billion.

In this remarkable turnabout, technical factors, to be sure, play a part. As the tight-money policy of the Federal Reserve has given way to increasing ease, many foreign holders of short-term dollar claims have chosen to switch to gold. But the reasons for today's loss also run deeper. The United States simply is paying out more dollars than it earns. During the slump, imports have held up relatively well, falling barely 5 percent from last year's lofty level. Exports, in contrast, have shrunk a phenomenal 18 percent. Actually, since official statistics include the whole gamut of economic aid and farm surplus disposal, in addition to commercial sales,

the true picture is even worse than it looks. True, America's gold stock, at nearly $22 billion, still appears ample to support the Nation's credit structure. Nonetheless, it is the downward trend which is significant, not to say ominous.

John Maynard Keynes, for one, would have had no trouble in diagnosing what ails the United States. Fundamentally, it is a growing inability to compete on equal terms with foreign producers. Most American farmers, for example, long have huddled under the double shelter of import restrictions and export subsidies. The automakers, who enjoy no such protection, have seen the United States, traditionally the world's leading exporter of cars, turn into its biggest importer. In diesel locomotive and in machine tools, European competitors are making headway, some even selling in the American market. Only recently, giant General Electric besought Washington for some insulation against overseas producers of turbines and transformers. Looking to the future, Britain is challenging the once impressive United States lead in nuclear power.

The dreary picture is highlighted by some World Bank statistics, pinpointing how the proceeds of its foreign loans have been spent. In the 7 years through June 1954, borrowers the world over spent no less than 65 percent of their funds for goods made in the United States. In fiscal 1955, that proportion dropped to 54 percent, and in the latter half of calendar 1956 to less than 48 percent. In the first quarter of this year, America's shares plummeted to 33 percent.

Faced with the loss of business here and abroad, many domestic industries plead tirelessly for price supports and market quotas, export subsidies, and buy-American legislation. All these supposed panaceas, however, not only are extremely expensive, but also threaten to make the illness worse. For at bottom it is the inflated costs of doing business that make this country vulnerable to competition from many a less wealthy nation. Everyone knows, of course, that United States wages are unparalleled elsewhere. It is equally significant that, owing to Government supports and subsidies, many manufacturers also have to pay far more than the world price for raw materials like cotton and nonferrous metals. Thus in seeking to pacify one pressure group after another, Washington merely has succeeded in hobbling American business more severely in the unending race for world markets.

What is happening to the flow of gold, then, discloses certain fundamental dislocations within the economy. Under the lead of Democrat and Republican alike, Washington in the postwar years has piled Pelion on Ossa in economic commitments at home and abroad. Yet the resources of even the wealthiest nation, it is well to remember, are not limitless. Before this continuing drain begins to jeopardize the Nation's credit, it is imperative to pause and take stock. For the gold now ebbing away symbolizes the loss of something even more vital: the very qualities and strengths that once gave America its competitive edge.

Judge Richard Henry Alvey, Distinguished Son of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, following the death in 1906 of Judge Richard Henry Alvey, a former chief justice of the Courts of Appeals of Maryland and the District of Columbia, one of his colleagues in the judiciary eulogized him as follows:

His work speaks for itself. In a word, his opinions as reported are not excelled in the judicial annals of the State, or by the judgments of any other judge where the English tongue is spoken.

This is high praise, but it is a historical fact that the remarkable Judge Alvey was entirely deserving of it. Here was a man worthy of emulation, not only by his contemporaries, but also by today's generation and those of the future. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that a biography of Judge Alvey be printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD. It was prepared by Ruth Worthington Pfeil (Mrs. Robert H. Pfeil), of Middletown, Md., a granddaughter of the late Judge Alvey.

There being no objection, the biography was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDGE RICHARD HENRY ALVEY, DISTINGUISHED SON OF MARYLAND

At Leonardtown, on March 6, 1826, Richard H. Alvey first saw the light. His forefathers had come to Maryland in 1634, with Leonard Calvert, and several had served as soldiers in the American Revolution. Richard H. Alvey was the son of George and Harriet Wicklin Alvey, who were highly regarded because Mr. Alvey both taught school and acted as the justice of the peace in Leonardtown.

With this background, young Richard attended the school taught by his father. His father's law library was his chief delight and, as he grew older, Richard spent more and more time studying his father's law books. He was sent to Charlotte Hall Academy, in St. Mary's County, to continue his studies.

By 1844, having reached the age of 18 years, he decided that practicing law must be his vocation. With that object in mind, he went to Charles County, where he studied law at night and became the deputy clerk, and later the clerk, of the circuit court of Charles County. He was admitted to the bar in Charles County in 1849. The next year he moved to Hagerstown, where he began practicing law and acquiring many friends.

Soon after settling in Hagerstown, Mr. Alvey was nominated by the Democrats for State Senator from Washington County. Judge French, a popular Whig, was his opponent. Washington County at that time was strongly Whig, and the result was a tie. Then a second election was held, and Judge French won by a few votes.

In 1852 Richard Henry Alvey was nominated as a Pierce presidential elector, and canvassed Maryland thoroughly. This time the voters gave him a large majority.

Shortly after coming to Hagerstown, Richard H. Alvey met Miss Mary Wharton, the daughter of Dr. James O. Wharton, a prominent physician. The young couple were much attracted to each other, and in 1856 they were married. A little daughter was born to them, and their happiness seemed complete. But fate decreed otherwise, for Mrs. Alvey passed away in 1860, when only 26 years of age, and her little daughter soon followed her.

At this time there was a wide breach in the hitherto serene life of the period in Maryland. Situated as it is between the Northern and the Southern States, and with the Nation's Capitol within its borders, there was bitter feeling between Maryland's Northern and Southern sympathizers on many questions.

On April 19, 1861, Union troops came to Hagerstown, and bitterness ran high between the two factions. As Mr. Alvey had not hesitated to express his views on States rights, he was hated vindictively by the Union sympathizers. The Union soldiers decided to capture him as a prisoner, but had no legal grounds upon which to arrest him. Therefore, they resorted to a trick, as a result of which Mr. Alvey was taken to Union headquarters and subsequently transferred to the Hagerstown jail, then to Fort McHenry, near Baltimore, then to Fort Lafayette, in New York State, and finally to Fort Warren, off the coast of Massachusetts. In the following February 1862, he was allowed freedom, but only as a parole prisoner.

After Mr. Alvey returned to Hagerstown, he became acquainted with Miss Julia Jones Hays, daughter of Dr. Joseph C. Hays, of Sharpsburg, Washington County, Md. She admired the brilliant lawyer for his courageous stand on his convictions, and when he asked her to marry him, she accepted. The wedding took place in St. John's Episcopal Church, in Hagerstown, on November 2, 1862. This marriage was a most happy one. Ten Alvey children made the welkin ring through the house.

In 1865, the War Between the States now over, all the Southern sympathizers were disenfranchised, and deprived of many of their rights as American citizens. Richard H. Alvey, having suffered much himself, was among the first to work in behalf of the many fine citizens who had been excluded from serving on a jury. He drafted the present jury law in force in the counties, and attended the legislature of 1867 to work for its passage. The new law was passed as he had prepared it.

This same legislature of 1867 called the constitutional convention which framed the present constitution of the State of Maryland. Richard H. Alvey was sent to the convention as a delegate.

With the new constitution in force, he became a candidate for the position of chief judge of the fourth judicial district, composed of Washington, Allegany, and Garrett Counties; and simultaneously, as associate judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland. He was elected by a splendid majority in the fall of 1867, and again, after a 15-year term, in 1882.

Upon the retirement of Chief Judge Bartol, of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, Judge Alvey was called to be chief justice of the Court of Appeals of Maryland by Gov. William T. Hamilton, his former law partner.

In 1893 President Cleveland organized a new court for the District of Columbia, and invited the distinguished jurist of the Court of Appeals of Maryland to be its first chief justice. Judge Alvey accepted this honor with pleasure.

Judge Alvey presided on the bench in Washington for 11 years. He also acted as chancellor of the National University of Washington, and lectured to the law students.

President Cleveland in 1896 again honored Judge Alvey by appointing him a member of the Venezuelan Boundary Commission, which was set up to investigate the boundary between Venezuela and British Guiana.

In June 1902 Princeton University conferred upon Judge Alvey the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws. St. John's College, at Annapolis, Md., on June 15, 1904, also bestowed the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws upon him.

Judge Alvey retired from his last important office of chief justice of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia on December 30, 1904. At home again in Hagerstown, the judge lived quietly with his family on Prospect Street. On September 14, 1906, after a short illness, Judge Alvey passed away at his home.

Political Significance of Rockefeller Economic Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Rockefeller Economic Report was a magnificent contribution to an understanding of the great economic problems facing this country and Congress. At the time the report was published, I noted that it was immensely heartening to find the seasoned, practical, successful businessmen, who took part in writing the report advocating policies of bold economic aggressiveness, policies very similar to those of the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

One of America's greatest columnists, Miss Doris Fleeson, commented in the Washington Star last night on the great political significance of this report. Miss Fleeson said:

It demonstrates that the Democrats cannot count on a monopoly of liberal and progressive ideas in national campaigns no matter how many Republicans coalesce with southern Democrats in Congress. It shows that a Republican presidential candidate who strikes out as the champion of economic growth and expansion can count on very telling support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article written by Miss Fleeson be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARADOX OF THE ROCKEFELLER REPORT—IDEAS IN DOCUMENT NOTED AS EVIDENCE OF RISING LIBERALISM WITHIN GOP

(By Doris Fleeson)

The conservative manner in which President Eisenhower handles the Government economy, including the recession, has been highlighted from an unexpected source. It is the Rockefeller report which, as its name suggests, is the work of important men identified with large vested interests and strongly oriented toward the Republican Party.

Naturally the antirecession measures suggested in their bulky document got the headlines, especially as their tax cut proposal seemed to cut across the President's program. The business and financial community has since had time to give the report more intensive study and is voicing some arresting conclusions.

One is that, far from attacking the welfare state, the report takes the country further and faster along that path than Roosevelt and Truman did. The evidence:

The report states as a fact that the Nation is dedicated to economic growth and full employment and that to this end real wages out to be doubled in 30 years with a possible rate of growth of 5 percent a year.

By contrast the President has referred to the recession as a minor emergency we are meeting internally. He dwells upon each bit of evidence that the climb back to the old plateau may have begun and has offered no growth plans.

Detailed forms of desirable Government regulation of the economy are set forth also in the Rockefeller report, including use of the taxing power and monetary and fiscal policy. The Federal Government is urged to take the lead in transportation policy, land and water use on a national scale, urban problems, and various other social needs.

The Rockefeller planners do not, of course, represent all of business, and their philosophy is perhaps overweighted with the ideas of Eastern internationalists. But they are a sufficiently inclusive group to prove that a revolution in the thinking of important business interests has taken place since President Roosevelt took office.

That they are interests which intend to be counted in American politics can hardly be denied. They supported in large part the Eisenhower candidacy and it is an irony of history that at this point the Midwest smaller business backers of the late Senator Taft—like former Treasury Secretary Humphrey—seem to have the greater influence now with Eisenhower on economic matters.

What the report does in a broad sense is accept it as proved that this Nation is in a race for expansion with the Soviet Union. In its details it sets up a timetable and direction signals for that race.

Politically its significance is twofold. It demonstrates that the Democrats cannot count on a monopoly of liberal and progressive ideas in national campaigns no matter how many Republicans coalesce with southern Democrats in Congress. It shows that a Republican presidential candidate who strikes out as the champion of economic growth and expansion can count on very telling support.

Service by Schoolteachers in State Legislatures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in my State of Oregon an unfortunate constitutional provision has acted to bar schoolteachers from serving in the Oregon State legislature, despite the desirability of having their knowledge and education and idealism in the halls of government.

In fact, the Oregon Education Association is currently circulating an initiative measure to correct the present regrettable situation.

For that reason, I am delighted that the distinguished Governor of Maryland, the Honorable Theodore R. McKeldin, declared on May 4 that it is not only permissible but highly desirable that schoolteachers serve in the legislature of the State of Maryland.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article pertinent to this matter from the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 5, 1958, entitled "Teachers in Legislature Endorsed by McKeldin," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEACHERS IN LEGISLATURE ENDORSED BY MCKELDIN

BALTIMORE, May 4.—Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin said today:

"It is not only permissible but highly desirable" that schoolteachers serve in the Maryland Legislature if they have the inclination and are elected.

The Governor took an opposite stand from his State superintendent of schools, Dr. Thomas G. Pullen, in a speech recorded for radio broadcast here.

Dr. Pullen had ruled that J. P. Carlton, agriculture teacher at Southern High School in Lothian, could not serve in the house of delegates from Anne Arundel County if elected and take leave of absence during legislative sessions. He said schoolteachers are State employees and barred by the constitution for serving in the assembly.

"Certainly public-school teachers of Baltimore City and the counties are not employees of the State," said McKeldin, emphasizing the "not." "And even if they were, there is precedent for State employees, as distinguished from State officers, obtaining leaves of absence from their regular posts for legislative service.

"If a teacher were to be barred from seeking or occupying a seat in the assembly because of his or her status as a city or county employee, then there are holders of other public positions who should not have served in past sessions, and who should now either resign from the legislature or from their regular jobs."

McKeldin's comments, in the seventh of a series of weekly broadcasts he is making on public issues, obviously stemmed from questions raised by Carlton's bid for public office, but he did not mention the candidate by name.

Effects of the Recession in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has been among those States to suffer most during the current recession. One out of every 14 of our workers is currently unemployed and several of our most important industries have long been in serious economic trouble.

John C. Cort, in an article in the Nation, describes the situation in Massachusetts graphically.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nation of April 5, 1958]

BOSTON: 45,300 JOBLESS

(By John C. Cort)

BOSTON.—Last week I was talking to a friend, a man with five small children who had recently lost his job. He said, "After the first week out of work the tension starts creeping up the back of your neck and goes right to the top of your head. And the only thing that can cure it is a good stiff drink."

Stories on unemployment, including this one, are bound to be soggy with statistics. In reading the figures, it might be helpful to think of them in terms of men, like my friend, who are trying to stay sober and sane at the same time, but are not quite sure they can make it.

In capsule form, the situation in Massachusetts is as follows: Unemployment is esti-

mated at 158,000, which is 7.5 percent of the work force, and about 50,000 more than this time last year. Greater Boston has 45,300 jobless. All industries have been hit except for finance, insurance and real estate, services, miscellaneous, and mining (first time I realized we had any mines in the Commonwealth), and State and local government. The last category accounted for an increase of 6,000, which could indicate either that unemployed citizens are being put to work on local work projects or that the politicians are taking care of their friends, an appropriate phenomenon in the land of the last hurrah.

One of the more disturbing items in the breakdown is that the number of men receiving unemployment benefits is going up much faster than that of women. As of March 15, the figure was 66,000, an increase of 28,000 from a year ago, whereas the number of women on the benefit rolls had risen only from 26,000 to 38,000. Since men are traditionally the bigger moneymakers and breadwinners, this reflects the rate at which purchasing power is dropping and hunger increasing in this State.

If you have been following closely up to this point, you will have noticed that only 104,000 are receiving State unemployment benefits out of the estimated total of 158,000 unemployed. Another 7,000 are getting either veterans' or Federal employee benefits. This leaves 47,000 who are either unlucky enough to have been working in an uncovered industry or occupation (mainly self-employed, farming, local and State government, domestic service, charitable, religious and educational institutions) or who have exhausted their benefits.

The latter would mean that in most cases they have completed the 26 weeks for which they were eligible for benefits. It is no surprise that the "exhaustees" are increasing every month. Last month, there were 5,400 new exhaustees as compared with 3,600 in February 1957. In the week ending March 15, there were 1,700 new ones, which would mean a monthly rate of over 7,000.

All hands, or at least most hands, are looking hopefully to Washington for passage of the Kennedy-McCarthy bill, which would increase from 26 to 39 the maximum number of weeks for receiving benefits. This would do much to ease the problem of the exhaustees, who are currently approaching the point of no return unless things pick up rather quickly. The bill would also provide for a new benefit maximum of two-thirds of the average wage, or about $50 as compared to the present maximum here of $35 per week. It should be added, however, that the State pays $4 more for each dependent under 18, which makes things a little easier for my friend with the 5 kids. How inadequate this is to keep human flesh and spirit intact should nevertheless be evident to every reasonable man. Even Senator Kennedy's bill is not going to make up the difference.

A small number of our unemployed are getting SUB (supplemental unemployment benefits, originally known as GAW, or guaranteed annual wage), mainly through contracts held by the autoworkers or steelworkers. This would include the 1,200 who were laid off when Ford closed its Somerville plant on March 14, one of the most discouraging single foldups that has hit this area in some time.

New Englanders are resigned when another textile mill closes. The collapse of this industry has come to be one of the accepted facts of life. Nevertheless, I was surprised, in looking at the figures, to see how much of a collapse it has been. Since 1947, textiles have slid from a work force of 130,000, by far the largest manufacturing industry in the State, to a current employment of 56,000, which leaves them in fifth position behind electrical products, machinery, leather and leather products (another declining industry, but more slowly), and apparel.

What really depresses us, however, is to see a progressive, modern industry like autos close up a plant. And we are not exactly cheered by the spectacle of layoffs in the electrical industry, which had added 22,000 jobs in the 10 years between 1947 and 1957 and is now our largest manufacturer, with something over 90,000 jobs. In every discussion of the New England economy, somebody sooner or later mentions the word "electronics" and everybody feels better. But now we see that there are about 6,000 fewer jobs in this industry than there were a year ago. Most of these layoffs, incidentally, have been in the big General Electric plants in Lynn and Pittsfield.

Geographically, the saddest area in the State is still Gloucester, where 19.9 percent of the work force is on the street or the beach. Ironically, Gloucester, 1 of the worst spots in the Nation, is, along with Lawrence, 1 of the only 2 areas in the State that has more jobs than it did a year ago. Which perhaps means that the fishing industry, still another sick one, has reached rockbottom at last.

Lawrence has edged upward from a bad 11.1 percent to 10.6. The effort to fill up the abandoned textile mills with diversified industry is paying off slowly.

Everywhere else the picture is darker. In North Adams, there has been a jump in the jobless from 6.3 percent to 15.6, the worst deterioration in the State. Mayor O'Connor, of Springfield, reports triple the normal unemployment from that area, or about 15,000 of a labor force of 150,000, and has asked his city council for money to put people to work on sewer and road projects.

Fall River and New Bedford, which were bad a year ago, are worse today, with percentages running over 11 and 10, respectively.

Strangely enough, one of the areas least hurt has been that of Greater Boston, which accounts for 45 percent of the State's total labor force. And it is perhaps this fact that makes the big difference between Massachusetts and a State like Michigan, where the principal city is operating at so poor a fraction of capacity.

The difference is probably that Boston is strong in the white-collar and institutional trades, which have been least affected by the recession so far. A year ago, for example, Boston's unemployment percentage was 3.4, which is a bit lower than the healthy norm. Today it is a little over the norm, but still well under the national average. And despite the ever-mounting tax rate, which has everybody half sick, there was a wave of something approaching enthusiasm in the old city as the Prudential Insurance Co. moved ever closer to the day when it will break ground for its big new business development on 32 acres in the Back Bay now occupied by railroad yards.

This could make a difference, too, in the construction industry, whose unemployment figure has risen from 13,000 a year ago to 20,000 on March 15. There should be plenty of building jobs soon in the Back Bay.

To sum up, Massachusetts could be in worse shape, but it could also be very much better. Judging from unemployment benefit figures, the situation is at its worst since the recession of 1949 (current claims for total and partial unemployment number 114,000 as compared with 117,000 in March, 1949). In that year, the Commonwealth paid out $115,000,000 in benefits and almost busted its fund. As a result the merit-rating system was suspended for 3 years and all employers were forced to pay the maximum levy of 2.7 percent of payroll. This in turn put the State's industry at a nasty competitive disadvantage with States that pay lower benefits and for this reason can afford to give their employers a lower rate on payroll taxes. Now Massachusetts is back down to a rate of 1.6 percent, which is not much above the national tax average of 1.3, but somewhat more than such States as Texas and Ohio (0.7 percent) or Virginia, Colorado, and Iowa (0.5).

Which brings us to the ancient question: "How long, O Lord, are we going to allow the States of the Union to bid against each other for new business with the coin of human hunger and despair?" It would seem to be more than about time that we cut out this heartless nonsense and put unemployment compensation under a uniform, nationwide system whose benefits and tax rates are established by Federal law. The Kennedy-McCarthy bill is a move in the right direction, but only a move.

Postal Pay Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, last year postal workers suffered from the President's veto of the postal pay raise bill. This year the postal workers are suffering from the failure of Congress to complete action on the long-overdue, well-deserved pay increase for postal workers.

A letter I just received from a postal worker in Missoula, Mont., points up the dire financial problems of these faithful Federal employees. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSOULA, MONT., *May 2, 1958.*

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: What gives with the postal pay raise?

Last year when the President vetoed the pay raise we employees were assured by an overwhelming majority of Congressmen and Senators that one of the first orders of business in the new Congress would be an immediate and adequate pay raise. We are now beginning the fifth month since Congress convened and still no results.

Reading the news reports today leads one to believe that a raise for us postal people is all but a dead duck for the near future. Can't something be done?

We are like shipwrecked, drowning people, reaching for straws.

Senator MANSFIELD stated in his TV appearance during the Easter recess that $3,600 a year was a bare subsistence wage. My take-home pay is just slightly over that figure and I am in the top pay grade plus second longevity grades. My biweekly check amounts to $150.77; figure it out yourself. We have received what was supposed to be a 6 percent increase since 1950, but my deductions were increased by 2½ percent, so my total increase then amounted to just slightly over $2 a week take home, a barely noticeable amount.

As you know, the Government's own figures give 23 to 25 percent as the cost-of-living increase since 1950, and the experts freely admit that figure is too low. Yet there are those in Congress, as well as the President, who talk of 6 percent as a realistic

increase; actually, 16 to 18 percent would be much more so in the face of the facts.

I have worked myself to the point of physical collapse working at my postal job, plus outside work, in an effort to make a decent living. My wife is now working, but even so, it is still a tight squeeze.

My oldest daughter is graduating from high school and would like to go on to school, but unless she can find a job to make her way it will be practically impossible for us to afford the additional money to send her even though the university is in our own town.

Please do something for many of us who are about to go under.

Yours truly,

———— ————.

A Program To Meet the Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Democratic Advisory Council to the Democratic National Committee has this week released a statement summarizing concern of its members over the recession confronting the American people, and offering suggestions as to constructive action to restore prosperity.

The statement is the outgrowth of careful study and deliberations, in which some of the Nation's leading economists were called upon for advice and counsel.

As a member of the advisory council, I feel the statement reflects a prevailing viewpoint in the Democratic Party.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the statement referred to, entitled "A Program To Meet the Recession," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with a list of the 24 members of the Democratic advisory committee issuing it.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROGRAM TO MEET THE RECESSION

The well-being of the American people is now at stake. So is our reputation before the world. The United States can no longer afford the present spectacle of political confusion and economic incompetence in the face of a seriously mounting crisis. There are now over 5 million out of work. With the inclusion of additional part-time unemployment, we have the equivalent of at least 7 million unemployed. This is double what it was last year.

The time has come to end this recession. The debate should no longer go on as to the desirability of vigorous antirecession action. The answers to what should be done are not to be found in devising new economic gadgets, or in cheerful slogans of confidence.

We must bring to bear all of the available remedies that we know will work until the recession has been ended and the growth of our Nation is resumed.

No economic misfortune was more clearly foreseen or the subject of more specific warnings than the present recession. For several years the rate of advance in the economy has been less than that which is possible or needed to employ an expanding labor force and serve an expanding population. The present recession represents the conversion of an inadequate rate of advance into a definite retreat.

In short, the present Republican administration has never grasped the potential for growth in the present economy—a potential that is only realized by widely shared well-being. Its deflationary farm policy, its upper-income tax policy, its reluctant approach to needed public investment, and its tight money policy have all contributed to present problems.

This is not hindsight. Early last autumn this council warned of the gravely damaging consequences of the tight money policy. Early last winter we urged early and prompt action to arrest the recession, and we spelled out specific measures. We also pointed out that prompt and preventive action at an early stage would avoid the need for much larger scale action later on.

Nonetheless, the administration, true to Republican tradition, has remained committed to its policy of inaction and evasive words. President Eisenhower, after proclaiming last January that recovery would begin in March, now says the bottom is around the corner. By way of remedy, he one day recommends the hard sell and the next day tell manufacturers to stop cramming goods down people's throats. In one breath he calls on people to buy everything and in another to do it selectively. Such questions as to what the man who is out of a job should use for money have never seemed important to Republican Presidents.

Meanwhile, Vice President NIXON, characteristically, has played both sides of the tax cut debate, while apparently hoping that people will not notice that he is part of the administration. Other members are lining up on the side of no action whatever. Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks has even stopped his weekly predictions of prosperity.

Two excuses have recently been offered for inaction. One is that inflation is not yet over. The other is that measures now taken to remedy the recession may contribute at a later date to renewed inflation.

As to the first excuse, it must now be clear that whatever the causes of inflation, unemployment and recession are not a remedy.

As to the future inflationary effect of measures taken to combat recession, it is quite possible that steps taken now will require later reversal. Taxes now reduced may later have to be increased. To justify inaction now because of fear of inaction later on represents a new high level of absurdity and a new low level of futility in Republican economic policy.

To get out of the recession we need a revision of monetary policy, increased public spending and a reduction of taxes.

MONETARY POLICY

So far the Federal Reserve has been far too cautious in reversing its tight-money policy. Despite the large business decline since the middle of 1957, reserves of member banks and excess reserves, which largely determine the amount of money, are unchanged as compared to a year ago or even since the beginning of the decline some 8 months ago.

The Federal Reserve Board should show the initiative which was displayed in the 1930's and provide several billions of additional cash to the market by purchasing Government bonds in the open market. The result might well be at least a beginning toward a return to lower rates of interest which are a prime need for recovery.

PUBLIC OUTLAYS

When the private economy is reducing its spending, employment and income fall. This creates the need for compensatory action by Government.

This program should make the maximum contribution toward treating the recession. Outlays must be judged especially for their effectiveness in getting prompt increase in employment.

But we hasten to add that the long-run purpose and effects of such programs are also of essential importance. We have many vital national needs. There need be no spending for the sake of spending.

Requirements for education, health, housing, urban redevelopment, natural resources, roads, are all urgent. We must have in mind the long-run benefits of these programs as well as their contributions to recovery.

The Congress under Democratic leadership has already taken substantial steps to increase Federal expenditures as a recovery measure. The programs now approved or currently under active consideration—Community Facilities Act, extension of unemployment compensation, the highway program, area redevelopment, education, and housing—will ultimately involve outlays of perhaps $4 billion a year; however, the additional spending in calendar year 1958 is not likely to be more than $1 billion to $1.5 billion. The reduction of private investments inclusive of inventories, the likely reduction of the excess of exports and the threat of a decline of consumption indicate a reduction in private spending of the order of $10 billion to $15 billion at an annual rate. This is what we must offset promptly if we are to be certain of reversing the decline.

In addition to any possible expediting of needed national-security expenditures, we urge a program of $1 billion annually for education (construction and equipment), and a doubling of the programs for urban renewal, public housing, and hospital construction. We would also urge a rise of one-third in outlays on natural-resources development, with particular emphasis on the great river basins of the West. These programs would add $2 billion on an annual basis, though less in 1958.

Undoubtedly the most immediately effective program is an extension of the period for paying unemployment compensation. The money goes directly to those who need it most, and it immediately enters the spending stream to generate more economic activity.

We stress the need for a permanently liberalized unemployment compensation program. This should include, as a goal, Federal standards with increased coverage, a maximum benefit of two-thirds the average wage and a minimum of one-half, duration of 39 weeks and Federal reinsurance. However, as an immediate recession measure the country needs Federal funds to provide the liberalized benefits, extension of coverage, and a larger period of coverage which are promptly needed until the States have an opportunity to meet minimum Federal standards.

We also propose liberalization of old-age benefits. An average of $65 per month is altogether too low.

TAX REDUCTION

If we were to choose between increased spending for public improvements and tax cuts as an exclusive approach, we would favor the former. And for two reasons:

First. We have underspent for schools, health, roads, urban development, and natural resources since the 1930's.

Second. Because on the whole taxpayers are more affluent than nontaxpayers, we propose to help those with less means rather than those with more.

We believe, however, that the present situation is now so serious as to require a tax cut also—in part because the effects are likely to be felt sooner than a spending program. The period of reduction should be related to business prospects at time of passage.

In order to help low-income taxpayers and insure maximum effectiveness we propose a substantial reduction in the personal income tax either by splitting the first bracket rate or alternative cuts of similar incidence, and a reduction in excise taxes excepting liquor,

tobacco, and those related to the Federal-Aid Highway Act or to Federal control measures.

The present economic distress emphasizes the need for a comprehensive revision of our tax laws. We must eliminate the loopholes and leakages that make our tax system inequitable and unnecessarily burdensome. By eliminating the most flagrant of these, at least $3 billion of additional revenue could be immediately secured to offset partially the tax reductions we here propose.

SUMMARY

We have proposed a genuine easing of monetary policy, larger public expenditures to offset declining private outlays, and emergency tax reduction. Our objective is not to increase deficits but rather to introduce policies that would reverse the decline of income.

What we propose then is a policy to raise income and thereby raise the tax base and hence tax receipts. We have every hope that the result will be a much smaller deficit than would prevail with a do-nothing policy.

(Note submitted by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER: While I am in general agreement with the analysis and remedies here presented, I feel that greater emphasis should be placed on price reductions rather than on tax reductions in halting and reversing the present economic decline. It seems to me that a stimulation and broadening of consumer markets could readily be achieved by price reductions, particularly in basic industries such as steel and automobiles where prices have not yet reflected production decreases.)

(Note submitted by Gov. G. Mennen Williams: I feel that a broad public works program is the prime essential in any national effort to overcome the recession. I believe that properly planned and instituted public works can have a rapid effect on the economy—and that they are particularly necessary at this stage of the current economic downturn. While I am in general agreement with this policy statement of the council, I would not favor antirecession moves taken at the expense of public works.)

THE DEMOCRATIC ADVISORY COUNCIL

Jacob M. Arvey, Democratic national committeeman of Illinois.

Paul M. Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Miss Katherine M. Cullinan, Democratic national committeewoman of Rhode Island.

Mrs. Benjamin Bryan Everett, Democratic national committeewoman of North Carolina.

Leo C. Graybill, Democratic national committeeman of Montana.

Camille F. Gravel, Jr., Democratic national committeeman of Louisiana.

Gov. W. Averell Harriman.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mrs. Ione Hunt, Democratic national committeewoman of Minnesota.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER.

Arthur B. Koontz, Democratic national committeeman of West Virginia.

Mayor David L. Lawrence.

Former Senator Herbert H. Lehman.

Gov. Stephen L. R. McNichols.

Mrs. Margaret Price, Democratic national committeewoman of Michigan.

Calvin W. Rawlings, Democratic national committeeman of Utah.

Mrs. Thelma Parkinson Sharp, Democratic national committeewoman of New Jersey.

Adlai E. Stevenson.

Mrs. Lennard Thomas, Democratic national committeewoman of Alabama.

Mrs. Marguerite Peyton Thompson, Democratic national committeewoman of Colorado.

Former President Harry S. Truman.

Mayor Raymond R. Tucker.

Gov. G. Mennen Williams.

Paul Ziffren, Democratic national committeeman of California.

Russian Proposal To Halt Nuclear Tests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal has just printed an extremely useful and somewhat surprising summary of foreign reaction to the Russian proposal to halt nuclear tests and to hold a summit conference.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Milwaukee Journal be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal of May 4, 1958]

WHAT OUR FOREIGN FRIENDS THINK OF TESTS AND SUMMIT

We have had an excellent opportunity in recent days personally to test world opinion on two subjects important to Americans: Foreign reaction to the Russian proposal to halt nuclear tests and the holding of a summit conference.

The findings: Our foreign friends and allies see the phoniness in the Russian proposal, and they favor a summit conference.

This unusual opportunity came in traveling around the United States for 11 days with 72 foreign newspaper editors, executives and a few wives. The transcontinental air journey, with visits in nine major cities, followed the seventh general assembly of the International Press Institute in Washington. (About 30 more of the foreign members at the meeting did not make the tour.)

Here are sample comments of our foreign colleagues:

Torolv Kandahl, editor, Tidende, Drammen, Norway: People know that the Russian offer came after an endless series of tests of their own. A sensible person naturally asks, "What kind of an offer is that?" As to how Norwegians look at a summit meeting—maybe something would come out of it.

Rudolf Kalmar, editor, Die Presse, Vienna, Austria: If Russia tests its atomic weapons for the first 6 months of the year and the United States tests its weapons the last 6 months, we are not so foolish as to accept as honest a Soviet offer to suspend tests at midyear.

Zeyyat Goren, foreign editor, Hurriyet, Istanbul, Turkey: United States prestige was not at all affected by the Russian offer. Most of our people feel that the United States should continue testing its nuclear weapons. Our people feel that a summit meeting might be helpful even if the only result is an exchange of opinions.

Mansur Ali Khan, managing editor, Zamindar, Lahore, Pakistan: The Russian offer did not make a great impression. Pakistanis never liked or trusted the Russians and feel there is a hidden meaning of some sort in everything the Soviets say. It is unlikely anything worthwhile will come out of a summit meeting at this time.

Ernst Bieri, editor, Neue Zurcher Zeitung, Zurich, Switzerland: The Russian offer did not create a great stir in Switzerland. We don't trust words about peace and love. We want to see facts. The most impressive fact was what happened in Hungary.

Paul Fieschi, editor, Journal de la Corse, Paris, France: Very few Frenchmen were fooled by the Russian offer. We are quite optimistic about the possibility of peace as long as the United States continues its atomic experiments.

Alf Schiottz-Christensen, editor, Stiftstidende, Aalborg, Denmark: The average Dane realizes that the Russian offer was a propaganda move, but has to admit it was a propaganda victory. If the Russians really are willing to stop tests, it must mean they have all the information they think they need or can get. As for a summit conference, the average Dane believes that, with all the apparent difficulties, some good might come out of it.

Werner Friedmann, editor, Suddeutsche Zeitung, Munich, West Germany: We don't trust the Russians and their offer didn't harm United States prestige, but we do feel, without such a start toward ending nuclear testing, there is no hope of reunifying Germany. For the same reason we hope for a summit conference, although we realize there is no great hope of a successful meeting.

Representative Charles O. Porter Writes on Freedom From Totalitarian Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in speaking of international relations, since the beginning of the cold war, we have come to apply a brief name to that part of the world which is not under the domination of the governments in Moscow and Peiping, or under other Communist authority.

We call this non-Communist-dominated portion of the globe the free world.

That is a beautiful phrase, evocative of the best traditions of our own history. No doubt it is an effective concept with which to counter the Marxist vocabulary in the worldwide ideological conflict of our times. However, its effectiveness in the long run will be directly proportional to its accuracy, in actually describing the nature of the society we would present as the alternative to that offered by communism. Its accuracy must be a matter of continuing and genuine concern to us, lest our claim of freedom is to be as hollow a slogan as the Communist's cynical and fraudulent use of democracy.

Do we in fact maintain such a genuine concern for freedom in the free world? Absence of Communist control or domination over a nation in itself is not yet freedom. A nation whose government is independent of Soviet dictation is not by that fact free, for freedom is an attribute of the life of men and women, not of States. If we care about freedom, we must ask more than "Is this nation's government on the Soviet side or on ours?" We must ask "Can the people of this nation speak and write freely? May they travel, read foreign literature, practice a religion of their choice, criticize their government? Do independent courts protect them against arrest, detention, punishment by police agents without legal warrant? Most funda-

mentally, does their government recognize a legal, organized opposition, which has the right and the opportunity at regular intervals to assume the reins of authority by a public, civilian choice, in the peaceful interchange between 'ins' and 'outs' that is the essence of parliamentary democracy?"

These are the questions which have been raised, courageously and persistently, by Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, of Oregon's Fourth Congressional District, ever since he first came to Congress in 1957. He has raised them most recently in an article in the April 14 issue of the New Leader magazine, entitled "The Struggle Without End."

CHARLIE PORTER is dedicated to freedom in fact, and not only in phraseology. Upon his election in 1956, he happened to be at once confronted with a dramatic question of freedom in one small corner of the free world, in the famous case of the disappearance in the Dominican Republic of Gerry Murphy of Eugene, Oreg., Mr. PORTER's own hometown. It is characteristic of him that he did not stop with making routine representations to the State Department on behalf of a constituent. He has made the cause of freedom in the Western Hemisphere his cause, heedless of the fact that it has initially been a lonely one in the face of indifference and even opposition. I agree with him that it is a good cause; and it is one which will prove increasingly critical as communism shifts from aggression to social and economic tactics in its competition with us, and as our proud claim of freedom will have to prove itself in affirmative accomplishments, not only in negative noncommunism, however despotic.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Representative PORTER'S outspoken article on "The Struggle Without End," from the New Leader of April 14, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STRUGGLE WITHOUT END

(By CHARLES O. PORTER)

When I was in Bogota, Colombia, in June 1957, I was asked at a university forum, "When do you expect to win your fight against dictators?" I replied in my limited Spanish, "Never, this is la lucha sin fin—the struggle without end."

A few weeks earlier, I had visited Costa Rica and discussed the same problem with that nation's remarkable President José Figueres (who is now completing his term of office). I spent some pleasant and informative hours as a guest at President Figueres's ranch. Its name is La Lucha Sin Fin, and the reference is identical. Figueres has fought hard, long, and effectively for democracy in Costa Rica and elsewhere. Back in 1948, he personally led the first armed resistance to communism in this hemisphere.

My own involvement in this struggle began in December 1956, when a constituent of mine, a young man by the name of Gerry Murphy, disappeared in the Dominican Republic under circumstances which shrieked of murder by order of Dictator Trujillo himself. Representatives of the State Department and the FBI came to my office at my request. They told me of the Dominican explanation that a co-pilot had killed Gerry in a drunken fight and then committed suicide out of remorse. They said that stirring matters up would only bring out evidence of certain shortcomings on Gerry's part.

The Dominican explanation of Gerry's death was full of holes, and I felt that Trujillo had shown fantastic effrontery in offering it. I was aghast that our officials seemed willing to accept it. When I called Gerry's parents, who live in my hometown of Eugene, Oreg., they wanted me to go ahead and press for an investigation.

On February 28, 1957, I made my first speech as a Member of the House of Representatives. Police swarmed around the Capitol, and I had warnings that my life was in danger. My speech was an analysis of the known facts in the Murphy case, including the inconsistent and implausible explanation given by Trujillo's government. Two weeks later the State Department rejected the Dominican explanation and asked for further investigation.

The State Department also requested three times that Arturo Espaillat, former Dominican consul general in New York, who subsequently became Trujillo's Minister of Security, be made available for questioning and possible trial. This request was refused each time.

Soon afterward, because widespread unfavorable publicity in the United States and Latin America was causing the Dominican Government to lose tourists as well as respectability, Trujillo hired the famous New York lawyer and author, Morris Ernst, to investigate the related cases of Gerry Murphy and Jesus de Galindez, the Basque scholar who disappeared in New York in March 1956. I had admired Ernst as a keen, fearless lawyer and a foremost guardian of our civil liberties. Now, regretfully, I have my doubts about him, because he has refused to carry his investigation into the Dominican Republic itself and require full publicity there by TV, radio, and newspapers. He agreed to do this when he came to my office last fall. Now he writes me that he never agreed to it at all.

The Murphy-Galindez case is far from closed. John Frank, a Washington lawyer, was convicted in December 1957 as an unregistered Dominican agent who was mixed up in the affair. The Government has told me that more indictments are in prospect.

But there is a larger issue involved: the whole question of American policy in Latin America. The treatment accorded him by Washington in the past gave Trujillo every reason to believe that he could commit murder with impunity.

My mail, my visitors and my reception on 4 trips to Latin America in 1957 make it clear that I enjoy wide popularity on that continent. The reason for this is my work in the Murphy-Galindez case and my often expressed belief that the American people hate dictatorships and love democracy and that our foreign policy should reflect this fact.

My efforts are important to Latin Americans because they see in them the possibility that the United States will change its soft-on-dictators policy. I am receiving support from Latin American leaders who for years have risked their lives and fortunes so that their peoples might have better, more democratic conditions of life. I refer to men like Luis Munoz-Marin of Puerto Rico, Jose Figueres of Costa Rica, Ramon Villeda Morales of Honduras, Eduardo Santos and Alberto Lleras Camargo of Colombia, and Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela.

My warm reception by democratic leaders is itself a sign that our State Department should reverse its policies which lend respectability to police states and their chiefs. I have yet to find any member of the Department below the highest echelon, or any newspaperman who knows Latin America, who did not applaud my position, and in many cases, offer assistance.

Gen. Lemuel Shepherd, Chief of the Inter-American Defense Board, tells me that we don't deal sternly with Trujillo, Somoza, or Batista because we need them to help defend the Panama Canal. (As if they and their armed forces would be any help against supersonic air or missile attack.) Similarly, the State Department told me that we did not praise Colombia publicly for throwing off a dictatorship because Marcos Pérez Jiménez, then still in power in Venezuela, might have decided not to let United States companies develop his country's oil resources.

I say we need a policy based on facts like these:

The United States is the leader of the free world and must base its leadership on moral as well as material resources.

The American people believe in government by free elections and in courts which are fair.

In our struggle with international communism, we may have to ally ourselves with police states, such as Spain, for reasons of defense, but we do not have to allow them to identify their tyrannies with us and make it appear that we regard them with favor.

Political, social, and economic gains in non-Communist nations make them stronger allies of the West; hence, we should encourage their development, as we are doing to some extent already. The chief need is that we stand up and declare our faith in democracy over tyranny without implying that we believe ourselves to be perfect or that the advantages of democracy can be achieved quickly and without effort.

Last August, the State Department wrote me that juridical equality and nonintervention were the indispensable bases of our relations with Latin America. Nobody has any complaint about juridical equality. But nonintervention has been blown up beyond its original meaning of renouncing the use of marines or money to change governments.

Consider the State Department's response to my suggestion that we publicly call a spade a spade, a dictator a dictator. After citing the Charter of the Organization of American States, which happens to be a very prodemocratic document, it said: "It is the opinion of this Department that for the United States, by means of official proclamations, to characterize its neighbor countries as being dictatorships would now be viewed by practically all of the Latin American governments and peoples as an act of calculated and distinctly unwelcome intervention in their internal affairs."

I agree that the dictators would cry intervention, but the democracies and the nations striving in that direction would be encouraged. This is the kind of intervention that spells moral leadership and ultimate victory for those who believe in human rights.

The State Department went on to say that "for the United States to become a self-appointed official censor of existing governments in the Americas would soon have us in unwarranted difficulties with our neighbors." But we are already in unwarranted difficulties with nations which should be our friends. Nor is there any question of censorship involved. We would simply be saying out loud what we already know. Batista and Trujillo are dictators. They know it. All Latin America knows it. The State Department knows it. Let's say it so that the American people will know it, too.

Finally, the spokesman denied that any of our friends in Latin America feel that the United States has shown undue friendship for dictatorial governments. Again, the overwhelming evidence is to the contrary.

We gave medals to Perez Jimines and Somoza, we send arms to Batista even though he is using them against his people in violation of the agreement he signed with us, and we are giving military and economic aid to Trujillo. Why should men like these receive aid from us? Will they help us if the Soviet Union attacks us? I say negli-

gibly, if at all. Is this aid helping to keep down internal subversion? I say no.

Opponents of dictatorship soon realize that the United States has identified itself with their oppressors. Inevitably, they will turn to the Soviet Union, whose agents are glad to form a popular front and hope to profit from the overthrow of the police state to set up their own brand of totalitarianism.

It is a struggle without end, but not a struggle without hope. The first step is to recognize that our leadership in the free world must be based on moral principles. Liberty and justice for all means not only all citizens of the United States but all citizens of this one world we live in today.

Consumer Buying Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the latest issue of U. S. News & World Report contains an article entitled "Trend of American Business." The article includes a summary of consumer buying plans just released by the National Bureau of Economic Research. These plans are based on a poll of 25,000 families who are members of the Consumers Union. This comprehensive analysis of consumer buying plans should put Congress on notice that for the next 6 months the American consumer now plans to reduce his purchases of automobiles and household equipment, and that people who thought the present a bad time to buy outnumbered by 2 to 1 the people who thought it a good time to buy.

Mr. President, under these tremendously important psychological conditions, it seems to me imperative that Congress should continue to act decisively and aggressively to adopt measures to stop the economic slump.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREND OF AMERICAN BUSINESS

American consumers, on the whole, are not yet in a mood to buy heavily. That's what scientific polls of consumer attitudes are finding out. Conclusion is that buyers must be assured of an end to recession before they try to bring about an end to the setback by their own actions.

Here is an insight into consumer-buying plans just released by National Bureau of Economic Research, an independent research organization. It stems from a poll of 25,000 families who are members of Consumers Union.

Plans to buy new cars in the next 6 months declined by 20 percent from October to early April. More people planned to buy used cars.

Auto-purchase plans, as a result, are down only 10 percent since October, but the prospect is not encouraging for new car sales.

Buying plans for household equipment are off by a bit more than 10 percent since October. This poll sampled plans for buying expensive items, such as refrigerators, ranges, food freezers, and television sets.

The poll found that people who thought the present a bad time to buy outnumbered by 2 to 1 those who thought it a good time to buy. Almost a third of the households expected worse business conditions in months ahead.

It's not that these families are hard up, or overburdened with debt.

Half the families told the pollsters they had only mortgage debt.

A fourth of them said they expected to be out of debt within a year.

More than 40 percent reported they had increased liquid assets—cash, bank deposits, securities—during the past 6 months. Only 10 percent said that they had reduced their liquid assets during that period.

Many of these families, moreover, had suffered no financial reverses in the recession. Apparently they were well able to buy if they wished to.

Soil Stewardship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, May 11 to 18 will be observed as Soil Stewardship Week, in churches of many denominations throughout the country, reflecting man's responsibility to God in preserving our heritage of soil and water resources, and our stewardship in caring for God's rich natural gifts.

More than 2,700 soil conservation districts throughout the country will participate in observance of this week of thankfulness for our productive blessings.

In preparation for this week, the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts has prepared and distributed an attractive and inspiring booklet reminding all people of man's sacred obligation in the ownership and use of our land, our water, and our other related resources.

The booklet contains an open letter from Nolen J. Fuqua, President of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, entitled "A Word of Concern," and a preface entitled "Together" which aptly discribes the purpose of the Soil Stewardship Week.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter referred to, as well as the brief preface be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and the brief preface were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WORD OF CONCERN

There is in every man, latent though it may have become, an awareness of his responsibility to God for the wise use of our soil and its related resources—water, plants, and wildlife.

It is the responsibility of those who assume the leadership for spiritual and moral matters to include in their sphere of effort the awakening of man to his soil stewardship responsibility.

The church is, and truly ought to be, a factor for reminding man of his obligation to God in the use of God's rich natural gifts. For too long our people have neglected or used without appreciation or understanding these divinely created resources.

Already in this comparatively young Nation we have lost millions of acres of good productive land. We have let water, a necessity and a boon to every community, become a scourge as it rushes seaward, bearing loads of sediment to stream, channel, and precious reservoir.

Therefore, we may see in every muddy rivulet, in every dust laden wind a warning from God. His rules regarding the use of His earth by man are being violated.

All people must now realize the importance of an abundance of good water and its relationship to our soil and our watersheds, for soil and water are life itself.

The stewardship of soil and water resources must be the concern of everyone who loves his Nation. The responsibility of this stewardship rests with the people who own and operate the land. These are the farmers and the ranchers. Upon them we must depend to save and to improve what we have left in soil and water resources.

The Nation's soil conservation districts need the help of the churches and their leaders in this divinely-directed responsibility.

NOLEN J. FUQUA,
President, National Association of Soil Conservation Districts.

TOGETHER

In the widespread observance of a week dedicated to soil stewardship, it is fitting that we state the principles regarded as basic in man's use of the land:

1. God created the world, of which the earth is a portion, with a purpose. Through His loving providence He maintains the world for the good of human beings.

2. The land is God's greatest material gift to mankind. It is a fundamental source of food, fiber, and fuel. It is the storehouse and channel of another of God's great blessings—water.

3. Ownership of land involves social responsibilities. The steward of land has a duty to protect and to enrich the soil he tills and to hand it down to future generations as a thank offering to God, the Giver, and as a loving inheritance to his children's children.

4. The family is the primary institution, and a main objective of soil stewardship is family strength and unity. A unique relationship exists between the family and the use of the soil.

5. In land use, efficiency is to be judged—not by material yields alone, but also by the spiritual and social values that benefit the individual, the family, and society.

6. Society has the responsibility to encourage and to assist the stewards of land in the conservation, use, and treatment of soil with such techniques as will make them masters of their own economic destiny.

7. Stewards of the soil owe sacred duties and obligations to God, to the community, and to humanity. Faithful and honest fulfillment of their responsibilities goes hand in hand with their rights and privileges.

Beginning on Sunday, May 11, 1958, and continuing through Sunday, May 18, the more than 2,700 soil-conservation districts of this Nation will observe Soil Stewardship Week. It is hoped that the entire Nation will join in this observance.

The publication of this booklet by the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts is in the hope that it will be an instrument of good in awakening man to his responsibility in soil stewardship. In its preparation, the national association has had the guidance of national church organizations and their leaders in town and country work. For this assistance the national association is grateful.

May churches of all faiths find this booklet helpful in reminding all people of man's

sacred obligation in the ownership and use of our land, our water, and our other related resources.

The Powers of Congress Over the Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column In the Nation by the able writer, Mr. Arthur Krock, which appears in the May 1, 1958, issue of the New York Times. In this column, the distinguished correspondent discusses, with his usual candor, the bill approved by the Judiciary Committee to limit appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION
(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, April 30.—The Senate committee bill, approved today, to reduce the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court asserts a power of Congress that has been used but once and seldom strongly urged in the history of the United States. But this power was specified by the Constitutional Convention in a formal vote on August 27, 1787.

In 1867, in the emotional atmosphere in which reconstruction was imposed on the prostrate South, Congress exercised this power and reaffirmed the action over President Johnson's veto. This law took from the Supreme Court its jurisdiction to review denials by lower courts of applications for writs of habeas corpus. The Court, acknowledging the power of Congress to limit its appellate province, dismissed on that ground a pending appeal from such a lower court denial.

In view of some of the decisions of the current Supreme Court that have overruled previous decisions and longstanding precedents, it cannot be taken for granted that the Court would refuse to review parts of the bill for their constitutionality or rule them invalid. But so far as the record can establish it, the committee has asserted a general power plainly bestowed by these words of section 2 (2), article III: "In all the other cases (save those in which original jurisdiction is specifically granted) the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction both as to law and fact, with such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make."

In the present phase, therefore, and until or unless the Supreme Court should grant review on and uphold some claim that a part of the Senate committee bill is an unconstitutional construction of the words above, the only issue raised by the measure is of public policy. In that area it poses these questions:

Does international communism create a clear and present danger requiring that the standards for bar admission shall be fixed by State courts and not be subject to Supreme Court review? Does this new menace make it vital to national security that congressional committees be the sole judges whether questions to witnesses are pertinent to their legislative purpose and this pertinence also made clear to the witnesses? (On the ground that this relation was not made clear the Supreme Court quashed the contempt for one unresponsive witness before a congressional committee investigating Communist activities.) Does the threat to national security make it essential that the States shall enforce their own antisubversive laws? (In the Steve Nelson case the Court held that Congress had preempted this entire enforcement field.)

AMENDING LEGISLATION

Another section of the Senate committee bill, and a recommendation by a subcommittee, both of which also grow out of international Communist activity, would amend existing legislation without question of the Court's jurisdiction over the texts in their present form.

The first would amend the Smith Act of 1940 to make it a crime to teach or advocate the violent overthrow of the Government. (The Supreme Court decided the Smith Act makes criminal only conspiracy to overthrow, or activities designed and calculated to incite action to that end.) The subcommittee recommendation was for action to relieve peace officers and the lower courts of an impediment to the conviction of major criminals that was imposed by the Supreme Court's decision in the case of one Mallory. He had been detained by Washington police for 7½ hours before arraignment for rape, during which time he confessed to the crime, committed under particularly brutal circumstances. The Supreme Court ruled that Mallory's conviction was invalid because he had not been arraigned before the unnecessary delay forbidden in the Federal penal code.

In the confusion of police officers and lower courts over what the Supreme Court may periodically adjudge to be a span of reasonable interrogation of criminals before arraignment, other confessed major criminals have been set free and prosecution thwarted. This has arisen particularly in rape cases, where identification of the criminal by the victim is usually difficult and confession the only evidence that will stand up in court.

That is the Supreme Court background for the second determined congressional effort in American history to limit its jurisdiction, and for the additional effort to rewrite laws to remove the bases on which the Court made certain rulings. Both enterprises are orderly and have the weight of established legality.

All but the recommendation to clarify what is unnecessary delay in the arraignment of persons for heinous crimes are and will be opposed by many as public policy. But the moves to limit the Supreme Court's jurisdiction represent the legitimate use of one of the checks and balances by which the Constitution sought to keep any one branch of the Government from infringing on another. Nor was the Supreme Court designed to be excluded whenever, exercising the judicial supremacy that, as Judge Learned Hand put it, Chief Justice Marshall imported into the Constitution, it exceeds the high obligation of self-restraint.

Trickle Down a Poor Theory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News of Saturday, March 15, 1958, entitled "Trickle Down a Poor Theory."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRICKLE DOWN A POOR THEORY

In the near panic of the Washington politicians, ever since they suddenly discovered there is a business slowdown, only a few voices of sanity are being heard.

One of them belongs to Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, whose facts and arguments in the Senate this week helped stall, for the moment, the headlong rush toward a reduction in taxes.

Mr. WILLIAMS paid his respects to this foolishness in plain pocketbook language which any wage earner can understand (even if some of his political representatives can't).

"Tax reduction," he said, "is being pushed on the basis that if the man who has a job is given a tax cut some of the cut will trickle down to the man in the street who is out of work."

"If it is desired to do something for the unemployed," he said, "let us do it directly, and not on the trickle-down theory. What an unemployed man wants is a job, and not a lot of hot-air promises."

He said a lot more:

"Tax reductions on borrowed money only mean more inflation."

"Through this resulting inflation, we would only further increase the cost of living, thereby making it even harder for the person who is unemployed and who needs assistance.

"Do not overlook the fact that as a result of the inflation of the past 20 years our dollar has lost over one-half of its 1939 value. That means that one-half of the life savings of every American has been destroyed.

"We are thinking too much of the political implications of a tax bill rather than discussing such a bill from an economic standpoint.

"Our Government cannot spend itself into prosperity on borrowed money."

And:

"I think the trouble today is that the confidence of the people in their Government has been undermined as a result of some of the schemes that have been proposed. The Congress is on the verge of being stampeded into rushing off in all directions at the same time."

The trickle down from a tax cut, if it trickled at all, would be only a pittance to what inflation shortly would steal back—and inflation follows Government red ink as surely as debt follows borrowing.

Lobbyists Peril Postal Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article under the title "Lobbyists Peril Postal Legislation," written by Jack Steele, and published in the Washington Daily News of May 1, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOBBYISTS PERIL POSTAL LEGISLATION
(By Jack Steele)

The postal rate-postal pay bill is in danger of being lobbied to death.

A Senate-House conference, after weeks of being subjected to some of the most intense lobbying ever seen around the Capital, broke up in bitter disagreement.

REFUSAL

The angry conferees refused even to set a date to meet again to try to clear the bill for final congressional approval.

Imperiled by this lobbying pressure is a measure which would:

Boost the pay of 550,000 mail carriers and other postal workers by an average of slightly over 10 percent.

Increase postal rates enough to offset these pay rises and trim about $300 million a year from the huge post-office deficit.

The bill already has been stalled in conference for 2 months.

Meanwhile, the Capitol has swarmed with lobbyists interested either in the pay or rate features of the measure.

More than a score of officials of postal workers' unions and other groups of Government employees have camped on the doorstep of the conference committee.

INTEREST

Their interest is the proposed postal pay increases—which would set the pattern for later wage boosts for other Government workers.

These union lobbyists have blocked Capitol corridors, buttonholed conferees entering and leaving committee meetings and elbowed reporters out of press conferences.

Just as active, although not quite so obvious, have been lobbyists for big mail users, chiefly magazines and junk mailers. Their objective is to hold down the proposed postal rate increase or, preferably, to kill the bill entirely.

Hon. Will M. Whittington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR WINSTEAD

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with others here today in congratuating the Honorable William M. Whittington, a distinguished fellow Mississippian, on the occasion of this 80th birthday, and in paying tribute to him as an outstanding Mississippian and one of the ablest, most honest, and courageous men who ever served in the Congress.

Mr. Whittington was first elected to serve the people of Mississippi in the 69th Congress, and remained in the House for the succeeding 26 years. At the end of this time he voluntarily resigned from Congress, but he has maintained his interest and active participation in the affairs of our State and Nation since his retirement.

Mr. Whittington enjoyed the friendship, esteem, and respect of every Member of Congress who served with him, and he has carried with him into his retirement the admiration and high regard of all of us. He was not only a man of unusual ability, but one who devoted his time and energy to the task at hand, finding no time to waste but ample time to counsel and advise with fellow Members, both young and old, on matters in which they were interested or needed help. It was my privilege to serve with him for several years, and our association was always most pleasant and his counsel most helpful. His career and notable contributions to the laws of our country remain as an example and inspiration to all of us. I sincerely wish for him many more years of happiness and contentment.

Labor Abuses—Defects in the Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Spotlight on the Payoff," published in the Washington Post of April 30, 1958, dealing with the abuses exposed by the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, and defects in the Taft-Hartley Act.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPOTLIGHT ON THE PAYOFF

Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON undoubtedly won a major victory in turning aside the Republican barrage of amendments to the welfare and pensions funds bill, but how big a price did he pay? The price cannot be accurately calculated at present because of the uncertainties surrounding the new labor-reform bill which the leadership has promised to lay before the Senate. But the price appears to be substantial, and it is by no means certain that the majority leader will continue wear the smile of the tiger when he has to pay it.

Mr. JOHNSON'S strategy last week and again on Monday was essentially a holding operation. He checked a flood of amendments that were threatening to swamp the welfare and pensions funds bill by promising to let them flow in orderly fashion through the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Ordinarily, this might seem to be a minor concession, but in recent years the Labor Committee has acted as if its function were to bottle up legislation instead of considering it on its merits. Now the Senate leadership stands committed to a breaking of the log jam. If its promise is fulfilled in good faith, that may well prove the most significant aspect of current controversy.

Despite its passage of the Kennedy-Douglas-Ives bill requiring full accounting for the operation of pension and welfare funds, almost without change, the Senate has demonstrated that it wants to go further. There is as yet no indication as to how much further it wishes to go. But the Committee on Labor now has a mandate to write a bill embodying the best of the proposals that have been voted down on procedural grounds and to send it promptly to the Senate floor. Any failure to do so, would be a major embarrassment for the Democratic leadership generally.

The strong case that can be made for enactment of a more comprehensive labor bill at the present session may be seen in the nature of some of the amendments that were voted down on procedural grounds. One of them sponsored by the Eisenhower administration would have repealed the union-busting provision of the Taft-Hartley Act. Another would have permitted the NLRB to certify a construction union as a bargaining agent without an election when there was a history of bargaining with the employer in question. A third offered by Senator WATKINS would have permitted the States to deal with labor-management disputes in the present no-man's land between the NLRB's operations and the jurisdiction of the States.

It is not to be supposed that all the abuses exposed by the McClellan committee and all the defects in the Taft-Hartley Act can be corrected in one omnibus bill to be put together in the next few weeks. But the Labor Committee will not be plowing in virgin soil. It can and should promptly write a measure that will correct the most flagrant abuses and defects. Meanwhile the House should put the bill for regulation of pension and welfare funds on its must calendar. It is difficult to see how Congressmen could face their constituents if they failed to act on this essential and noncontroversial reform.

Detroit: Focus of the Basic Duel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the New York Times magazine of May 4 there appeared an excellent article by A. H. Raskin on the hard-hit automobile industry. Mr. Raskin points out that what is happening in Detroit has worldwide implications. He notes that the Soviet Union has made it clear that ultimate victory in the contest between totalitarianism and freedom will go to that side which builds the highest standard of living for its people. Our ability to solve the dilemma faced in Detroit will serve as a test of our strength in meeting the Soviet challenge.

I ask unanimous consent that this thought-provoking article, entitled "Detroit: Focus of the Basic Duel," be inserted in the Appendix of today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DETROIT: FOCUS OF THE BASIC DUEL

(By A. H. Raskin)

DETROIT.—From the outside little is changed. The huge automobile plants that made the Detroit area the mass production capital of the world have lost none of their grimy majesty. Only the barren parking lots betray the stillness within. Sharply curtailed payrolls, short work schedules and skip-weeks have become the pattern for most of the industry that has made itself bearer, backbone and badge of the American economy.

It is an industry so efficient that technicians from every continent flock here even now to regard its factories in shrinelike reverence. But this year's cuts in output

reflect no miracle of push-button automation. The public is not buying cars with anything like the enthusiasm it did in most postwar years. And when Detroit's assembly lines stop for lack of sales a tide of secondary idleness washes through hundreds of other cities across the Nation. For the auto industry normally gobbles up a fifth of the country's steel and staggering quantities of rubber, glass, textiles and other basic commodities.

Detroit lives on a roller coaster. It leads the economy and it is chained to it. Its manufacturers gamble upward of a billion dollars each year on their ability to guess what Americans will want and on their having enough money to buy it. Many of its workers are no less venturesome. They count on the steadiness of their pay checks to buy an imposing list of goods on the installment plan.

This willingness to go for broke makes Detroit a vibrant community, one in which violence runs close to the surface. It has not forgotten the turbulent sitdown strikes that forced the first break in the industry's resistance to unionism 21 years ago. Its racial tensions erupted in 1943 in a riot that left 34 dead and 700 injured. Its labor movement gave rise to the very different but equally controversial characters who head the country's two biggest unions, Walter P. Reuther of the United Auto Workers and James R. Hoffa of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

Control of its industrial life is centered in three mammoth corporations, General Motors, Ford and Chrysler. The abandoned shells of once flourishing plants stand as acre-broad tombstones for companies that could not meet the test of survival in the war for market supremacy. State analysts estimate that 77,000 jobs have disappeared in Michigan auto factories in the last 3 years as a result of the consolidation of companies, the transfer of operations to other States and the heightened productivity of automated equipment.

This was the arsenal of democracy in World War II—principal supplier of the guns, tanks, trucks, and planes that gave the Allies their victory over nazism. Now, a few weeks after Nikita Khrushchev took over the Soviet Premiership with the boast that he would destroy capitalism by outproducing it, a third of the productive facilities are blacked out in the city the world views as the fountainhead of America's high living standards.

THE MOOD

The sign on your hotel bureau says, "You never had it so good," and goes on to extol the roast beef, steak and shrimp in the new grill. It is your introduction to the wistful effort the city that put the world on wheels is making to prove it is not careering downhill. "Look at the doughtnut, don't look at the hole," is the advice an inquirer gets from one top industry executive.

The city's banks are bulging with savings deposits, the two cars that are being turned out in closest to normal volume are both in the luxury price range—Cadillac and Thunderbird; the restaurants hardest to get into are those that charge $5 to $8 for a steak; the opening of the baseball season brings 46,698 out to cheer the Tigers; private investors press plans to start $150 million worth of downtown development projects in the next 9 months.

These manifestations of well-being, even opulence, leave the visitor ill prepared for the misery that is Detroit's other side. It is to be found in the human wastepile of the unemployed—the dispossessed and those with a shaky hold on their possessions; the worried woman on her way to the hospital, whose husband had a heart attack the week his job insurance ran out; the youth about to sign up for another hitch in the Army, who confides: "All the money I've got, you can hear it jingle."

In all this there is no panic, rarely a display of rancor. The men and women in the long queues at the State unemployment offices ("wall-to-wall people," one official calls them) wait with almost as much outward detachment as if they were on the check-out line at a supermarket.

When one talks to them, even those who have lost their homes, their cars or their furniture are likely to sound apologetic about the collapse of their security, as if it were all somehow their fault. But there is, in many, a sense of defeat that goes beyond resignation. It takes hold at the last twist of the wringer when they must make the dreaded turn from insurance paid as a matter of right to public relief issued only after proof of destitution.

This is Detroit, 1958 model. No schizophrenic ever was so bedeviled with contradictions, conflicts, and frustrations. And, as if these were not enough to dismay even the most dynamic community, this city of 2 million finds itself the setting for the year's most crucial and most acrimonious union-management negotiations—the wage talks between the Big Three auto companies and Walter Reuther's UAW. Even though the slackness of production and the staggering backlogs of unsold cars in the hands of dealers have made the chance of a strike virtually nil, the emotional overlay of the unresolved labor issues adds to Detroit's jitters.

THE WORKERS

The chief sufferers on the human side include tens of thousands of ex-G. I.'s, one-time members of the 52–20 Club, who drifted here and found steady work after months of futile search for an area of civilian usefulness in their hometowns in the hills of Kentucky and Tennessee and in the segregated, under-industrialized Deep South. The layoff ax, moving implacably up the seniority list, has chopped off the great bulk of the workers who got their jobs in the last 10 or 11 years.

That means that most of the orphans of the assembly line are former servicemen and others who came to adulthood and family responsibility too late to have suffered through the great depression of the thirties. Now they are victims of a slump that already has caused 55,000 Michigan workers to exhaust their 26 weeks of State insurance benefits and that brings 5,000 more to the same dreary terminal each week.

The mother stood with her five children in the shabby parlor that has a 2-foot hole in the plaster beside the television set. The 10-year-old said he didn't want to go out to play—the other kids on the block teased him too much because his blue jeans were 6 inches too short and full of patches.

"I've always tried to keep my family clean and decent, but now their clothes are just falling apart," the mother said wearily. She was a slim graceful woman, soft-spoken and looking younger than her 30 years.

She told of the troubles that had piled up since her husband, a Navy veteran, lost his job as a welder in the Chrysler body division September 6. One child fell off the back steps and had a concussion. Another had to go to the hospital for treatment of infected sinuses. By then the Blue Cross had lapsed and the medical bills came to $300. The washing machine conked out in December and the transmission in the 1948 Ford called it a day a couple of months later. They kept up their $80 monthly rent until February, but by the time they drew their last weekly insurance check of $48 a month ago their original savings of $200 had turned into a $200 debt to a finance company and an unpaid installment of $15 on their sewing machine.

"The landlord's been nice to us," the mother said, "but he works at Chrysler and he's laid off, too. My husband goes out every day just walking and walking, looking for work. But there is just nothing anywhere. Sometimes he babysits for 50 cents an hour. We are both nervous wrecks; we never had it like this before. We have applied for relief and they give us a temporary allowance of $26.42 a week for food. Accepting money from welfare, I feel we're down to the last notch. I don't want the children to grow up with the idea of welfare aid. My parents back in Arkansas raised me never to lean on welfare. If I could only get a job—any job—even with five kids."

The credit jeweler interrupted his lament that business was practically killed to wait on an old customer, a Chevrolet worker idle for the first time this year as a result of a 1-week shutdown. The jeweler came back scratching his head. The worker had bought $750 worth of jewelry—on the installment plan.

An armored truck stood outside the unemployment insurance office in a down-at-the-heels neighborhood 5 minutes' ride from Detroit's glistening civic center. On the truck's side was a sign: "Charge for cashing checks. Up to $50—15 cents. Over $50—20 cents." Two-thirds of the workers streaming out of the office thrust their checks through the slot and paid tribute to the man in the truck.

But he was not their only partner. A ponderous blind man in blue denim and galoshes sat on a milk case beside the truck. A tipsy woman in a brown jacket held the alms cup for him. She pushed it forward every time a worker got his money. "Something for the blind," she said. Not one failed to drop a dime or quarter in the cup. "It's bad luck not to give," one donor explained sheepishly.

Inside the office the manager frowned: "That armored truck is violating the law, but the cops don't bother the owner. And the wives like it, it keeps their men out of the beer gardens to cash their checks. They say the blind man pays that woman $50 a week. Not long ago the woman's husband had an argument with the blind man and cut him over the eye. This is a rough section. Occasionally, workers are stuck up in broad daylight as they walk away with their money."

The hot sun brought hundreds of jobless to the banks of the Detroit River to fish and doze. The perch were not biting, but that did not bother anyone much. A metal finisher in his 12th week of layoff at Fisher Body looked up and down the line of DP's from other auto plants on the embankment, and said:

"After a while just sitting around the house gets you down. You look at TV till the last show goes off and then you have nothing to do till you start looking tomorrow. What with your wife being nervous, you're always getting into arguments. The other day she said to me, 'I see in the paper where President Eisenhower says 300,000 people got jobs last month. Why weren't you one of them?' I only wish the President would tell me how to get from the fishing line to the assembly line."

The two Chrysler workers had not seen each other since they were laid off in January. They met on the street, each with his small children at his side. One reported that his wife had found work as a nurse. The other's wife was working as a charwoman.

"I do all the cooking, take care of the kids and run the errands," the first one said.

"I do all that and the washing besides," said his friend.

"I don't do that."

"Well, you will."

His grin was so cheerful that a passerby might have thought the short, amiable man with the blue shirt and grey dungarees was telling a funny story. His unemployment insurance ended 2 months ago and he took his wife to move in with her widowed sister

and 2 youngsters in a hotbox that looks like a transplant from Tobacco Road. He has a road-weary Ford he bought secondhand 4 years ago and on which he already has paid more than $500. He still owes $310.60 on it, but it is so dilapidated that the finance company never bothered to come and haul it away.

"They've took about everything else," this ex-Chrysler assembler said in his uncomplaining way. "They took my bedroom set and my living room set. I owed $300 on them. Then they took my gas cabinet range. I lacked $100 on that."

Relief is his next stop.

The lunch buzzer sounded in the busy Cadillac plant and four girls sat on the floor beside a fuchsia body assembly to munch sandwiches. They talked angrily about a washroom rumor that all married women were to be fired to make jobs for men. "When times were good," one exclaimed, "the men didn't want these jobs. They would stay a day or two and say I can get a job somewhere else." The girls all felt better when a visitor assured them that the company had no intention of ousting women and that the union contract forbade any sex discrimination.

THE MANAGERS

Industry executives, tasting austerity through a sharp falloff in their own bonuses and special compensation, do their best to accentuate the positive. Each fresh cutback in production rates is accompanied by a barrage of comforting statements about future sales prospects. The chief of one operating division that is finding it particularly hard to hold its market travels east to tell businessmen that the economy is not sick—it is not even ailing. "Even a sound and healthy economy has to pause occasionally for a rest," is his clinical estimate.

Few things irk the industry more than suggestions that people are not buying new cars simply because they consider them too big, too gadget-encrusted or too costly. The angriest reproaches in the first month of union negotiations were touched off by a Reuther quip that the companies would sell more cars if they designed models that did not need a block of parking space.

This is the ultimate heresy in management circles. There are a lot of reasons other than stubbornness to explain why the industry is so resistant to pressure for a small economy auto. Bigness does not make for maneuverability, whether in cars or in corporations. Unlike frenetic Seventh Avenue, which can switch from waistlines to sacks overnight, the auto manufacturers require a year or more to make a U-turn in their basic styling. And that lead time begins only after a summit decision, made agonizing by the layers of authority to be consulted and the monumental expenditures involved in a wrong guess.

"Certainly any unemployed is too many," the General Motors vice president declared, "but when you look at the general level of the economy it provides solid basis for optimism. So far as the long-range future of the auto industry and of the national economy is concerned, I think we all have to be very bullish. The entire situation underscores the necessity for good, sound, constructive selling."

Footnote by another vice president of the same company: "It is not the unemployed people who are causing the recession, but the employed people who refuse to buy at this time."

In the private dining room at the suburban club, the wife of a company official made excuses for her mink: "It's last year's and it's getting a little shabby; it doesn't look good for an executive vice president's wife to wear a new mink this year." A bank official, who serves on an auto company's board, also had a recession note to contribute. He had promised his daughter a yacht as a fifth wedding anniversary present this year, but he decided to defer the purchase. To make amends, he cut short his winter vacation in Florida and lent her his own yacht for a Caribbean cruise.

With all the security precautions of a trip to Cape Canaveral, the visitor was ushered into the top-secret styling showroom in which hand-built prototypes of the 1959 models were stored. They were not calculated to cause exaltation to an admirer of small cars. The executive said: "If the public wants to lower its standard of living by driving a cheap, crowded car, we'll make it. But we still don't believe that's what they want, and every survey we have made backs up that belief. The industry intends to invest well over a billion dollars in tools and dies for new big-car models for 1959. We are confident it will prove a sound investment."

Despite this brave talk, reports are widespread in the motor center that all the Big Three are rushing preparations to have a small car ready for sale—by 1960.

THE HIGHWAY AHEAD

The green light for full production is not likely to flash on before the 1959 models go on the line this fall. On the charts the Michigan Employment Security Commission uses to record the ups and downs of unemployment, the blue and yellow mountain already has climbed right off the graph that was adequate to handle all the fluctuations in the 20 years since the job-insurance system began. The statisticians forecast: "We have only begun to set records."

No less worrisome is the danger that Detroit will remain a distressed area even after the auto plants swing back into sustained production. Prof. William Haber, of the University of Michigan, one of the country's prime experts on manpower problems, warns that 200,000 workers in the State (nearly half the 450,000 now unemployed) would stay jobless even if the recession ended tomorrow. He feels that Detroit may be in for the kind of readjustment that caused such a prolonged industrial blight in New England when its textile factories started moving out.

Diversification—a massive effort to attract new industries—is imperative unless unemployment is to become a permanent drag on the area's prosperity.

THE LESSONS

An observer comes away from a week of trudging through somber streets full of somber homes and somber people wondering whether we know as much about keeping our economy from causing wholesale human suffering as we think we do.

Here are factories built to satisfy America's desire for a more abundant life. Their equipment represents the ultimate in industrial technology; behind them stretches an overfull pipeline of raw and processed materials awaiting conversion into finished goods. And here, locked out of these factories for want of orders, are 265,000 workers in a three-county industrial area—their only mission the collection of unemployment payments, their living standards on the downgrade, their confidence in their own worth sagging with each week of being unneeded and unwanted.

How long their stoicism will last is a question on which no one likes to speculate. Mike Marasco, community services director of a UAW local in hard-hit East Detroit, has this answer after months of responding to pleas for help in getting surplus food and in keeping household effects from being carted off:

"Our people are not bitter. They have plenty of faith in the future of Detroit. But they won't sit still for another winter like the one they've been through. They're looking forward to going back to work in the fall. If they don't they're not going to be quiet till someone tells them why."

The jobless find it puzzling that their ordeal evokes so little sense of urgency in Washington. The delay and bickering over proposals to extend unemployment insurance was an initial disappointment. It condemned additional thousands to turn to relief while awaiting Federal action.

But the real interest of the idle lies not in more benefits but in more work. For all the vigor of the industry's campaigns to stimulate sales through such slogans as "You Auto Buy Now," Detroit sees little hope that its woes will lessen materially without an upsurge in the national economy. That means that the city must look to President Eisenhower and Congress for any Government initiative needed to hasten the rise.

Detroit also must look to itself. It is still far from certain that, once national prosperity is restored, enough people will want to buy the kind of cars Detroit is making at the prices it is asking. The conviction is growing that buyers will be more selective in the future, less disposed to trade in their old car every year for the sole purpore of having one that looks a little more like a mobile neon sign.

"There was a fellow in this town once who became a billionaire by selling transportation, instead of gingerbread," is a sentiment one hears often among the industry's hometown critics.

The city's dominant power forces in labor and management are unlikely to add to the economic bloodletting by a test of strength this year. But their long-range antagonisms on pay, prices, profits, politics, and personalities have been made more virulent by the present travail. The prospect of a cooperative effort to solve Detroit's deep-rooted ills appears remote. This is doubly tragic, because there are few cities so well endowed on both sides with men of intelligence and imagination.

This is a frontline in the battleground Khrushchev has picked for the contest between totalitarianism and freedom. He has made it clear that the decision will not go to the country that launches the most sputniks into outer space or that piles up the most imposing reserves of thermonuclear weapons, but to the one that builds the highest living standards for its people. We start with an enormous advantage in that contest of peaceful accomplishment. How well we do in Detroit will be a large measure of our ability to stay ahead—and to stay alive.

Survival in the Nuclear Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a splendid address, Survival in the Nuclear Age, which was delivered by Brig. Gen. Alden K. Sibley, on December 7, 1957, at the Miltary Government Association dinner, in Boston, Mass.:

SURVIVAL IN THE NUCLEAR AGE, ADDRESS BY BRIG. GEN. ALDEN K. SIBLEY BEFORE THE MILITARY GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION, DECEMBER 7, 1957

Mr. President, Secretary Roderick, members of the Military Government Association, ladies and gentlemen, to meet with members of the Military Government team tonight is a deeply nostalgic experience for me. In Au-

gust of 1944, 52 members of the French Country Team of the European Civil Affairs Division arrived in Paris to report to General Eisenhower's military mission to the French Government. They tackled the problems of initial food supply, public health and sanitation, rehabilitation of French telephone and telegraph systems, opening up the flooded French coal mines, rehabilitating the disrupted system of the French railroads, establishing an initial system of military justice later to be taken over by the French courts, and in general, rehabilitating the dislocated economy and political structure of the French nation with great dispatch and efficiency. As chief of staff of the SHAPE mission to France, I could only sit by and watch the skillful accomplishment of their specialist missions with awe and admiration.

In a period of international tensions and cold war the specialized problems of military governments are among the most challenging which our country faces today. As President Eisenhower indicated in his November 13 address in Oklahoma City, the United States has military agreements with 42 countries. The economic aid missions, the military assistance advisory groups which we call the MAAG's and the United States Forces stationed by agreement on our bases in these host countries are confronted with problems familiar to all of you in this room. In a world situation, many of whose aspects are without precedent in history, posing a challenge to the American way of life and even to our survival, it is important that we as a Nation set our bearings by the stars and not by the lights of each passing ship. It is important too that we not wear out the rubber of our tires by alternately stepping on the gas and screaming to stops through a series of uncoordinated traffic lights.

In our great democracy a wise administration is alert to the changing political climate of the Congress and the Members of Congress in turn are sensitive to the views of their constituents. Accordingly, it is most important that the American people, as a whole, be well informed of the problems of our age. And, more importantly, that they be prepared to think; to think until it hurts. And we can well search the writings of Clausewitz and Mahan and Douhet and MacKinder, for in an age without precedent the American people have real need for guidance. Thus I should like to discuss with you tonight the need for an informed and thinking public as prerequisite to our survival as a Nation in the nuclear age.

As framework for our discussion this evening, I suggest that we use the outline of the classic five-paragraph military field order. Its five paragraphs are as follows:

1. Situation
2. Mission
3. Operations
4. Logistics
5. Command

I think we may find that this simple outline, when considered from the point of view of national strategy, will lend simplicity and perhaps a degree of force and emphasis to our deliberations.

First of all, therefore, let us consider paragraph 1, "Situation": The situation in which the United States finds itself today. Our country emerged victorious from World War II faced with two startling, unequivocal facts. First, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics progressively revealed itself as the antithesis of a benign former ally content to live with us in peaceful coexistence. We found instead the specter of a police state motivated by Marxist-Leninist international communism and relentlessly devoted to the destruction of the capitalist system and to world conquest by any means. It soon became clear to us that the continued adherence of the masters of the Kremlin to Marxist-Leninist doctrine of world conquest was confirmed almost daily by their every word and deed. Mao Tse-tung, the acknowledged leader of the Communist Party in China, like Hitler in Mein Kampf, has written for all the world to read: "I am a Marxist dedicated to communizing China and the world under the leadership of Moscow." And more recently, we are all familiar with Khrushchev's statement to the effect that the masters of the Kremlin could be expected to depart from the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of world conquest when the snail learns to whistle. The second unequivocal fact which faced the United States following the end of World War II was the consequence of a technological revolution which we ourselves had precipitated. We were faced with a transition in weapons which we slowly came to realize was without precedent in the history of mankind. When we consider that it was actually possible as late as 1825 for the British War Office seriously to consider the replacement of musketry by the crossbow in the hands of British infantry, we can begin to appreciate the magnitude and suddenness of the transition from conventional to nuclear weapons.

It was during this period that man learned to reproduce on earth the nuclear fusion reactions which take place in the central regions of the sun. The proper isotopes of hydrogen are sufficiently plentiful in ordinary sea water to make a pound of heavy hydrogen sell for about $35; hence, as big as you like, as many as you like, and almost as cheap as you like, or more bang for your buck. But in spite of the rapid increase of our nuclear and thermonuclear stockpiles, some felt that every ounce of nuclear material should be allocated further to increase our retaliatory capability against the Soviet heartland. In recognition of Soviet aggressive intentions and as a deterrent to global war, the principle of massive retaliation received general support in allied councils. Although it can be argued that our capacity for massive retaliation was successful in preventing Soviet nuclear aggression against the heartland of the United States during this period, it must, of course, be recognized that until about 1955 U. S. S. R. did not possess the capability for such an attack. Henry Kissinger suggests that our concentration on the principle of massive retaliation may even have limited the freedom of American diplomacy to some extent during this period.

Our national strategic concept was founded on the assumption that the American democracy would not itself precipitate an aggression. The corollary to this assumption, of course, was that the military advantage inherent in a surprise attack had to be conceded to the aggressor. As a counter to surprise attack, therefore, the capacity for massive retaliation gained currency as the only effective deterrent. The limitation of this concept was, of course, the fact that little less than a direct threat to the survival of the United States itself would have caused us to release such a holocaust. The masters of the Kremlin, of course, knew this. They also knew that, inhibited by the horror of nuclear war prevalent in the minds of our allies, we should not be likely to resort to such measures to counter limited peripheral aggressions. The doctrine of total massive retaliation, and the absence of a capability for the limited employment of nuclear force which might have carried with it the conviction of plausibility may give some clue to the predilection of international communism for conquest through subversion, sabotage, political corruption, and economic infiltration around the periphery of the world island.

In the United States the recognition gradually dawned on even the most ardent isolationist that America at last had become a Nation among nations, dependent economically on Europe, the Far East, and the uncommitted areas for world markets and for raw materials. With only one-seventh of the world's population and an approximately equal proportion of its natural resources, the United States could scarcely permit the sinister inroads of international communism to ring down the Iron Curtain successively on the other nations of the world. Such a course of isolation would ultimately present the United States with a strategically impossible situation. We faced the dilemma of being nibbled to death by mice or atomized in a world holocaust. The record of the states enslaved by international communism, however, was clear: initially, Russia, then Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, Albania, East Germany, the mainland of China, Outer Mongolia, Tibet, North Korea, North Vietnam, and, in process of enslavement today, Egypt and Syria—18 countries including parts of countries and over 900 millions of people. Those of us who have not as yet been engulfed or subverted and thus enslaved by Communist dictatorship would be less than prudent not to provide an effective deterrent to Communist aggression. But what kind of a deterrent is needed? In answering this question it is significant that the Communist leaders with competent scientific advisers are acutely aware of the fact that in unlimited nuclear war there can be no victor. Thus they have turned to the orthodox methods of dialectic materialism to accomplish the avowed aims of the world conquest and domination by means other than total nuclear war. Moreover, while the free world has been diverted by the necessity of putting out successive brush fires around the periphery the world island, the Soviet Union has been busily engaged in a sinister and relentless program of technological education at home.

To compare the number of graduates in scientific fields within the last 30 years in America and in Soviet Russia is not particularly frightening until one looks at the past 2 years and realize that probably 33 percent of Russian graduates are fundamental researchers: pure physicists, mathematicians, chemists, and the like. Perhaps the Russians are wrong in such a concentration of national effort in science. If they are wrong, they will have an overabundance of scientists; if we are wrong in developing too few scientists, it may cost us our survival as a Nation. In Soviet Russia a young man or woman who attains distinction in mathematics or science over the intense competition of the high schools automatically becomes a member of the economic and social elite. Concessions by the state, fringe benefits, and incentive awards place him in a kind of a Socialist aristocracy where he maintains his place by his mental fertility, his production of ideas and his publication of scientific papers. Tragically, in our country the road to economic success and to the presidencies of corporations seldom leads through the laboratory. There is too little opportunity for material success in America for the pure scientist—for the fundamental researcher. Or, conversely perhaps, we place so high a premium on material success as such, that the more lasting achievements of the advancement of human knowledge tend to get lost in the shuffle. But on the other hand, we have been and probably are today the world's masters in engineering and technology. We are essentially a Nation of gadgeteers and this has come to us naturally with the necessity for conquering the wide-open spaces of our great continent. In contrast, the crowded cities of Europe are more conducive to the contemplative way of life—to pure research. In America, with a $5 billion research and development Federal appropriation each year, we devote only about 10 percent to pure research; 90 percent goes to developmental technology. We research the hell out of everything but we contemplate very little.

So we emerge in the fall of 1957, 12 years after the end of World War II, with a technological breakthrough by the Soviets. The launching of the space satellite is, however, but an outward and visible manifestation of the thoroughgoing success of the scientific education program of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Militarily it has two significant implications. First, it shows that the quantity and the quality of Soviet scientists is at least equal to our own. It brings home to the man in the street some of the facts which have gravely concerned the National War College in Washington and the National Security Council in the past several years. Whereas in 1950 the United States graduated 130,000 young men and women in all scientific fields, as compared to about 70,000 graduates per year in the Soviet Union, in 6 years the picture was almost exactly reversed. In 1956 the number of graduates per year in all scientific fields in the United States had dropped to about 70,000 and in the Soviet Union had reached nearly 140,000. Militarily it gives us pause to wonder from when the next technological breakthrough will come and who will make it. Secondly, the most recent Soviet technological breakthrough makes it clear that they are on the threshold of an operational intercontinental ballistic missile capability. It may also provide an answer to the enigma which has puzzled our air strategists for the past several years as to the failure of the Soviets to develop long-range tanker aircraft and the technique of inflight refueling for their Bear and Bison bombers. It is possible that they have considered the manned bomber as an interim weapon and, with their disregard for human life, have been willing to rely on its capacity to conduct one-way missions against continental United States, pending the era of the ICBM.

Here we have the richest nation in the world, the greatest industrial nation in the world, 3 million square miles, highly productive, richly endowed with natural resources; 165 million people live here; the acknowledged masters of the art of mass production. They have a gross national product of $400 billion, and in the last 5 years over $200 billion of capital investment has been made in plant and equipment alone in this country. One hundred million of these people live in cities; one-half of these reside in 232 cities; one-third of them live in 41 cities. The central cities of the 32 largest metropolitan areas cover only an infinitesimal 55 square miles of the total 3 million square miles of territory, but at the peak period crowded into this tiny area are 22 million people. In 25 cities are located 70 percent of all petroleum products, 89 percent of all financial transactions and one-half of the Nation's foreign commerce is carried on in 6 port cities; one-quarter of our foreign commerce is in a place called New York. With the Soviet's present capability for the delivery of one-way nuclear attacks on this great industrial complex, we are today living in the long-heralded era of nuclear plenty. This term must not be confused with nuclear parity for it is quite clear that the Soviets will not have attained the equivalent of our enormous nuclear stockpile for some time to come. However, with the capacity for destruction of our economy, what, I ask, would it avail them to be able to destroy it twice over? This then is the situation in December 1957.

Let us now turn to paragraph 2 of the classic 5-paragraph field order. This paragraph, titled "Mission," when applied to national security planning is termed the "strategic concept." In his November 13 address in Oklahoma City the President spelled out with crystal clarity the four elements of our national strategic concept in the nuclear age. He said that we must: "(1) As a primary deterrent to war maintain a nuclear retaliatory power of such capacity as to convince the Soviets that any attack on us and our allies would result, regardless of damage to us, in their own nation's destruction. (2) In cooperation with our allies, provide a force structure so flexible that it can cope quickly with any form of aggression against the free world. (3) Keep our home defenses in a high state of efficiency. (4) Have the reserve strength to meet unforeseen emergency demands."

With this clear and unambiguous statement of our 4-point national strategic concept, let us now look at paragraph 3 of the field order: "Operations." How do we carry out our 4-point mission that the President has set for us? First, we must, of course, maintain our nuclear retaliatory power in the form of an ever alert strategic delivery capacity by the Air Force and the Navy, supplemented by intermediate range ballistic missiles in overseas bases, and provided with intercontinental ballistic missiles as rapidly as the combined efforts of our dedicated scientists and engineers can make them.

As the second element of our national strategic concept, the President has prescribed that in cooperation with our allies we must provide a flexible force structure to cope quickly with any form of aggression. It is well that we examine this, as our operational plans for meeting this second element of our mission may well provide the key to future diplomacy and even our national survival itself. Whereas our preoccupation in the past with a total and overwhelming nuclear retaliatory power entailed a course of action inconceivable in the absence of a direct threat to our national survival, the possibility of a graduated and flexible capacity for nuclear retaliation provides a means for relating military force directly to diplomacy in any area of the world. A capability in being to counter peripheral aggression by limited, nuclear actions should constitute a plausible use of force which could well give the Communist aggressor pause to stop and consider the consequences. Forces to compete successfully in limited war in the nuclear age must be widely dispersed, technically trained, extremely mobile, and above all self-sustaining. They would thus not present the concentrated targets which massing of conventional firepower entails, nor would they require highly vulnerable port, depot, and logistic supply systems—ideal targets for nuclear attack.

It is entirely possible to have forces, trained and equipped for limited nuclear war, which at the same time have the capacity to fight conventional war with conventional weapons. The forces to counter aggression against the free world must be designed, trained and equipped with a capability for tactical nuclear combat, if need be. This as the President has said, we are doing. The importance of the Army's role in limited warfare of the nuclear age is of such importance that I understand Secretary Roderick, your key speaker this evening, plans to discuss this subject with you and will bring to it a far greater degree of clarity and emphasis than could I.

An immediate consequence of the concept of limited tactical operations of interest in passing, however, is that the aggressor is placed at a disadvantage in achieving his purpose of occupying territory and controlling populations. During the revolt of the Hungarian people in November 1956, for example, the Red army was forced to employ 22 divisions to put down a presumably unarmed populace. Such concentrations of manpower would present unexceptionally vulnerable targets to a nuclear armed tactical defending force. Moreover the masters of the Kremlin in full realization that general nuclear war would spell disaster for their cause would have every incentive to avoid extending such limited actions and so precipitate their own annihilation.

As the third element of the President's strategic concept, we must "keep our home defenses in a high state of efficiency." Here in New England, the strategic northeast corner of the United States, we are making great strides in this field. The NIKE defenses of our industrial and air base complexes spell the doom of the piloted bomber. These deadly air defense missiles are being supplemented by even longer range and more effective defenses, as the headlines have proclaimed in recent weeks. Even today my own office is hard at work in the engineering, design and construction of complex installations and emplacements to complete the shield of air defense, and our dedicated scientists are applying their best brain power to the solution of the anti-missile missile problem.

Thus, it seems every aspect of the President's 4-point strategic concept brings us back in the end to the question of brain power and from this overriding requirement our military leaders are certainly not exempt. The weapon systems of the modern age have already become so highly involved technically that even minor tactical units, infantry company and the artillery battery, require scientists on their staffs. The time, therefore, has long passed for the professional military commander at any echelon to sit back, complacent in his leadership and command ability, leaving the difficult technical questions to the scientific "long hair." In the age of modern weaponry any commander who fails to know his weapons and to study with diligence the complex problems of weapon effects will progressively abdicate command to those who do. For it stands to reason that he who knows how the blast, heat, and radiation of a weapon strike can affect the course of battle will control the military decision and will in consequence become the "de facto" commander.

And just as I would urge upon my colleagues in uniform, green, gray, or blue, the importance of becoming military scientists as well as commanders and leaders of men, so I would call upon our captains of industry and our great educational leaders in whom New England has such a rich heritage to grasp the nettle of their grave responsibilities for our survival in the nuclear age.

For the dignity and prestige of the executive and the thinker in our national plan of operations to give effect to the President's strategic concept are fully as significant as are those of us in uniform. In our great democratic system the Federal Government can only prime the pump of basic research and scientific education. The continuing impetus which alone can produce the mathematicians, physicists, chemists, political scientists and statesmen we must have, must come from the citadels of private enterprise and the halls of learning of our country. This is a real and vital problem. This is your challenge and my challenge, for we as Americans must find the way to remove this vulnerable Achilles heel in our security structure before it is too late. Until we make it possible for the mathematician in his study, and the physicist in his laboratory, to aspire to the material recognition we give to the chairmen of our boards and the presidents of our corporations, the ablest and best will desert the study and the laboratory for new worlds to conquer and those very material rewards on which our society has come to place so high a premium. So much for an outline of the operational plan to implement our national strategic concept set forth by the President.

Let us turn briefly to paragraph 4 of the field order "Logistics." What is logistics? I should like to propose to you the definition contained in the Outline Logistic War Plan for Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe under NATO. It reads, "Logistics is

the science of marshaling the resources of nations in support of their allied military objectives." This definition perhaps has shortcomings and the author will be glad to answer for them. Classically our military field manuals have divided logistics into five specific functions. First, supply and procurement; second, evacuation and hospitalization; third, movements in transportation; fourth, construction and installations; and fifth, signed communications. Paradoxically, however, the most important aspect of logistics is that which it is not. Congressman KILDAY, several years ago in the House Armed Services Committee gave the following pointed definition of logistics: "An army marches on its stomach; without money they'd be empty stomachs and they'd march with bare feet. Without money that captivating word 'logistics' has no meaning."

A significant example of the importance of one field of logistics, that of construction, has always been to me the fact that NATO infrastructure, the construction effort of our European alliance, is the only function of that alliance which is considered so important as to be funded out of an international budget through a cost sharing formula contributed to by the 15 nations of NATO. The President stated with regard to our airpower, our defense system, and our warning system: "More runways, more fueling stations and more housing." This means more construction. This means more dollars, which must be spent carefully and conscientiously in the interest of our national security.

The construction effort in some ways may be described as the most important of all logistic functions. Construction in a very real sense is the first concern of any military commander. Before a weapon can be designed, research and development facilities and testing installations must be built. Before a single soldier, airman, or sailor can be mobilized and trained, classrooms, training installations, and camps must be constructed. Before a single air defense weapon can be installed, facilities must be constructed for its installation. Before a single military unit can be deployed overseas to any 1 of the 43 nations with whom we have military base agreements or elsewhere, military bases and facilities must be constructed. The Army engineers of our airborne division, using air transportable construction equipment, must provide four landing strips for assault aircraft within 3 to 5 hours. And with the rapid developments in technology, our complex of installations must be modified frequently, many of them actually in the course of construction.

As the President announced in Oklahoma City, during the last 5 years $211 billion have been appropriated for our national security, an average of $42 billion a year. How much of this fantastic sum has gone for construction alone, only one of the functions of logistics? The cost of a single, long-range bomber is measured in terms of millions of dollars, but the cost of long-range bomber bases is measured in hundreds of millions of dollars. We think today of the high cost of nuclear material, and yet the developments of the Manhattan district in the initial $12 billion investment by this country in atomic energy at Oakridge, Hanford, and elsewhere, was largely spent for construction. The President has indicated that the Federal Government is appropriating at a rate of $5 billion a year for research and development today, and yet, when we think of the guided missile test range at Cape Canaveral, the Lincoln Labs, and the Cambridge Research Center here at Bedford, construction represents the preponderance of the cost of these research facilities. The construction of the 35 NIKE air-defense missile batteries we have just completed in New England has cost much more than the missiles which arm them.

Let us look for a moment then at the role of the construction engineer as it contributes to our survival in the nuclear age. Before the plans for a new weapon or a new piece of equipment are off the research and development drawing board, the construction engineer must be planning his installation designs. Many of these designs will be unprecedented, requiring pattern-making engineering solutions: the construction of Arctic airbases on compacted ice sheets; of miles of tunnels in lieu of roads on the ice cap, and of crackproof rigid pavements to carry 240,000 pound gear loadings on frost susceptible, glacial till material. The construction engineer is among the first to come to grips with the realities of implementing the national strategic concept. His capabilities frequently dictate the feasibility of military plans and operations. Meticulous design, careful construction supervision, and inspection must produce the high standard of construction for which the Army Corps of Engineers is reputed. And paradoxically enough, the proudest act of the Army engineer is to strike his colors. When the flag bearing the engineer castle is finally lowered over an Army engineer construction project and the flag of the using service is raised, there is deep satisfaction in knowing that the installation has taken its place at last as part of our national security structure. So much for logistics.

When we consider the final paragraph, No. 5 of the classic field order: "Command," we have a problem for the future. In applying the field order to a small infantry unit such as a platoon, paragraph 5 usually reads, "I will be at such and such a place." Even when applied on the national scale the principle of command recognizes that once a decision is made by the Commander, he relinquishes for a time the control of his operations. After the Commander's decision has been made, he cannot, however, sit back idly and watch the course of the battle. The Commander's job is immediately to undertake plans for the next move. What is our Commander planning for the future? Again the President in Oklahoma City, answered this question with finality: "One thing that money cannot buy is time. Frequently time is a more valuable coin than is money. It takes time for a tree to grow, for an idea to become an accomplishment, for a student to become a scientist. Time is a big factor in two longer term problems, strengthening our scientific education and our basic research. * * * Remember that when a Russian graduates from high school, he has had 5 years of physics, 4 years of chemistry, 1 year of astronomy, 5 years of biology, 10 years of mathematics through trigonometry, and 5 years of foreign language. * * * Young people now in colleges must be equipped to live in the age of intercontinental ballistic missiles. However, what will then be needed is not just engineers and scientists but people who will keep their heads and in every field, leaders who can meet intricate human problems with wisdom and courage. In short, we shall need not only Einsteins but Washingtons and Emersons." Thus the Commander has made his decision and has launched the planning for the future. The time for educational dilletantism, for poor and underpaid teachers, and the tendency of a student to just get by in academics in order to play football, is long past if we are to survive as a Nation. We must learn to think and think hard if we are to escape the defeat of the Roman Empire. We are the richest Nation in the world. We have the highest standard of living in the world. We cannot afford to allow ourselves to go soft. We must have the courage and the intestinal fortitude to pay the annual premiums on our national insurance policy with adequate military stature and adequate scientific and technological strength. Just as a rich man must lock his door at night not to tempt the housebreaker, so we must be prepared to protect our riches or we shall surely lose them to the international gangster who will take them if he dares. To carry out such a challenging program requires more than national fortitude. Survival in the nuclear age requires national brains. Collectively and individually, Americans must learn to think, to think hard. For I say to you with all the energy and vigor at my command, that young Americans must either learn to think or learn Russian.

Chairman Lewis L. Strauss Sets the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, AEC Chairman Lewis L. Strauss is a man as sincerely dedicated to peace as any in the world. His dedication to this cause, however, does not take the form of meaningless eulogies of the concept or espousal of boobytrapped schemes to weaken the United States capability to resist Communist enslavement in the name of peace.

He correctly gages the difficulties facing our Nation and the strength we must maintain to overcome them and ultimately reach mankind's basic goal of a peaceful world. The Los Angeles Examiner on May 5 editorially noted both Chairman Strauss' dedication and courage to face our problems realistically as follows:

A STRAIGHT SET OF FACTS

Chairman Lewis L. Strauss of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, put together a pretty straight set of facts on the troublesome question of international disarmament, in his recent statement before a subcommittee of the United States Senate.

He said it is the earnest hope of the American Government, as it is of all thoughtful men throughout the world, that a reliable and effective system can and should be negotiated by the major powers for the control of the world's armaments—"a system which can reduce and finally eliminate the possibility of a third world war."

But he also said there are certain things that have to be remembered and given prior consideration.

One of these vital things is that the act of aggression needed to start a great war will never be of our doing. As a democracy, it is the unavoidable destiny of America to be cast in the role of defender in any war. The uncomfortable but irrefutable fact is, as Mr. Strauss says, that we are compelled by our moral concepts to leave the responsibilities and the advantages of aggression to the totalitarian nations.

The advantages of being the aggressor are obvious. They give our enemies the chance to pick both the time and the place of attack, but aboye all the chance to strike the first blow—a frightening thing under the conditions of modern warfare.

This being true, our only protective recourse in offsetting the advantages of initial

attack which we grant to the aggressor is just what Mr. Strauss says it is—that of having more and better weapons than the aggressor can bring against us.

Our sole hope of survival if war comes under these circumstances of our disadvantage is in having such overwhelming weapons of reprisal and retaliation that our ultimate victory will be assured. And of course the brightest and best hope that springs from this position of defensive strength is that it will confront the potential aggressor with such a certainty of defeat and such a burden of cost that he will be deterred from making war against us.

Hence, whatever else we seek and agree to in our negotiations for a system of international disarmament, our unyielding insistence must always be, as Mr. Strauss urges, that:

"It must not be such as to impair the defensive and retaliatory power of ourselves and our allies without a convincingly compensating restriction on an aggressor's ability to attack."

United States Exhibit, Brussels World's Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter just received from Louis Lancaster, of Santa Barbara, Calif. Mr. Lancaster was formerly connected with the Department of State and for many years has been a successful businessman. He has spent much time abroad and is well qualified to pass objective judgment upon the effectiveness of the United States exhibit in the current World's Fair at Brussels. This he does in the letter which follows:

WORLD'S FAIR,
Brussels, Belgium, April 26, 1958.

Congressman CHARLES TEAGUE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHUCK: I wish you and a few other Congressmen would hop a plane and take a quick look at our exhibit here. It has just opened and they expect 40 million people at the fair this summer.

Our building is beautiful—probably too beautiful. Inside most of the floor space is a pool of water. On an island—our main feature—a fashion show of mink stoles, costly evening gowns.

Russia—next door in a large, factory-like building—features sputnik, manufacturing, education.

The impression one gets. United States—pretty, rich, indolent, frivolous. Russia—strong, serious, down-to-earth.

Why must we again miss the boat? It's not too late to change our interior display. There are so many things we might have done—a typical United States community (modern home, supermarket, school, library, church, etc.).

I hate to have 40 million Europeans think our main thoughts are on mink stoles, rich evening gowns, and anemic, slinky fashion models. Most people in the world are poor. Why flaunt a let them eat cake attitude?

Regards,

LOUIS LANCASTER.

SANTA BARBARA.

Educational Potentials of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BURNS
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii has been famed as the land of song, but little recognition has been given to her real achievements in the field of music. In including the following article which appeared in the New York Times of April 27, I wish to draw attention to the progress Hawaii has made, and underscore the spirit of understanding among people which has contributed in no small degree to this advancement.

In the not too distant future, I am sure the University of Hawaii will meet its responsibilities by a college of music so that the meeting place of the East and West will contribute to greater cultural achievements for all.

HONOLULU LOOKS AT THE MODERNS
(By Ben Hyams)

HONOLULU.—As spontaneously as night-blooming cereus bursts into blossom around the Punahou School campus, modern music is flourishing seasonally in this unexpected academic quarter.

Staid, missionary-founded Punahou sprang a pleasant surprise last spring when its music school, staged a Festival of Music and Art of This Century. It became quickly apparent that an institution had been founded, and the subsequent announcement that a second festival would be held April 20–23 came as no surprise at all.

As festivals go, this was a modest affair, comprising three concerts and a forum; but size is no measure of its value. For the occasion, Montague Hall, the music school building, besides providing the hall for the concerts, was turned into a gallery for a concurrent exhibition by members of the Hawaii Painters and Sculptors League.

The festival is the brainchild of the music school's director, Miss Marian J. Kerr, who came to Punahou in 1945 as chairman of the piano department after having served on the faculties of Pennsylvania and Northwest Missouri State Colleges. Miss Kerr felt her school owed the community something more stimulating than its tradition-bound faculty concerts. With no box office to worry about, Punahou emerged as a progressive force.

LIVING COMPOSERS

Her phrase "of this century" in the festival title was chosen to avoid the limitations of the word "contemporary." Nevertheless, all the music programed was by living composers, three of them living here. It was planned that way. By a departure from the first festival, this year Miss Kerr wrote or talked with various composers, asking some of them to suggest works of theirs for performance.

The response was nearly total, and totally compliant. Those represented on the programs included Walter Piston, Alvin Etler, Burrill Phillips, Paul Hindemith, Ingolf Dahl, Hawaii-born Dai Keong Lee (now of New York) and the three resident composers—George Barati, Homer Keller and Donald E. Wiley. There also were Alan Hohvaness, Quincy Porter, Alexei Haieff, Vaughan Williams, Henk Badings and Benjamin Britten.

ADVANCED TASTE

Publishers replied, too, offering material in some cases still in their printing shop. But here and there Miss Kerr thought she detected doubts of Honolulu's competence. Phrases like "you wouldn't want my very difficult quartet" hurt a little. Performers in the festival are no amateurs, but mostly mainland-trained musicians who will face up to dodecaphony with the best of their brethren back home.

Thus music in Honolulu is marked not so much by its differences from mainland music as by its similarities. While the Hawaiian guitar is sovereign at Waikiki Beach, back along the soft hillside slopes of this island the classic instruments prevail, including even the viola d'amore, lute, harpsichord and Japanese koto. Situated in that are are Punahou and the University of Hawaii, which are the main centers of musical life and provide a fair portion of the Honolulu Symphony Orchestra's membership.

The orchestra received a welcome infusion of modernism 8 years ago when Mr. Barati, a modernist composer-'cellist, became its conductor. Under his direction the orchestra has grown in national status from the community to the metropolitan class.

Composition of the Honolulu Symphony is as mixed as its racial ancestries. A university player may sit next to a lawyer or sugar scientist whose avocation is music. The likes of Robinson, Iwanaga, and Wong play as neighbors under their Hungarian-American conductor. Another member is undoubtedly the islands' best civilian bassoonist, Floyd Uchima, who is also a basso well known for his grinning portrayals of Leporello, Don Pasquale, and similar roles. So valued is Uchima's bassoon that a woodwind quintet by Barati scheduled for last year's Punahou festival was put off until this year because Uchima was unavailable then.

Among the young performers in the second festival concert, for children, were noted three Chinese-American Yee sisters and a boy named Oh, of Korean extraction. Honolulans will also tell you with a smile that the town's three leading choral directors are Murphy, Kelly, and Gallagher. Racial dividing lines are faint in this American community.

FESTIVAL SPIRIT

Since the first Punahou series, but not necessarily because of it, something of a festival spirit has spread. Last Christmas, Julius Herford came from New York to lead Honolulu's first Music Workshop and Festival, devoted to Bach-Beethoven and climaxed by a performance of Beethoven's Ninth by Barati and the symphony. Now a second Herford-led workshop-festival is planned for next Christmas, possibly on contemporary music.

Meanwhile, an established local chamber music organization called for guarantors to back a new spring season of concerts. They were readily oversubscribed. In addition to concerts by local ensembles, the Amadeus String Quartet will play here April 1 and the Alma Trio May 1.

Honolulu may be far from becoming a world music festival center. But let us say at least there are stirrings in that direction.

An Open Letter to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is rare, I believe, when an issue affect-

ing a large segment of our economy and our population, is so clearly pinpointed as has been done by a small independent oil producer in Hereford, Tex. I refer to the recent letter of Mr. Joe G. Evans to the President of the United States which was reproduced in the April 27 edition of the Sunday Brand in that community. Because it states the problem so graphically, under unanimous consent, I insert here Mr. Evans' open letter to the President:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

HEREFORD, TEX., *April 23, 1958.*

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President, United States of America,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EISENHOWER: I think I would not be exaggerating to say that your decisions on imports of oil and agriculture have directly or indirectly put 1½ million people out of work, which means these people are having to house up with relatives and live on short rations like they did in the 1930 years of depression.

It doesn't seem that the price of wheat makes much difference in a loaf of bread, for I remember when we were getting $3 per bushel for wheat; we could buy a loaf of bread for 17 cents that now costs 26 cents and wheat is selling at $2 per bushel. Everything the farmer buys has gone up, up in price and everything he sells is down. In many cases, a farmer cannot hire help because he doesn't have a margin that will enable him to do so.

Mr. Eisenhower, can you tell us where the importing of oil gives the needy home folks one bit of justice? When he had 20 days allowable, our domestic oil industry was healthy. They found the huge oil reserves in the foreign countries and our Government began to cut our days of allowables here at home, so that the most powerful oil companies in the world could flood us with foreign oil and we were cut from 20 days down to 8 at the present time. These mighty oil companies that have ruined our domestic industry have tried to pose patriotism by saying, use foreign oil in time of peace and our home oil in case of war. You take the extra profit they make out of imports, over domestic oil, and you will see where their patriotism will be.

Mr. Eisenhower, just the fellows who work on the drilling floors are not the only ones that are put out of work, every industry in the Nation is seriously affected. I understand there are about 22 companies that are doing the major part of this importing—they are already fat with wealth, for instance, Mr. Paul Getty averages 100,000 barrels of import every time the sun comes up. Is it right for that few, who are already too rich to even have any feeling for humanity, to destroy the biggest industry of the Nation and put a million people out of employment?

Already, Mr. Eisenhower, many independents have gone under, because of the excessive oil imports. The few huge oil companies have tried for years to put independents out of business, but never could as long as independents had a fair deal, but now with the huge oilfields in the Far East, and with strangling 8 days allowable here at home, so that the mighty oil companies can have room for their oil when their tankers reach our ports, they can and will.

Well, Mr. Eisenhower, I could go on and talk for hours but it looks to me like a 12-year-old boy could see through this. I am not informed on all of it, but I have seen enough and heard and read enough to know that it is terribly unjust. You have the power, Mr. Eisenhower, to impose mandatory control, why don't you do it and thus put a million of our people back to work and, at the same time, save many an independent from going completely under—many of them are hanging on by a slender thread.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON on March 12, 1958, made a speech explaining this terrible situation—on March 6, 1958, he wrote you a personal letter, I have a copy of each.

Mr. Eisenhower, the people of the Nation are depending on you to give relief in places where you have the power to do so.

Sincerely,

JOE G. EVANS.

How Stalin Stole Spain's Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I offer an article by Lawrence Sullivan, our distinguished coordinator of information, entitled "How Stalin Stole Spain's Gold." It reveals a pattern of Communist subversion that should serve as a warning to all Americans.

HOW STALIN STOLE SPAIN'S GOLD

(By Lawrence Sullivan, coordinator of information, U. S. House of Representatives)

(In 1936 the Spanish Communists secretly delivered 600 tons of Spain's gold reserves to Stalin. Here is the sworn testimony of the Russian NKVD agent who engineered the shipment.)

When the Communist Popular Front took over Spain, in February 1936, the new government assumed control by the familiar Kremlin tactics of assassination, violence, and pillage. And when communism was thwarted by Franco's forces in October, the Red leaders determined upon one last act of treachery—the secret transfer of all Spain's gold reserves to Moscow. The shipment consisted of 600 tons of bar gold, valued at approximately $700 million.

Moscow never has returned this treasure. Today the Kremlin's price for return of whatever may be left of the Spanish gold is stated in terms of baldest blackmail—resumption of diplomatic relations between Spain and Russia, and Spanish acceptance of a large staff of Russian "technical forces" throughout Spain.

The story of Spain's betrayal was told under oath before the Senate Internal Security Committee on February 14, 1957. The witness was Alexander Orlov, who formerly had served in Moscow as deputy director of the Soviet Secret Police, and later as economic adviser to the dreaded NKVD. Orlov renounced communism in July 1938, and fled to the West.

Orlov, in Moscow, was ordered to Madrid late in 1935, to set up Kremlin operations for the Spanish civil war, which broke violently in February 1936.

"I directed the guerrilla warfare there," the witness related.

Sickened by Moscow's treachery against the Spanish people, Orlov renounced communism on July 12, 1938, made his way to the United States and was granted asylum. In 1953 he published his first book, The Secret History of Stalin's Crimes.

The Communist Popular Front Government secretly turned Spain's gold reserves over to Russia in October 1936.

Orlov, in Madrid, received a personal telegram from Stalin on October 20, directing him to arrange the shipment.

"I hold you personally responsible for this operation," Stalin's coded message said. The text of this message appears in Orlov's Senate testimony, at page 3430:

"Together with Ambassador Rosenberg, arrange with the head of the Spanish Government, Caballero, for the shipment of the gold reserves of Spain to the Soviet Union. Use for the shipment a Soviet steamer. This operation must be carried out with the utmost secrecy. If the Spaniards demand from you a receipt for the cargo, refuse. I repeat, refuse to sign anything, and say that a formal receipt will be issued in Moscow by the State Bank. I hold you personally responsible for this operation. Rosenberg has been instructed accordingly."

Franco's anti-Communist forces then were pressing at the very gates of Madrid, and the Communist government was preparing to flee the city.

"From our Embassy we went to the Spanish Ministry of Finance, where Negrin, the Finance Minister, introduced me to the Chief of the Treasury, Senor Mendez Aspe," Orlov recalled.

"Only three men in the Spanish Government knew about this operation. No one else in the Cabinet knew about it. Those were Prime Minister Caballaro, Finance Minister Negrin, and the President of the Republic, Azana."

Fearing he might be caught by Spanish patriots in the act of transferring the gold to Russian ships, Orlov obtained from Finance Minister Negrin a special certificate in the name of Blackstone, designating him as an agent of the Bank of America (San Francisco, Calif.) to which the gold presumably was enroute for safe keeping.

"Negrin did not object," Orlov's testimony continues. "He thought it was a fine idea. I spoke more or less decent English, and could pass for a foreigner. So he issued to me credentials in the name of Blackstone, and I became the representative of the Bank of America. * * * I commandeered four Soviet steamers then in Spanish ports. * * * And I left for Carthagena, the Spanish port where the gold was stored in a huge cave hewn out of a mountain.

"I asked the Government to give me 60 Spanish sailors to do the loading of the gold. The Spanish sailors were kept for 3 nights and 3 days in that cave. They understood pretty well what was in those boxes. * * * but they did not know where the gold was being taken—maybe to another Spanish city.

"For three nights the loading of the gold was done during the night, and transported during the night in complete blackout, to the pier where it was loaded on the Soviet ships. * * * The health of Mendez Aspe was a very serious thing. He was a nervous man. * * * So he fled and left just one assistant, a very nice Spanish fellow, who did the counting of the gold for them * * * but after Mendez Aspe fled and that lone officer did the counting, the figures began to diverge."

When the cave had been emptied the count showed a discrepancy of 100 boxes of gold, each box weighing 125 pounds. Orlov made a special report to Moscow on this discrepancy in the loading count. Although Orlov's count showed 7,900 boxes, the official receipt later issued in Moscow was for 7,800 boxes.

"I think that probably Stalin decided that he could use 100 boxes of gold, maybe for some Comintern work," Orlov testified (p. 3433).

"The Spanish Communist Minister of Defense, Prieto, provided a special Spanish naval escort to see the gold ships safely through the Mediterranean en route to Odessa, but he did not know what the ships carried.

"Several months after the shipment of the gold, when I was lying in a surgical clinic of

Professor Bergere, in Paris, the chief of the Soviet NKVD himself, Sloutsky, came to see me; and he told me about the gold, what a great event it was when it arrived in Moscow; and he told me on good authority that that gold, according to Stalin, would never be returned to Spain."

Another visitor from Moscow told Orlov of the celebration banquet attended by all the top Soviet brass in Moscow to mark the safe landing of the Spanish gold. At that banquet Stalin said: "The Spaniards will never see their gold again."

Orlov continued (p. 3434):

"The gold is still locked up in the underground vaults of the Kremlin, and if nothing is done about it, it probably will never be returned. That gold belongs to the Spanish nation. Regimes come and go, but the gold belongs to the people, and the Spanish nation has a right to do it. I think it would be a good idea if the leaders of the Spanish political parties, irrespective of their political affiliations and ideas, would combine together and demand that the gold should be returned, or transferred to the United Nations, or to the World Bank, in safekeeping for the Spanish nation."

The importance of this gold piracy to Spain is suggested by the fact that the total gold reserves of the Bank of Spain today are reported at only $200 million.

After the collapse of the Communist Government in Spain, Dr. Juan Negrin, the Red finance minister, lived in exile in Paris until his death on November 14, 1956.

Soon after Negrin's death, the official Moscow receipt for the Spanish gold was delivered from Negrin's personal papers, to a Paris representative of the Franco Government.

The Negrin papers revealed in 1956 for the first time, that the gold had been assigned to Moscow, ostensibly as security for Russian arms shipments to the Communist Republicans in Spain during the 1936 civil war.

The Russian receipt for the Spanish gold was signed in Moscow February 5, 1937, by G. F. Grinko, People's Commissar for Finance, and N. N. Krestinski, Assistant People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs. It was countersigned by Marcelino Pascua, Spanish Communist Ambassador to Russia at the time. The receipt specifies only 510 metric tons of gold delivered from Spain at the Russian port of Odessa.

In April 1957 Moscow radio announced that more than $420 million of the Spanish gold had been spent "to finance the Spanish Republican cause." The same broadcast contended Spain still owes Russia $85 million for loans to the Communist Popular Front government in Madrid during the Spanish civil war.

This savage act of piracy and betrayal in Spain doubtless will be heard before the World Court of International Justice.

Meanwhile, the world has another tragic example of Moscow's real aims and purposes in Popular Front peaceful coexistence.

The unofficial Soviet explanation was printed in Pravda, Moscow, April 5, 1957, about seven weeks after Orlov's testimony in Washington.

"Some foreign newspapers carry articles concerning the deposit of Spanish gold in the U. S. S. R. 20 years ago, completely ignoring the expenditure incurred by the Spanish Republican Government. * * * After the Spanish Republican Government had deposited the money in Moscow, it frequently asked the Soviet Central State Bank to make payments abroad from it. The payments became so frequent that the money soon was all gone."

United States Secret Service agents exhibited before the Senate committee some $100,000 in counterfeit Federal Reserve notes gathered in from Texas in 1928. These counterfeit notes were in $100 denominations.

"I learned about this operation of counterfeiting $100 bills in 1930, and I learned that that operation had been directed by Stalin personally," Orlov told the committee (p. 3441). "That money was well fabricated, because it was made in the Russian engraving and printing offices * * * so it is no wonder that that money is undistinguishable from American $100 bills. * * * The plan was for $10 million at first."

Secret Service agents traced this counterfeit United States currency from both Shanghai and Berlin in the years 1928–33, but never were able to determine precisely how much of it Stalin had printed in Moscow.

"Stalin was in need of money for financing industrialization," Orlov explained.

In 1945 Stalin seized $340 million in German bonds from captured Berlin bank vaults, and ordered them smuggled into the United States, to be redeemed by the United States Treasury as German property seized in the United States at the outbreak of war in December 1941. But the German-American Validation Board spotted this Stalin fraud, by positively identifying the bonds as German, rather than American, property.

Orlov also told the Senate committee that 18 Soviet spy rings operated in the United States in 1938, when he was associated with NKVD operations.

"Two rings, as we know, have been exposed, one by Whittaker Chambers, the other by Elizabeth Bentley. It stands to reason that at least 16 spy rings are at large and have the free run of this country" (p. 3459).

In addition, there were 20 other Soviet spy rings operating under the direction of the fourth department of the Soviet army. These 20 military intelligence rings operated entirely apart from, and independent of, the 18 NKVD rings.

The terrorist Communist militia which sprang to life throughout Spain in February 1936 to commandeer all wealth then in the safe boxes of banks, had been organized secretly in every large city by the Moscow underground. First all gold and silver bars were transferred to the mountain caves near Carthagena. Next all jewels and foreign currency were emptied from private safe boxes in all banks. No accounting of these safe-box raids ever has been made, but computations by the Franco Government later established this plunder at more than $200 million gold value.

"On the night of November 6, 1936," the official Franco report relates, "an individual called at the Bank of Spain, accompanied by the then director general of the Treasury, Francisco Mendez Aspe. This man, named Masegosa, styled himself captain of carabineers. The head of the safe-deposit service being called, they informed him that the Minister of Finance had ordered the opening of the safe deposits and that the operation would have to be carried out with all speed so as to get through it before 10 o'clock next morning. * * * The assailants who, in case of need, had brought with them some 60 locksmiths, forced open 3,959 safes, emptying them of their contents * * * besides which they forced open 2,236 jewelry safes. * * * The hired safe deposits of all the private banks suffered the same fate" (p. 373).

In the private banks alone, a total of 4,887 safe boxes were emptied.

"Carabineer forces invaded the buildings of the private banks, forcing the safe deposits and strong rooms and removing the contents."

During November 1936 all this plunder was moved from Madrid to the new Communist capital at Valencia.

As the Communist Popular Front government fell apart under the steady pounding of the Franco forces, the loot, representing virtually the entire movable wealth of Spain, was smuggled to Russia, France, and Mexico.

"In less than 1 year Spain was denuded of all the wealth accumulated through the centuries. In all, 14,393 private bank safes were forced open and plundered, plus 297 strongrooms, with a large quantity of bonds, stocks, and banknotes" (p. 380).

To block legal proceedings seeking restitution of the confiscated wealth, "the ex-convict, Juan Garcia Oliver, was raised by the Popular Front government to the dignity of Minister of Justice. He had neither a lawyer's degree nor any other academic qualification. This individual ordered the destruction of the archives of the Central Registry of Convicts and Rebels, thus depriving Spanish society, whatever its political regime may be, of an indispensable instrument of defense against common criminals."

The sickening and revolting details of Moscow's rape of proud Spain reveal once more the familiar Communist pattern of Popular Front penetration. Moscow will promise anything to get a foothold in a country. It always begins with an open alliance with the so-called liberals or progressives in the country to be taken over.

Once accepted, the Communists first take over the entire Popular Front organization, then the key posts in government. At this point the plunder and rapine begin, and the liberals and progressives who helped establish the Popular Front are revealed as stark traitors.

Their own country has been sacked, and usually there is then no escape possible from the savage Communist yoke.

Let all patriots beware of the Popular Front appeal. It is always the opening wedge to Communist pillage.

Washington and Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues in the House to an interesting and informative article that appeared in a recent issue of a publication sponsored by the National Federation of Independent Business and has to do with renewing and extending our present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

The article in question attempts to show the proponents of the extension and enlargement of our trade policies form a monopoly made up of a few huge exporting concerns together with interested groups who have foreign investments that exist and thrive only through their ability to import cheaply produced foreign goods into the United States to the detriment of our domestic industries.

The article follows:

WASHINGTON AND SMALL BUSINESS

(By C. Wilson Harder)

Perhaps not since President Andrew Jackson waged a successful battle to knock out the charter which gave the privately owned Bank of the United States complete control over the Nation's currency and banking, has there been such a clear-cut battle waged

between monopoly interests and American independent enterprise as now goes on in Washington.

The issue is the request for a 5-year extension of the so-called reciprocal trade treaties.

Now, at a time of high-peak unemployment, a highly developed welfare state, and also when big labor has forced up labor rates, there is a drive to open the American market still further to cheap imports, some made with labor as low as 7 cents per hour, produced on modern machinery given to the foreign nations through the foreign give-away programs.

Spearheading the drive to extend reciprocal trade treaties for 5 years, which is to all intents tantamount to slashing protective tariffs, is an organization known as the Committee for a National Trade Policy.

This cozy-sounding committee is headed by one Sidney Svensrud, who just happens to be board chairman of Gulf Oil, one of the biggest domains in the oil business.

It also so happens that Gulf Oil has a heavy stake in the international angle inasmuch as its foreign investments are pegged at somewhere around $30 billion.

Included in the members of this organization are such groups as the American importers of Japanese Textiles, American Chamber of Commerce for Trade With Italy, Cooperative League of the United States of America, National Council of Jewish Women, National Export Traffic League, the Straw Goods Importers Association, United States Cuban Sugar Council, and many others.

Opposed are such groups as the American Fine China Guild, American Glassware Association, National Cattlemen's Association, and a whole host of groups made up of small United States manufacturers, farming groups, labor groups.

On several occasions, the Nation's independent businessmen, voting through the National Federation of Independent Business, have gone on record against further rape of American industry and employment via the tariff slashing method that reciprocal trade treaty legislation places in State Department.

Actually, some observers on Capitol Hill believe the issue is so clear cut it will be possible to run a box score on final congressional votes on measure.

These observers say that a vote for extension of this system will mean the voter is a supporter of monopoly business.

This may be a severe method of appraisal. On the other hand, it is going to be hard to explain to a worker any vote that jeopardizes his job in favor of a 7-cents-per-hour-wage-slave in some Japanese monopoly-owned factory.

Thus, the battle is joined.

It will be a major battle, and casting a shadow over the debate will be the specter of the present 5 million unemployed in the land.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. FULTON. We wish to join with our good Polish friends and relatives of the Polish people in this country in celebrating May 3 as Poland's Constitution Day. On this date 167 years ago, democratic rights and religious freedom for all Poland's people were established by the Constitution.

We people in America remember the freedom of the Polish people, and urge our good friends and relatives in Poland to keep up their faith and good spirit in their brave efforts to regain their freedom. We have not forgotten the accomplishments of Poland under its Constitution of 1791, and we take this opportunity to extend the hand of friendship to the people of Poland, and assure them of our sincere interest in the cause of freedom, independence, and justice. We compliment the Polish people on this the anniversary of the Polish Constitution, and send them our best wishes.

Fuel for Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, 1958, the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable OREN HARRIS, addressed the annual meeting of the Panhandle Producers & Royalty Owners Association at Amarillo, Tex. His remarks were on a subject that is of vital interest to the entire Nation and its economy. The subject was one on which he is eminently qualified to speak. The tremendous acclaim with which it was received by those attending the meeting in Amarillo, Tex., together with my own appreciation of the outstanding talents of the gentleman from Arkansas, prompts me, under unanimous consent, to include his address in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to be preceded by the introductory remarks of Gen. Ernest O. Thompson, member of the Railroad Commission of the State of Texas:

INTRODUCTION OF OREN HARRIS BY ERNEST O. THOMPSON

Few men in our country, certainly few men in the United States Congress have had and do have as much to do with the commerce of our country as does our distinguished speaker here tonight, the Honorable OREN HARRIS, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives, United States Congress.

OREN HARRIS is a lawyer, born in Belton, Ark., December 20, 1903. He holds a bachelor of arts degree from Henderson State College, Arkadelphia, Ark., clas of 1929, and a bachelor of laws degree from Cumberland University, 1930. He was married to Ruth Ross May 9, 1934, has two children—Carolyn Marie and James Edward. He was admitted to the bar in Arkansas in 1930 and to the United States Supreme Court Bar in 1943. He served as deputy prosecuting attorney, Union County, Ark., 1933 to 1936, and prosecuting attorney, 13th judicial circuit, 1936 to 1940. He was elected to the 77th Congress in 1941 where he has served for 18 years ably and well, and as I said in the beginning, he is the present chairman of one of the greatest committees of the Congress. This is the same committee that was formerly presided over as chairman by the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, now Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress.

Congressman HARRIS is a member of the Arkansas Bar Association, was district governor of Lions International for Arkansas 1939 and 1940. He is a Democrat, a Baptist, a member of the SAE fraternity, a Mason, a Shriner, and member of the Knights of Pythias.

It has been my pleasure and privilege, at his invitation, to appear before his honorable committee several times. He generates and engenders real sincere interest in the work of the committee from and by every member of his committee of both parties. He is one of the best informed men it has ever been my pleasure to know and I am proud to present him to this meeting as a distinguished American, a true patriot, a real statesman, Chairman OREN HARRIS of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress.

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE OREN HARRIS, OF ARKANSAS, BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE PANHANDLE PRODUCERS AND ROYALTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, AT AMARILLO, TEX., ON MAY 1, 1958

FUEL FOR THOUGHT

Mr. Chairman and my friends, you were extremely kind in inviting me to be with you for this occasion. I appreciate this opportunity of being with you and the privilege of being here in the district with my esteemed friend and colleague, WALTER ROGERS, your able and effective Congressman, of whom you are rightfully proud.

There were two reasons that I hastened to accept the courtesy of your invitation to be with you tonight.

In the first place I am always delighted to be with knowledgeable men like you and to increase my own understanding of some of our vital problems.

But, beyond that, I must confess I seized this as an opportunity for the presentation of some things that, in my opinion, badly need saying now. There are some things I have in mind that relate intimately to the health of our entire economy, for they concern the energy requirements of that economy.

I do not mean that they are important just to you who are producers and royalty owners associated with the production of oil and gas. You do have a direct and immediate interest in the problem but yours is not the only or even the dominant interest.

I am not thinking of this problem as being important only to you and to those who use the oil or the gas you produce. Your customers, that is, the consumers, do have a great stake in the problem, but the real import of it transcends even their interests too.

No; this is a matter that goes to the public welfare in its broadest possible interpretation. Fuel for Thought, about which I want to talk tonight, should claim the serious attention and consideration of every person in our Nation.

Conflicting claim

At the heart of what I want to discuss with you lies a big question: What can and should be done about natural gas for this Nation's growing needs?

There are some consumers, for example—and especially some self-appointed so-called spokesmen for consumers—who seem to have an easy though impossible formula. What they want is a superabundance of natural gas at exceedingly low and depressed prices. Seeing no conflict between these two de-

sires—although there plainly is one—they are all out for rigid government controls to drive prices downward.

Some producers, on the other hand, without quarreling about the desirability of expanded supply, see the price matter very differently. They would like better prices, not lower ones, for their output. Consequently, they would prefer having no controls of any kind on prices to keep them down.

As a Member of Congress, I have listened—and sympathetically, I trust—to the arguments from both sides. I have heard the consumers argue that their preferential position should be maintained. I have heard the producers argue that the very importance of this fuel to progress and prosperity makes it imperative to give them the preference. And I must admit that each side can in its own time make a very persuasive case for its claims and counter claims.

As other Members of Congress and particularly with our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I deem it my duty to not become a champion of one segmented interest against another. I see only one course that I can in good conscience follow, and that is the course leading to general rather than to particular or special interest. We should not plump for the consumers on the one hand or for the producer on the other. Our adherence should be toward a policy that will insure an impartial justice to everyone.

The need for solution

To obtain this objective, I introduced H. R. 8525, cosponsored by my colleague, Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota, which in our opinion is the embodyment of the fairest answer to the natural gas supply problem.

Having made an intensive study of the problem over the years, I was convinced when we introduced the bill it was necessary in the public interest.

Now, in this period of recession or slump, or whatever you might call it, my conviction has deepened and grown stronger.

When we introduced the bill last year, I saw it then as a balanced solution to the natural gas problem. It would give consumers a meaningful assurance of adequate future supplies along with a federally insured guaranty of a reasonable price. It would give the producers a degree of freedom from meaningless redtape at the same time that it would define for them clearly an area of unconfused operation. Without loosening the producers completely from controls, it would at least provide that the controls to be exercised on them would be realistic and practical.

My views toward this legislation are firmly held, without alteration. But what I want to say here is that recent events have given this bill an urgency even far greater than I had realized at the time of its introduction. It is needed now, not just to bring an end to the chaos produced by the court-directed effort to impose utility controls on nonutility gas industry but it is needed and immediately as an important contribution to the Nation's necessary fight against the effects of the downward trend in our economy.

The recession

Washington is filled with talk about this recession. Frankly, much that has been said on the subject—particularly from the White House—has appalled me.

We recall the President himself, saying back in January that the slump was bottoming-out. Soon, he said, with beaming confidence, "business would be turning upward."

Well, March has come and gone. April has come and gone too. Still the recession persists and in many areas worsens. The problem stubbornly refuses to disappear simply on the basis that people in high places keep insisting that it really isn't here. Something else is needed.

To be sure a few localities and even some industries have thus far escaped the full impact of the business decline. Maybe they will continue to escape it though that seems increasingly improbable. But the economy in general has been at least temporarily staggered by the slump. And the people in the oil and gas producing industry in particular are undergoing what former Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey described as a "hair-curling" depression.

The Federal Reserve Board index of industrial production fell in a few months from 147 to its March level of 128, a drop of nearly 13 percent. Inevitably this has meant a sharp decline in the use of energy in industrial production. And that in turn has meant that those who provide the fuel for the energy have been hit and hit hard.

Slump in fuels

This does not hold only for you who are in the oil and gas business. Coal has felt the devastation too. The demand for coal in March 1958 was almost 11 percent below that of a year ago. Exports of coal have also declined. Here is a sick industry. It too had better take note and I am sure it is.

The demand for oil in March 1958 was only 0.3 percent above that in March 1957. Yet the normal postwar increase earlier had been averaging 5½ percent a year.

Domestic production itself has, of course, been even more badly hit than these figures for overall demand would indicate. In that area the imports flood has made an already bad picture even worse.

Mr. ROGERS, my esteemed colleague, has already covered this thorny problem of imports in his able address at noon. Let me add to his preceptive comments that it is my own conviction that it is high time for some constructive action on this thorny problem, and it should be resolved without resorting to legislation. But that approach doesn't appear too helpful.

But what I want to point out here is that imports in and of themselves now constitute only one part of the total problem of slump that confronts the petroleum industry.

Since the Phillips decision

Go back to mid-1954, the time when the Supreme Court so shockingly held in its Phillips decision that natural-gas production was subject to Federal Power Commission control. You'll find there the beginning of a trend—a most disquieting trend—that simply can't be attributed solely to the influence of imports.

Since that decision there has been a 25-percent decline in the number of exploratory crews actively engaged in seeking new oil and gas reserves. One out of every four are gone from the scene.

Admittedly, the decline cannot be attributed solely to the ill-advised split Court decision. Other elements have had their effect, too. But surely it's much more than coincidence that exploratory efforts fell off so sharply immediately after that decision.

A part of the incentive for discovery has been removed. Confusion and uncertainty had been imposed on the entire gas branch of the industry. Obviously, those who might otherwise have invested risk capital in the search for new gas supplies decided to hold off until the rules of the game could be clarified.

It's true that well-drilling itself continued for quite awhile to stay at high levels even after the Phillips ruling. People in the industry were continuing to prove up properties on which the exploration work had been done earlier. The drilling figures continued to give the appearance of health.

But, by the middle of 1956, much of this backlog that had been built up by the earlier exploration was worked off. The drilling rate turned downward, and it has continued downward steadily ever since.

The total wells drilled in 1957 were 7 percent fewer than in 1956. Through the first 3½ months of 1958 the figure is down by another 13 percent. For the same period wildcat drilling, all-important in the finding of additional reserves, is down by 25 percent. If present drilling rates persist, the industry's completions this year will be down from 1956 by 20 percent.

These statistics, of course, only confirm what you yourselves have seen. You have watched drilling rigs and experienced personnel being transferred to foreign producing areas. You have been approached for jobs by the laid-off members of one-time drilling crews. You've heard others talk about deferring their drilling plans, and maybe you've deferred at least a few yourself. You have seen leasing activity fall off. You have witnessed the drilling industry grow sicker by the day.

What you've been seeing can be blamed in a large measure on the split-court pronouncement of June 7, 1954. The Supreme Court sowed the wind, and the petroleum industry has since reaped the whirlwind.

GROWTH AND NATURAL GAS

What is perhaps particularly tragic in all this is the fact that at least one segment of the petroleum industry—the gas segment—could have been growing even more than it has been in recent years.

It has grown, as a matter of fact, even though it has been put under wraps by forcing gas production into a straitjacket of controls. But it would have expanded even more, recession or no recession, were gas supplies available in increased quantities.

Think of the great market for natural gas that is currently going begging for supplies. Witness after witness who appeared before our committee during hearings on H. R. 8525 called attention to this situation. There are on the waiting lists of distributing companies in areas served by natural gas literally hundreds of thousands of potential customers. They are actually impatient for a service that is denied to them only because the supplies aren't available in assured quantities.

You hear many explanations for this recession that we're in. One of the soundest, surely, is that there has been a falling off in consumer purchases of durable goods. People go on buying eggs and bacon and cigarettes and clothes. But they've cut their purchases of automobiles and of the major appliances such as water heaters and ranges and clothes dryers.

Figure for yourself, then, what effect on the recession might come if those hundreds of thousands of would-be customers who want natural gas could get it. Calculate the number of gas furnaces that would be bought and installed, the number of gas water heaters, the number of gas stoves, the number of gas incinerators. Can anyone doubt that such buying would give an impetus to recovery?

Think of the employment that could be created by local distributing companies if only they had the gas supply to bring to these waiting customers. There would be new distributing systems built, and extensions of old ones. You'd have a vast and profitable market created by these distributors for both materials and labor.

Transmission companies would do their part, or more, in expanding their materials-and-labor market. Many of them already have their expansion plans engineered and waiting on the drawing board. In some cases construction of totally new lines waits only on the unmuddying of the waters of present Federal policy. Given the green light of an end to the existing chaos, these

companies would proceed promtply to the execution of their many plans.

Additional gas wells would be drilled calling for increased oil country tubular goods and labor.

Certainly the sum total of the capital outlays that are being held up would exceed $1 billion a year. I submit that this would be an antirecession step that would cost the taxpayer nothing; that would be carried out entirely by private business funds; that has the endorsement of the administration and of Congress; that would provide lower energy costs; that would require hundreds of thousands of tons of steel pipe and oil country tubular goods; that would put thousands upon thousands of men back to work; that would be of benefit to the total economy.

Record of frustration

Why is it that this industry growth is being blocked out of our economy?

At the risk of repeating to you what you may already know, I'd like quickly to review the record.

When the Natural Gas Act of 1938 was adopted by Congress, practically everyone was quite clear about what it was intended to do. It prescribed a plan for the regulation of the utility business of pipelines that transport gas interstate from the gas fields to the distributing companies. It did not prescribe any plan for regulating the business of nonutility producers and gatherers. In fact it stated most explicitly that its terms were not to be applied to production or gathering. It applied to transmission. It didn't apply to production.

On 11 separate occasions over a 16-year period, FPC's varying political complexions steadfastly held that the act meant just what it said. But the courts were another matter, and there certain unfortunate ambiguities in the original legislation offered a loophole for misconstruction.

When it became obvious, in 1948, that some court might some time actually fall in with the strained interpretation of the law, Congress acted. So there could be no possible misunderstanding, it moved to make doubly clear that production and gathering were outside the scope of FPC rulings.

I was chairman of the House committee that drafted the amendment to the Natural Gas Act that later came to be known as the Kerr bill. That bill handily passed both Houses of Congress. But it was vetoed by the President.

Phillips decision and after

Then in 1954 what we had begun to fear might happen in the forties did happen. The Supreme Court on a 5–3 split held that the Natural Gas Act did, in spite of everything apply to production. For the first time in the peacetime history of this Nation a commodity was brought under Federal utility-type control.

In the year following, 1955, Senator FULBRIGHT and I together introduced what became known as the Harris-Fulbright bill. It was not, its numerous vociferous opponents to the contrary, a complete decontrol bill as the simpler Kerr bill had been before it. It provided—I think effectively—for an indirect control of prices by the FPC, but it did free the producers from all direct controls upon them.

Both the House and the Senate passed this bill after thorough study and prolonged debate. But once again a presidential veto intervened. For reasons which had absolutely nothing to do with the merits of the legislation, the President withheld his signature.

Maybe the smart thing to have done at that point, at least as far as I am personally concerned, would have been to abandon the entire effort. Twice the Congress had spoken. Twice for extraneous reasons the Congress' actions were set at naught.

And yet, I couldn't rest easy in the face of my steadily growing conviction that the national welfare and even the national security were vitally involved here. I couldn't justify to myself standing idly by while a great industry was being throttled and the supply of a valuable resource was being choken off.

H. R. 8525

So it was that another effort is made by the pending bill, H. R. 8525. It marks a completely new departure in its approach to the central problem.

It is not a decontrol bill. Anyone who says it is either has not read the legislation at all or is deliberately set on misleading others about it.

It would give to the FPC direct control of the field prices of natural gas. But upon a realistic basis, not upon the basis of theories about utility control that cannot possibly be tailored to fit gas production.

For almost 4 years now the FPC has been trying, and trying valiantly, to work out some fair formula that might conceivably permit the regulation of field prices of natural gas. The commissioners are by now completely willing to admit that it can't be done on a cost basis. Utility-type control, in their own words, is patently inappropriate and unworkable. The need for some other system is obvious, and the Harris-O'Hara bill provides it, along with a very complete set of safeguards to protect the consumer interest.

The principles incorporated in this bill have twice been recommended to Congress by the President. The Federal Power Commission, itself, has strongly recommended passage of the measure. It has received the support of the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, who testified that it is in the interest of defense requirements. The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has reported the bill favorably.

And yet, because of circumstances which again have no relation to the merits of this proposed legislation, the bill most certainly will not even get to the House floor for consideration this session barring some legislative miracle. It has been cruelly sabotaged. One man, thoughtlessly and naively, undertook an ill-advised appeal for political purposes. Again a faux pas has for the present thwarted a program badly needed in the general public interest because the carefully cultivated reaction to his letter has buried this essential legislation for the time being some 9 feet under.

Legislative miracle?

You may ask, does that mean I have despaired of action at this session? Not necessarily. I still cling to the hope, however faint, that with sufficient interest, effort and understanding of the imperative need of this legislation that there may be the legislative miracle that could revive the near-dead measure.

I am making no book on the possibility, and certainly I am offering no odds that it will occur. I am somewhat of a realist. As I see it now in the light of present circumstances and the time element, I have to be realistic enough to recognize that the chances are not at all bright.

And yet the logic of the situation seems to me overwhelmingly to call for revival of the program and its quick passage.

There was need enough for the bill before. On it rests the consumer's only present hope tha there will in the future be adequate gas supplies at reasonable prices.

But now at a time of slump the need is actually pressing. The basic problem of gas supply and the growth of the gas industry has been complicated by the new problem of the recession.

There are scores of programs being proposed in Washington as partial antidotes to the slump. Whole handfuls of them are being acted on, not always with the consideration and the foresight they really deserve. And yet here is one that could make a tremendous contribution to recovery without the expenditure of a dime of Federal funds totally neglected. This bill, whose passage would unlease all of the constructive energy of the natural-gas industry again, remains on the shelf.

I can only hope, and frevently, that it will be taken from that shelf and examined on its merits rather than in light of a single badly written letter, or some other ill-advised act.

All that is needed, I am convinced, is for everyone to recognize the importance of this issue and to agree to what is eminently true—that this is must legislation.

If and when we can and will join in pushing for its passage in what is so clearly the public interest, the Congress will act. Of that I am certain. And I am confident that the next time such legislation, so carefully drawn for consumer protection will be approved all the way.

Industry action

And yet in view of the fact that it was an act by certain members of the industry given as the reason for killing the bill 2 years ago, and now by another act has all but killed the present effort, I cannot quite let it go at that.

I would, therefore, like to leave with you on this occasion some carefully guarded and considered words of advice. Constructive advice, I firmly believe.

Sooner or later something is going to have to be done with this problem. It cannot continue to remain in the chaotic and uncertain status. It is too widespread and affected by the public interest to such a degree that the welfare of the Nation will demand it. The longer it is postponed, the worse it will be for the welfare of the Nation.

If this proposed bill is revived at this session or even if solution of the pressing problem is postponed and considered at a later session, the industry is on trial. It will be watched carefully in every move it makes.

In all candor, you have been on trial before. To date I must say you haven't been doing too well for the last few years.

Let me suggest 2 or 3 things for your consideration. Perhaps by asking some fundamental questions deserves careful consideration, frank and honest answers.

In the first place, has the fuels industry become so highly competitive and self-centered as to breed frustration, envy, and strife within to the extent that it threatens the inherent principles under our American system and the service demanded by the American public. Healthy and vigorous competition, yes, strengthens this system as we know but when we get to a matter of principle, I wonder if we recognize that through unity and coordination and understanding, it will prevail.

Within your industry, within the entire fuels industry, it is important to discontinue the infighting and to work together toward legislative policy so obviously in the interest of our total economy.

Furthermore, have you in the industry told your story fully and fairly to the American people?

Have you made known the facts—all the facts—about your operation?

Have you across the board been willing to stand up and meet the issue and battle it out in the good old American way with those, your enemy in principle, that would destroy or seriously hamper your future and the service that you can perform to the American public?

Or have you been letting internecine warfare create in the public mind an image of this great industry as a collection of self-seekers who have no regard for the public welfare?

You have a story to tell, a service to provide, a fundamental principle to preserve, a strong and effective industry and organization if unity of purpose on fundamentals could be effectuated.

You see, we are on the receiving end of your letters and your testimony on matters that concern the industry and we honestly find it most difficult at times to tell where the truth lies when royalty owners are pitted against producers or producers against refiners, or refiners against jobbers, etc.

The common ground

Finally, isn't there a common ground on which a great industry as is yours and the fuels industry can unite on principle—the common ground that is the welfare of the general public?

It is on this basis there should be unity. This should be the paramount concern. Otherwise, I am frank to say, we are going to see a great industry hard put to its survival, much less to prosper. We should remember and act on the solid adage that "there is no true profit in anything that results in a public loss."

My years of experience in Washington have convinced me that the oil and gas industry must undertake and pursue a sound course on this common ground and present facts and a fair interpretation of them.

I believe that the industry has an obligation to the public and to the government to improve its public relations.

The opposition is working steadily and skillfully. Make no mistake about it. The need for giving the true and factual story is acute. Even while you sit here today, the net of a strangling regulation draws more tightly around you.

We must remember that in this long drawn out problem that at every step of the way, support for the cause of freedom has grown weaker.

The formula for success in combating this trend is quite simple: All that is needed is to present the facts fearlessly and fairly in combating vicious propaganda and then stand together for the common welfare, working together for a finer national economy. You will gain by it. Your children will gain by it. We will all have a greater and more prosperous future.

Anthracite Coal Industry Ignored by the Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of April 28, 1958, which comments on the Federal subsidy plan of the administration to aid depressed mining industries, but ignoring the long-depressed anthracite coal industry:

AID FOR INDUSTRIES

The Associated Press reported from Washington yesterday that the Eisenhower administration proposed Federal subsidies for domestic producers of copper, lead, zinc, fluorspar, and tungsten. The story explained the President had endorsed the stabilization payment plan for depressed mining industries.

The dispatch was of special interest to this community because it contained no mention of coal. Apparently anthracite is not regarded in the Nation's Capital as a distressed industry.

Utilization Research in the State Experiment Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to enclose a paper which was presented by Dr. J. R. Beckenbach, director, Florida Agricultural Experiment Stations at the spring collaborators conference, Southern Regional Utilization Laboratory, New Orleans, La.

Dr. Beckenbach is doing outstanding work in Florida, and I feel this timely article will be of special interest to those of us who are vitally concerned with the problems of American agriculture.

UTILIZATION RESEARCH IN THE STATE EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Both Federal and State agricultural research agencies are presently facing a situation which demands a sharp increase in so-called utilization research. To some extent, we are at fault, in varying degrees, for not foreseeing this need. On the other hand, however, who among us could be expected to foresee the two war situations of the past sixteen years, and the various farm policy programs that resulted from this? Or the supluses? We do better, I believe, if we just face the situation as it stands, and attempt to work out practical solutions.

We are faced with several major agricultural commodities in surplus, which are costing millions per day for dead storage. We are faced with Government programs designed to reduce these surpluses, and with other programs which allow for surplus increases, in the event that the first ones don't work. This indicates the complexity of the situation. And we are faced with the probability of sharp increases in funds designed primarily for research to be used to develop alternative and new industrial uses for these commodities.

As you all know, the need for utilization research by public agencies is hardly a new thing, but is as natural a development as was the need for production research and for research in marketing. This laboratory is no new thing, and has made many fine contributions in this field. However, none of our agencies are geared to crash research programs in this area, and yet a crash research program may shortly be launched and is possibly justified. This places something of a dilemma before us. It is not a simple problem, especially for those of us in the States. The crux of the problem is personnel—there is no reservoir of able but unemployed biochemists in the country, nor of capable unemployed scientists in the related areas. Consequently, a greatly expanded program is not only going to have its own personnel problems, but will create problems in existing research agencies.

An obvious need is the one for more trained scientists. This is peculiarly a problem for the land-grant colleges, and that means the State Experiment Stations, indirectly. Our research people are also our teachers, and our laboratories are also the graduate students' laboratories. Any crash program that bleeds the land-grant colleges of trained research and teaching staffs is a short-sighted program. A centralized crash program would do just that, in my opinion.

I believe that the time is past due to back up and take another look at the overall problem.

First, what is the nature of this problem? Does it compare with the need which resulted in the crash program that developed the atomic bomb? It was certaintly the success of this which popularized crash-program research. It seems easy to forget the fact that the bomb success was made possible by several unique factors: (1) A single, specific objective, (2) the urgency of a war situation, and (3) it was a military problem, wholly Federal in scope.

Our agricultural surplus problem is quite different. There is no single, specific objective, but several commodities now in surplus, and any agricultural commodity can move into a surplus situation at almost any time. We have a short-range problem of eliminating the commodities now in enormous surplus; we have a long-range objective with almost every agricultural commodity which moves in volume. The short-range objective is to divert food, feed, and fiber commodities now in surplus into industrial channels. This can be no long-range objective. Food, feed, and fiber is where the ultimate use will be.

Perhaps the State stations have been remiss somewhat in not developing utilization research to a greater extent earlier. If so, our Southern States have been less so than other sections; this laboratory and present State programs are testimonials to that. Individually, some of us have active programs in our State stations, but probably no State station has a utilization research program which matches its production research program.

Lest anyone jump in at this point and criticize us too severely for this discrepancy, let me say that the States could hardly be expected to anticipate the patchwork quilt of Federal programs which resulted in these surpluses. These present surpluses are basically Federal babies; if appropriation requests are to be presented only for the Federal research agencies, that is really outside of my concern, except as it may tend to bleed us of personnel in already established programs. The latter point is my concern, and should be the concern of every State station.

Should sharp increases accrue to the Agricultural Research Service, provision may be made for State participation under contract. I would say on this point only that it is difficult to hire good research people for short-term appointments in the present highly competitive market. Such contracts are no adequate solution to the problem.

It is my opinion that the State stations are in for some rough weather in the area of utilization research. The President's Commission took little cognizance of the fact that several States have aggressive utilization programs. Its recommendation for fellowships, nonetheless, seems to assume that we are adequately staffed to train personnel for utilization research, while its recommendations for research appear to be such that the increases will tend to bleed us of these instructors. We had better be prepared for stiff competition for our people—in terms of salaries.

It is my hope that this laboratory will receive a substantial part of the increases that may be appropriated. The Southern States have learned to work with this staff.

All of the above, or the most of it, is defensive policy as far as the States are concerned. Any Maginot Line that we may devise can be no complete answer. It seems

to me that we need now to look ahead in the States to a deliberate program designed to attack the long-range objective—the development of utilization research on all of our major commodities. This should include by-product research and the utilization of culls and wastes as major objectives.

It would be my recommendation that every State station review its own home State agricultural production with a critical eye at this point. None of us are doing sufficient research on the utilization of agricultural wastes or of agricultural byproducts. We are not about to get any increases in Federal grant funds for this purpose—none were included in the budget. Why this was so, at least to an extent matching the Agricultural Research Service increase, or at least a compromise between that and the zero, I do not know.

I do know this, however. The record of the State stations in production research has been the hard core of agricultural progress in this country. The decentralized, close-to-the farmer approach in production research at our stations is very responsive to the need, and close to the critical eyes of the industry. Increased appropriations at the State level prove the job that has been done.

The States are equally capable in the marketing and utilization research areas, and these, too, can benefit by the very fact of our decentralization. We should deliberately choose to expand here. Thinking and planning by many capable people who are close to the problems is bound to have some advantages over thinking and planning of equally capable people, fewer in numbers, who are geographically removed from the problems. We should balance our programs with utilization research.

We already have the machinery set up for coordination of effort, both among ourselves and with the research agencies of the Federal Government. Duplication of research effort in such broad fields is largely a bogie, but even so, we manage to keep pretty clear of criticism in our present programs, and it should be no handicap in these other areas.

We need to move smoothly into these research areas. We have an added obligation to do so, since ours is the obligation to train future scientists for all agencies. And we must not be robbed of our present personnel, or all of agriculture will be the loser. Research increases ought to be carefully balanced among agencies, so that overall and continuing progress will result.

Perhaps as various of our regional projects close out, we can use regional funds released for some work of this kind. It would certainly seem desirable for most States to carefully consider their needs in this area, and base their requests for increased funds on specific utilization research proposals.

This talk has been somewhat disorganized, and perhaps it would be worthwhile to outline briefly what I consider to be the soundest approach to this utilization research problem. I am going to number and list the several desirable steps as I see them:

1. Increase utilization research in all existing laboratories, both Federal and State, on commodities now in surplus in the area concerned. This should be a direct Federal grant program with respect to the States concerned.

2. Initiate some utilization research at each station located at the land-grant college, using presently available State or Federal grant funds. This will permit the concurrent development of student training.

3. In the immediate future, expand both Federal and State utilization programs, the latter with Federal grant funds. A 2-to-1 ratio is suggested, in keeping with the present Agricultural Research Service-State ratio for production research.

4. Amplify the student training aspects to whatever extent the Congress may determine by appropriations for fellowships or assistantships in this area.

If you have gathered from all of the above that I have little faith in a crash program solving more problems than it creates, then I have gotten my main point across. It seems to me that we already have the pattern for sound collaborative research effort between our State and Federal research agencies. Not to follow such a proven pattern would seem to prove that our fathers were much smarter in this agricultural research business than we are.

Placing the Blame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Camden News, Camden, S. C., of May 6, 1958:

PLACING THE BLAME

Juveniles are contributing far more than their share to the increasing national crime rate, according to the latest annual crime report issued by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Persons under 18 years of age were arrested last year in 10.3 percent of all arrests for crimes against the person: Murder, negligent manslaughter, rape, and aggravated assault. In the crimes against property category—robbery, burglary, auto theft, and other larcenies—persons under 18 represented the startling total of 53.1 percent of all arrests. In the theft of automobiles alone the 18-and-under group represented 67.6 percent of all arrests. This probably comes from youths having become accustomed to using the family car and when its use is not possible they just steal one.

The tremendous growth of juvenile delinquency is indicated by the fact that arrests of persons under 18 years of age have increased 55 percent since 1952.

J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, and one of the most competent officials this country has ever had, places the blame for juvenile delinquency squarely on the home.

In a letter which he recently directed to all law-enforcement officials in the Nation discussing the problem he said:

"The growing menace of youthful depredation is the core of the crime cancer in America. The avalanche of juvenile crimes, increasing not only in numbers but also in viciousness, has brought misery and destruction to communities throughout the land. Almost 46 percent of the persons arrested for major crimes are under 18 years of age. Since 1952, while population in the 10 to 17 age group has increased only 14 percent, arrests in those same age brackets have mounted 42 percent.

"Children are not born bad. Lacking spiritual guidance and moral training in the home during early years, youngsters generally develop badness and mature into teenage terrors through parental negligence. Such irresponsibility on the part of parents is a crime against society. Certainly, it is only sensible to hold the parents of youthful vandals and hoodlums legally and financially accountable for the crimes of their offspring.

"The vast majority of our youngsters are upright, wholesome citizens. Unfortunately, the public reputation of the entire group of American youth is too frequently jeopardized by the vicious acts of the relatively small percentage of youthful hoodlums. Individually and in gangs, however, these teen-age criminals commit some of the most violent crimes of the day.

"The recent scourge of street mugging, sex attacks, bodily assaults, murder, and other carnage by young criminals across the country demands a reappraisal of the ugly reality which is juvenile crime.

"What a fanciful flight of imagination it takes to label such crimes 'juvenile delinquency.' The present youth problem does not involve child pranksters and mischief-makers. The real terror today comes from the vicious juvenile criminal. Soft justice and unwarranted leniency merely encourage these young thugs in disdain for lawful authority.

"We can no longer afford to let 'tender age' make plunder into a trifling prank, reduce mayhem to a mischievous act, and pass off murder as a boyish misdemeanor. This distorted notion of justice has even permeated our court system. In all too many instances the law has been bent to favor the criminal at the expense of the rights of his innocent victims.

"The battle against juvenile violence must be waged by the mothers, fathers, and all adult citizens of America who share responsibilities for youth. The time for theories and test-tube treatment is past. Only fair but stern action against delinquent parents and snarling young thugs can bring a halt to the present plague of youthful lawlessness."

This is the word of the man who knows more about crime perhaps than any other man in the Nation.

Every now and then you will hear some public speaker get up and discount the wave of juvenile delinquency by saying that the youths today are no worse than when he was growing up. Some are not—that is true—but the crime records of this country show conclusively that juvenile delinquency has become what Mr. Hoover cites as the core of crime cancer in this country.

It would seem that every father and every mother who reads the daily newspapers and thus becomes acquainted with the horrible crimes being committed by youths over the Nation would think long and earnestly of how they might save their own children.

Loyalty Day Observance Held at Nanticoke, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of April 25, 1958, which comments on the Loyalty Day ceremonies held at Nanticoke and the meaning of Loyalty Day:

LOYALTY DAY OBSERVANCE

A parade and other ceremonies at Nanticoke tomorrow will be the highlight of the local observance of Loyalty Day, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Throughout the country, there will be similar celebrations to offset the annual May Day of the Communists next week.

Loyalty Day has come to have a special meaning to Americans, apart from the orig-

inal intent to meet the Red challenge. It is a time for Americans to rededicate themselves to a way of life that is freighted with more significance than at any time in history.

If at all possible, participate in the Nanticoke demonstration tomorrow as a marcher or spectator. In any event, display the flag from your home or business place. All communities may share in the spirit of Loyalty Day in this manner.

Projects Versus Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gaffney Ledger, Gaffney, S. C. of May 3, 1958:

PROJECTS VERSUS TAXES

President Eisenhower has vetoed a $1½ billion water projects bill. It was designed to fight the recession, and was supported by many Democrats and some Republicans.

President Eisenhower definitely had a point in vetoing the water projects bill. Some of the projects included in the bill were of questionable merit, and since the bill he vetoed was an authorization bill, and not an appropriation bill, his veto will probably have the eventual effect of reducing the number of projects authorized. The ones with considerable merit, and the most commendable of them, will no doubt be carried out.

One of the things some people overlook in viewing public projects versus lowered taxes—in fighting the recession—is the fact that a more immediate effect will be felt by lowering taxes. Congressman JOHN J. RILEY, South Carolina Democrat, has pointed this out with clarity.

RILEY notes that public-works projects, while good, take some time to be put into effect. In addition, the money to be used in financing public-works projects is collected from the taxpayer in the form of taxes, and by the time the Federal Government handles it, administers the project, and pays all sorts of administrative salaries and costs, about one-third of the total amount is dissipated before it is used to create jobs.

On the other hand, a tax reduction would create immediate buying power. RILEY estimates there are 62 million workers in the United States. As an example, if $1 per week were returned to them, in the form of reduced taxes, and they spent it, that would be an expenditure of $62 million a week.

Figured over a period of 1 year, this would increase the buying power in the market by several billions of dollars. If this increased buying power put more men back to work, enabling them to earn money and pay taxes, then the Government would not fare badly—since it would collect taxes to offset the loss of the several billion dollars in lower income taxes to the 62 million workers.

This is why we favor a tax cut over other courses, in fighting the recession it will provide immediate relief, it will provide relief to those who will probably spend the money immediately, and it will, through increased purchases, stimulate industry and create jobs. It is a necessary part of any successful program to check the current recession.

Communistic Political Aspects of Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, on April 13, 1958, I made a television broadcast over the CBS network on the subject of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. The following is the text of that broadcast:

Bills to admit Hawaii and Alaska as States will be acted upon by Congress very soon.

Hawaii would have 2 Senators and 2 Representatives.

I have said, in and outside Congress, that, in granting statehood to Hawaii, we actually invite four Soviet agents to take seats in our Congress. They will be carefully selected by Communist agents, cleverly following the Soviet party line, although always appearing to be merely liberal. I repeat this statement.

Most advocates of statehood have sincere motives. They believe in the right to vote.

The right to vote can be a misleading slogan.

Last month, 99 percent of the Russian voters voted for Khrushchev's candidates. These people exercised their right to vote.

But this isn't the effective political equality that we believe in.

The civilian population of Alaska is 160,000. The total vote, in the last 1956 election, was only 26,266.

Statehood would grant to this handful of citizens 2 Senators, 1 Representative, and 3 electoral votes, in choosing our President.

Alaska's 2 Senators and its excessive power, for example, would nullify the will of California's 14 million people, of Illinois' 10 million people, of Georgia's 4 million people, and of the voters in each of the other 48 States.

The voters in Alaska, with 3 electoral votes, would have 5 times the voting power of your vote and mine, in electing a President.

The framers of our Constitution founded a Republic, combining the best features of both Federal and national types of government.

The powers granted to the Federal Government were limited, reserving the residual sovereign power to the States and its people. The plan of two Senators to be selected by each State legislature conformed to the Federal nature of our Government.

There have been drastic changes in our Republic.

The President and the Senators are now elected directly by the voters.

The Senators are accountable only to their constituents and are no longer responsible for preserving the powers of their States. Their prime interest must lie in expanding national power to satisfy their areas with Federal funds.

The National Government has assumed powers wholly beyond the original concept of our Constitution.

Expenditures and taxes are a fair estimate of the exercise of political power.

The people of this country pay a total tax of more than $100 billion per year. The National Government takes 75 percent of this. The remaining 25 percent goes to support the State, local, and school governments. By this test, we have evolved from a Federal republic into a national democracy.

Twenty-five States, with a population of 31 million people, constituting only 18 percent of the Nation's population, control 50 votes and have the majority power in our Senate.

This imbalance of power is a prime factor in our huge Federal bureaucracy, its wastages, and the consequent huge Federal taxes. Every question in Congress, even defense, is tinted with practical politics.

I imply no criticism of the Members of the United States Senate. They are all hard-working, honorable gentlemen.

But, it is a paradox, that the harder they work, the greater our expenditures and taxes become, and the weaker our Nation.

The Senators, too, are the victims of this great and, perhaps, fatal weakness in our constitutional structure.

Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii is repugnant to the proper apportionment of representation for a national democracy. It violates our ideals of political equality. We cannot, of course, reapportion the Senate. But let's not make our condition any worse.

Now I shall attempt to establish the relationship between the Communist Soviet Government, the Communist Party of the United States, statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, the Supreme Court of the United States, and our Congress.

William Z. Foster is chairman of the American Communist Party. The Baltimore Sun of March 23, 1958, reports his plans, printed in the Moscow Kommunist magazine. This is the official bible of international communism.

His orders are to agitate for a peace crusade, create dissension among farmers, Negroes, and the unemployed.

He says that since 1955, there is no law to fear and his orders are, full steam ahead.

Mr. Foster has reference to the series of Supreme Court decisions since 1955. The Nelson case invalidated every antisedition law of the 48 States.

The Yates case states, in effect, that "we must be on the brink of a successful revolution, before the Federal Smith Anti-Sedition Act can be invoked."

The recent Supreme Court decisions have paralyzed all efforts to control Communist subversion.

These decisions were made despite the findings by Congress, by the President, by the FBI, and by the Attorney General, that the Communist Party is a subversive integral agency of the Soviet world conspiracy; that Communists owe their allegiance to the Soviet.

The Supreme Court's decisions even shackle the emergency powers of our President.

This is a fantastic and frightening state of affairs.

Statehood for Hawaii is a major objective of the Soviet conspiracy to which Mr. Bridges and his unions lend themselves.

We show you a photo of Chairman Charles Fujimoto announcing the program of the Hawaii Communist Party. He says, "We favor statehood." Period.

The Communist power in Hawaii emanates from two unions, the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union and the United Public Workers Union. Their abbreviations are ILWU and UPW.

Both of these unions were expelled by the CIO in 1950 on the ground that their policies follow the Communist Party and that Communists control these unions.

The ILWU has a membership of 25,000 in Hawaii. Harry Bridges, next to William Z. Foster, is the greatest force aiding American communism. He is the international president of this union. Louis Goldblatt, who was expelled from England as an international Communist agent, is secretary-treasurer.

Jack Hall, an identified Communist, is the regional director in Hawaii.

The UPW is headed by Henry Epstein who claims that its membership increased by

1,000 in the past 2 years to 3,000 members. Most of its officers are also Communists. They control the vital transport, waterworks, fire, and even the sheriff's department.

I show you an article in the October 1956 American Legion magazine by Victor Riesel. He is the courageous labor columnist who has done so much to protect the decent rank and file union members against labor racketeers and labor Communists.

One of these photos shows:

Harry Bridges drinking a toast with Mr. Molotov.

I quote from this article:

"Last Christmas week, Russia's top geopoliticians announced that the Kremlin considered Hawaii a colonial power. Last New Year's Eve, the Kommunist magazine stated that Hawaii and American Samoa must be liberated by revolutionary action.

"Comrade Khrushchev knows that the first phase of Harry Bridges' political and industrial infiltration is completed.

"His well knit disciplined voting machine can deliver 40,000 votes. It is the power on the island."

Mr. Bridges rules a Communist collectivized kingdom in Hawaii.

I now quote, from the Hawaii Commission on Subversive Activities, report of 1955:

"The ILWU has established 16 book lending libraries. Their books are uniformly subversive, teaching race hatred, ridiculing religion, glorifying Russia and Red China and teaching military techniques for mass labor and political strikes.

"The ILWU uses 4 radio stations to broadcast their communistic propaganda, every day, in the English, Japanese, and Filipino languages.

"The ILWU expends more than a quarter of a million dollars a year for treasonable propaganda."

The ILWU of Hawaii operates in both the Republican and the Democratic parties. It is just, now, reaching the peak of its power.

I show you reports of the 1954 elections by the two largest Hawaii newspapers, the Star Bulletin and the Advertiser.

The headings are: "Jack Hall Says Unions Get Credit for Victory," "Labor Backed Candidates Did Well in Isle Elections."

I quote from these reports:

"The survey shows the ILWU gave its endorsement to 71 candidates. A total of 58 were elected.

"In the house of the legislature, 28 out of 30 were endorsed. 22 of the backed candidates won."

Now in the last 1956 elections, the ILWU did better than in 1954.

I show you a clipping of the Star Bulletin. The heading is "ILWU Backed Candidates Won in 26 of 28 Contests."

I show you a listing of all of the 15 senators and 30 representatives in the Hawaiian Legislature. The "x's" indicate ILWU endorsements.

Six out of 15 Senators are so endorsed.

Twenty-one out of 30 representatives were elected with the ILWU endorsement.

I show you this page of photographs from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin. It shows the agents of the ILWU and the UPW operating with the legislature in the Iolani Palace, the Capitol Building.

On November 8, 1956, Governor King forced the resignation of his attorney general for attending a testimonial dinner for Jack Hall. Governor King was not reappointed.

In the 1956 elections, William F. Quinn accepted the ILWU endorsement for senate. He is now the Governor, succeeding Governor King. I show you newspaper accounts of Governor Quinn tendering a public appointment to Jack Hall as a member of his traffic commission.

It is an accepted political fact in Hawaii that you can't receive the recommendation of the Interior Department for a Presidential appointment without the blessing of the ILWU.

I would like to pay special tribute to Dr. Lyle Phillips, to the Dillingham family, to former Governors Judd, King, and Stainback, to the Hawaii Residents' Association, for their courageous fight against communism in Hawaii, at great personal sacrifice.

The International Fishermen and Allied Workers of America is one of the largest unions in Alaska. It was expelled from the CIO in 1950 as being Communist controlled. The next day it joined Bridges' ILWU. It is Bridges' beachhead in Alaska, today.

Just as soon as statehood is granted, Bridges can and will send 100 organizers into Alaska. It will be "apple pie" to take over its politics.

The chain of command, the line of discipline will be completed from Moscow to Foster to Bridges, to Honolulu and Juneau, Alaska, then into our Congress.

By the way, Mr. Eugene Lyons, senior editor of the Reader's Digest magazine, has a fine article on communism in this same American Legion edition of October 1956.

The last poll in Alaska shows the people there voting 2½ to 1 against statehood. Certainly, we ought not impose statehood upon them against their will.

I thank you for your interest.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of May 2, 1958, on the occasion of the commemoration of Polish Constitution Day:

THE 3D OF MAY

When you are reading these lines tonight, it will be Saturday in Poland because of the difference in time. A new day will have arrived—the 3d of May, normally the greatest civil holiday on the calendar in the land that gave to the world Pulaski, Kosciuszko, and so many other notables. For this day commemorates the constitution of May 3, 1781, a document that introduced to Europe the idealism in government, exemplified by the Constitution of the United States.

The 3d of May is Constitution Day in Poland, or at least it was until the Soviet Union obtained a stranglehold of this land and installed a Communist puppet regime.

The constitution of Poland, commemorated this day, proclaimed that "all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people." That, of course, does not apply to this enslaved land now.

A year ago, there were high hopes that this 3d of May might be freighted with significance instead of having officials ignore or give lipservice to the spirit of the occasion. But these dreams of liberation have not materialized, although the fires of liberty continue to burn. A century of subjugation failed to extinguish them, so there is every reason to believe they will survive the current ordeal.

The spirit of Poland seems to grow stronger under oppression instead of being broken. This is easy to understand when the principles, incorporated in the constitution of the 3d of May, are considered.

Are the Veterans of World War I To Be Placed Eternally on the "Maybe" List Until They Are Extinct?

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 7, 1958, Lewis Brake, the national commander of the Veterans of World War I, in a speech at Lima, Ohio, stated:

The Government may not owe every veteran a living, but it does owe its life to the veteran.

Commander Brake continued by saying:

With the passing of each day there are 320 fewer veterans of World War I.

He said he knew from personal experience as a veteran service officer in Illinois that many of the World War I veterans who die each day were in need of medical care, food, and clothing.

Mr. Speaker, Commander Brake's statement can be confirmed by hundreds of service officers throughout the Nation who have firsthand observation of the economic plight of the vast majority of the remaining 2,900,000 veterans of World War I whose average age is nearly 65 years. In addition Commander Brake's statement reveals that those veterans who are alive out of the 4,744,000 Americans who served in World War I are truly the forgotten veterans of the Nation. They are forgotten because this Congress and many previous Congresses have taken no action on numerous bills providing for pensions similar to those paid to the veterans of the Spanish-American War.

Mr. Speaker, in revealing the economic plight of the World War I veteran as he advances in years, it should not be forgotten that upon discharge he received a $60 separation allowance for the purpose of purchasing a suit of civilian clothes and an overcoat.

Later the World War I veteran received a so-called bonus; but, Mr. Speaker, it was designed as an adjustment of the $30 monthly pay the American doughboy received for his military service in 1917–18.

Having mentioned the $60 separation allowance and the so-called bonus, it should be emphasized that as far as the veteran of World War I was concerned there were no fringe benefits such as terminal-leave pay, unemployment-insurance benefits, or GI benefits in general as received by the veteran of World War II.

Let me stress the point Commander Brake made in his address at Lima, Ohio, when he said:

The Government may not owe every veteran a living, but it does owe its life to the veteran.

This is a true statement, and, applying it to the veterans of World War I,

the gratitude of the Nation is lacking because they have not been accorded equal treatment with veterans of other wars.

Mr. Speaker, at this time H. R. 972, H. R. 2201, H. R. 5011, H. R. 5054, H. R. 8425, and H. R. 10451 are pending before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, all of which provide a $100 monthly pension for veterans of World War I when they reach age 60, subject to certain income limitations.

In addition, H. R. 316, H. R. 2128, and H. R. 5272 are also pending before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which provide a $100 monthly pension for World War I veterans at age 62. All of these bills have been pending in the 85th Congress for months, but no action has been taken or scheduled at this time.

Mr. Speaker, any one of the bills pending is a step in the right direction, and I sincerely hope we can get action on such legislation before the adjournment of this Congress. Any bill to be perfected by the House should provide for a monthly pension of at least $100 at age 65 or if the veteran is permanently or totally disabled. In addition, I think the bill should provide outpatient care for every veteran of World War I who is in need of medical treatment on the same basis as provided the veteran of the Spanish-American War.

In conclusion, let me quote from an editorial appearing in the April 26, 1958, issue of the Army-Navy-Air Force Register regarding "forgotten men":

> Congress sees fit to appropriate billions to be used in other ways. But what of the veterans of World War I? Are they going to be placed eternally on the "maybe" list until they are extinct? They are, indeed, the forgotten men.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Poles are one of the most gifted, industrious, and courageous peoples of Europe. They have a long and glorious history, and their contribution to western civilization in the arts and science, in statesmanship, and in military leadership, has been great. They have also made a significant contribution in the art of governmental institutions. This last point is clearly borne out by the liberal and progressive constitution which they adopted on May 3, 1791.

That constitution expressed the true spirit of the age. The powers of the monarch were curtailed, and a real check was placed upon the exercise of his authority. Autocratic government was cast aside and in its place ministerial responsibility was introduced. Many intricate and obsolete features of the old and unwieldy system were abolished, and class distinctions were reduced. Personal privileges formerly enjoyed by the few were made available to all townsmen, and the peasantry was placed under the protection of the law. Religious toleration was established and religious fredom was guaranteed. These advanced features of the constitution represented a decided advance over anything yet known in Central and Eastern Europe.

The annual commemoration of the Polish Constitution Day provides a fitting occasion for all those who believe in freedom and independence to pay tribute to the memory of the men who forged that inspiring document, and also to those brave souls who through the years have sacrificed their lives so that the ideals embodied in the constitution of 1791 might take firm roots and live on.

Michigan and Its Accomplishments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, this is the time of the year that the people of Michigan set aside to publicize and make known the benefits of being residents of the Wolverine State. The people of Michigan have much to be proud of since during the long and glorious history of their State they have been blessed with an abundance of natural resources, human achievement, social and technical progress, and dynamic leadership.

When most people consider Michigan they automatically think of the automotive industry and justly so. Michigan is the automotive center of the world, but the automotive industry is by no means the only industry in our great State. Michigan contains over 12,000 factories with over one and a half million employees. Michigan, besides being the leading manufacturer of automobiles, also ranks first in the production of automotive trailers, grey iron, cutting tools, woodworking materials, breakfast foods and refrigerators. The State of Michigan is also one of the leaders in the production of metal stampings, drugs, refrigeration equipment, sporting and athletic goods, steel, furniture, chemicals, and paper. The Dow Chemical Co., one of the largest chemical producers in the world, has its headquarters in Michigan. Kalamazoo is known throughout the world as the "paper city." The industrial capital of the "arsenal of democracy" is Detroit, part of which I am privileged to represent. On a per capita basis, no other major city has an equal number of factory workers or as large a volume of manufactured products. Detroit's industry is also diversified. Besides the automotive industry it ranks first in pharmaceuticals, adding machines, foundry products, paints and heavy chemicals. Detroit also uses over 10 percent of the Nation's output of finished steel. No other major city in the United States has as high a proportion of its families living in single, detached homes. Detroit is also the healthiest city in the world. It has been the recipient of the National Health Contest three times and has the lowest death rate of any city with more than a million inhabitants. Detroit is the Nation's third ranking city in business and industry while remaining fifth in population.

But industry and commerce are not the only factors that make the people of Michigan proud of their State. In the field of agriculture Michigan ranks 10th or higher on production of the Nation's 20 major crops, although ranking only 22 in area. Michigan leads the country in the production of tart cherries, navy beans, celery, cantaloupes, strawberries, and chicory. Michigan ranks second in the country in the production of plums, carrots, field beans, cauliflower, red clover seed, onions, blueberries, and is one of the leading commercial producers of apples. Wayne County, which includes Detroit and is the industrial center of the State, leads the other 83 Michigan counties in production of sweetcorn.

Besides being blessed with a great industrial capacity and an agricultural abundance Michigan is also a leading vacationland. Michigan has four times as much water covered area as any other State. Our neighboring State of Minnesota brags about having 10,000 lakes while we of Michigan make little of the fact that we have 11,037 inland lakes. Michigan also contains 36,350 miles of streams and 3,121 miles of Great Lake shoreline.

Michigan is also a sportsman's paradise. More fishing licenses are sold annually in the State of Michigan than any other State. The finest trout fishing in this country is found in the streams of Michigan. The Wolverine State also leads the country in the number of State parks and campsites available to the public. Hunting is also a leading vacation feature offered in Michigan. The annual deer herd of Michigan, averaging 700,000 in number, is the largest east of the Rockies. Isle Royale National Park, Mich., is noted for having one of the largest remaining herds of great antlered moose in the United States. Furthermore, in the State of Michigan one is never more than 6 miles from a lake or stream. People from throughout the United States come to Michigan every year to enjoy the scenic splendor, grandeur, and hospitality that Michigan and its people offer the year round.

Michigan has also been a leader in the field of transportation. The story of the automotive industry and its development as a basic part of the American story and its great contribution of putting America on wheels has played a major role in the development of the vast transportation and highway systems that are an integral part of our social and economic life. One of the first cement highways in the world was built in Detroit in 1899. The Ambassador Bridge between Detroit and Canada is the world's longest international suspension bridge. International Bridge, one of the world's largest jackknife bridges, spans the American locks, St. Mary's Rapids and the Canadian locks at Sault Sainte

Marie. The newest achievement in this field is of course the opening of the Mackinac Bridge at the Straits of Mackinac. The Mackinac Bridge is the longest suspension bridge in the world. Including anchorages, but excluding any approaches, its length is 8,614 feet. Including approaches the total length of the bridge is 23,195 feet, almost 5 miles. Michigan is particularly proud of this new engineering achievement. One of the most important aspects of the bridge that the people of Michigan are justly proud of is that the bridge itself was built without any Federal assistance. Linking the two peninsulas of the State the Mackinac Bridge will stand forever as a fitting monument to the people of Michigan.

Michigan is also America's largest inland water trade center. The Detroit River is the busiest waterway in the world and Detroit is the third largest port in the country in dollar volume of cargo handling. Detroit is the No. 1 port for trade with Canada, the United States best customer. The Detroit River also carries more tonnage than the Rhine, Thames, Seine, and Volga combined.

Michigan has also been a leader in the field of education. Michigan was the first State to assure every child the right to a tax-paid high school education. Michigan was also the first State to provide in its constitution for the establishment of a public library system. Michigan also leads all other States in the number of organized 4–H Clubs, with well over 5,000 throughout the State. Michigan was the first State to organize school safety patrols over 25 years ago. The State has also been a leader in the field of juvenile welfare. The first State school in the Nation for neglected and dependent children was established in Coldwater in 1875.

Michigan has also shown the way in higher education. The University of Michigan, founded in Detroit in 1817 and moved to Ann Arbor in 1837, is regarded as the "mother of State universities" because of its leadership in the development of State-supported higher education. The University of Michigan is listed among the Nation's 5 or 6 leading universities. It is fourth in size among American universities and ranks first among State universities in the number of alumni listed in Who's Who in America. Among other achievements of the University of Michigan that we of Michigan are justly proud is the fact that it is the first university to be governed by a board of regents elected by the people; it is also the first university to admit women. The school of public health, established in 1941, was the first such school established in this country. The university center of Japanese studies is the only one of its kind in the United States. The University of Michigan law school ranks as one of the finest in this country and it has one of the foremost law libraries in the western hemisphere.

Michigan is also proud of its other major institution of higher learning, Michigan State University. Ranking as 1 of the 10 largest universities in the country, Michigan State University was founded in 1855, when it established the first agricultural college in the United States. The first commencement exercise in 1861 was canceled in order that the entire class could be excused to enlist in Howland's Engineers for service in the Civil War. Michigan State has also achieved many "firsts" on the field of education. The first building for the teaching of scientific agriculture in America was established at Michigan State in 1857. It was also the first land-grant college to admit women. In the field of scientific agriculture, the first hybridization of corn was done at Michigan State in 1877. In 1888 it established the first horticulturist laboratory in this country. It has also achieved many firsts during the last 40 years. It was the first college in the Nation to employ radio having its first broadacst in 1924, and it also was the second college in the country to establish a fully equipped television station.

Michigan has also been a pioneer in the field of public health. This year the Michigan Department of Health celebrates its 84th year of service to the people of Michigan. During the long and dedicated history of the Michigan Department of Health it has helped bring about many changes to further the health and welfare of people everywhere. The department developed one of the first effective vaccines for protection against whooping cough and was one of the first States to remove tuberculosis from the welfare category and declare that payments for hospitalization was for the protection of the public health. Michigan also pioneered free X-rays for the detection of tuberculosis and in October 1940, it had one of the first mobile X-ray units in the world. The famous Kahn test for syphilis was developed in the Michigan Department of Health laboratories. Michigan has some of the best water supplies in the Nation. Eighty percent of the population drinks water from supplies approved by the health department and not one case of typhoid fever has been traced to the water supply since 1934. Michigan is the leading State in providing community programs for the application of sodium fluoride solution to the teeth of children for the prevention of tooth decay. Michigan's program for the screening of children for defective vision and for improving visual environment was the first program of its kind to be undertaken on a statewide basis. Michigan is the only State in the country preparing and distributing antihemophilic globulin used in control of hemophilia. The Michigan Department of Health was the first State agency to distribute blood plasma to hospitals and physicians for civilian use. The first low-cost incubator for premature infants, now in use in every State and in 44 foreign countries, was developed by the Michigan Department of Health. Michigan also initiated the first State program of consultant service to hospitals on care of mothers and newborn babies. Michigan was the site of the first Governor's Conference on Mental Health. Held in 1954, the conference was the first concerted effort of the States to lay out a program to combat this serious social problem. Michigan has done much to improve the general health of all its people and it has contributed much to the betterment of the health and well-being of people everywhere.

Michigan has led the way in many other fields too numerous to mention, and the Wolverine State will continue to display the indomitable spirit and determination that has gained it a worldwide reputation. The people of Michigan are justly proud of their heritage and during Michigan Week they want to share this feeling with everyone. The people of Michigan have a proud and glorious past and they look to an even greater future as the Wolverine State continues to work for the betterment of all people.

Tribute Paid to the Late Henry Walser, Hazleton (Pa.) Publisher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Hazleton Plain Speaker of April 25, 1958, calling attention to the tribute paid to the late Henry Walser by the American Newspaper Publishers Association at its recently concluded annual convention held in New York City:

AMERICAN NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS PAY TRIBUTE TO HENRY WALSER

NEW YORK.—A solemn memorial service which honored the name of Henry Walser, late co-owner and publisher of the Hazleton Plain Speaker and Standard-Sentinel was held here yesterday by the Nation's foremost newspaper executives in the closing session of the 72d annual convention of the American Newspaper Publishers Association in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel.

As they stood in silence, William Dwight, retiring president of the organization, recalled to the assembled delegates the name of Mr. Walser and others "long identified with leadership in their communities, lost to us by death since we last met together."

Reading from the ANPA necrology, Mr. Dwight said, "the year that has passed has taken from us friends and colleagues whose memory should be solemnly and affectionately honored by all who are gathered here today.

"These men who sat with us in our deliberations were devoted guardians of the truth and dedicated servants of the profession we all hold high. They were willing to assign their time and energies to the tasks above and beyond the pressure of their own duties. They contributed to American journalism the zeal and fire that has kept it the fighting defender of the rights of mankind and the intelligence and integrity and vision which has distinguished America's press in its crusades for enlightenment and peace among all peoples.

"As newspaper leaders they were proud of their role and jealous of the idealism which still vitalizes the decisions and performance of our profession. They served it

with a wide range of talents, but always in the high-principled spirit of increasing its influence, dignity, and authority.

"As evidence of our distress at the passing of these trusted and beloved colleagues and as an indication of the grief we share with those who knew and loved them, we in this 72d convention resolve that this recognition be made a part of the permanent minutes of this meeting and that copies of this tribute be sent to the families of those who have left us, together with an expression of sorrow and sense of loss in their passing."

Pan American Games in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include a letter from the Honorable Richard J. Daley, mayor of Chicago, and a fact sheet on the Pan American Games to be held in Chicago in September of 1959, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 5, 1958.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: That you may be informed regarding planning for the Pan American Games to be held in Chicago in 1959. I am forwarding you the latest fact sheet.

The many references by distinguished leaders of our government of the great importance of furtherance of understanding and friendship between the people of the Americas serves to emphasize the importance of the Pan American Games.

The bringing together of some 2,000 young athletes from all the countries of the Americas to engage in friendly athletic competitions in the heart of mid-United States is an enormous project.

In serving as host for the games, Chicago becomes the United States in the eyes of the thousands of visitors who will come here to participate in and see them. We intend that nothing be left undone to make this event one of the greatest in the history of our country.

We will appreciate your assistance in informing the congressional delegations, and the Government departments and agencies, of the coming of the games to Chicago in 1959 and urge the sympathetic and cooperative interest of all.

Sincerely,

RICHARD J. DALEY,
Mayor.

[From the fact sheet of the Chicago Pan American Games Citizens' Committee, Chicago, Ill.]

The Pan American Games will be held in Chicago August 27 through September 7, 1959.

The Pan American Games are held every 4 years under the direction of the Pan American Sports Organization. The member countries are those countries of the Americas whose National Olympic committees are members of the International Olympic Association.

At present countries eligible for participation in the games are: Argentina, Bahamas, Bermuda, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Columbia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Chile, Dominican Republic, Dutch West Indies, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Puerto Rico, Trinidad, United States of America, Uruguay, and Venezuela. It is probable that before the games take place Ecuador, Haiti, and Nicaragua will be added to the list of eligible countries.

The erroneous opinion exists generally that the Pan American Games will be held in Soldier Field. The games program includes 20 sports, in 7 of which there will be competitions for both men and women. All of the sports facilities of the Chicago area will be used.

PROGRAM OF SPORTS AND LOCATIONS

Track and field (men and women), Soldiers Field.
Basketball (men and women), Northwestern University, Loyola University.
Baseball, Wrigley Feld and Comiskey Park.
Boxing, Northwest Armory, International Amphitheater.
Equestrian sports, Oak Brook Polo Club, Soldiers Field.
Fencing (men and women), University of Chicago.
Football (soccer), Hanson Park.
Gymnastics (men and women), University of Illinois, Navy Pier.
Weightlifting, Lane Tech High School.
Wrestling, Rivas High School.
Swimming and diving (men and women), Columbus Park, Portage Park.
Modern pentathlon, Oak Brook, Camp Logan, Bartlett Gym, Columbus Park, Washington Park.
Equestrian polo, Oak Brook Polo Club.
Rowing, Cal-Sag Canal.
Tennis (men and women), Oak Park, River Forest.
Pistol and rifle, skeet, Camp Logan, Lincoln Park Gun Club.
Volley ball (men and women) De Paul University.
Water polo, Riis Park.
Cycling, Humboldt Park.
Yachting, Lake Michigan.

At the previous games in Buenos Aires in 1951, and in Mexico City in 1955, each time there participated 1,800 athletes. Accommodations will be provided for 2,000 athletes at the Chicago games.

There has been appointed and are functioning 20 sports organizing committees each charged with the responsibility of planning for the conduct of its sport at the games. These committees are composed of men and women identified with the sport they are serving. This identification comes through experience as competitors in major competitions; as officials; or as athletic directors, coaches, and administrators.

In addition there has been appointed and are functioning a feeding and housing committee, a publicity and promotions committee, a ticket committee, an awards committee, and a transportation committee.

The Chicago Rotary Club; the Pan American Council; Cook County Council of the American Legion; the Olympians; and the Spanish Speaking Community of the Chicago Area have organized hospitality committees to assist in the entertainment of the athletes and officials.

The Department of Defense has named consultants for the conduct of the modern Pentathlon and the shooting events. The equestrian committee has engaged the service of one of the leading authorities in the United States to assist in laying out the riding courses. As needed, the services of other consultants will be employed.

A campaign to raise $500,000 to finance the games will be commenced shortly. Half this mount is needed to augment the sum which each country will pay for the feeding and quartering of its athletes. Their contribution will be $3 per day per athlete. The estimated cost for food and lodging is $10 per day. The balance of the money is required for providing facilities for the conduct of the various sports, and for administration.

Contributions in substantial amounts will be solicited and a city-wide campaign to enlist sponsors, persons who will contribute $5 each, and who will receive credit coupons in that amount which can be exchanged for tickets to the track and field events.

Headquarters will be opened at 69 West Monroe on May 1.

The assistance of all is solicited and those who are desirous of helping are invited to contact the mayor's office.

Inspired by the holding of the Pan American Games there will also be held in August of 1959 a great cultural and information congress; participation in which has been extended to all the countries of the Americas. This event, of which Arnold Maremont is chairman, has been named a Festival of the Americas.

Nineteen Hundred and Fifty-eight North Dakota Mother of the Year, Margaret K. Beauchamp Breuer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, North Dakota has what I believe is a unique honor in having chosen Mrs. Henry B. Breuer, a member of the Arickara Tribe of Indians, as North Dakota mother of the year for 1958. As a tribute to the Indians of North Dakota, as well as the State as a whole, I should like to here insert Mrs. Breuer's autobiography:

Mrs. H. A. Belcher, of Fessenden, N. Dak., president of the North Dakota Mothers Committee, announces that the selection committee members have named Mrs. Henry B. Breuer, of the Fort Berthold Reservation, Emmet, N. Dak., as the 1958 North Dakota mother of the year.

Mrs. Breuer, born in August 16, 1906, on the Fort Berthold Reservation, in a community then known as Armstrong, a member of the Arickara Indian group, 1 of the 3 groups of Arickaras, Mandans, and Hidatsas, comprising the Three Affiliated Tribes of Fort Berthold Reservation. Her people who have lived in this area for many generations, have been agriculturalists and with the other tribes have given to the Northwest much of its 90-day maturing seed.

Mrs. Breuer is a member of the Arickara Congregational Church. Her father, Peter Beauchamp, taught school for many years as a Federal employee and was one of the early pastors of the Arickara church. A councilman for many times, a delegate to Washington, D. C., on tribal business a number of times, and an interpreter for his people. He is now retired and lives with his daughter, Ina B. Hall, of Parshall, N. Dak.

Her mother was Adeline Powell Beauchamp, who came to Fort Berthold as a young woman as missionary teacher and adviser under the American Missionary Association, serving at the Fort Berthold Mission School for a number of years before she married. Later she became a field matron. (The mission school was started May 9, 1876.)

Her only sister, Mrs. Ina B. Hall, is associate home demonstration agent with the North Dakota Agricultural College Extension Service, working out of Parshall, N. Dak. Her brother, Safford Beauchamp, lives in Garrison, N. Dak.

Began her education at the Congregational Mission School, later attending public schools being the second pupil of Fort Berthold to

graduate from a town public high school, which was Garrison, N. Dak. Then to the Minot State Teachers College, where she earned her degree, mainly through summer sessions in 1941, and her life professional certificate in teaching in 1957. Taught her first school in the fall of 1926 and later entered the Federal school service.

Married in 1928, Mr. and Mrs. Breuer have 3 sons, Peter, Bernard, and Almit. Peter is a graduate of the North Dakota Agricultural College, majoring as an agricultural engineer, and is now working for the Bureau of Reclamation in Bismarck, N. Dak. Bernard graduated from the Bacone College, in Bacone, Okla., and is now a machinist foreman working in Los Angeles, while Almit follows ranching and farming near the Breuer home. In addition, Mrs. Breuer has been like a mother to her niece, Adeline Hall, daughter of Mrs. Ina Hall, and who is now married and lives in Overly, N. Dak.

Mrs. Breuer has been a vital factor always in developing and improving the relationship between the races, teaches in the Whiteshield Federal School which school has a biracial setting, very active in community and church affairs and one who is always ready to do her part and more when it comes to strengthening the community life in all its phases.

Dr. Ben Reifel, former superintendent of the Fort Berthold Reservation, now area director for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, with offices in Aberdeen, S. Dak., writes of Mrs. Breuer: "In addition to rearing a family and being a farm homemaker, she found time to continue her education to the point where she was able to get a bachelors degree and is at present one of the outstanding teachers in the elementary school in the Bureau of Indian Affairs. She is also a vital factor in developing and improving the relationships of both groups within the community, among adults within the community as well as children within the school. She is ever a resource for advice and encouragement to Indians and non-Indians alike in the reservation community within McLean County. She keeps active in church affairs and serves as an outstanding example of Christian womanhood."

Mr. Albert Wabaunsee, principal, Whiteshield School, writes: "A mother has to be a stabilizing factor if a home is to be successful. In this case Mrs. Breuer has lived up to a mother's place in the home. She has provided her husband and family with an excellent home life, providing them with all the necessary ingredients to prepare them to take their place in modern civilization. In my observation, Mrs. Breuer has lived up to her reputation as a good teacher, an outstanding teacher; and by that I mean she has her children under control at all times. Her main objective is to prepare them for the second grade, scholastically, morally, physically, mentally, and socially. The youngsters leave the second grade with confidence in themselves, in their classmates, and in other teachers. She not only uses the professional training which she has received in getting a degree from the Minot State Teachers College but draws on the experiences which she has acquired in the past 29 years as a mother and teacher to her own as well as to others. There are those many little extra things which she does to develop her pupils—to develop democracy, it is lived rather than taught. The children are taught that there are laws which have to be abided by, yet they have opportunity to voice their own opinions. The children are treated fair in their work as well as play and they have opportunity to do both. A varied program is carried on in her teaching. With her modern professional training she has the ability to adapt the modern with some of the traditional which makes a worthy program for the youngsters. Always happy and congenial, she gets along well with fellow employees as well as the people of her community. She is teaching the second generation of children and both parents and children have respect for her. Briefly, Mrs. Breuer has done and is doing outstanding work in the classroom as well as successful work in the community. She has tried to use her home training, daily life's experiences in developing the youngsters to be future citizens of these United States of America."

Dr. Ralph Hubbard, former professor of biology and social science, Minot State Teachers College, writes: "Mrs. Breuer is a very brilliant, intelligent, and gifted lady. While taking her college work she was both teaching and raising her family at the same time. This all included, in the natural course of events, a great deal of activity in social, civic, community, and church affairs. At the college the faculty found her grades and student craft most superior. She was outstanding in research as proven by her intelligent use of the library facilities. Her reading was very broad. In the department of educational science, Mrs. Breuer presented marked contributions, backed by her powers of observation and excellent experience in the practical field of education. This lady comes from a strong family of fine citizens and educators. Her sister, Ina B. Hall, who has also raised a splendid family, is a powerful figure in the field of education."

Unemployment-Compensation Spread Is First Line of Defense Against Recession

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration H. R. 12065, Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, no economist can agree on one single reason as the cause of the current recession, or on one factor that will guarantee economic recovery.

The first victims of any slump are the unemployed.

Their predicament is immediate and clear.

For those covered by unemployment compensation, the benefits they receive are considerably less than the wages they once earned, and there is a definite limitation on the number of weeks that this insurance will provide them with some purchasing power.

For those not covered by unemployment compensation, the loss of a job means instant deprivation.

It is generally agreed in the Congress that we must extend, temporarily, the number of weeks to which an unemployed person is entitled to benefits as the first line of defense that will absorb the immediate shock of this recession.

When the jobs of over 5 million people disappear, we have a situation that affects not only the unemployed, but everyone in the Nation. The repercussions extend to all the world.

When 5 million people are forced to curtail their buying, then use up their savings, and finally fall back on the charity of relatives or the welfare provided by the community, you have 5 million personal tragedies and 5 million customers out of the market.

This is temporary legislation, but it also points up the fact that we have delayed in modernizing our unemployment-compensation system.

I hope that, apart from this emergency measure, we will proceed to enact permanent legislation that will extend coverage to include those who presently have no protection whatever when they lose their jobs.

H. R. 12065 provides up to 16 weeks of additional unemployment compensation for those who have exhausted their benefits, and the extension of coverage up to 16 weeks to those who did not come under any State or Federal unemployment-insurance program.

The unemployment-compensation laws of the States are adequate to meet the needs of normal unemployment, but they cannot cope with a situation like the present. When benefits are exhausted and there are no jobs available, how are these unemployed going to survive?

Even worse are the immediate hardships suffered by the 600,000 unemployed who had sufficient wages to qualify for benefits, but had the misfortune to work in noncovered employment. The discrimination operating against them demands correction.

The simple and expeditious way to provide aid is by a grant from the general funds of the Federal Treasury. Otherwise, there would be no relief in time to avert acute suffering.

This is temporary unemployment legislation designed to meet an emergency problem.

It would be self-defeating if it became mired in technicalities.

And it will give us a breather, during which we can explore and advance those fundamental changes that are required to modernize and strengthen our whole unemployment-compensation system.

If this bill is to succeed in its humane and economic objectives, it will have to be passed swiftly and without any crippling amendments.

In fact this bill, by reversing the loss of purchasing power, will help to regenerate the demand that will create jobs and thus stimulate economic recovery.

Among all the antirecession measures that have been suggested, the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 clearly merits top priority.

How Can It Happen?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. George E. Sokolsky which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on April 30, 1958:

HOW CAN IT HAPPEN?
(By George E. Sokolsky)

I read a broadcast from Panama City which tells a mighty tale about all the money

that we are scattering about the world with little concern for what happens to it. Let me repeat the Panama story:

"This is the story of an incident that occurred in the capital of our country; we shall call it the story of the lost building.

"This building, which was a large one and which contained recreational facilities, such as an ice rink, dance hall, gymnasium, and so forth, was sold to the Panama City administration by the United States Government for 1 balboa. The understanding was that the building was to be moved to another site, where it could be used by the children for their activities.

"But what happened? The building has disappeared, and the lot on which it was to be re-erected is being used for commercial purposes. No one knows what happened to the building; no one knows why the new lot, which was set aside for the relocation of the building, is being used for profits; no one knows why children have been deprived of the use of both the building and the new lot. Attempts have been made to find answers to these questions, but we have always been given idiotic answers. In the meantime, what happened to the building? Who is profiting from all this?"

A balboa is worth $1. It is a sad tale of our generosity going astray.

I was reading a speech—a sort of annual report—delivered by Tito to the Federal People's Assembly of Yugoslavia on April 19, in which he said:

"Part of the (military) requirements has been supplied from the aid received since 1951 from the United States. As is known, receipt of this aid was suspended in December last year after a mutual agreement at our request, because that military aid was no longer in accord with our foreign policy, the policy of coexistence, in the changed international situation."

In a word, when we aided this fellow up to the tune of $1 billion, he felt that he was doing us a favor by accepting the aid. He will now do us no more favors. We can keep our tanks, and planes, and whatnots.

In fact, Tito regards Soviet Russia's competition with us in the giveaway business as particularly notable. Let me quote his words:

"In the field of so-called international economy and technical aid, a significant moment came when the Soviet Union started granting aid on a broader international plan."

This cost the United States about $1 billion before our officials in Washington discovered that Tito continued to belong to the Soviet world, that his quarrel was personal with Stalin, and that once Stalin died, the quarrel is no more. Note his own comments on the subject:

"A great event of broad international significance was the visit paid by a Soviet delegation headed by Comrade Khrushchev to our country, as well as the regulation of the relations between the two countries and the visit of our delegation to the Soviet Union."

The time has surely come for a restudy of the giveaway program, call it by whatever name. It was surely devised originally, in the form of lend-lease, to assist our allies in war. It has been exaggerated into a worldwide eleemosynary effort to aid remote and distant countries to achieve by one hop, skip, and jump to an agricultural and industrial plateau similar to ours.

We have sought to expend money to bring all the world to a common standard of living, which can only mean dragging down the countries of noble cultures to the standards of the Polynesian fishermen of remote Pacific islands.

This program never made much sense but was an expression of American sentimentality which we all delight in and undoubtedly explains why we contribute more to private charity after paying enormous taxes than any people on earth. It is the way we are constituted and as long as we have the money, who can complain?

It is only when we hit troubled times, like these, when cash in hand is less than usual, that we begin to look around to see what we can do to save a buck here and there. And we expect the same of our Government. Before this depression is over, the United States may have to drop many of its outlandish philanthropies.

The Case of Ezra Pound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, on last Tuesday I had a famous visitor, poet Ezra Pound. Mr. Pound came to wish me speedy recovery from the little ailments that I have been bothered by of late, and to thank me for promoting his release from St. Elizabeths Hospital, where he had been since 1946.

Mr. Pound told me that when he was at St. Elizabeths he used to think that there were 160 million worse cases outside, and he said that after viewing our modern-day city traffic he could see why this might be true. Of course, it was because I also thought there were millions of worse cases outside that I introduced a resolution last summer to investigate his case with a view to ending his long and unnecessary incarceration at the Federal hospital for the insane.

Mr. Pound and I talked about many things. Mr. Pound told me: "You've had a chance to talk as much as you like. It is what you're paid for. I've had to plug in for 12 years."

As the Library of Congress report on Mr. Pound indicated, he had not made public utterances of any sort during his long stay at St. Elizabeths. So last Tuesday Mr. Pound tried to tell me as much as he could about his views and ideas.

I am sure that Mr. Pound does not agree with me on many of my interpretations of economics and history—and also the other way around. But Mr. Pound is a learned man, and I listened with great interest to what he had to say. That is not to say that I joined him in his views or, for that matter, would or could express myself in just the way that he does.

It was May 5, 1945, 13 years ago last Monday, that Mr. Pound surrendered to the Allies in Italy. For the next 7 months or so, Mr. Pound was the guest of the American Army at the disciplinary training center near Pisa, and for part of this time, in a gorilla-cage-like security cage. Mr. Pound told me: "Few men of letters have had these opportunities."

The Library of Congress report, the first three installments of which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 29 and 30, has given the details of the now-dismissed case of United States versus Ezra Pound. There has been much honest—and some dishonest—agreement and disagreement over the various aspects of his complex case. As the Library report indicated, there are several Ezra Pounds—the poet and critic, the amateur economist, the medical patient, the man who didn't like President Roosevelt and said so, the man who has been criticized about as much as he has criticized, both wrongly and justly.

Mr. Pound, 15 years ago, wrote Attorney General Francis Biddle a letter to explain why he had been broadcasting his views over Radio Rome:

> A man's duties increase with his knowledge. * * * Someone must take count of these things. And having taken count must act on his knowledge, admitting that his knowledge is partial and his judgment subject to error.

Last Tuesday, Mr. Pound told me: "It is a shame that a man has to be 72 years old before he can learn history. That is to say, here I am 72 years old and I am going back to kindergarten, reading Coke's Institutes. At any rate, that's what's wrong with the whole educational system."

Mr. Pound's grandfather, Congressman Thaddeus Coleman Pound, of Wisconsin, once made a speech, back in 1882, on the floor of the House arguing for vocational education for our American Indians: "Give them spades in place of powder, plows in place of guns, opportunity rather than hymns and prayers. Encourage citizenship."

Last Tuesday, Mr. Pound commented about his grandfather: "T. C. was asking for the same things I am asking for in very much the same style."

On November 28, 1957, the Hailey (Idaho) Times, edited by Mr. Berwyn Burke, carried an interesting article which suggested almost prophetically that in the next few months the complicated Pound case might indeed be settled. I am pleased that, in introducing House Resolution 403 last August and in requesting the Library for the LRS study, I may have been in a small way partially responsible for bringing the Pound case into the open so that the Court would have the opportunity to resolve the whole business in the way that they did.

I want to wish Mr. Pound many more years of good writing, and whether Mr. and Mrs. Pound choose to remain in this country or to return to the Italian Riviera, I wish them many years of health, happiness, and peace.

[From the Hailey (Idaho) Times of November 28, 1957]

THE CASE OF EZRA POUND

One of the world's most skillful and most influential writers was born 72 years ago in the western mountain mining town of Hailey, Idaho. Name? Ezra Loomis Pound. The grandson of a Wisconsin Congressman and a distant cousin (by way of his mother) of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Ezra Pound left Hailey as a baby, grew up to poethood and one of the most controversial careers of our time. It has been predicted that future generations will rank him with such all-time literary giants as William Shakespeare, and indeed things may work out just that way.

Pound's present whereabouts? A little room in a red-brick building on a sprawling campus of red-brick buildings surrounded by an unpoetic red-brick wall—St. Elizabeths. Federal hospital for the insane, District of Columbia. Pound was committed there in 1945 as incompetent to stand trial for allegedly treasonous doings during the Second World War.

Pound, who had been living on the Italian Riviera for several years before war, broadcast over Radio Rome during the war. He bitterly lashed out at Messrs. Churchill, Stalin, and Roosevelt, most Jews, and the antipoetic world, in general. If Pound had been convicted of betraying the United States, he could have gotten from 5 years' imprisonment to death in the electric chair. Instead, he never went to trial, was found insane by the court, and committed to the Federal lunatic asylum. And there he has been, a relatively forgotten man for 12 years.

Tokyo Rose, sentenced to 10 years in jail, is out now. Pound, arrested before Tokyo Rose or Axis Sally, or any of the broadcasters accused of treason, has gotten—according to some—a life sentence to the mental hospital.

One Congressman, North Dakota's maverick, USHER BURDICK, has decided to look into the Pound story. Some say Pound is as sane as the average person. A noted psychiatrist, Dr. Frederic Wertham, of New York, has insisted all along that Pound is sane and shouldn't be at St. E's. Just before the end of the first session of this Congress, Representative BURDICK introduced a bill for an investigation and study into the question of Pound's sanity.

Another legislator, an unidentified Senator, has asked the Library of Congress to prepare a report on the present status—literary, medical, political and juridical—of the 72-year old poet. The Library's study is being made by H. A. Sieber, young modern poet and Library of Congress assistant in political science.

A national civil liberties organization has announced its intention to take the Pound case to the courts, in an effort to obtain his release from the mental institution.

There are several ways of looking at Ezra Pound. He may be a great poet, some say, but he is a traitor and a lunatic. He may be sane and he may be innocent of the charges, some say, but he is no poet, at least, not a great one. He may be innocent and an important writer but he is insane, some say. And so on. There are several ways of looking at Pound. The facts are hard to come by.

As time goes on, Pound's claim to greatness may be proved or disproved. Time, after all, is the literary court with the last word.

But sanity may be just a whisper away from insanity.

And treason may be just a breath apart from patriotism under some circumstances. Hard cases make bad law, it has been said, but (if Congressman BURDICK's plans take hold) the next few months might see the settling of a very difficult case.

When Pound dies, his tombmarker may simply read "Ezra Loomis Pound, American Poet. Born Hailey, Idaho, October 30, 1885. Died ——." A friend of the poet once composed an epitaph for him: "Here lies the Idaho kid. The only time he ever did." Pound himself, in one of his famous Pisan Cantos, has written an appropriate final self-appraisal:

"What thou lovest well remains, the rest is dross.
What thou lovest well shall not be reft from thee.
How mean thy hates
Fostered in falsity, to have gathered from the air a live tradition
Or from a fine old eye
The unconquered flame
This is not vanity.
Here error is all in the not done."

It should not be forgotten, of course, that "the rest is dross."

War Memorial on Corregidor Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. S. DEVEREUX
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Speaker, today, for many of us, the months and years appear to pass by with alarming speed. The days and weeks are not long enough to permit us to complete fully the many tasks and duties of our daily lives.

Sixteen years ago, Mr. Speaker, on May 6, 1942, I had more time on my hands than I knew what to do with. I was in a position of enforced passivity. I was a resident of a Japanese prisoner of war camp.

Today is, therefore, the 16th anniversary of the surrender by Gen. Jonathan Wainwright of the American and Filipino forces on Corregidor Island in Manila Bay.

All of you recall that unhappy event which may be said to have marked the low mark of the ebb tide of our struggle against aggression in the Pacific.

The tide may be said to have actually turned the next day because on May 7 our naval forces in the battle of the Coral Sea sunk the Japanese carrier *Shoho,* and on May 8 damaged the *Shokaku,* thus stopping the seaborne attempt to capture Port Moresby.

In less than a month there was no doubt the tide had started to flood when Admiral Nimitz and his ships won the Battle of Midway on June 6, one of the most decisive battles in naval history and the historic turning point in the Pacific war.

Even though the years since these epochal events have passed all too swiftly I am pleased to note that the Congress has not been oblivious of the successful effort of over 4 million servicemen, and women, and the sacrifice of a hundred thousand who died in defense of our liberties and freedom.

On August 5, 1953, there was enacted into law a bill to establish the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission. Serving on it are 3 Senators, 3 Congressmen, and 3 noncongressional members. During my second term in this body I was proud to accept assignment to this Commission because I believed wholeheartedly that the American people would wish to recognize, by an appropriate form of a memorial, the sacrifices of their fellow countrymen who had achieved victory in the Pacific area in World War II.

Within this vast area and over a period of 4 long years, we suffered initial defeats at Pearl Harbor, Bataan, and Corregidor. But then we regained our freedom of the seas at Midway in June 1942; we held at Guadalcanal in February 1943; we broke through the Bismarks barrier in May 1944; and we reentered the Philippines in November 1944. General MacArthur announced the liberation of the Philippines on July 5, 1945. A month later the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima and victory came with the signing of the surrender documents on September 2 on board the battleship *Missouri.*

The victories leading up to the surrender were of course the result of the combined efforts of our industrial might, our leadership, and the valor and ability of the 4 million men who served in the Pacific area. But in battle there is frequently a time when victory lies in the balance and then the scales are tipped by the bravery of the individual—by the men who die to purchase that victory. It is for them that we are planning the memorial.

It will be a memorial to all the Navy, Marine and Air Corps aviators lost at Midway, but particularly to the crews of the 41 torpedo planes who skimmed low above the water straight toward the 4 Japanese carriers and into their own valley of death. Japanese fighter planes dived down to the attack and left unguarded the air above their carriers. But at this same moment two waves of our dive bombers arrived and found no Japanese Zeros on station to intercept them. Methodically each American pilot brought into his bombsight a carrier flight deck and, when the attack was over, four Japanese carriers were left burning and sinking. Seventy brave men went to gallant deaths in the torpedo planes but the Battle of Midway was won.

It will be a memorial to all the brave men who fought in the battle of Guadalcanal, but particularly to 1 battalion of soldiers and 1 battalion of marines who fought side by side during the crucial night action of October 25, 1942, on the south slope of Bloody Ridge with the vital Lunga airstrip at their backs. It was this brave band who bore the brunt of the last major effort of the Japanese to capture the airfield and drive the Americans into the sea. From immediately after dark until daylight the Japanese kept up their reckless assaults only to be thrown back with ever-mounting casualties. It was this small band of soldiers and marines who broke the last offensive of the enemy ground forces and insured the safety of Guadalcanal.

It will be memorial to all the soldiers who finally broke through the Bismark's barrier and opened the way back to the Philippines, but particularly to Pvt. Rodger Young, who fought on New Georgia in the Solomons. He knew how to move forward but not to retreat. His platoon, fighting in a deep jungle, was pinned down by intense machinegun fire and ordered to withdraw. Young, badly wounded, called out that he could see the Japanese position and crawled toward it. Wounded again, he kept moving forward, firing his rifle and hurling grenades until the enemy gun crew was killed. Rodger Young was awarded the Medal of Honor posthumously.

The tales of individual heroism during the capture of the Philippines are numberless. But there was Sgt. Jose Calugas, a Filipino mess sergeant serving with a battalion of artillery. During the defense of Bataan he saw that one of the guns on the left was not firing. He ran across a wide field raked by enemy machinegun fire to the position of the gun. There he quickly organized a new gun crew and had the gun in action when the

enemy charged. For this act of extreme bravery, he was awarded the Medal of Honor.

It is to honor all of these heroes and all of the thousands who, from December 7, 1941, until September 2, 1945, formed the valiant group that won the battles under the leadership of Admiral Nimitz and General MacArthur. The fame of these leaders will be perpetuated in the history books. Let us perpetuate the bravery of the individuals by means of this memorial which in itself may become an important part of history.

One may ask what will be accomplished by the construction of a magnificent war memorial on Corregidor Island? We, the members of the Commission, believe it will accomplish three significant purposes.

First. It will be a symbol to every survivor of the Pacific war of the months and years of his participation in beating back an aggressor bent on conquest and tyranny. To such a veteran and to the families of those who did not survive it will be well-deserved recognition of each man's contribution—be it large or small—to the war in the Pacific, the greatest feat of arms in all recorded history; its only rival being the European war of World War II.

Second. It will be a symbol to every Filipino who sees it—and they will be numbered by the hundreds of thousands—of the understanding and appreciation in the United States of the Gethsemane they endured through 4 long years in order to stand bravely and fearlessly by the side of an Occidental nation.

Third. The most significant point of all, the memorial will become so strong a symbol of the power of free peoples banded together against despotism and tyranny that it will inspire all peoples to struggle against those enemies of democracy constantly seeking to enslave the body and mind of the individual. As such a font of inspiration it will become a living memorial to encourage the Filipinos and other oriental nations to work unceasingly in the cause of democracy and freedom.

The Commission has been fortunate in obtaining a beautiful and inspiring design for the memorial. During 1956 and 1957 there was held a nationwide competition in which 43 architectural firms participated in strict anonymity. A year ago a distinguished jury of award selected the design submitted by the Seattle firm of Naramore, Bain, Brady & Johanson. The jury of award was composed of Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy; Gen. Walter Krueger, United States Army (retired); Gen. George C. Kenney, United States Air Force (retired); Mr. Pietro Belluschi, dean of the School of Architecture and Planning, MIT; Vice Adm. William O. Hiltabidle, United States Navy (retired); Arthur Brown, Jr.; William Gehron; William J. H. Hough; Lee Lawrie; Frederick V. Murphy; John W. Root.

The design has elicited many expressions of praise from any groups including the National Commission of Fine Arts. It was accepted unanimously by the Philippines National Shrines Commission established in 1954 by President Magsaysay to cooperate with the American Commission.

The Commission has studied several plans developed to raise the cost of construction. It has decided recently on a most fitting and appropriate one. The Department of the Navy is anxious to dispose of a number of obsolete naval vessels in order to reduce the heavy cost of their annual maintenance. The sum realized from the sale of about 29 warships would be relatively small—about 13 to 15 million dollars. Half of this amount would suffice to build the war memorial on Corregidor Island.

Why is this method of obtaining construction funds considered to be fitting and appropriate? Because many of these now obsolete naval vessels saw World War II service in the Pacific and thus became an intangible part of each man who served on board. To put it another way, each man left part of himself in the ship in which he served. He left not only that period of his life measured by his months and years of service, but also his valor and his fears, his hopes and disappointments. Thus each of the ships and the men who fought in them became a unit which paid their part of the price we all paid to purchase victory in the Pacific.

The thought now to dispose of these ships as scrap steel without any final meaningful purpose becomes repugnant. But dispose of them we must. Their annual maintenance costs, we recognize, are prohibitively excessive. Realism requires their eventual disposal, sentiment urges a delay. How best can we reconcile this matter?

A solution is to use part of the steel and bronze from these old war vessels in the actual construction of the memorial—a thousand tons could be so used; and in addition to make available to this Commission funds not to exceed $7½ million from the proceeds of their sale as steel scrap for the purpose of proceeding promptly with the blueprint and construction phase of the memorial.

The thousands who served in these ships and particularly each of the 4 million veterans of the Pacific war will applaud such a decision on the part of the Congress. Token amounts of steel from Army and Air Force sources could be added to the steel from these war vessels to form a cohesive bond between today's efforts to insure security and peace with the efforts of the men whose deeds in the past we wish now to revere and memorialize. To the thousands of veterans who will one day stand before their memorial and recall the years of service they spent in distant lands and on distant seas, the use of these obsolete war vessels as an instrument to create their memorial will seem a highly appropriate and most fitting use.

My colleagues on the Commission, and I, have introduced a bill to accomplish this dedicated purpose. It is H. R. 12353. I earnestly seek your support of this bill if, in your judgment it merits support, when it reaches the floor.

My hope, Mr. Speaker, is that this memorial when erected on Corregidor will become a shrine dedicated not solely to the valor of those who served in our victorious armies and fleets, but to the search of mankind for ultimate peace and freedom throughout the world.

California Facts on Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Mr. Robert McKay, of the California State Teachers Association, before the Sucommittee on General Education of the House Education and Labor Committee, which I believe represents a most valuable contribution to a documentation of the need for Federal aid to education. While Mr. McKay's remarks are directed to the school crisis in California, the problems which he presents so clearly are the same problems which exist throughout the country, and for that reason I include his statement for the interest of all my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF THE CALIFORNIA TEACHERS ASSOCIATION PRESENTED BY ROBERT E. MCKAY, GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS EXECUTIVE, CALIFORNIA TEACHERS ASSOCIATION, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON GENERAL EDUCATION OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, MAY 2, 1958

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Robert E. McKay, of San Francisco. I am governmental relations executive of the California Teachers Association, an organization which with its 94,000 members is the largest statewide professional group in the United States.

I am appearing in support of the principle of Federal aid to education and to urge favorable action on the legislative proposal now being considered by this subcommittee.

I do not propose to repeat the broad economic considerations already submitted which we feel indicate the imperative necessity of the Federal Government shouldering its share of educating the youth of the Nation.

Instead, I should like to confine my discussion in the main to conditions in my home State. I should like to offer evidence that education is a national responsibility that cuts across State lines and that Federal aid is needed by California, a State generally considered to be wealthy and capable of completely meeting its own educational needs without assistance.

I propose to show that the shifting pattern of population in the United States has created a problem of gargantuan size in California, that this problem with its national implications cannot be solved with State and local resources alone, and that Federal funds should and must be used to meet the crisis.

MASS MIGRATION

The overriding consideration in California's educational problem is the unbelievable increase in its population. It is responsible for the critical shortage of classrooms and the equally alarming shortage of properly trained teachers.

History shows that periodically peoples of the world have moved en masse to new

areas, there to make their home. Over the centuries war, pestilence, climate and economic conditions have caused sizable segments of the population to migrate to new and presumably more favorable lands. In most instances they have bundled up their belongings and, of course, their children and moved to what they considered an area of greater opportunity. Usually they took with them little in the way of worldly goods or economic wealth. Invariably, however, they arrived in the new land with needs which had to be met largely by those who had preceded them and established the area.

Such a movement has been underway in the United States for the past 50 years. At the outset the westward trend was so gradual that it was scarcely noted. It started, of course, with the discovery of gold at Sutter's Mill in 1849, but it was not until the turn of the century that it became dramatic, with people by the thousands pouring into California from other states. It has never stopped.

California is the focal point of the greatest mass migration in the history of the world. Her population has more than doubled every 20 years, with the result that she is now second only to New York State in number of inhabitants. And the end is not in sight.

Every day of the year nearly 1,000 residents of other states pack their bags and move to California, there to stay. Yes; nearly 30,000 people a month come streaming across the borders of the Golden State from other parts of the Nation, principally from the East, the South, and the Midwest. When you add to that the product of a high birth rate within the State you find that California is expanding by an average of 45,000 persons a month. That means an annual increase of more than half a million persons, 550,000 to be exact.

This has been a steady, continuing growth, not a sporadic thing, with the rest of the United States contributing the major part of the growth, and a major part of the educational and other problems which accompany such fantastic expansion.

Here, in capsule form, is the story of California's growth:

In 1900 it had grown to a respectable 1,485,000 residents.

Twenty years later it had more than doubled. Its population approximated 3,500,000.

In 1940, just 2 decades later, it hit 6,907,000, just about twice the 1920 figure.

By last year, 1957, it had exploded to 14,160,000 persons, more than doubling again in just 17 years.

With indications that the westward migration will increase rather than decrease, it is now estimated that California's population will exceed 17 million within the next 8 years and will exceed 24 million by 1975.

I have gone into some detail on the nature and extent of California's growth in order that the magnitude of her educational problems may be understood.

SCHOOL HOUSING

The housing of the hordes of school children which accompany such fantastic population increases is a monumental task. California has done her best to mobilize both State and local resources to meet the need; she has not been able to keep abreast of classroom requirements, even though thousands of new schools have been built, and cannot meet the long-range need without assistance.

TEACHER SHORTAGE

The same is true in the field of teacher supply. California has, by straining resources available to it, been able to maintain a high level of salaries for teachers, compared to many areas in the Nation. Consequently it has attracted many teachers from other States. It has stepped up its own program of teacher education, but it still cannot produce or attract enough qualified young people to staff its mushrooming school system.

CLASSROOMS

California's school enrollment has raced along with and at times ahead of the State's population increases.

It took 90 years—between 1849 and 1940—for California to enroll 1 million children in its public schools.

The enrollment of the second million took only 13 years, from 1940 to 1953.

It then took only 5 years, from 1953 to now, for the schools to be jammed with the third million.

And in less than 5 more years, by 1963 at the latest, California will have 4 million children in her schools.

The provision of classrooms for these children is a king-sized undertaking which already is taxing almost to the limit the financial resources of the State of California and her school districts.

Under State law and generally accepted fiscal policies a limit has been set on the amount of money which can be raised from local ad valorem sources for capital outlay. In California this is fixed at 5 percent of the total assessed valuation of the school district. When that limit has been reached the district is prohibited legally from raising additional money, even though it may have thousands of unhoused pupils.

With the full impact of migration and high birth rate just starting to be felt in 1949, California undertook a program under which the State, through general obligation bonds, came to the rescue of these destitute school districts. It has thus far made available to an increasing number of qualified districts a total of $690 million in State aid for school construction. In addition, another State bond issue of $220 million will be voted on by the electors of California in November, bringing to $910 million the amount of aid the State of California has within 10 years poured into what is still only a partial solution of its school-building problem. The State's share of this program has approximated $100 million a year.

The State-aided program has in that 10-year period produced 17,800 new classrooms. That amounts to about 60 percent of the classrooms built in California; the other 40 percent were constructed by school districts which still had local resources available to do the job. The number of districts in this category is dwindling rapidly.

In addition to the sizable amounts provided by the State, local districts have strained their resources to meet the building needs. In the 9 years following World War II, slightly more than half of the $1½ billion of capital outlay was financed from the proceeds of district bond issues—$781 million—or 52 percent.

Despite this prodigious effort California has been unable to keep pace with her classroom needs. The number of children on half-day sessions has increased, not decreased. In 1952, a total of 140,000 pupils were going to school on a double-session basis. Today the number is 163,000, an increase of 23,000 pupils on half-day sessions in the last 6 years.

LOS ANGELES' NEEDS

Perhaps the construction need can be visualized more rapidly if translated into terms of one district's problems. Los Angeles is the largest of California's approximately 2,000 school districts. Its growth is typical of the State, even though some smaller districts are growing more rapidly.

The average annual increase in enrollment of the Los Angeles schools is 30,000 pupils. Just to keep abreast of that growth the district has had to construct an average of 1,000 new classrooms during each of the past 10 years.

The Los Angeles School District must open a new 23-room school every Monday morning simply to meet the increased enrollment.

It still has 34,000 pupils on double sessions, a situation which would require construction of an additional 1,400 classrooms.

Los Angeles spent $52 million last year in capital outlay, for land, buildings, and related facilities. It spends an average of $1 million every week in an attempt to meet its building needs.

To house the children which it knows will be waiting on the doorstep in the next 10 years, California must build an additional 59,000 classrooms.

SALARIES

California traditionally has maintained teacher salary schedules at or near the top in the ranking of the States. Currently the median for all teachers is $5,585 a year. For teachers at the elementary level, where the greatest number serve, it is $5,307 a year. These salaries have been possible only through a relatively high level of State support and high operating taxes locally in most instances.

It might be presumed that comparatively high salaries in a State would eliminate the possibility of a teacher shortage. This has not been the case in California. The level of earnings generally in California is higher than in many other areas, so that the existence of reasonably adequate teachers' salaries does not give the schools the advantage in employing available personnel that it might be presumed to give. The competition of business and industry for trained personnel has made it impossible to properly staff the schools of California.

More than 13,000 teachers are serving in California's schools on substandard or provisional credentials. That amounts to about 10 percent of the total teaching staff in the State. The number of teachers completing requirements in California institutions is falling alarmingly short of the needs. Were it not for teachers moving to California from other States it would be impossible to keep classrooms open even with inadequately trained persons.

California had a shortage of 17,000 teachers this past year. It will need at least 15,000 new teachers each of the next 10 years. This need cannot be met until teachers' salaries are raised to a truly professional level.

RESOURCES NOT AVAILABLE

The twin problems of school construction and teachor shortage are acute in California at this time, but will appear mild when compared with those of the years immediately ahead. When the full impact of population growth and enrollment expansion hits the schools, particularly at the secondary level, the combined resources of local districts and the State simply will be inadequate to meet the needs. In addition, the problems of higher education in California, where more than 190,000 full-time students are already enrolled, are of magnitude similar to those at the elementary and secondary levels which I have described today.

Local school districts are approaching the danger zone in school finance in California. Even though property owners have shown an amazing willingness to shoulder the maximum burden necessary to provide good education, there is a point beyond which land and improvements and other locally taxable wealth cannot safely go. State law in California sets the maximum school tax rates which can be exceeded only by a vote of the electors. A majority of all school districts in the State have voted to exceed those statutory limits, some of them assuming total school tax rates of as much as $6 per $100 of assessed valuation. Local tax sources cannot provide the greatly expanded revenues needed to meet the California problem.

STATE SOURCES

In common with many other States, California faces serious fiscal problems at the State level. Expenditures in the current State budget exceed income by more than $113 million. The 1958–59 budget has been balanced only by the near-exhaustion of all available surplus and reserve funds. California faces the end of its next fiscal year with a potential deficit of $250 million. Revenues for the first 9 months of the current fiscal year have failed by more than $7½ million to equal the estimates on which the budget was based.

Thus, it appears from the fiscal evidence available, that supposedly wealthy California will be unable to solve its problems of school finance from State sources. With local tax sources already strained to the limit, there remains only one logical source of aid, the Federal Government.

A NATIONAL CONCERN

Educational expenses no longer can be paid chiefly by means of a property tax. Our present national income depends more upon economic activity than it does upon fixed property which is declining relatively as a source of governmental support. Corporate profits and compensation of employees now account for about 81 percent of the total national income. These increasing sources of wealth have traditionally paid very little taxes to support the public schools. If such wealth is to carry a portion of the education load, the taxes must be levied by the Federal Government. The most recent analysis available indicates that more than 96 percent of taxes on personal and corporate income are paid to the Federal Government, leaving available to State and local government only a relatively small portion of the taxpaying power of the total economy of the Nation. This broader tax base, we believe, should be utilized for education.

I have attempted to show that education in California, as it is elsewhere, is a national problem. The shift of population across State lines is demonstrated perhaps more dramatically in my home State than in others, but basically the problem is Nationwide in character. The United States has the facilities to meet the challenge. It is our earnest hope that immediate steps will be taken to do so.

The Story of the Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, the current dispute over changes to the United States Capitol is one more index to the beloved place it has in our national affections. To all, it is a revered symbol of our democracy and hundreds of thousands visit it every year as a shrine. It is one of the few real links we have with the infancy of our Nation, recalling as it does the multitude of dedicated men and women who made the United States what it is. With praiseworthy diligence, thousands of our school children are brought here annually.

With the Capitol such an object of devotion and attention, it is strange that for years the average tourist and student has not had a reliable, handy history and guide to the building. Congress has seen this need and attempted to meet it, but the official publications have not been distributed widely enough to meet the need. Most of the historic buildings in metropolitan Washington have been adequately described, but the Capitol was not.

So I am happy to report that the long-felt need for a reliable, complete, and interesting guide to the Capitol is now available.

It is The Story of the Capitol, by Stephen V. Feeley, and is published by Henry J. Stewart, Inc. Both the writer and publisher are Buffalonians and old friends. Before coming to Washington as a newspaper correspondent, Mr. Feeley had made fine contributions to our regional western New York history from his original research. His new book on the Capitol has been praised by historians, educators, and Members of Congress. He brings out many new facts and anecdotes about the venerable Capitol, and he educates in an entertaining fashion.

The publisher is to be commended for assembling text and many pictures into a handsome paperback at reasonable cost.

The new book on the Capitol is available to Members of Congress at the stationery room, and I urge my colleagues to inspect it. They may wish to make it available to schools, libraries, and student groups in their districts. It is a notable contribution to American history, worthy of broad distribution and study.

Time To Decide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I was much impressed by an article by the distinguished columnist Walter Lippmann appearing in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald on the subject of the recession. Those of us in Congress who come from areas badly hit can understand the merit of this article. I hope everyone will read this article and assist us in securing vigorous congressional action at the earliest possible date to help the people affected. I insert the article in the Appendix:

TIME TO DECIDE
(By Walter Lippmann)

With the recession more than 9 months old, the President is still undecided about taking stronger measures to overcome it. He is impressed with a few signs that the decline has begun to slow down, and he is hoping that after a while a recovery is somehow destined to take place. That is what seemed to happen in 1954, and if it happened then, why not now?

There is no proving that the President may not be right in his hopes. But it is quite possible that he may be wrong. For this recession is certainly more severe than the recession of 1953–54. And moreover, the measures have not been taken, namely a big tax cut, which preceded the recovery of 1954. Nor are there many convincing signs that there exists the kind of consumer demand for automobiles, houses, and other durable goods which promoted the boom after 1954.

If the President is wrong in counting upon a recovery beginning this summer, he is taking a very great risk in not setting up stronger measures before the present session of Congress adjourns. It will be a long time from the midsummer of 1958 to the midwinter of 1959. Even supposing that the decline is arrested this summer, if unemployment continues at or near the present level, it may well be profoundly depressing to public confidence if strong measures—that is to say a tax cut and the formation of a long-range spending program—have not been taken.

The situation is one where it is wiser to overinsure rather than to underinsure the economy against what may be at best, as Business Week puts it, "a sluggish, unenthusiastic recovery."

The President might well compare what he is doing today with what was done in the recession of 1953–54. The contrast is striking. For while the earlier recession was much milder than is the present one, the remedial measures taken were much stronger.

It is enlightening at this point to read a chapter entitled "No More 1929's" in Mr. Robert Donovan's authorized book, Eisenhower: The Inside Story. We find there that in the preceding recession, as in this second one, the signs of a decline were clearly evident at the end of the summer. By September 1953 the Cabinet had been warned by the administration's economic advisers that a recession had begun. On September 22, Secretary Humphrey announced in a speech to the American Bankers Association that the administration would make no effort to prevent the tax reductions which, under the Korean war tax legislation, were scheduled to take effect 3 months later, on December 31, 1953. On that date the excess profits tax was to expire; so, too, was the 10 percent emergency increase in personal taxes, and there were to be some reductions in excise taxes.

All in all, at the first sign of the recession the taxpayers were assured of a large relief to begin within a few months. The tax reduction was in the order of $7½ billion a year.

There are reasons for thinking that Secretary Humphrey's speech in September was not primarily meant to announce a policy to combat the recession. Then as now, he was a firm believer in balancing the budget at a lower rate of taxation and of expenditure. Without relation to the recession he may have been for the tax reduction of 1954, knowing that in the coming Eisenhower budget there would be a continuing cut in expenditures.

But the fact remains that President Eisenhower and Secretary Humphrey did in 1953 what a growing body of expert opinion today would have the administration do now. When the recession of 1953 was detected, a big tax reduction was announced, and this tax relief took effect in the months before the recession ended in June 1954.

The President might also take a look at what happened in the Truman recession of 1948–49. Then, before the recession got started, there was a tax cut. The President should find it entertaining to recall that this tax cut was enacted by the Republican Congress and that it was passed over the veto of Harry S. Truman. This tax cut, plus, of course, the big public spending which began in 1949 under the Marshall plan, are almost certainly why the Truman recession did not last very long.

Experience indicates, therefore, that in the postwar era the recessions have been short

and mild because there has been early tax relief. Since the end of the World War the American economy has faltered three times. In the two earlier recessions, which proved to be mild and short, there were tax cuts before recovery. In the first there was also a big spending program, the Marshall plan.

In the second, there was a great private spending boom, activated by the pent-up demand after the austerity of the Korean war and financed by an enormous extension of consumer credit and a boom in capital investment.

This third postwar recession is plainly worse than its two predecessors. But this time there is no tax reduction. This time there is no public spending program to compensate for the decline in private investment. This time there are no signs, indeed quite the contrary, that there is a large pent-up consumer demand for the durable goods that are now depressed.

Is it, then, wise, is it safe, to ignore our experience and to put off from month to month the decision to take strong measures, hoping that something will happen to make them unnecessary?

Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to find that unemployment statistics for the city of Detroit and the State of Michigan have again risen. The number of unemployed has risen and is now 275,000, or 18 percent of the labor force in Detroit, and 465,000, or 15.9 percent of the labor force in Michigan. According to the Michigan Employment Security Commission the current jobless total is the largest since 1938. The increase in unemployment in Michigan was 49,000 between March 15 and April 15..

It is imperative that immediate action be taken by the Congress to alleviate this critical condition.

I insert herewith three articles from the Detroit News describing the present economic situation:

JOBLESS MARK HITS 18 PERCENT IN CITY—15.9 PERCENT IN STATE

More than 22,000 Detroit-area workers were added to the jobless rolls in the first 2 weeks of April as the community's unemployment rose to 275,000, or 18 percent of the labor force.

The continued slump was general in Michigan. The total increased to 465,000, or 15.9 percent of the labor force.

These figures were announced Friday by the Michigan Unemployment Security Commission, which also disclosed the record load of idled workers had cut the unemployment insurance trust fund to below $200 million.

As the employment rolls dropped, the Michigan Employment Security Commission feared the State constitution might prevent Michigan from participating in the extended jobless-aid program now being studied by Congress.

The barrier is a provision that forbids the incurring of State debts in excess of $250,000 without approval of the voters.

Attorney General Paul Adams will be asked to rule on whether the constitutional amendment is applicable in the present case.

While 49,000 persons in Michigan joined the unemployed ranks, between March 15 and April 15, the number of persons working in Detroit stood at 1,241,000 and in the State at 3,308,000.

Currently, 350,000 persons are drawing unemployment benefits from the Michigan Employment Security Commission. Another 56,663 exhausted their benefits in the first 4 months of 1958.

These persons would benefit under the proposed Federal-aid extension of jobless benefits in Michigan by 13 weeks.

The Michigan Employment Security Commission also sought some way to charge additional costs of administering the emergency extension of benefits to those employers with the largest number of workers idle.

Michigan Employment Security Commission said the current jobless total is unquestionably the largest since 1938. But the State has no records before 1949.

Previous peaks in the last 10 years were in September 1954, when 271,000 were out of work in Michigan, and in December 1949, when 350,000 were unemployed.

Max M. Horton, Michigan Employment Security Commission director, said he didn't think the situation would worsen appreciably, but neither did he see an upturn before fall.

He predicted that the unemployment list would be further expanded in June when high school graduates and college students enroll for jobs and are automatically added to those out of work.

APRIL AUTO PRODUCTION CUT SHARPLY

Further cuts in domestic passenger-car production in April reduced dealer inventories to about 800,000 units, down 60,000 from April 1, Ward's Automotive Reports said Friday.

"It is likely," said Ward's, "that the industry's severe manufacturing cuts will persist throughout the summer, a prelude to some of the earliest shutdowns for model changeovers since the pre-1940 period."

The statistical firm tallied April car production at 316,503 units, lowest for the month since 1948. The total compared with 357,049 in March and 548,656 in April 1957.

Car production was up 35.8 percent this week, Ward's said, despite the closing of 12 of the industry's 48 assembly plants. The week's total was 79,661 cars, compared to 58,664 last week.

IDLE BENEFIT ROLLS IN UNITED STATES DECREASE

WASHINGTON.—Unemployment as measured by the unemployment compensation system showed the first improvement in many weeks in late April, the Labor Department said Friday. Part of the improvement was seasonal.

Both initial claims and insured unemployment were down notably in the latest reporting week. Initial claims are a measure of new layoffs.

In the week ended Apirl 19 insured unemployment fell by 30,742 to 3,332,602. This was 8 percent of the labor force, compared with the record 8.1 percent of the previous week. The total was still more than double a year ago, however.

Initial claims in the week ended April 26 were down 23,335 to 423,031.

The Labor Department said the improvement in both measures was partly due to a pickup in outdoor work, particularly construction.

California showed much the biggest change, with a drop of 22,400 in insured unemployment.

States with increases included Tennessee with 10,100, Michigan with 5,100, and Ohio with 4,000.

The report also said the number of persons exhausting their benefit rights in the 8 large States that report weekly fell in the week ended April 26 to 24,500, down 800 from the week before.

The issue of exhausted benefits—and ways to extend them—again dominated the recession front in Washington Friday.

President Eisenhower was said to be gratified by House approval of a modified version of his plan for a 50-percent extension of benefits, in substitution for a more liberal and costly Democratic plan.

The first signs of a fight in the Senate on the issue appeared as Senator DOUGLAS Democrat of Illinois, said: "We have got to improve on the House bill."

DOUGLAS, a member of the Finance Committee, said it should provide for extension of benefits for 16 weeks, should help unemployed workers not covered by the benefit system, should not require special sessions of State legislatures to take effect and should make a start toward improving State benefit amounts.

In a related development, the House Appriations Committee approved a second urgent deficiency appropriation for the relatively small federally financed unemployment compensation system for Korean war veterans and Federal workers. The amount was $26 million.

The House Banking Committee heard H. Christian Sonne, head of the National Planning Association, recommend a tax cut of $7 to $8 billion to assure a vigorous recovery from the recession.

Sonne said he felt the dip in the economy "will probably come to an early halt."

But he said it is "most doubtful that in the near future we will be back on the road toward a satisfactory level of activities if we wait for the forces of the market to resume their expansion."

A tax cut, plus a probable increase in spending of about $4 billion "seems to be large," Sonne said. But he argued it was "not too large if seen in the perspective of the task, namely raising production by $30 to $40 billion."

The Late W. C. Handy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, when the evening sun set for W. C. Handy, the author of Memphis Blues, St. Louis Blues, Beale Street Blues, and the Harlem Blues, America lost one of its great composers.

Mr. Handy had a varied and interesting life. One time, when I heard him play the St. Louis Blues and the Memphis Blues on his famous trumpet, he remarked to me afterward that he really liked the melody of the Memphis Blues better than anything else which he had written. There was probably some sentiment about this, because it was his first composition, which he arranged and played at the rallies of Mr. Edward Crump in his first campaign for mayor of Memphis, Tenn.

The man in Tennessee who was closest to Mr. Handy and in whose home he visited once a year is Lt. George W. Lee, and he has written a memorial, I Knew Handy, which I am presenting for the RECORD. Lieutenant Lee, who is grand commissioner of education, Improved Benevolent Order of Elks of the World, is an outstanding orator. He was selected by the late Robert A. Taft to second his nomination at the national convention in 1952.

I KNEW HANDY

(By George W. Lee)

MEMPHIS, TENN.—"I hate to see the evening sun go down," is a line in the St. Louis Blues, which hangs in the American mind like tinsels on a Christmas tree.

For W. C. Handy, the composer of this immortal tune, the evening sun has gone

down for the last time beyond Old Man River. But like Old Man River the melody of his sad, sweet songs will just keep rolling along through the corridors of the centuries and baffle the mists of time.

I once asked W. C. Handy what made him great. He pondered the question for a moment, and finally, when he lifted his head to answer, a strange light was in his eyes. He said slowly, "I don't know about being great, I just love people, and I love doing things to glorify them."

Handy loved Beale Street. I am sure of that. He spent a life in full service to all its demands and its traditions, its weaknesses, and its ecstasies. To him there were humor, pathos, and drama in that crooked little street which sprang as from some miasmic dream of a paved Congo, the jerky pantomime of plaint and piety, suppressions, and sensuousness which were the outer soul of the Negro come to the American town.

Handy had been blind for years, but he could see though his eyes were closed. Louise Handy, his loyal and faithful wife, was his eyes.

He had been married once before to Mrs. Elizabeth Handy, the companion of his youth and years, who died in 1937.

Last Friday, at 3 o'clock in the morning, at the Sydenham Hospital in New York, he passed quietly into another world, at a time when he didn't have to see the evening sun go down. There were those about his bedside who saw him come to the end of his day long before the night had fallen from heaven on a rope of twilight—W. C. Handy, Jr., Wyer Handy, his two sons; Charles Handy, a brother; Mrs. Catherine Lewis, a daughter; Mrs. Handy, and William Handy, a grandson. From the ends of the earth other mourners came, as thick as grief.

Rivers full of muddy water have rolled down to the sea since that night back in 1909 when Handy first got a blues song right in his head and set it down on music paper. A million bands have gone to town on that song, the Memphis Blues. A million voices have echoed it like winged music through eternity and a million juke boxes have swelled up loud in smoke-laden night clubs from Beale Street to a crossroad shack in the Montana plains.

For the past 40 years America has been singing Handy's first song, the Memphis Blues. Its mood and melody have resounded around the world. Its melody created the St. Louis Blues, which went with President Harding's flagship to Alaska and to Washington to entertain Ramsey MacDonald. But the father of the blues has no more melody in his soul, nor will he listen again to one of his great sacred songs: They That Sow in Tears Shall Reap in Joy.

The life of W. C. Handy and the story of how he originated the blues have been told many times. He has been honored by everybody. His hometown of Florence, Ala., recently erected a handsome ultra-modern public school in his honor. Memphis has a town square named after him, and St. Louis has a scholarship fund in his name to be awarded annually to worthy Negro and white youngsters with musical talent.

The fund offices will be housed in a new building to be erected on the spot where Handy once slept as a hobo. The huge clock on its facade will play the opening bars of the St. Louis Blues on the hour.

Handy made a long step from Alabama to the advancing wave of circumstances on which he advanced himself to one of the high pinnacles of earthly grandeur and renown.

He was born on November 16, 1873, in Florence, Ala. As a child he was thrilled by the singing of his people. In his 10th year, he could read music at sight and he had a good tenor voice. His father and mother wanted him to be a minister, but Handy wanted to be a musician. His first step was to get enough money to pay for instructions. To this end, he left home and walked all the way to Birmingham, where he taught school for a while.

When the depression that marked the Cleveland administration brought general unemployment, he joined a saloon quartet and set out for the world's fair at Chicago. The singers had no money, so they hopped a freight train and attempted to beat their way west. Luckily for them, the brakeman who discovered them had a weakness for songs, so with cornet and guitar, as Handy said, "they soothed his savage breast," and instead of being red-lighted, they were conducted to a caboose deluxe.

In 1897 Handy returned to Alabama and taught vocal and band music at the Agricultural and Mechanical College in Huntsville. His life at this period was restless, interspersed with travel in Mexico, Cuba, and Canada. Handy, the composer, had not found himself. It was in Memphis, Tenn., where Handy received the impetus that sent him along the road to renown.

Through the mist of the years he beheld the golden towers of his dreams rise at last against a background of reality. A great impulse to set the songs of the cottonpickers, the work songs of the railroad, the river songs of the roustabouts who made music as they worked. To them singing was a necessity, rather than a luxury. W. C. Handy, who like Stephen Foster, brooded over the songs of the Negro flowing in quick tears and laughter straight from his unhappy heart. So, in Memphis, Handy emphasized the native and nationalistic element of these songs and gave them as an enduring gift to America's treasury of music.

A political situation in 1909 afforded nationwide publicity for Handy and his new music. In that year Williams, Talbot, and E. H. Crump were running for election for mayor of Memphis. Jim Mulchay, political ward boss, hired Handy to play for Crump. Echford and Bynam bands were employed for the other two candidates. In order to outdo these two great bands, Handy was spurred to creative efforts. Down in Clarksville, Miss.; in St. Louis, Mo.; in Evansville, Ind.; in Henderson, Ky., and later on Beale Street, Handy had devoted himself to acquiring the material and atmosphere which would some day aid him in making a musical rendition of Negro folk songs.

Now he found his store of knowledge useful in another way. His band opened the campaign at Main and Madison with a piece called Mr. Crump, a composition which took the shape of the inevitable results of the tempo of cotton-picking work songs along the aching side of old man river, of happy nights in the pleasure palaces strung out along Beale Street, and the privation of poverty-chinked cabins and slender precarious meals.

The crowd in the streets literally went wild over it. They shouted until they were hoarse, demanding to hear it again and again. They whistled and danced with the rhythmic sway of the music as the words came with the drift of the wind:

"Mr. Crump don't 'low no easy riders here,

"Mr. Crump won't 'low no easy riders here.

"I don't care what Mr. Crump don't 'low,

"I'm gonna bar'l-house anyhow.

"Mr. Crump can go and catch hisself some air."

That tune was the vehicle which carried two to victory. Handy rode on it from Beale Street to Broadway. Crump to 25 years of undisputed political leadership in Memphis. After the election, the Mr. Crump song was changed and titled "Memphis Blues" and offered for publication. After every publisher in the country had turned it down as worthless, it was sold to T. C. Bennett, a young white man, head of the music department of a department store, for $100. The young white man made a fortune out of the Memphis Blues.

Handy's next number, the St. Louis Blues, suffered the same fate with the publishers as did the Memphis Blues. When the publishers rejected it and laughed at him, he became discouraged and laid it aside. Finally, he organized the Pace and Handy Music Co. to publish the St. Louis Blues.

This little song about the man stealing a woman with her diamond rings, has sold more than 2 million copies, is played and recorded in almost every country on the map and has become one of America's national anthems.

The growth of Handy's music in our time has a consequence which is still impossible to determine. I think, some day this music called the blues, will provide the raw material which will stimulate American culture.

There are many people in these vast United States, who have become famous in the field of music, but without a doubt the leader and dean of them all is the late W. C. Handy, famous for composing and writing the Memphis, the St. Louis, the Beale Street Blues and in addition, many sacred songs that America is now listening to, such as They That Sow in Tears Shall Reap in Joy.

The last time Handy was a visitor in my home, he said that Handy Brothers Music Co. was about to publish an outstanding symphony called Blue Destiny. The first movement would be based on the St. Louis Blues, the second movement on the Beale Street Blues, the fourth movement based on the Harlem Blues and the Memphis Blues.

So, the dean of American music has passed. He brought to the American public songs that the heart cannot tell in its own futile terms, but must borrow out of travesty and fervent plant, the wails from which he drew his own great songs.

The Beale Street Blues, the Memphis Blues, the St. Louis Blues hold fast to something deep down inside of one. They are more than songs. They are a loving, shining symbol that only the soul of man can understand.

Loyalty Day 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in over 700 communities of the United States, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States through their local posts sponsored Loyalty Day ceremonies.

On Saturday, May 3, 1958, I delivered the following speech at Ebensburg, Pa., in connection with the Loyalty Day program sponsored by the Lt. W. Garfield Post No. 4963, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States:

LOYALTY DAY 1958: SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE LOYALTY DAY CEREMONIES, SPONSORED BY LT. W. GARFIELD POST NO. 4963, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, EBENSBURG, PA., MAY 3, 1958

Mr. Chairman, I consider it an honor to have been invited to join you in your annual observance of Loyalty Day.

As many of you know I am a next door neighbor and have visited Ebensburg many times in my capacity as a Member of Con-

gress and as a veterans leader. On every occasion I have enjoyed mingling with you.

You who make up the membership of Ebensburg post No. 4963 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars are to be commended not only for your accomplishments in the field of patriotism, but especially for today's parade, and for this evening's spendid meeting.

As a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars I want to join you in giving our great organization the credit it is entitled to for launching an annual nationwide observance of Loyalty Day.

I can recall a period many years ago when the Veterans of Foreign Wars decided to establish an annual demonstration of loyalty on the part of real Americans as a counter-offensive to the May Day celebration of the Communists and their fellow travelers.

This year, as in previous years, from one end of the country to the other hundreds of communities are matching your Loyalty Day celebration with a similar observance.

In each instance you will find spearheading the observance, your organization and mine, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

It is fitting that the Veterans of Foreign Wars play such an important role, because it is an organization composed of men who defended their country on the field of battle.

Today as veterans of various wars we refuse to compromise on the principles of true Americanism.

I am not going to confine my remarks solely to our veteran population. But to the contrary, what I have to say here tonight about Loyalty Day is directed to every liberty-loving American.

Loyalty Day, May 1, as a counter observance to the May Day celebration of the Communists, provides an appropriate occasion to lay stress on our blessings as a people.

Moreover, since loyalty is everybody's job, it presents an excellent time to point out the danger of subversive forces within, and the peril of international gangsterism without.

This two-pronged danger should influence intelligent citizens to work more resolutely for a strong united America wherein lies our hope for survival in a divided world.

Never has this Nation been under such a ruthless attack as that levied upon us by Soviet Russia in the form of a cold war. To meet this challenge to our national security we must at all times be vigilant and strong.

In this connection the important sources of our strength as a Nation comprise three major factors:

1. Religion and the Bible.
2. Schools and the education of youth.
3. Americanism and love of country.

From these three basic elements of true Americanism were derived the power and inspiration that built and preserved the Republic. Let us consider them.

First, it should never be forgotten that the vital factor in the moral integrity of an individual and a nation lies in the field of religion.

Our belief in Almighty God is now in a death struggle for survival against Soviet Russia which is dedicated to atheistic communism. This was reflected best by the Communist leader, Lenin, when he said that religion is an opiate of the people.

Recently Mr. Khrushchev said that 99 percent of all Russia is atheistic.

In contrast, Daniel Webster, in commenting on our forefathers who had left the persecutions and restricted opportunities of the Old World, said: "The Bible came with them and it is not to be doubted that to the free and universal reading of the Bible in that age men were much indebted for their right views of civil liberty."

Yes, Daniel Webster considered the Bible "a book which teaches man his own individual responsibility, his own dignity, and his equality with his fellow man."

You and I know that laws are never sufficient without a spiritual desire to comply with them. An adequate definition of spiritual values is difficult.

Yet we know what happens when men have proper respect for Almighty God.

Such men have a deep reservoir of moral strength. Such men are courageous, sincere, honest, patient, and capable of meeting adversity as they discharge their obligations as American citizens.

As I mentioned a moment ago, religion, now seriously challenged, has inspired the greatest leaders of our civilization, and clothed all mankind with the human dignity intended by God.

Since we know that western civilization and the Judeo-Christian religion are at stake, there is a pressing need for militant religion to meet the definite challenge. That means the necessity for rallying to the old slogan and battle cry of "loyalty to God and country," which, interpreted in the words of scripture and in the fine tradition of our civilization, is: "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's."

The second vital factor to be considered is our schools and the education of our youth.

It was realized by the Founding Fathers that the spreading of knowledge and wisdom among the body of the people was the major means of determining whether the rights and liberties of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights would be preserved.

But little did our Founding Fathers know there would in time arise in the ranks of educators and social scientists some, and I repeat some, who would attempt gradually to educate the basic philosophy of our Republic away. Teachers who would advocate alien ideologies and a one-world government.

This form of creeping socialism, which has often been used as a veiled protest against the American way of life, moved in upon the American educational system and the country in general in a sly and sneaking manner.

For example, by 1949 resolutions petitioning Congress to consider world government had been adopted by 23 State legislatures, although others had earlier repudiated this movement.

But since 1950, after the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the DAR and other patriotic organizations had brought the true meaning of one-world government to the attention of the various State legislatures, 21 of the 23 States rescinded their previous action.

It should also be remembered that this idea of one-world government was, and is still, being taught in some schools.

Let me make it clear that there is no question of a teacher's right to accept, and as a citizen to promote outside the classroom, the premise that capitalism will, or should, be replaced by socialism or any of the numerous forms of world government.

But it is entirely different when teachers use their profession, when appearing before involuntary audiences of their pupils, to become agents, propagandists, and advocates of alien ideologies.

While this has been going on, many teachers neglected to instruct the youth committed to their care in the responsibilities of American citizenship.

In short, let me state frankly that people who are employed to teach the American philosophy of government along with the three "R's" are by no stretch of imagination supposed to advocate to students dreamland forms of government or other radical changes in our social order that would displace the American system which has made us free, prosperous, and mighty as a nation.

I warn all of you tonight to stop, look, and listen. Then think and act as you consider the education of American youth.

Ask yourself this question. Is the curriculum in the schools of the Nation based on historic American principles? What is taught of the meaning of freedom?

Are the young people learning anything about our American heritage and what it has given, and is giving today, to civilization?

Is there anything said about the Christian heritage?

What is being taught the millions of young future voters in our schools about the high duty of loyalty to country?

Frankly, we can render our country and our family no greater service than to insure that our children become loyal, thinking Americans.

Let us not forget that the philosophy of government which controls American youth will control this Nation and possibly the world.

We should also remember that reliable and well-informed sources tell us that cunning forces are working against us in the field of education.

We, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, believe that the third and last great factor needed to inspire and strengthen us as a people is a double-barreled dose of good old-fashioned Americanism. It will give us a keener and deeper appreciation of our American system of government and those who founded and preserved it.

It will continue to inspire us to keep faith with those illustrious Americans who gave their lives on the altar of freedom.

After all, when we as Americans realize the true value of our blessings, then we will give full time to promoting an unadulterated type of real love of country.

All of these things are part and parcel of the broad field of true Americanism.

I say to you, true Americanism is the most effective antidote to godless communism and the ruthless cold war challenge of Soviet Russia.

By working together to protect, preserve, and to promote American ideals we repay our debt to the American way of life that has done more for more people than any form of government yet devised.

One of the most inspiring features of loyalty day parades such as your parade is the participation of proud Americans whose ancestry may be traced to foreign lands yet who appreciate the precious blessings they enjoy as American citizens.

Loyalty day definitely provides a time for us to examine and restate in terms of today's needs the rights and responsibilities of American citizenship.

Furthermore this will be stimulated throughout the year by an added emphasis on the education of youth, the religious foundation of the American way of life, and by individual and collective effort to learn more of the history and ideals of our great American heritage of liberty and freedom.

As I conclude let me leave this thought with you:

Today we are hearing a lot about the so-called wave of hysteria and fear resulting from the efforts to ferret out Communists and subversive elements in every walk of life.

Let us assure you that we have nothing to fear as a nation if every American worthy of the name will measure up to the high standards of citizenship as embodied in the type of Americanism exemplified by our forefathers and defended to this day on the field of battle by succeeding generations.

In short, these are perilous times, for the Soviet challenge to the American way of life was never more real or of a more definite threat.

Therefore as I conclude this loyalty day address let us heed the stern admonition of George Washington, that in times of dire emergency we should make certain that we put only Americans on guard.

Judicial Powers Differ in Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Stroudsburg, Pa., Daily Record of May 2, 1958:

JUDICIAL POWERS DIFFER IN COURTS

(By Hon. Chester H. Rhodes, president judge, Pennsylvania Superior Court)

The present system of courts in Pennsylvania consists of the appellate courts (the supreme and the superior courts) and the district or county courts.

The supreme court has the ultimate judicial power in Pennsylvania. There is no further appeal unless a Federal question or the United States Constitution is involved. In that event the United States Supreme Court may ultimately determine the controversy.

The Pennsylvania Supreme Court was first established by the Provincial Assembly on May 22, 1722. It consisted of the chief justice and two associate justices who held sessions in Philadelphia. They also traveled throughout the colony for the trial of cases.

At the present time, justices of the supreme court still have the power to sit in the local courts in serious criminal cases. This power is rarely exercised. The number of justices of the supreme court was increased to 4 in 1767; it was reduced to 3 in 1809; it was increased to 5 in 1826; the constitution of 1874 increased the number to 7.

By the earlier constitution of 1776 it was provided that the justices be appointed by the president of the provincial council for a term of 7 years. By the constitution of 1790 they were given life tenure. In 1838 the term was fixed at 15 years. In 1850 the constitution of 1838 was amended to make the judiciary elective.

A justice of the supreme court today serves for 21 years, and is not eligible for reelection. The justice with the oldest commission is designated the chief justice.

The Commonwealth is presently divided into three districts in which the supreme court convenes—eastern district at Philadelphia; middle district at Harrisburg; and western district at Pittsburgh.

The supreme court is essentially an appellate court, but it has original jurisdiction in certain specific matters which include habeas corpus, mandamus, writ of prohibition, title to office.

The superior court was created in 1895 to relieve the appellate burden of the supreme court. The court is composed of the president judge and 6 other judges, all of whom are elected by the voters of the State at large for terms of 10 years. They may be reelected.

The court sits in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Harrisburg, and Scranton. It has original jurisdiction in cases of mandamus and prohibition as well as in habeas corpus.

Like the supreme court, the superior court is essentially an appellate court. The appellate jurisdiction of the superior court lies principally in three categories—criminal, civil, and administrative.

Appeals in all criminal cases except felonious homicide are taken to the superior court. The same is true of divorce cases. The superior court hears appeals from the courts of quarter sessions, the Municipal Court of Philadelphia County, and the County Court of Allegheny County.

Appeals from the various State departments and administrative agencies, such as the public utility commission, the unemployment board of review, the workmen's compensation board, are taken exclusively to the superior court. In some instances there is an intermediate appeal from a department or an administrative agency, such as the workmen's compensation board, to a local court before it reaches the superior court. Appeals from the revocation or suspension of drivers' licenses are in this category.

With the exception of those rare instances when the appellate courts exercise original jurisdiction, all litigation orginates in the county courts, the administrative agencies, or the minor judiciary.

The principal local courts are designed as the court of common pleas. Their origin, as previously indicated, may be traced from early English history through colonial times. We have a minor judiciary of limited jurisdiction both civil and criminal. This is made up of justices of the peace, aldermen, and magistrates.

The Pennsylvania constitution of 1874, which is presently in force, provided that the courts of common pleas should continue as then established, and that not more than four counties should be included in any one judicial district.

In districts composed of more than one county there are associate judges who are lay persons not learned in the law. They have considerable power which is seldom exercised.

The office of associate or lay judge not learned in the law is as old as the judicial system in Pennsylvania. In 1834 the legislature first required certain associate judges to be learned in the law. Gradually "learned in the law" became a requisite qualification for the office of judge of the various local and statewide courts.

In the constitution of 1874 the office of associate judge not learned in the law was abolished in all counties forming separate judicial districts. In those counties not forming a separate judicial district, such as Monroe and Pike Counties, there are two lay judges in each county, as well as a president judge who must be learned in the law. He, of course, is Judge Fred W. Davis in our district.

Any two of the judges may hold a court of common pleas, a court of quarter sessions, or the orphans' court.

President Judge Davis may hold a court of common pleas or orphans' court without any of the associates; he must be present with an associate to constitute a court of oyer and terminer and general jail delivery.

On questions of law the associate judges are bound by the determination of the president judge. On questions of fact or in the exercise of certain discretion the judgment of the majority of the judges prevails. Although associate judges have these broad powers, they rarely exercise them.

A comprehensive treatise on this subject was prepared by the late Frank B. Holmes, Esq., of the Monroe County Bar, and presented before the Monroe and Pike County Bar Associations on June 16, 1936, at Milford, Pa.

A Bad Veto for Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from a recent edition of the Tulsa Tribune. This newspaper, which is generally regarded as Republican and which supported President Eisenhower in both 1952 and 1956, criticizes the ill-timed veto of S. 497, the omnibus rivers and harbors bill.

The editorial follows:

A BAD VETO FOR OKLAHOMA

Thirty thousand new jobs will be needed in eastern Oklahoma in the next 5 years to bring this area up to the employment level of the rest of the State, Governor Gary's economic development commission has been informed.

The Governor will call railroad executives and other business leaders together next month to consider a program to produce these jobs. There is no doubt in their minds that the area involved is Oklahoma's No. 1 economic problem. That is why President Eisenhower's veto of the rivers and harbors authorization bill the other day was a body blow to Oklahoma.

There were, of course, political and economic reasons for the veto, and it has been hokum for the Democrats to describe it as a measure aimed at relieving current unemployment. It takes some years to convert an authorization project into one under construction. The first duty of the President and Congress is to afford immediate relief from the hardships of the depression. The President signed the additional highway bill in preference to the rivers and harbors measure for the reason, doubtless, that he thought it could be translated into jobs sooner.

But one of the reasons the President gave for his veto was his opposition to authorization of a series of reservoirs in the mountains of four of Oklahoma's problem counties—McCurtain, Choctaw, Pushmataha, and Le Flore. We can't accept that silently. Oklahoma Democrats and Republicans alike should lay aside partisanship and submit the facts to the White House so this error will not be repeated.

In 1956 the average income per capita in the 4 counties was under $750, less than half the average for Oklahoma, and barely 38 percent of the national average.

One dollar out of each eight came in public welfare assistance payments. Today a fourth of the population is receiving Federal surplus commodities.

Twenty-five years ago much of the South looked like that statistically. It was called America's No. 1 economic problem. While it still lags behind the Nation, one of the reasons it has made great strides forward has been the private industry growth which accompanied such public developments as TVA. Not many Americans today are worried about having to support the South during the next century.

The four Oklahoma counties, in which the reservoirs contemplated in the public works authorization bill are located, would benefit greatly by a similar but smaller development ignited by the Federal Government. They are rich in natural resources. They have rainfall ranging up to an annual average of 50 inches. They have fine stands of timber as well as coal. The water is the finest in quality to be found anywhere.

Today they elect 3 State senators and 6 State representatives who have no other job but to saddle as much of the cost of their local governments and schools upon the rest of the State as possible. Through matching money supplied from Washington they are a great burden to the country. This will go on for years unless a bold plan of reform is executed. The water development scheme was such a one.

The President is right in asking that it be clearly pointed out where the Federal interest lies in these projects. We have suggested

one area. Flood control on the Red and Mississippi Rivers is another. Some of the dams will provide electric power. Others will be excellent municipal water supplies and should be revenue producing. The recreation possibilities are great. None of the land to be inundated has a present-day value that amounts to much.

The Federal Government is carrying out scores of developments that have fewer possibilities for public good and United States money saving than these. Unless it intends to go out of this business it mustn't draw the line when it comes to Oklahoma.

Cultural Achievements in Israel Marking 10th Anniversary Hold Lesson for United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Israel's 10th anniversary sees some 40 institutions established in the graphic and performing arts, as well as in archeology and literature which are beneficiaries of the America-Israel Cultural Foundation. The Israel Philharmonic Symphony, ranking among the world's leading orchestras, now plays in its own air-conditioned, acoustically perfect $2,500,000 Frederic R. Mann auditorium in the new cultural center in Tel Aviv. Though this auditorium seats 2,800, each program must be repeated several times to meet the demands of avid, would-be ticket buyers. An academy of music is being completed, and the Israel Opera Company has become well-established. Six professional theater companies and 100 amateur and semi-amateur troupes perform throughout the country, while Tilon, a children's theater, has just received official recognition from the Ministry of Education and Culture.

In the reassessment of American education which is taking place today it will be helpful, I think, to look at what one of the youngest nations—and one of the oldest peoples—in the world is doing in art, music, and the theater since these are considered to be frills by some critics of education but certainly not by many of the ablest educators and leading scientists. Hope for a better program of education lies, I think, in the broad agreement which, in reality, exists among leading protagonists on both sides of the current debate as to what constitutes frills and what is basic.

American schools have done a tremendous job in educating people at a rate beyond the dreams of most nations. Such a quantitative achievement was bound to hit some snags but in the debate over what constitutes a worthwhile education program, as Life magazine said in a recent editorial which it reprinted in the New York Times of March 26, 1958:

It serves no purpose to polarize the educational debate by shouting "un-American" at the late John Dewey's bones (a distinctive Americanism, in fact, was one of Dewey's intellectual boasts), or by making blanket denunciations of frills in education (if how to run a beauty shop has no place in a general high-school curriculum, a good challenging music-appreciation course very definitely has). * * *

Years of barren discussion courses in English have made a whole generation chronically incoherent in the English language (the mutterings of a United States teen-ager trying to discuss his beliefs generally sound like a sanitized version of Elvis Presley). * * * Surely the history of the Crusades can give a young American a better grasp of the problems implicit in the U. N. or NATO than dressing up as a Pakistani delegate in an imitation U. N. assembly at school. * * *

The worthwhile innovations in method brought by Dewey's educationists should be kept. But their exclusive devotion to techniques and group adjustment should never again be allowed to hide this fact: American education exists first of all to educate the individual in a body of learning, with a tradition and purpose behind it.

A man so educated is far better equipped as a democratic citizen than the merely well adjusted. For he will have not only the social ease to make his civilization comfortable, but the intellectual discipline to help save it.

Dr. Eugene Rabinowitz, atomic scientist, in an address before the 44th annual meeting of the American Association of University Professors, held this year in Denver, Colo., has said:

It is not enough to teach the scientist some philosophy, some history, and some sociology or awaken his interest in art. He has to learn to integrate science with the humanities and not place the two mechanically one beside the other.

Dr. Louis B. Wright, Director of the Folger Shakespeare Library and an outstanding student of 18th century America, recently declared the United States is a great Nation today because Washington, Jefferson, John Adams, Marshall, Franklin, and a host of others "were intelligent, patriotic, and frequently wise." He went on to say that in many ways these men "represent a striking contrast to the 20th century, which has placed its highest emphasis upon material success and has scorned learning."

Dr. Wright added:

Our whole social structure depends on the creation of evermore material desires, which we must satisfy by expanding our credit. We are mortgaging our souls and the souls of all future Americans at the behest of Madison Avenue. For what? For bigger and longer motor cars, loaded with useless gewgaws, designed in the most vulgar taste imaginable.

And now, forsooth, we are told that to be patriots we must rush out and buy these monuments of vulgarity to keep our economy healthy—and the manufacturers wealthy and happy. Apparently it has never occurred to the makers of motor cars that the manufacture of a sensible car within the financial range of the average citizen would be a patriotic—and a profitable—enterprise.

HADASSAH NEWSLETTER, APRIL 1958, REPORT ON CULTURAL ACTIVITY OF THE AVERAGE ISRAELI TODAY

I include here a report on the place cultural activity occupies in the life of the average Israeli today. I think this has great significance for us. It was written by Mrs. Zelda Popkin, a well-known author, and appeared in the Hadassah Newsletter of April 1958:

ART, MUSIC, THEATER
(By Zelda Popkin)

It was 1948. The young Israelis sailing with me on the steamship *Marine Carp* were going home to fight a war, but every night the decks shook with their horas (a kind of rock-and-roll). This was an integral part of their culture.

Arriving in Tel Aviv, I found an art show exhibiting mainly nonobjective paintings, as in so many galleries on New York's 57th Street. The first Knesset was assembled in the Tel Aviv Museum. During lengthy debates, ministers and members strolled around the galleries to examine art.

I entered Jerusalem by the wreckage-strewn Burma Road, my duffelbags crammed with clothing, food, medicines, cigarettes, and New Yorker magazines. My visitors that evening snatched the magazines. "No fresh reading matter since the siege began," was their apology.

Every book on every shelf was dog-eared, worn with many borrowings. The soldier at the barbed wire barricade at a border intersection kept his Sten gun on his lap while he read a ragged volume of Heine's poetry. The daily press then was undersized and thin. Paper was the luxury of luxuries.

Leonard Bernstein and the Israel Philharmonic also struggled up that Burma Road to play Beethoven in Jerusalem while the mortars boomed. The week the Negev war was won, the musicians traveled to Beersheba where Bernstein performed Gershwin's Rhapsody in Blue.

When the Road of Courage from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem was paved, it was Hanna Rovina, Habima's leading lady, who marched, with Ben-Gurion, to cut the white ribbon, opening the new highway. The Habima and Chamber Theatres continued rehearsing, producing, performing as though there was no war. A story circulated, apocryphal no doubt, that Yigal Yadin, the army commander, had been denied petrol by a soldier in the Negev when he announced his name. "I know you're an imposter," the soldier supposedly said, "Yadin was here last night. Yosef Yadin acted for us at this base." Generals were well known in 1958, but actors apparently more so.

When the State was being formed and history created, Israel brimmed over with culture, but it bore importers' labels, mainly Made in Europe or Made in U. S. A. The orchestra was a good orchestra, but it was composed of musicians who had been trained abroad, and its repertoire consisted of standarde European works; Habima, born in Russia, steeped in Stanislavsky, was addicted to the classics; the Chamber Theatre, younger and bolder, broke the tradition by presenting Hebrew versions of contemporary Broadway plays, but its technique was Stanislavsky, still.

The novelists wrote nostalgically of the Russia nor Galician villages where they had spent their childhoods. Their styles were lush and Victorian. The painters looked back to Paris, which had influenced their youth. Even Reuben Rubin, of whom it was said, "he made the Palestinian landscape," was oddly reminiscent of Corot.

Only the silver filigree work of Bezalel and the languorous strains of The Song of the Negev—No. 1, then, on the Israel Hit Parade—suggested that this country lay in the Middle East.

When I returned to Israel in 1951, a definite change had begun. The ingathering had become an inpouring. From Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, Cochin China, Morocco, and Yemen, Jews were streaming in. The highways were pageants from the Arabian Nights. Israel was receiving her diverse sons, and with them a fantastic inheritance. How catch and preserve the colors, patterns, melodies, the symbolism of primitive ways, before they faded into the uniformity of life in a modern state? How digest this all at

once? And how achieve the transformation into the oneness of spirit of a new Israel?

Musicologists, with their tape recorders, swarmed over the ma-abarot to catch the folk tunes, the liturgical variations, before they might be corrupted or entirely lost. At Hadassah's Alice Seligsberg School, the fingers of the students flew, copying costumes, to preserve them for posterity and inspire designers for decades to come.

This was merely skimming off the top. What lay beneath—in racial memories, in spirit, fettered long in hostile lands; in creativity, left fallow in the drowsy Middle East? Would one culture seek to dominate another—the European overwhelm the Oriental, or the other way around? How big a part would the sabra play? Would Israel, out of all the variety, create a unique cultural contribution? In 1951 all this was just speculation to fill the leisure hours of cafe conversation.

There were trends: the young writers were producing novels, plays, poems and vignettes. Their prose was lean, the no-romantic-nonsense of the sabra. The plot lines of their dramas and their books and novels suggested the Soviet Union's boy-and-girl-meet-tractor school. Recent events, contemporary problems preoccupied the writers, and their approach was either propaganda or journalese. The emotional jelling, settling down, which transmutes what writers' eyes and ears have marked into universal human terms, were not yet in evidence.

The theater was booming. Ohel, the Workers' Theater, following Chamber Theater's lead, was performing modern plays. Chizbatron, a new satirical group, was cutting its professional teeth, bringing welcome laughter to the army camps and hard-pressed settlements. An amusement-famished public in a land which lacked the dollars to bring in cans of films, offered plentiful encouragement to live entertainment. Talent was abundant and some of it, as time and international applause has proved, was very good indeed.

Now, almost 10 years later, we can begin to analyze Israel's cultural trends. The word "culture" here is loosely used. It lumps together creation and enjoyment, sources and results. It has many facets. Literacy—the mere ability to read and write—is one; mores and religion are others. Israel's culture, compounded of diverse ethnic, social and spiritual strains, will develop with succeeding generations.

A progress report cannot be clairvoyant. It must deal with tangibles. In these tangibles the tiny nation's cultural achievements are surprising. Witness the 40 established institutions in the graphic and performing arts, as well as in archeology and literature, which are beneficiaries of the American-Israel Cultural Foundation. Organized by the late Edward A. Norman, the foundation has brought moral and financial encouragement, and a deep interest in the growth of Israel's cultural endeavors.

The Israel Philharmonic, ranking among the world's leading orchestras, now plays in its own air-conditioned, accoustically perfect $2,500,000 Frederic R. Mann Auditorium in the new cultural center in Tel Aviv. Though there is a capacity seating of 2,800, each program must be repeated several times to meet the demands of avid would-be ticket buyers. Celebrated foreign composers and soloists vie for its guest-performer invitations. The orchestral repertoire includes, in addition to the classics, recent works of Israeli composers.

The Rubin Academy of Music is being completed in the remodeled Shocken Mansion in Jerusalem. It will have, in addition to its auditoriums, studios and classrooms, a dance studio where Martha Graham will teach. Haifa and Ramat Gan, too, have chamber orchestras. Kol Yisrael's excellent orchestra plays live as well as on the radio. The Israel Opera Company will be singing "Faust" and "Don Pasquale" for Tenth Anniversary visitors. A number of music teachers travel among the border settlements, employing flute and drum and song for integrating newcomers.

Six professional theater companies, headed by the veterans—Habima, Chamber and Ohel—and 100 amateur and semi-amateur troupes perform throughout the country. Tilon, a children's theater, has just received official recognition from the Ministry of Education and Culture. The current choice for theatergoers may range from that hardy perennial of the Yiddish and Hebrew stage, "Mirele Efros" with the great Rovina as a female King Lear, all the way to "Snunit on the Coast of Mayumba", a musical comedy in which an Israeli ship is beached in Equatorial Africa, its crew establishing contact with the Negro natives, including a seven-member local Zionist organization.

The Inbal dance troupe, so enthusiastically received in the United States this winter, represents a trend, too—a singularly successful way to utilize the treasures of the ingathering. The Yemenites are a quiet, pious people, yet their impact upon Israel has been remarkable. In their centuries of isolation in Yemen, they developed skills—gold and silver craftsmanship and exquisite embroidery work. It is their handicraft which seems to the visitor most typical of Israel. It was the tradition and folklore of ancient Yemen, brought by the gifted Sara Levi-Tanai into the theatre, which personified for Western audiences the spirit of modern Israel.

Next to the Yemenite, the Persian ethnic inheritance seems, at present, most adaptable to Israel's creative needs. Israel composers have begun to borrow from the Persian for their symphonies; her painters are favoring the strong clear blue and the delicate style of Persian miniatures. Into the cultural hopper all this goes, along with the strong bold colors and drum beat of North Africa, the swaying, hand-clapping of the *hassidim* of Eastern Europe, and other characteristic cultural stamps, out of which will evolve Israel's individual voice and style.

Israel's painters and sculptors—whose ratio to the general population far exceeds that of other modern lands—have commenced at last to find roots in their own land. While painters set up their easels in Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, Ashkelon and everywhere, there are two exclusive "artists' towns"—Ein Hod and a section of Safed.

Ein Hod is a former Arab village dating back to Crusaders' times. The War of Independence left it a rubble heap. Bulldozers were about to wipe it off the map when the painter Marcel Jancu rescued it. The artists moved in, repaired the roofs, cleared the roads, and made an idyllic setting for fifty creative workers who live here all year round.

In the old Arab houses of Safed, medieval stronghold of the Cabbalists, high up on a mountain-top in Galilee, another group of artists, headed by Jerusalem-born Moshe Castel, live and work, and here the beginnings of an Israeli school of painting have been made—the grouping for a common denominator of color and for a distillation of the mystique of the land.

Museums are everywhere, in city and kibbutz, as are also libraries. Bookshops, well stocked with current literature, in Hebrew, English, Russian, German, French, Hungarian, crowd one another on the avenues, and since the new paper mill at Hadera makes it no longer necessary to spend hard currency outside of the country, the publishing industry is flourishing.

In a single recent year, Israeli publishers printed 1,000 Hebrew titles, of which 75 percent were original Hebrew works, with the remainder translations from publications outside Israel. The sale of a novel published in Hebrew is usually 2,000 copies. A best-seller sells 6,000 copies. Readership is, however, far greater than sales figures indicate. Every purchased copy of a book passes through many hands.

The cinema shortage, too, has been remedied. The movie-goer in Tel Aviv last month could take his choice of Peyton Place, Gunfight in the O. K. Corral, Charlie Chaplin's King in New York, or the latest French, Italian, British, Russian, or Indian films. The product of the local studios at Herzlia is still limited to one full-length production, Hill 24 Does Not Answer, and a variety of shorts. Its limitations are not of talent or equipment, but of capital to compete with Hollywood.

This, then, is a brief report on the extent of Israel's participation in those activities we designate as culture. The quantity is spectacular—but even more extraordinary is the penetration of that culture to every stratum of the population. The bleakest kibbutz room, lacking every luxury, will have an oil painting on its wall, a bookshelf beside the farmer's cot. The city worker and soldier will budget for theater or concert tickets just as for their rent and bread and margarine.

A case in point is Eilat. This is the outpost at the southern tip of the Negev, a fishing village surrounded on three sides by enemy territory—Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and Egypt. The area is remote from populated centers, but in the very week when the American oil tanker *Kern Hills* made the first "innocent passage" to Eilat, the community heads sat down with the representatives of the American-Israel Cultural Foundation to plan their town's cultural future. The music sphere was to be the first, since Eilat already possessed a concert hall. The American AFL–CIO had built it as a memorial to Philip Murray.

A few weeks ago, Eilat had its first concert. Jose Iturbi, world-celebrated pianist and conductor, who had been the Israel philharmonic's honored guest, flew down, his grand piano convoyed down the winding desert road. He gave two concerts in Philip Murray Hall, one at 7 in the evening, one at 9. Seven hundred music lovers—a huge proportion of the population for any time or place—came to hear him play.

Yet all this, impressive as it is, represents only a trend, to be noted in progress reports. Israel participates in cultural activities; Israel creates in all the arts. After one decade, the country possesses the places to house her cultural activities: museums, orchestras, concert halls, theaters, cinemas, libraries, and universities. But these are mere physical repositories.

A nation's culture stems from deep within, from roots. In the land of the Bible, those roots are Biblical. Eliezer Sukenik, the renowned archaeologist, risking his life during the Jerusalem siege 10 years ago to bring, through lethal shelling and barbed wire, the first three of the Dead Sea Scrolls, acted from those roots. Moshe Dayan, until lately chief of the Army, relinquishing his command to study the humanities at the Hebrew University, Yigael Yadin, digging up ancient history at the site of Hatzor, personify the basic trend from which an indigenous modern Israel culture will eventually evolve.

How's That Again, Denver Post?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately for many years, the press and other news media in sections of our country have failed to understand and properly present the true facts in the

southern section of our country regarding the relationship of the white and Negro races. Particularly in the North and West we find many editors, news reporters, radio commentators, and columnists who profess to know our problems and offer suggestions for solving them. Many of these people, even though they profess to know all about the true situation in the South, do not have first-hand knowledge of the true facts nor in many instances are their statements of fact correct. Because of this situation, the South's position is ofttimes incorrectly reported in other sections of the country.

A glaring example of this appeared in the Denver Post of April 29, 1958. The article in the Denver Post was commented on editorially in the Richmond News Leader on Saturday, May 3, 1958. This editorial, which is exceedingly well written, points out cogently how many writers are ignorant of the subject matter about which they are writing.

In the hopes that our newspaper friends in other sections of the country will try to get the true facts before they attempt to write about our problem, I include with my remarks the editorial in the News Leader mentioned heretofore entitled "How's That Again, Denver Post?" The editorial is as follows:

HOW'S THAT AGAIN, DENVER POST?

If the Southern States had nothing more to combat than contrary opinion in their effort to win friends outside the South, the struggle might not be so discouraging. In a free country, every man is entitled to his own opinion, and besides, reasonable men may be persuaded to change their opinions on the basis of rational appeal.

But it is not merely contrary opinion, but also a vast amount of misinformation and plain ignorance that the South has to deal with. A good part of the Nation, sad to say, still pictures the Negro people of the South as a mass of woebegone African slaves, clad in gunny sacks, ridden with pellagra, confined to tar-paper shacks, and regularly whipped before breakfast by white overseers. That is exaggerated, perhaps, because we are a little annoyed in the writing of this piece, but it is not much exaggerated.

What prompts the annoyance is a psalm-singing sort of editorial in the Denver Post of April 29. Paul Manns, member of the house of delegates from Caroline County, happened to be in Colorado this week, and sent it along. There are some good men on the editorial staff of the Denver Post—Leverett Chapin and Stanton Peckham, to mention two—men who are not total idiots, but one fairly groans at their ignorance of the South today.

The Post's editorial was designed to encourage contributions to the United Negro College fund, a most excellent cause that we have commended in the past and freely commend again. The fund is seeking $2,250,000 to be divided among 38 Negro colleges and universities, including 3 in Virginia—Hampton Institute, Virginia Union University, and St. Paul's Polytechnic in Lawrenceville. The 33 institutions participating in the fund are private institutions, and they are having budget problems in common with other private colleges throughout the United States. Readers who wish to contribute may send their checks to William Trapnell, at the Commonwealth Natural Gas Corp., 116 South Third Street. Mr. Trapnell is chairman of this year's campaign in Virginia.

The Post's editorial did not stop with promoting the Negro colleges taking part in the drive. The Post, reaching into thin air, felt compelled to say that three-quarters of all college-age Negroes still live in the South, where the chance of getting a college education is slim. And what irked us especially was the next sentence: "Without these 33 colleges, which have a combined enrollment of 24,000, it would be practically nil."

Practically nil? How ignorant can you get? Without attempting any definitive survey, we turned up records yesterday of 27 public, tax-supported colleges and universities for Negroes in 14 Southern States, having a combined enrollment of more than 37,000.

Let us educate the Denver Post. There are in Virginia two outstanding institutions of higher learning for Negro students, Virginia State College in Petersburg (enrollment 1,600) and VSC's Norfolk branch (enrollment 2,000). It surely would be news to Negro high school graduates in North Carolina to learn that their opportunities, apart from the six private institutions in the Fund, are "practically nil." North Carolina lists such State-owned facilities as the North Carolina Agricultural and Technical College at Greensboro, 3,250; North Carolina College at Durham, 1,350; Fayetteville Teachers College, 560; Winston-Salem Teachers College, 830; and Elizabeth City Teachers College, 300.

Farther to the south, one finds at least 3 State-supported Negro colleges in Georgia, including a well-regarded university at Savannah; the large Florida A&M University, with an enrollment of nearly 3,000; in Mississippi, Alcorn A&M; in Alabama 2 substantial institutions; in South Carolina a State college of 1,500 students; in Tennessee a polytechnic university with an enrollment of 2,600, and in Texas, two outstanding institutions, one at Prairie View, the other at Houston, with a combined enrollment above 5,500. There is Langston in Oklahoma, and Bluefield in West Virginia, and the large Morgan State College in Maryland. One wonders have the Denver Post could have overlooked Southern University at Baton Rouge, with an enrollment of some 3,600 Negro students; Colorado itself has only two institutions that are larger.

The 27 State-supported institutions in our random compilation and the 33 private colleges in the United Fund are by no means all the institutions of higher learning for Negroes in the South. Others contribute to an aggregate enrollment that is estimated to exced 70,000 Negro college students this year. Nor does this total include the many Southern Negroes whose tuitions in Northern universities are paid at public expense; this year Virginia alone is sending 557 Negro students to such institutions as Columbia, New York University, Yale, and Harvard, at a cost of $130,000. There are now more Southern Negroes attending Negro colleges in the South alone than there are total students in all the universities and colleges of England.

We don't pretend to know all about the public power, reclamation, and irrigation problems of the West. It certainly would be helpful if the Denver Post didn't pretend to know all about Negro higher education in the South.

Why Idaho Needs Continued Federal Aid Under the Library Services Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRACIE PFOST

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, through a printing error, a section of my statement supporting the appropriation of the full authorization for the Library Services Act for the fiscal year 1959 was omitted from the hearings of the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. The section omitted reported the splendid progress made in the State of Idaho under the provisions of this act.

Because I am sure other Members of this body would be interested in the extent to which the Idaho Library program has been accelerated by the Library Services Act, under unanimous consent, I include my full subcommittee statement in the RECORD:

Mr. Chairman, I am here to ask the subcommittee to appropriate for the fiscal year 1959 the full $7,500,000 authorized by the Library Services Act, rather than the $3 million recommended by the President for this program. Only with the full authorization can we make any real progress toward the goal of the Library Services Act—to bring adequate library service to all of our people.

Few States would benefit more from the full authorization of funds than my State of Idaho. More than half of our population is without library service of any kind—about 70 percent of the people have mediocre local libraries.

In 1955, our State legislature recognized the need for more and better libraries by enacting enabling legislation to allow for larger library units and a more adequate tax basis. In 1957, the legislature appropriated money on a biennial basis, and its appropriations were based on the natural supposition that Idaho would received a Federal allotment each year of $72,729—the amount provided under a $7,500,000 appropriation. Not to give it to them is to break faith.

I wish you could see what giant strides have already been made in my State under the Library Services program to date. Rather than try to summarize the accomplishments, I would like to ask permission at this point to insert in the record a report prepared by Mr. Eugene D. Hart, the new State librarian. I am sure it will give you a lift in spirits to read it—as it did me:

"WHY IDAHO NEEDS CONTINUED FEDERAL AID UNDER THE LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

"The following facts show the current status of public library service in Idaho and graphically show the need for continued Federal aid under the Library Services Act, as a stimulus to further library development and to provide library service to Idaho citizens in the missile age.

"Background information

"More than half of the population of Idaho is without direct library service of any kind. About 70 percent of the population has inadequate library service.

"In 1955, the need for better library service in Idaho was recognized when the Idaho Library District Enabling Act was enacted to allow for larger library units with a more adequate tax basis.

"In 1956, of the 48 States, Idaho ranked 46th in terms of per capita expenditure for public library service. Idaho expenditure per person was less than one-fourth of its neighboring States—Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming. More than one-half of Idaho's population, as compared with an average of one-fifth of the United States as a whole, had no local library service.

"In 1957, an analysis of library statistics in Idaho revealed the following facts:

"The 10 largest public libraries of Idaho served 29 percent of the population, received 76 percent of the income, and loaned 72 percent of the books circulated.

"Of the existing 71 public libraries, 20 libraries reported an annual income of less

than $2,000; 20 libraries reported an annual income of less than $1,000; 7 of the smaller public libraries were open 3 hours or less per week.

"In 1957, the Idaho Legislature tripled the biennial appropriation for the Idaho State Library on the basis that Federal funds would be matched with the increased State funds to effect the following program:

"1. The State library would be staffed and administered by trained and experienced librarians.

"2. The State library would provide assistance, guidance, and advisory service to existing libraries.

"3. The State library would give the impetus and guidance necessary for expansion of direct library service in the State through the establishment of district, county, and multicounty library units.

"4. The State library would be a supplementary source of books and materials for other libraries in the State whose collections are relatively small; and would provide direct and mail library service to residents in the State having no other library facilities.

"5. The State library would administer Federal funds and make them available on a matching basis to Idaho libraries extending their services into the rural areas.

"6. The State library would be the focal point to which all Idaho libraries, library organizations, and interested citizens could turn for advice, assistance, and guidance.

"Accomplishments—1957 to date—as a result of Federal aid

"The following accomplishments may be reported to date:

"1. A State librarian and an extension librarian now head a staff of 8 full-time employees as compared with the previous staff of 4.

"2. More books have been purchased and processed in the past 6 months than in the entire previous biennium.

"3. A 2-day conference and workshop for the Idaho State Library Planning Committee was held in January 1958 with approximately 150 participants to plan for expansion and extension of library service throughout the State.

"4. An exhibition bookmobile stocked with 1,800 books has been purchased and is being used to demonstrate the possibilities of mobile library service in Idaho.

"5. A monthly publication, Library Gems, has been started. This is to provide a continuing medium of communication with respect to current library developments in Idaho.

"6. The State library has assumed responsibility for compilation of statistical information on Idaho libraries.

"7. The State library has joined the Pacific Northwest Bibliographical Center in order to provide more complete interlibrary loan service to the libraries and the citizens of Idaho.

"8. Federal matching funds have been allocated to three district libraries in Idaho at the rate of $1 Federal for each $1 district library funds to provide more adequate library service. Additional Federal funds are available to other newly formed district libraries as a further stimulus to the establishment of larger units of library service and for the promotion of rural library service.

"9. Eight educational films for the promotion of library service have been purchased and are available to public libraries, groups and organizations interested in promoting more adequate library service.

"10. A revision of the library laws of Idaho has been published.

"11. The State library is providing a substantially increased service to individuals, schools, communities, and small public libraries as a result of its increased funds and staff.

"12. The trained staff of the State library is providing technical assistance, advice, and guidance to local libraries and to groups working for more adequate library service or to establish library service where none presently exists.

"Future planning based on continued Federal aid to fiscal year 1961

"The following services are planned by the State library to expand and further promote public library development:

"1. Increased individual assistance and advice to small public libraries on book selection, cataloging, and weeding of collections. There are presently numerous such requests for help and advice which the State library has not yet been able to fulfill.

"2. Three 2-day regional workshops for nonprofessional librarians are to be held within the State to provide guidance in library procedures and techniques.

"3. The State library will provide greater assistance to library board of trustees in planning library buildings and developing more adequate service.

"4. The book and periodical resources of the State library will be increased materially as a source for supplementary materials from which local libraries, communities, and schools may borrow to supplement their own limited facilities. More educational films and audio-visual materials will be purchased for the use of local libraries and local citizens groups interested in promoting library service.

"5. The State library will continue to assist several counties now working actively to create library districts, and to provide Federal matching funds and other assistance as a stimulus for creating larger units of library service.

"6. Additional demonstrations of library service are planned to show the needs and benefits of adequate library service, and the gains accruing from cooperative efforts among smaller library units.

"Curtailing of Federal funds under the Library Services Act, would mean to Idaho—

"1. A decrease of the amount of Federal funds which could be used as matching funds to stimulate appropriation of local funds for the inauguration or increase of rural library service.

"2. A reduction of the staff of the State Library and consequently the service which could be extended to the residents of the State, to schools, and to local libraries.

"3. A limitation of State Library resources—books, periodicals, films, audio-visual materials and consultant service—to which local libraries now turn for special requests, reference materials, expensive and infrequently requested materials.

"Elimination of Federal funds under the Library Services Act, would mean to Idaho—

"1. An end to any type of financial assistance to local libraries, and to the stimulation for the establishment of additional libraries.

"2. Greatly curtail the assistance and guidance given to libraries and to citizens' groups by the State library.

"3. It would probably result in reduction of appropriations at the State and local levels for public library service and thus result in a setback to library development in Idaho, now just getting underway.

"4. The recent gains made in Idaho library development would largely be lost since some are still in the early formative state.

"5. It would be, in effect, a breaking of faith by the United States Congress with the State of Idaho which has anticipated the availability of Federal funds through 1961. The Idaho State Legislature in 1957 appropriated money on a biennial basis and its appropriations were based upon the anticipated revenues for a 2-year period. Withdrawal of Federal library funds at this time would negate the achievements and hopes of those who have worked so hard for library development in Idaho."

Since the report speaks for itself, I won't take up more of the time of you gentlemen here today. I will only say that not only for the welfare of the State of Idaho—but for the welfare of the entire country—I hope you can see your way clear to appropriate the full authorized amount of $7,500,000. We pride ourselves on being the most prosperous and progressive country in the world—the country which provides the most abundant living. Surely we can provide enough money to give all of our people access to a library at which they can borrow good books to read for enlightenment, for education, and for pleasure.

For Boating Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the Evening Star of May 1 calls attention to the need for some type of legislation to provide for greater boating safety than presently exists. It points out that public safety on the Nation's waterways calls for the type of legislation which has been approved by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and is currently awaiting a rule by the Rules Committee.

Some 7 million small boats will carry over 25 million people on our waterways this year. Past experience indicates that at least 1,200 people will be killed and many more will be injured in small boat accidents unless Congress and the States act soon.

The pending bill is a step in the right direction and encourages the various State legislatures to act. It has the almost unanimous support of the Council of State Governments. I hope that a rule will soon be granted so that the House may have an opportunity to consider the legislation.

The Star editorial follows:

FOR BOATING SAFETY

The recent small-boat tragedy on the lower Potomac that cost the lives of four persons was typical of the accidents which have led to demands for legislation designed to make boating safer. The river accident involved a 14-foot plastic boat with a 50-horsepower outboard motor—a combination requiring unusual care and experience in boat handling. It was the owner's first tryout of newly purchased boat and motor. Under present laws no registration or inspection of the craft was required, since the Coast Guard has jurisdiction only over boats more than 16 feet long. The Bonner bill, pending before the House, however, would require registration of all small powered boats and would encourage adoption of safety measures by all boat operators.

The legislation is the result of lengthy hearings before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which Mr. BONNER is chairman. Under its provisions all motorboats would be assigned numbers by the Coast Guard, which, in the course of the registration process would make available to boat owners latest information on safe operation of outboard and inboard boats. Moreover, water accidents

would have to be reported to State authorities, and the Coast Guard would have enlarged power to impose civil penalties for reckless operation of boats.

With small boating growing phenomenally as a result of increased sale and use of outboard motors, the need for some sort of governmental control has become evident. As Representative BONNER told the House Rules Committee recently, this is "essentially safety legislation." The proposed program he said, would not be burdensome to the boating public. In fact, some witnesses before the Bonner committee wanted much stricter regulation of all power boats. "Our committee felt, however," Mr. BONNER said, "that it would be unwise to attempt any greater degree of regulation until experience with this legislation might indicate the need for it." Certainly public safety on the Nation's waterways calls for at least this first step toward curbing recklessness and ignorance of basic "rules of the road" by operators of small boats.

Los Angeles Board of Supervisors Unanimously Resolves in Favor of Corps of Engineers, United States Army, Continuation of Construction of Los Angeles County Drainage Area Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 26, 1958

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I present a certified copy of a resolution by the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County Flood Control District, unanimously approved April 29, 1958, indicating the strategic relationship of the flood control problems in Los Angeles County, Calif., and the necessity of emergency legislation necessary to allow uninterrupted continuation of the previously initiated and activated protection by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, in the construction of the essential Los Angeles County drainage area project.

The text of the resolution being self-explanatory, I respectfully urge the continuation of this essential Federal and county drainage and flood control project.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
Los Angeles, April 29, 1958.

The Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County Flood Control District met in regular session. Present: Supervisors Burton W. Chace, chairman, presiding, Kenneth Hahn; John Anson Ford and Warren M. Dorn; and Harold J. Ostly, clerk, by Gordon T. Nesvig, deputy clerk.

In re flood control: Resolution calling on all congressional representatives of Los Angeles County to take such action as may be required to effect enactment of necessary legislation needed to continue Federal flood-control work in the Los Angeles area, and related order.

On motion of Supervisor Ford, unanimously carried (Supervisor Hahn being temporarily absent), it is ordered that the following resolution be, and the same is, hereby adopted:

"Whereas the Congress of the United States after investigation and recommendation thereof by the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army and by the Board of Rivers and Harbors, has approved and adopted a program for the construction of various flood-control projects which are of interest and benefit to the entire Nation; and

"Whereas Federal law required enactment of legislation authorizing the appropriation of funds for construction of portions or units of approved projects; and

"Whereas during the past 22 years Congress has authorized and appropriated funds for and the United States by and through the Corps of Engineers as a part of such program has undertaken and constructed various units of that certain project within the county of Los Angeles which is known as the Los Angeles County drainage area project; and

"Whereas all authorization for appropriation of funds on the Los Angeles County drainage area project has been or will prior to July 1, 1958, be exhausted; and

"Whereas funds heretofore appropriated in fiscal 1958 and budgeted for fiscal 1959 cannot be expended by the Corps of Engineers until said authorization is correspondingly increased; and

"Whereas this board has been advised that a similar situation exists as to construction of some other approved flood-control projects; and

"Whereas there has heretofore and now exists an extreme flood hazard within the area which will be protected by the Los Angeles County drainage area project; and

"Whereas the needs of the area being and to be protected by the Los Angeles County drainage area project are yet increasing due to the vast and continuing development of said area; and

"Whereas lacking appropriate legislative authorization virtually all flood-control construction by the Corps of Engineers United States Army on the Los Angeles County drainage area project will cease as of July 1, 1958; and

"Whereas such termination will not only allow continuation, but in some cases will increase the existing extreme flood hazard and will also have grave effects upon the economic situation in the southern California area, especially as relates to the employment of the many involved in the carrying out of the drainage area project during a period of recession: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles and ex officio Board of Supervisors of the Los Angeles County Flood Control District, That and it is hereby recommended and requested that all Members of Congress immediately take such action as may be required to effect the enactment of such emergency legislation as may be necessary to allow the uninterrupted continuation by the Corps of Engineers United States Army of the construction of the Los Angeles County drainage area project; be it further

"Resolved, That and the clerk of this board is hereby directed and ordered to transmit fully executed copies of this resolution to the Senators representing the State of California, Members of the House of Representatives from the county of Los Angeles and to the Vice President of the United States. It is further directed and ordered that the chief engineer of the Los Angeles County Flood Control District transmit copies of this resolution to such persons as he may deem appropriate;

"It is further ordered that the Los Angeles County flood control district be and it is hereby authorized to submit copies of the above resolution to the cities concerned to encourage similar action by them."

How Hiring the Handicapped Helps You and Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, as Congressman for the 27th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, I am proud that Rosalie Dean Carson, of 324 Zara Street, Pittsburgh 10, Pa., a student at Carrick High School, is receiving an award by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped on May 8 for her essay in the 1958 national essay contest. Miss Carson's essay placed third in this contest and it is a real pleasure to insert her essay entitled "How Hiring the Handicapped Helps You and Me" in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because I believe her essay is not only excellent, but also worthy of reproducing. In addition, I want to take this opportunity to compliment the Carrick High School, the principal and teachers, as well as Miss Carson herself, on this selection.

HOW HIRING THE HANDICAPPED HELPS YOU AND ME

(By Rosalie Dean Carson, Carrick High School, Pittsburgh, Pa.)

"Look at me. Look at me" chants a little girl's shrill, excited voice.

A 6-year-old girl has scrambled up the climbing bars to the high ceiling of the school gymnasium. What is so unusual about this?

This is a very special little girl at a very special school. For the little girl is blind, and her school, the Anne J. Kellog School for Handicapped Children. She represents a modern-day miracle; upon entering school in the autumn, she would not move nor take a single step without holding to someone. Completely dependent, she had to be guided everywhere she went. Someone else's hands had to feed her, clothe her.

Now, the following spring, she runs freely about the school with confidence.

Before visiting this school where my brother teaches I felt revulsion for the physically handicapped. Passing a cripple in the street, I would cringe; shiver when I saw a spastic; look away from a legless man.

After my brother took me on a tour of this unique school, the handicapped became personalities to me. I realized they are not freaks, but people with problems. Spastics, amputees, blind, or deaf children became Tommy, Susy, Bill, and Debby, the little girl with heavily braced legs who has found her place by accompanying the school orchestra, the epileptic children with helmets for protection, the lunch line formed of kids in wheelchairs and on crutches, just as noisy as any other hungry group, most of all, perhaps, the little blind girl on the climbing bars, the one who had been withdrawn. Now she is completely sure of herself, running outside alone to play on the playground, dressing and eating unaided. Observing her classroom, I saw her reading braille and typing at a mechanical braille writer. I discovered another startling fact; her attractive, immaculately groomed teacher was blind. Yet she had built a life for herself. This child, too, will be well prepared to face the future. The door is open.

Here, in this school, reconstruction of life begins. Not only here—in veteran hospitals,

polio foundations, State employment offices, and schools for the blind all over the country. Reconstruction for what? Where does it lead? To a blind alley? To frustration or dispair? Or to living a life of fulfillment?

The scriptural injunction, "Neglect not the gift that is in thee," could be expanded to, "Neglect not the gift that is in them."

The disabled are able. Disadvantages become advantages when the remaining physical abilities are coupled with competence. During the past decade America has tested the thesis that it is good business to hire the handicapped. Millions have proved conclusively that, on the job, they are not handicapped at all.

Ideally, the handicapped person does not present a special case. The ultimate goal is to place the right man or the right woman in the right job. The same methods should prevail in hiring a handicapped individual as in the case of an able-bodied person. Instead of magnifying his handicap, accentuate the positive, and underline his strengths and skills. We must open for him the door to self-respect and independence. In essence, the difference between people is only in degree of ability. The so-called handicapped worker is equal to—and in some cases better than—the average individual. His need, in society and in business, to be recognized and treated as such lies at the root of fuller acceptance and opportunity for the handicapped.

The handicapped may be hired with confidence. He has much to give. Being conscious of a disability, the handicapped person is inclined to strive harder, to have a more conscientious attitude toward his job, with a resulting improved production record. Nature allows him to develop compensating qualities to offset his disability.

The handicapped, the guys nobody wanted, have coupled courage and initiative to their disability and hitched their future to their chosen job, when provided with that all-important opportunity to prove to themselves and the world that they can get along.

Marie's hooked hand enables her to handle hot dishes at the steamtable in the cafeteria.

Harry's deafness makes it easier for him to concentrate in the noisy aircraft factory.

Standing on his artificial leg, Bob can splice live wires with no danger of electrocution.

But how does hiring the handicapped benefit you and me? It makes for greater national production, strengthens our national security, and lightens the taxpayer's load. The handicapped add to the efficiency of our fathers' work force for their absenteeism is less, and their accident rate lower. Impaired workers produce at slightly higher rates and have fewer disabling injuries. Surveys have proven that the handicapped employees adjust well to their jobs by observing company rules and having safe behavior. From helping our fathers, the next step is helping the community which they will enrich as contributing members. From here, the State and finally the Nation, which they can make stronger. The conservation of manpower and working skills is vital to our national strength. America has 2 million handicapped men and women who can be added to the Nation's work force. Let's train them, hire them, make them useful citizens.

The American conviction that every individual is entitled to an opportunity equal to his abilities has paved the way for increased employment opportunities for the physically handicapped. The desire of the individual to take his place in society as a productive and self-supporting citizen lies at the very root of our democratic society. Happy is the nation whose people are content. We must see to it that American democracy gives a square deal to those who, above all others, deserve it.

Let us hear the appeal of the disabled:

"Lord, we are able."

"These hands are willing."

"These hearts are brave."

"These spirits are strong."

Can we not answer this plea of the handicapped to look up and live as other men? Cannot the rehabilitated echo the refrain of one little blind girl, "Look at me. I'm happy. I'm serving mankind."

Can Convictions and Politics Mix?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Gov. Edmund S. Muskie of Maine. It beautifully enunciates the philosophy which I have followed during my 37 years of political life. It has paid dividends to me and I am sure it will to all others who adopt it and pursue it.

Governor Muskie's article appeared in the New York Times of May 4, 1958, and is based on a recent talk he gave as the annual Robert S. Stevens lecture at Cornell Law School:

CAN CONVICTIONS AND POLITICS MIX?

(By Edmund S. Muskie)

Most Americans are interested spectators of the political game—its tricks, its maneuvers, the fascinating mixture of cynicism and high ideals and the ways in which the two combine to achieve constructive purposes. And the reaction of spectators and potential participants in this game is most important. So long as that reaction is based on an underlying faith in the capacity of our political system and those who operate it to produce constructive action in the long-term best interests of our country, then the system and those who operate it will produce such action. Too often, however, that reaction is based on a cynical disbelief that politics can be anything but a dirty game played by men and women who, if they are ever well motivated, find it necessary to sacrifice integrity and honesty in order to stay in the game.

In this political year, therefore, it is well for all of us—those of us who contemplate seeking public office, and those who simply evaluate issues and candidates as voters—to consider the question: Do convictions and politics mix? The spectator too often and readily accepts 1 of 2 easy answers: First, that politicans never act on conviction, but only from considerations of expediency; second, that if I were in politics, I would always vote for what was right—it being implied, of course, that the right course would always be clear and obvious.

The answer to the question I have put will determine our national ability to meet and surmount the critical problems which confront us on the national and world stages. Unless convictions and politics do mix, not only can we not justify our form of government, but it cannot survive.

Collectively, our political leadership has met the test which is implicit in the question, and, God willing, will continue to do so. However, individually, the practicing politician holding public office almost daily faces a choice of alternatives with respect to some official decision or action which poses the question for him.

For example, there is the general problem, "Shall I meet a politically dangerous issue or avoid it?"

Or more specifically: "Should I alienate politically important Mr. X by refusing to appoint him to a public office for which he is not qualified—or for which he is qualified but for which there are better men available? Should I refuse to appoint Mr. Y to a public office for which he is well qualified—because he is not the choice of politically important groups or individuals, or because an influential newspaper has opposed his appointment, however unfairly? Should I support the decision of a subordinate in my administration, however sound—if it is an unpopular one, or if he is unpopular, particularly when I did not appoint him? Should I publicly resist the tide of public opinion to defend an individual or to support a proposition when my action cannot be decisive? How much responsibility should I accept for decisions and programs of department heads whom I did not appoint and who are of a different political party?"

Must the politician always and continually crusade for his convictions? Can he ever justify compromise? Can he ever justify expediency? These questions suggest that there ought to be some sound and justifiable rules of conduct for a politician in this area of decision. There are. Otherwise, the statesman would have little hope of consistently surviving elections. The rules depend for their validity upon certain basic assumptions.

The first assumption is that most of those who support the politician do not expect that his views will agree with theirs all of the time. Most Americans are essentially fair-minded. They will allow the candidate of their choice a considerable margin of disagreement and independence, provided his position is sincere and based on honest convictions.

A second assumption is that many of those who differ with him can be persuaded to accept the politician's point of view on a given question if it is based on a solid foundation of fact, if it bears the earmarks of careful and of deliberate thought, if it is effectively presented to them, and, most important, if they have confidence in him.

A third assumption is that the politician will not be inflexible. Hindsight may reveal him to be wrong.

The fourth assumption is a much less comfortable one. It is that, however astutely the politician conducts himself, there may come an issue which sharply separates him from a majority of his constituents and about which they feel so strongly that they can no longer support him if he persists in his point of view. These may be the issues which create the civil wars, the Little Rocks—those heroic occasions when martyrdom may have its own appeal. Or, they may be relatively small issues which are important only to a few people and his own conscience. These are the issues, of course, which try a politician's soul.

When he is faced with such an issue, the politician should remember that the privilege and responsibility of leadership require the taking of risks. He should consider the effect of a departure from conviction upon the future of the persons, the institutions and the principles involved. He should consider that a stand on conviction, though resulting in immediate defeat, may lead to ultimate vindication and subsequent political victory; that, conversely, yielding to expediency, though immediately popular, will undermine public respect and confidence in him and ultimately destroy him politically.

If these assumptions are not valid, then the politician is lost in a wild sea of alternatives, out of sight of land, and without guidance as to the direction he should take. If they are valid—and I believe them to be—it is still necessary to apply the techniques and tools of politics.

The first rule: Get the facts and all points of view. The fancy name for this process is "research," the more descriptive one "homework." The most effective impression a politician can make on an audience—any audience—is that he is a man who knows what he is talking about. In practical-minded, hard-headed America, the man who can establish a logical, factual base for his argument has a universal appeal.

The second rule: Seek advice and counsel. Having obtained the facts, the politician should surround himself with those whose experience and judgment will enable him to weigh them. This requires conscious and positive effort. For there is a tendency, after a man has been in a position of public responsibility for some time, making decisions in weighty and complex matters, to exaggerate his own ability to make the right decision. And it is not easy to break through the ring of "yes men" who will flock around a successful candidate. He can profit more from those who will disagree with him than he can from those who thoughtlessly approve whatever he may propose.

A third rule: Be decisive. Having assembled the facts, weighed them and consulted with trusted advisers, the political leader should make his decision, without observable hesitation, cleanly and firmly. As he deliberates within himself as to the position which he should take on an important issue, occasionally he will go through moments of agonizing indecision; but he should never expose them to public view. Once the decision is indicated, he should not retreat from it, nor fumble it. He should make it. Indecisiveness can destroy public confidence in a political leader and his proposals about as quickly as anything except sheer dishonesty.

The fourth rule: Learn to use effectively the various techniques and media of communicating with constituents. Most people are constantly and busily engaged in their personal and private affairs. Most of them do not have the time, or will not take the time, to study thoroughly every public issue and problem with which the politician may be concerned. Their awareness of a problem, their understanding of it and their acceptance of a solution to it will depend upon the ability of the politician to attract their attention and present his case by means of images or impressions.

Honesty, ability, knowledge ability, decisiveness—these are some of the impressions a politician ought to try to create. A quip, a phrase, a picture, a chart—these ear-catching, eye-catching devices may be more effective in making a point with more people than an entire speech. I am not referring to slick salesmanship, but rather to the honest imagery which has always been the mark of the great orator, the great artist, the great teacher.

And there are so many instruments the politician can use—the press, radio, television. Each of these calls for different talents and different techniques. The inflections of the voice when a speech is delivered on radio or television can give it a substantially different meaning than the same speech appearing on the printed page of a newspaper. A voice emanating from a face on the television screen can create an entirely different impression from the same voice over a radio loudspeaker. These differences are significant; they can be used to advantage.

The press conference is an interesting medium for communication. The way in which a question is answered may convey a more important message than the answer itself. A "No comment" may arouse more speculation and thus attract more attention than would a direct answer. The planted question, or even a spontaneous question, may draw out information which the politician might have been reluctant to give in a formal press release.

All this suggests that politics is a profession requiring special aptitudes, a period of training and apprenticeship, and the development of skills and judgment which come only with experience and practice. It suggests, also, that acceptance of the assumptions I have stated, and astute use of the rules and techniques I have described, given appropriate personal appeal, will enable the politician to retain his convictions, survive politically, and render constructive service.

Nevertheless, however well the politician plays the game, he should be prepared to face that issue which may come—when his career is on the line, when the alternative is conviction and political oblivion, versus expediency and loss of self-respect.

That is when conviction and politics must mix for our country's sake. That is when the politician must be prepared to spend his political bank account—the bank account built out of the support of the hundreds or thousands of people who voted for him; of thousands more who have been impressed by his performance in office, if that performance has merited such goodwill; of the resulting confidence of his constituents in his ability to think and act responsibly in the field of public affairs, and of the growth of his spiritual strength and mental sinews as a result of his having grappled with and mastered perplexing and complex political and public problems.

This bank account is his, not to hoard but to spend. He should spend it prudently and wisely, conserving it so that, when he is faced with the crucial issues, he may have a substantial reserve. Then, if necessary, he should use it unstintingly.

How does a man bring himself to do a thing like that? I don't really know from personal experience because I have not yet faced such a choice. It is a favorite theory of mine, however, that life for us as individuals does not realize its full meaning, in the richest and most abundant sense, unless we are willing to test our capacity for growth beyond the limits of what we may, at any given time, believe possible. I can think of no more satisfying way to test one's capacity for growth than to try to meet the kind of challenge I have described in the public service.

Do convictions and politics mix?

Yes, if the politician has convictions.

The Case of Ezra Pound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, in 1955 an Australian newspaper carried a long scholarly article by Prof. G. Giovannini, of the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., entitled "The Strange Case of Ezra Pound." Last September Dr. Giovannini prepared a statement which brought his 1955 article up to date and which was included as appendix J to the report on Ezra Pound, prepared for me in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part 4 of the Legislative Reference Service report on Ezra Pound by H. A. Sieber:

APPENDIX J

STATEMENT ON EZRA POUND BY DR. G. GIOVANNINI,[1] PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH, CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA, WASHINGTON, D. C.

(Fourth installment)

(The following statement, prepared by Prof. G. Giovannini, of the Catholic University of America, critically reviews recent articles in the American press since 1954 on the Ezra Pound case. Professor Giovannini's statement serves as an addendum to his paper the Strange Case of Ezra Pound, published in the New Times (Australia) in 1955.)

I

In the summer of 1954 when I was gathering material for my article on Pound, I found that the American press had shown no interest in the case of Pound the prisoner, and I had to build my argument largely from statements in the foreign press. Even the heated controversy over the Bollingen award to the poet in 1949 failed to arouse interest in the juridical aspect of the case. The failure may perhaps be assigned to a facile assumption, tacitly made on political or other passions, that Pound was manifestly a fascist and a traitor and that therefore the juridical question of guilt is a purely academic matter. Pound the prisoner was almost forgotten even among professors of literature. In a group I was with several years ago at a meeting of the Modern Language Association, only one scholar knew of his whereabouts (and then mistakenly believed that Pound did not want to be released: he was enjoying himself at St. Elizabeth's), and another thought that Pound had been set free and was living again in Italy. But since the summer of 1954 the American press has broken its silence. When Hemingway was awarded the Nobel prize, it reported the novelist's strong plea for Pound's release (Time, December 13, 1954); it noticed Giovanni Papini's appeal to American traditional toleration of political nonconformists (Gerriere della Sera, October 30, 1955), editorialized on Pound's release (Life, February 6, 1956), etc.; and in magazines it featured articles which, though at times deficient in information and analysis, did at least make attempts to penetrate the surface of the case.

In part II, which follows, the brief notes I make were occasioned largely by articles in the American press of the last 3 years since my article appeared. Some of the articles, notably Arthur Gordon's (Look, February 19, 1957) and Robert S. Bird's (New York Herald Tribune) which link Pound with the activities of John Kasper and the racial fracas in Tennessee, must be set aside as sensational and untrustworthy journalism that misunderstands Pound the man and his works. I have also set aside the large bulk of material in literary magazines and scholarly journals (see the annual bibliography in Publications of the Modern Languages Association of America and in every issue of the journal American Literature): this scholarship makes clear his signal importance in literary history as a poet and critic, but it is not relevant to Pound's case as such. What remains is a substantial body of popular or semipopular material which now tends to favor, or at least report opinion in behalf of Pound. This change, which may indicate a change in the policy of the American press, is due perhaps to a number of causes, some of which are touched on in part II: (1) Pound's continued production of original verse and translations which have

[1] This statement, prepared by Dr. Giovannini, is appended to this report in order to expand his paper published in the New Times, 1955. The views expressed are Mr. Giovannini's and not necessarily the Legislative Reference Service's.

increased his reputation (they have been widely reviewed) and called readers' attention to his existence with the inevitable query as to his whereabouts and status; (2) the growing sense of embarrassment among Americans, especially intellectuals, that their Government has been holding in detention for so long a time, and in an indeterminate status, a man of letters of international stature whose career is at the center of modern literary history; (3) the feeling among the thoughtful with some knowledge of the case in the context of Pound's career, that the terms fascism and treason do not fit Pound the man,[3] whether or not they legally fit his action as such in time of war; (4) the sharp criticism of the Roosevelt administration, especially since the reports on the Yalta Treaty, and the feeling that Pound's imprisonment is perhaps another inherited mistake deserving attention; (5) the feeling, now becoming more vocal, that Pound has sufficiently suffered for what the Government charges against him (the minimum sentence for treason is 5 years and Pound has been in detention for almost 13), and that the Government ought to enter a nolle prosequi in the record of the case and set free a man who is now 72 years old.

II

Pound's international stature

Pound began his career as a comparatist in literary values, with the determination to discover the norm operative in the best poetry, that part of it which is "indestructible" in any language at any time, and for this end he says, "I learned more or less of nine foreign languages" (How I Began, T. P.'s Weekly, June 6, 1913, p. 707). The multilingual feature of the Cantos is a concrete illustration of the attempt to realize the permanent thematic and technical values interrelating various cultures, and to point up the fact that disciplined minds, remote from one another in time and place, will strike out in the same direction—a fact Pound pictures in a startlingly manner by inserting a translation of the Old English Seafarer in the middle of translations from Chinese poetry (Cathay, 1915). Pound has often been attacked for polyglot cultural interests in his poetry, but the attacks have had an unexpected result: they have increased his international reputation (he has been translated into German, Swedish; Greek, Italian, Spanish, Japanese) and made students conscious of the historical importance of his work in the American literary tradition, that part of it which searched for materials and values in foreign cultures. Pound's international stature has been recently indicated by the appearance of Hayden Carruth's article analyzing the poet's career in Perspectives (summer 1956), a magazine published by Intercultural Publications and distributed in translation in European countries: "The Canton," says Carruth (p. 146), "draw allusively upon many cultural depths, many literatures and strata of history." He also draws directly, and his many translations from occidental and oriental literatures (see his recent Sophocles' Women of Trachis and the translation of the Chinese odes collected by Confucius) have reinvigorated English poetry and made more solid his reputation as a master of his craft. The master was recognized, appropriately enough, by the Secretary General of the United Nations who cites him in the context of the artist's conquest of past and present realities:

"Modern art teaches us to see by forcing us to use our senses, our intellect, and our sensibility to follow it on its road of exploration. It makes us seers—seers like Ezra Pound when, in the first of his Pisan Cantos, he senses the enormous tragedy of the dream in the peasant's bent shoulders. Seers—and explorers—these we must be if we are to prevail." (Dag Hammarskjold, address on the 25th anniversary of the Museum of Modern Art, October 19, 1954, issued in mimeograph form by the Museum of Modern Art, New York.)

The intellectual's embarrassment

This is alluded to by Carruth, (p. 158) but strongly marked in Sam Hynes' The Case of Ezra Pound (Commonweal, December 9, 1955, p. 251), which refers to one room of St. Elizabeths as 'a closet which contains a national skeleton'—a phrase that is becoming a commonplace. As more details of his career are uncovered, the American intellectual feels strongly that Pound's case is both fact and symbol of democracy's failure to find a place for a highly gifted and individual mind. During the first 5 years of his career he succeeded, he says (How I Began, p. 707), in getting only one poem printed in an American magazine. He followed the example of other American artists, among them Henry James, whose work he values, and became the expatriate, publishing his first volume of verse in Venice in 1908—a revealing incident that may prompt future historians to scrutinize the level of American culture, and of the American publishing business at the turn of the century. His first American volume (Provenca, 1910) appeared after his London success, and it did not sell (I remember that circa 1926 the edition was "remaindered" and copies sold for a few pennies). Details such as these, and there are many in his career, outline a mistake we made, and made against our professed principle of utilizing the best in human resources. This sense of embarrassment can be traced in A. MacLeish's review of his recent cantos (New York Times Book Review, December 16, 1956) in a passage describing the horror felt at seeing "a conscious mind capable of the most complete human awareness," as his poetry abundantly shows, "incarcerated among minds which are not conscious and cannot be aware"—a passage quoted by J. La Zebnik in a reportorial article (New Republic, April 1, 1957, p. 6) which is largely inconclusive but at times suggestive of uneasiness at the continued action of the Government in detaining him after the barbarous treatment he suffered during his imprisonment for 6 months near Pisa. This embarrassment and uneasiness are sometimes accompanied by vexation with the stiff-necked attitude and official frigidity of the Government, and anger over the treatment of him which cannot be excused on any ground (Ezra Pound, a pamphlet "written on behalf of the committee formed to obtain his release," London, 1956).

The position of the Government

The Government's inaction in the case, with the implication that Government authority can do nothing because Pound is committed by court order, has been criticized with ill-concealed impatience, especially after Hemingway's forthright and oft-repeated plea for his release:

"Ezra Pound is a great poet, and whatever he did he has been punished greatly and I believe should be freed to go and write poems in Italy where he is loved and understood." (Time, December 13, 1956; cf. Hemingway in A Tribute to Ezra Pound, a program by Yale undergraduates, Yale Broadcasting Co., December 5, 1955, and in Ezra Pound at Seventy issued 1955 by New Directions publishers.)

The editorial in Life (February 6, 1956, p. 30), on the occasion of the release of Tokyo Rose after 10 years of imprisonment, reminded the Government that however technically complicated the case may be, it has the power to quash the indictment; and that European commentators are aware of this power and using "the Pound case to argue that American civilization is indifferent to its own poets and artists." To readers who have kept in touch with the European press, the summary of its opinion in the Life editorial is very much of an understatement. European critics have castigated Americans and their Government, and the opinion expressed in one British editorial is representative:

"Deprived of his freedom, Ezra Pound remains a reproach to the American love of freedom and its capacity for clemency. And it may be argued that his 10 years of captivity—a longer term than many Nazis or any Fascists have had to serve—have in any case purged his offense. A disinterested gesture of mercy could scarcely be misrepresented now." (Blackfriars, December 1954, p. 505, a monthly of the Dominican Order.)

A "grave concern" over the Government's inaction was expressed by the narrator at the end of A Tribute to Ezra Pound, and he expressed it for the eminent men of letters—Hemingway, Auden, MacLeish, Marianne Moore, W. C. Williams, and E. E. Cummings—who had spoken in praise of the poet:

"Ezra Pound's continuing confinement in St. Elizabeths Hospital is a source of grave concern to those who are familiar with his life and work. One of the aims of tonight's broadcast has been to present the feelings of some of the most distinguished of these men." This concern is registered at the end of the editorial in Life, which suggests the nascent feeling that Pound's allegedly treasonable act is now remote in time, somewhat faded and less weighty than we once thought:

"Pound's room at St. Elizabeths has been called a closet which contains a national skeleton. There may be good arguments for keeping him there, but there are none for pretending he doesn't exist. The crimes of World War II have aged to the point of requital, parole, or forgiveness. For this reason, if no other, the arguments for quashing the indictment against Ezra Pound should be publicly considered."

Life insists there is no acceptable reason for the government's inaction, for a review of war crime cases turned up the startling fact that "the Nazi storm trooper responsible for the Malmédy massacre in 1944, General Dietrich, is also out of jail, one of a growing line of commutees and parolees." This side of the history of war crimes is used by Richard H. Rovere to score the government in a detailed article on The Question of Ezra Pound (Esquire, September 1957), an article with much fanciful nonsense on the contradictions in pound and idle conjecturing on the state of his mind and soul, but commendable in the charitable direction it takes on the question of his release:

"Since he is not dangerous and since he receives no therapy at the hospital, he might be released * * * in the custody of his wife and friends" (p. 80). Rovere's conclusion is important as a lucid and forceful summary of feeling and opinion often heard and now appearing in print for the first time: that the government could and should act generously (cf. the editorial in the New Republic, April 1, 1957, p. 6, which expresses a common feeling: "We would like to see the government give this old man and this eminent poet his freedom"); that the government has not been so intransigent in other cases far more

[3] The statement on Pound's intention not to betray has often been repeated: "after continued opposition obtained permission to use Rome radio for personal propaganda in support of United States Constitution, continuing after America's official entry into the war only on condition that he should never be asked to say anything contrary to his conscience or contrary to his duties as an American citizen. Which promise was faithfully observed by the Italian Government." Ezra Pound, Selected Poems, a new ed. New Directions paperbook, 1957, p. viii. CF. British Who's Who 1957.

serious than Pound's (cf. Life quoted above); that in a long-range view of history his action in speaking over the enemy radio is of no moment, and that what should be considered is his extraordinary service to letters and his brillian achievements in verse which history will remember with gratitude; that at this late date after the war a cogent reason for the government's intransigence is hard to find and that American intellectuals, perhaps many of them, favor his release (Carruth, p. 158):

"The Government, if it wished, could act not on grounds of justice but on grounds of largesse. It has sat by while some pretty low characters have been sprung in Germany, Italy, and Japan—real war criminals, now given positions of trust. The war-criminal side of Pound is as trivial in terms of history as his poetry is great. As Hayden Carruth wrote in Perspectives U. S. A., the publication distributed abroad to the intelligentsia abroad in bundle lots, 'It is hard to think of a good reason why Pound should not have his freedom immediately' (Rovere, p. 80)."

The prisoner's rights and the Government

None of the articles and editorials raises the question of constitutional rights. His treatment in the Disciplinary Training Center near Pisa is reported (LaZebnick, p. 18; Rovere, p. 80), or alluded to in passing (New Republic, p. 6), sometimes with a sense of shock (Carruth, pp. 153–4) but without curiosity as to the constitutionality of such treatment. David Park Williams (cited below), who as a guard at the Center had direct knowledge of the treatment Pound suffered, never confronts the case with amendment VIII of the Constitution which prohibits 'cruel and unusual punishment.' Nor is the long delay of 6 months between arrest and arraignment ever confronted by a prisoner's rights assured by the Constitution—all of which is a deplorable reflection on those who profess to enlighten public opinion (I do not exclude myself speaking in the article of 3 years ago), and who are unaware of the foundation of our liberties in the greatest state document yet written (Pound, Culture, p. 270). Hynes (p. 251) is an instance in point. "Few thinking people," he says, "would question the right of the Government to act as it did," and he laments vaguely on "circumstances, or the system, or the nature of things in the modern world" which forced the Government to take action against a distinguished artist. Hynes has in mind the necessary restraint on liberty in the interest of national self-preservation. But Hynes' generalization is one sided: It looks to the responsibility of the Government in restraining for the common good, and never suggests the Government's responsibility to the person restrained. The Constitution is sensitive to the fact that an act of restraint is never simple, and therefore rules on the manner, duration, treatment under restraint—in short, on the quality of the act. Pound was taken into custody by the American military authorities in Italy on May 5, 1945, and detained virtually incommunicado in the Center near Pisa until early November of that year when he was brought back to the United States for arraignment. Detaining a civilian prisoner for so long a time as 6 months without arraignment, access to counsel, right of bail, and a speedy trial appears as violation of clauses in the Constitution:

1. Amendment V which assures citizens the right not to be deprived of liberty "without due process of law."

2. Amendment VI which states that "in all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial" and "have the assistance of counsel."

3. Article I, section 9, which states that "the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it."

There was neither rebellion nor invasion of the United States between May and November of 1945 (the war in fact had ended in all theaters by September), but during this time the authorities in Poland's case in effect suspended the writ. Moreover, his treatment at the center was, judging from Williams' account (Background of the Pisan Cantos, Poetry, January 1949, pp. 216–221), of the "cruel and unusual" type prohibited by amendment VIII. He was confined in a cage of heavy grillwork especially constructed for him—"the gorilla cage" of the poet's Canto 83—and he slept on the cement floor of it "with only a tar paper roof above him by day; at night he was permitted to rig a pup tent inside the cage to keep out the cold." One British commentator (Harvey Black, the Story of Ezra Pound, the European, November 1956, p. 164) refers to this treatment as "one of the more notorious scandals of recent history." It is difficult to believe that an animal's cage was the only available way of confining him, or that the Government could not have brought him back sooner, or that the Government did not know about the treatment. It was its responsibility to know, and to observe due process of law lest a successful prosecution of so serious a crime be jeopardized. But all this is past history, and what is more relevant is the present moment: Pound, who is now 72, has been in detention for almost 13 years—enough punishment for what the Government charges against him. Further detention, as Hemingway says, "should be classified as cruel and unusual punishment, and contrary to the Constitution of the United States" (A Tribute to Ezra Pound cited above).

World Brotherhood Community Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, Rochester, N. Y., has been designated to receive a World Brotherhood community award for its outstanding record of communitywide activities promoting international understanding and friendship with communities overseas. It is a great pleasure for me to call this award to the attention of my colleagues here because one-half of the fair city of Rochester is included in the district which I am privileged to represent here.

Rochester has been chosen for this honor by the World Brotherhood organization, a nonprofit organization with headquarters in the United States, Europe, and Asia devoted to promote understanding and cooperation between people of the world. Cochairmen are Arthur H. Compton, Carlos P. Romulo, Paul-Henri Spaak, Konrad Adenauer, and Mme. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit.

In announcement of the award, Rochester's community effort was said to have few parallels in the history of peacetime international action. No one person or group was credited with inspiring this activity; instead, the judges said, the sense of international responsibility which permeates the Rochester scene is intrinsically the product of individual citizen response to the challenge of the world outside.

This is, indeed, a wonderful tribute to the people of Rochester, and one which is highly deserved.

The Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, which also played its role in this communitywide effort, has reported the award in its news columns and I would like to include this report:

CITY WINS BROTHERHOOD AWARD FOR WORLD FRIENDSHIP EFFORTS

(By Constance Gomperts)

Rochester, a city with a sense of international responsibility, yesterday was named 1 of 2 recipients of the first annual world brotherhood of community awards.

The awards went to Rochester and Worthington, Minn.—a city of about 6,000—for "communitywide activities promoting international understanding and friendship with communities overseas."

The 2 brotherhood awards were made in 2 city population categories, with the 100,000-mark as the dividing line. Winners were selected after a nationwide survey of community programs in such fields as student exchange, hospitality for foreign visitors, foreign affairs education, and affiliation with a foreign city.

A local delegation will go to New York June 3 to receive an engraved bronze plaque and a Pan American World Airways community friendship grant presentation will be made by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Philippines Ambassador to the United States and cochairman of the World Brotherhood organization.

In announcing Rochester's selection for the award, the judges agreed, "Rochester is unique in that no single project, such as an affiliation with a specific overseas community was needed to mobilize its resources in a community effort which has few parallels in the history of peacetime international action."

Contributions by local industry and the Rochester Association for the United Nations won special mention in the judges' statement.

"The quality and extent of industrial participation in Rochester's international life is manifest at once through the many corporate gifts to worthy international causes, but also through the initiative and leadership shown by employees and management groups in inventing and carrying out specific plans for the international exchange of people, ideas, and friendship," the statement read.

The RAUN, with some 4,000 members devoting themselves to various international activities, is an obvious source of energy and enthusiasm within the city, and has provided the community with competent and highly valuable guidance, the judges remarked.

Rochester's entry for the World Brotherhood community award was prepared under the auspices of the RAUN. Information was gathered from more than 150 community leaders in the fields of government, religion, culture, education, industry, and social work.

"The sense of international responsibility which permeates the Rochester scene," commented the judges, "is intrinsically the product of individual citizen response to the challenges of the world outside."

Rochester received the award for the work of institutions and organizations such as these:

University of Rochester: A pioneer in the world awareness study program of nonwestern civilizations, founder of the high-energy nuclear physics conference with top East-West scientists and an active worker in plans for twin-city affiliation with Rennes, France.

Rochester Association for the United Nations: Largest United Nations group outside of New York City, sponsors International

Hospitality Committee for foreign visitors, cooperates with international projects of local groups.

City of Rochester: Reveals rich ethnic pattern without nationality problems, thanks to such activities as International Day music and dance festival. Also cited for exchange program with Rennes, and planned hospitality for international visitors.

Federation of Churches of Rochester and Vicinity: Leads the Nation, with the exception of New York City, in giving to World Council of Churches.

Catholic Diocese of Rochester: Outstrips any other diocese in per capita efforts for refugee resettlement.

Rochester business: Exceptional number and diversity of international companies, which attract more foreign visitors and study teams than any other city its size in the country.

Rochester City Club: Continues its 49th year of bringing top international speakers here.

Rochester public schools: Attract national attention for foreign language program.

Rochester International Friendship Council: Provides foreign students and trainees with a "home away from home" with American families.

Rochester Rotary Club: Sponsors United Nations scholarships for young people and and overseas student program.

Rochester Teen-Age Diplomats: One of most active programs in the American Field Service.

Rochester newspapers: Cited for quality and scope of international news coverage.

Rochester Museum of Arts and Sciences: Leads the Nation in broad community support of the UNESCO-sponsored Asia Month.

Rochester Chamber of Commerce: Shows interest in international relations by annual new citizens dinner.

Those were some of the main items compiled by Faith Wright in the report submitted by Rochester for the award. Miss Wright, a University of Rochester graduate and the winner of a Rotary International Fellowship, was hired by the RAUM to collect evidence of Rochester's qualifications for the award.

The local delegation that will receive the award will be chosen by a civic committee to be appointed by Mayor Peter Barry. The committee will include representatives from several principal organizations responsible for bringing the award to Rochester, Barry said.

The Pan American World Airways Community Friendship Grant, presented through the World Brotherhood organization, is for a reciprocal visit to a selected overseas city by a local community affairs leader. Judges said that the American communities should explore the possibilities of arranging these exchanges with cities in underdeveloped areas or behind the Iron Curtain.

Honorable mention for the World Brotherhood Community Awards went to San Jose, Calif.; Hagerstown, Md., and Montclair, N. J. Worthington received the award for its 10-year program of affiliation with Grailsheim, Germany.

The World Brotherhood organization, with headquarters in the United States, Europe, and Asia, is a nonprofit organization devoted to promote understanding and cooperation between peoples of the world. Judges in the contest were Edward H. Barrett, of the Columbia School of Journalism; Mrs. Ogden Reid, of the New York Herald Tribune; A. L. Cole, of the Reader's Digest; John Loeb, of Carl H. Loeb, Rhodes & Co.; and Dr. Everett R. Clinchy, president of World Brotherhood.

Fitting Emblem of Our National Life, History, Traditions: The Corn Tassel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 1, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the "Corn Tassel Lady" is the name given Miss Margo Cairns, of Minneapolis, Minn., by the Portland Oregonian. She sends a message to us recalling the claim our native corn has on our allegiance in this country, and the intimate part it has played in our short history. Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD, this short, stirring message, as follows:

When only 5 years old my grandfather lifted me to his knee and told me of the strange, yet marvelous, native plant he found growing in this land when he came from England. He sowed the seed of reverence in the fertile soil of a child's consciousness by calling it the Wonder Plant.

As I grew into the teens I became very fond of history. I frequently read of the role corn or maize played in building our Nation, from Jamestown in Virginia to Sutter's claim in California.

Searching back for a possible beginning I was, and still am, fascinated by corn's antiquity. Before the beloved Nazarene trod the hills of Judea maize was mothering teeming civilizations in the Andes. And farther back there was a long, long period of service—"a period to be expressed in milleniums rather than in centuries."

When I asked grandfather where the Wonder Plant came from, he earnestly replied: "God spoke, child, and it sprang forth." That answer satisfied me then, it satisfies me now. Henry Longfellow was right when he called maize "the gift of the Great Spirit."

Our Nation is so young that it seems only yesterday that valiant patriots made the dream of the ages come true—a home, a land, a Nation founded on the principles of freedom for all.

Patriots, gathered in tense meetings in Independence Hall during the stirring years of our national beginnings, relied on corn, not only for food, but as currency. They had shut the door on England and English coinage. There was no American mint until April 2, 1796. John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin relied on corn in financial transactions in the conduct of the War of Independence.

In the entrance to the law library of the United States Supreme Court there are six graceful columns carved in the likeness of bundles of cornstalks and topped with open ears of corn. They were ordered by our third president. Thomas Jefferson well knew the great debt the colonists owed corn.

Americans must wake up to an appreciation of the divine gift. No flower that blooms has so tender a claim on our history, our traditions, and our hearts as the corn tassel. As a man thinks, so is he. As a nation thinks, so is it. Gratitude, or the lack of it, powerfully affects the destiny of nations as well as individuals. History gives full proof of that.

During the birth throes of our Nation—in Philadelphia, in Boston, in Richmond, in the settlements, and at Valley Forge, maize or corn mothered, sustained and strengthened a visionary and determined people. Let us never forget.

MARGO CAIRNS.

Dynamiting and Its Lesson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the recent bombings in our country by fanatical bigots have aroused all right-thinking Americans. I can think of no conduct more ungodly or un-American or that would give more encouragement to the Communists than such outrageous actions. It is encouraging to be able to call to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial from the May 2, 1958, edition of the Catholic Week, the official publication of the Catholic Church in Alabama and northwest Florida:

THE ATTEMPTED DYNAMITING OF A JEWISH TEMPLE AND ITS LESSON

We thank God that the attempt last Monday to dynamite the Jewish synagog, Temple Beth-El in Birmingham failed. We thank God that His imposing house of prayer erected to the honor and glory of God was spared. We thank God that whereas human lives could have been destroyed, no one was injured.

In the name of the Catholic people of the community, we express our horror that such a reprehensible attempt to blow up a house of God could have been made. We join with the community in our expression of sympathy with Rabbi Abraham J. Mesch and his people that their temple could be subjected to such indignities. We rejoice with them that the attempt failed and that no one was hurt.

The local authorities are to be congratulated on the speed and determination with which they have attacked this case. Every effort must be made to uncover these guilty of such hoodlumism and bring them to full justice. We wish our officials every success and urge them to presevere in their investigations until justice is satisfied.

Such an outrageous attempt to dynamite a house of prayer is a time of conscience for us members of the Birmingham community. The city is now placed in dishonor until the wrong deed is righted. Public opinion will want to know what failing in our community makes such an act possible.

We, the people of city, while we lament this act, must look to ourselves, to our own thinking and to what we have been doing or allowing, that hoodlums can intimidate and bully and frighten and even perpetrate actual acts of violence with impunity.

Our complacency in the face of other similar acts of violence now comes back to haunt us. This is not the first house of prayer to be bombed in recent times. We have had many homes similarly dynamited. We have had families blown out of their beds in the dead of night.

But now a leading and imposing temple of God has been brazenly attacked. Where will this violence end if the community does not rid from itself the atmosphere that makes such acts possible.

The attempt to dynamite Temple Beth-El is a shameful sore on the face of our community but like sores it can indicate some interior decay that must be healed. And so it is, that this act of violence may prove of benefit for it can wake us up to the dangerous feelings of ill-will and hatred that we have allowed to develop within our community, and, which we have abetted by our complacency and indifference to those who openly and secretly propagate such hate and ill-will.

Military Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. COYA KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1958

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, at the request of a constituent, Mr. Howard L. McLeod, of Bemidji, Minn., I insert in the RECORD his protest against an inequity in the military disability schedules:

APRIL 30, 1958.

For: Attention of Members of the House of Representatives.

From: A disabled first lieutenant on maximum benefits.

Subject: Retired pay provisions of military pay bill H. R. 11470.

One across-the-board-percentage increase is just an easy out, merely sounding like equal justice for all. There is a lot of difference in the plight of 100 percent disabled junior officers where most of the casualties exist both from past wars and current accidents, who are largely unemployable and provided for now at hardship rates way under what the Veterans' Administration is paying 90-day married recruits with 100 percent disability, and the situation of the employed 20-year retired or the employed retired getting three-fourths pay of old laws for minor disability. It is discrimination to treat all the retired alike. The 6 percent of above bill does not overcome the inequity at all.

Only last session of Congress, compensation for the 100 percent disabled was raised 24 percent and the lesser disabled only 10 percent. I am being paid now, $248 per month compensation by the Veterans' Administration versus $206.19 the Career Incentive Act awards me for maximum disability retired pay set for anyone with 80 percent to 100 percent disability in first lieutenant category in short service, as World War I was only 19 months' hostilities. Any first lieutenant or second lieutenant caught early in a long war or in a short war with heavy disability, even the current crop, is similarly crucified. Please see the table attached hereto.

Thank you to take steps now to insert a provision in section 4 of the above bill to the effect that ranks O–1 (second lieutenant), O–2 (first lieutenant), O–3 (captain), shall receive $10, $20, $30 respectively over the $248 VA allows a married 90-day recruit entitled to 100 percent compensation, if such officers are entitled to a 100 percent rating at VA, and are entitled to maximum disability retired benefits of current laws for 80 percent to 100 percent disability. You will quickly see this eliminates the inequity fairly at little extra costs. Only about 6 percent of disabled service connected ever rate 100 percent; they are the ones that need more than the readily employable, longevity-retired, building up further retirements.

Respectfully,

HOWARD L. MCLEOD,
First Lieutenant, United States Army, Emergency Officers' Retired List.

Memorandum of data on military disability retired pay

	What a married 90-day E–1 recruit on 100 percent compensation gets from VA	What ranks O–3, O–2, and O–1 get from services as maximum disability retired pay for 80 to 100 percent disability World War I, World War II, Korean conflict and up to H. R. 11470 passage		
		Under 2 years	Over 2 years	Over 3 years
		Captain		
1949	$171	$235.13	$235.13	$235.13
1952	202	244.53	244.53	244.53
1955	202	259.20	259.20	263.25
1958	248	[1] 262.75	[1] 262.75	[1] 277.16
		1st lieutenant		
1949	171	$186.04	$197.72	$197.72
1952	202	194.52	205.63	205.63
1955	202	206.19	217.97	251.55
1958	248	[1] 218.56	[1] 230.05	[1] 266.14
		2d lieutenant		
1949	171	$160.32	$171.00	$171.00
1952	202	166.74	177.84	177.84
1955	202	176.72	188.51	222.30
1958	248	[1] 187.31	[1] 199.81	[1] 235.69

[1] Proposed 6 percent.

Please note there are no dependency allowances for wife or children in retired pay; nor are there any statutory awards for loss of use or loss of arms, legs, eyes, etc. with retired pay.

As to men of the above ranks in disability status as above, it appears they will merely be getting three-fourths of the 1952 base pay rate, if they become disabled after passage of the bill. That will be the rates shown above, opposite 1952, because of no raise in base pay in 1955 and 1958.

WHO GOT NO RAISE UNDER CAREER INCENTIVE ACT OF 1955 (AUTHORITY: P. 205, SENATE HEARINGS)

About half the entire enlisted population, 1,312,237 (enlisted men).

Corporals to master sergeants, 652,411 (E–3 to E–7).

About half of all first and second lieutenants (lieutenants O–1 and O–2 comprise about half the entire officer corps), 64,963 (O–1 and O–2).

Captains, 601 (O–3).

Majors, 572 (O–4).

Lieutenant colonels, 20 (O–5).

Few people realize that half the services are being deliberately underpaid in the lower brackets of pay. It gets cheap labor all right, but it should bother anyone's conscience a party to it.

No man is master of when disability hits, but the tables below show you the ridiculous differentials that exist between lieutenants of the same rank and degree of disability, because of only a mediocre difference in length of service:

80 to 100 disabled on maximum disability retired pay

	Under 2 years	Over 3 years	Difference per month for a year and 1 day
1st lieutenant:			
1955 law	$206.19	$251.55	$45.36
1958 proposed	218.56	266.14	47.58
2d lieutenant:			
1955 law	176.72	222.30	45.58
1958 proposed	187.31	235.69	48.38

Thus, a ridiculous premium is put on when a disability occurs. At all other points of service longevity is worth about one-fourth the above figures for 2 years.

Here's some more inequity: About 80 percent of all retired disabled officers are rated 30 percent to 60 percent disabled and 55 percent of these are rated only 30 percent disabled. Most of these 30 percent disabled get three-fourths base pay of old laws with some increases such as the one proposed in H. R. 11470 which would give a first lieutenant with short service $175.29 which is $5.84 per 1 percent of disability. A 100 percent disabled first lieutenant with the proposed 6 percent increase of H. R. 11470, also in short service gets $218.56 which is but $2.18 per 1 percent of disability. I am sure you get the idea: the higher the rate of disability the less the rate of payment—the opposite of Veterans' Administration policy.

Most of these anomalies or contradictions are traceable to the no-raise theory of the Department of Defense. The 6 percent increases of disability retired pay did not offset the two cuts in base pay for ranks O–1 and O–2 in 1955 and 1958 as proposed.

Tyrant parents used to sell their lads into bondage to ostensibly learn a trade, but actually to furnish cheap labor. It appears that is exactly what the Defense Department wants from civilians in line with Mr. Charles R. Hook's statement in 1949 that he worked for nothing to learn his trade. Modern business offers $350 to $500 per month with freedom from discipline, with expenses, and fringe benefits equal to the services, to college graduates, who, if the industry is defense strategic, get 4–F classification. Actually, 1 percent under the much lauded Hook Commission recommended rates of 1949 is what 1958 starting rates are. To say these rates are up to date is a falsehood on the face of it.

It would be an easy matter to cut out the 3-year column in the pay tables of H. R. 11470 and figure normal longevity back from the 4- or 6-year rates to establish under 2 and over 2 rates so symmetry and justice would prevail again.

One more statistical fact that is more startling than all the above: The Bradley report (p. 214) and the hearings on the Survivors' Benefits Act (p. 174), both in 1956, state that about 3 percent only out of all who enter the services ever stay in even for the 20-year longevity retirement where I suspect most get out or walk out after getting good specialized training, still young. Just 3 percent, apparently, like the services. Few people, also, do not want to be policemen or preachers or bartenders. I refer to the peacetime, more mercenary motives that go to work. Hard times may increase enlistments, but human nature's likes and dislikes won't change the ratios much, regardless of price tag.

So long as 97 percent of those who enter services are noncareer men, yet are a fine backlog of semitrained men, it would seem equal-pay consideration should be given them by a democracy. Service careers should not make anyone a superman. The tendency of the 3 percent is to disparage the 97 percent who also have careers affected.

Remarks of Senator Lehman at Birthday Dinner Tendered Him by the New York Board of Rabbis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend a dinner honoring Senator Lehman's 80th birthday, given by the New York Board of Rabbis, in New York City on May 1, 1958. Senator Lehman's remarks on that occasion are worthy of the attention of our colleagues, and were as follows:

I want to thank you for the honor which you do me here tonight, and for this very wonderful birthday party. If there was any single thing which could have added to the rewards of this 80th birthday, it is this party, and the opportunity which you have given me to speak to you tonight. This invitation was a particularly happy one for me, for the New York Board of Rabbis is an organization with which I feel completely comfortable. Jewish community life in America is replete with factional organizations. Personally, I have never been disturbed by the ritualistic and theological differences which sometimes have divided Jew from Jew. I am interested in Judaism as Judaism, just as this group has always been interested in Judaism. During the war and on many other occasions, you demonstrated that Jews can operate in union, if they are united by common concerns.

Today our common concerns are no fewer—our sense of kinship no less. And today we have, I believe, an additional bond holding us together—our common problems.

Our age is one of tremendous technological advance—and perhaps even greater technological potential. The 19th century believed in and accepted the laws of nature as immutable, the speed of sound, the science of behaviorism. At every turn, man felt that he was but a step away from ultimates. The 20th century brought discoveries which destroyed those limits. The law of relativity brought a new understanding of immutability as it relates to the laws of nature; the sound barrier is in our jet age little more than another speedometer reading; psychoanalysis and psychiatry have shown us a new dimension in human behavior which the behaviorists did not even suspect.

The striking thing in all of our progress is that it is progress beyond what, just a few decades ago, man conceived as goals. What has shaken, our civilization perhaps even more than our knowledge of the unprecedented destructive forces we have unleashed, is our sudden perception of our ignorance. Whereas in the nineties we thought ourselves on the verge of final answers, today we are aware that we may not even be asking the right questions.

There is great hope in this situation, for we know now that, far from being on the verge of knowing all the answers, what we have done is to push far forward the frontiers of knowledge. We know too that there is room for more and more probing and investigation. We have made great progress, and in the process, have freed ourselves from chains of superstition so that we understand that there is still much more to be learned and to be done.

But there is also real peril in our situation. Aside from the obvious danger that we will abuse our new technological knowledge, and, in a single error, destroy the world, there is also the risk that we will become enamored of technological progress for its own sake, and learn to move faster and faster, without pausing to wonder about our direction.

To avoid this pitfall, we must study our scientific achievements in terms of their human values—we must relate technological progress to human progress, and our newly discovered technological potiential to our eternal hopes and dreams of a better world. Our civilization is one in which sources of power can make the difference between a prosperous, secure nation, and an impoverished nation, between people contentedly working for their happy families and healthy children, and people suffering and hopeless. Knowing this, as we all do, is it not strange that even our most progressive and internationally oriented citizens have been more energetic in their protests against the destructive power of the atom, than in their pressure for the constructive use for the benefit of all humanity of the tremendous source of power which the atom represents?

How are we to assure ourselves that our scientific discoveries, present and future, will be used for human betterment, and not for human destruction? Of one thing I am certain. We will not accomplish these objectives by turning our civilization over wholly to the scientists, nor yet, as people have been urging recently, by training all of our children and grandchildren to be scientists. Without in any way detracting from the value of scientific achievement, we must recognize that achievement is a tool which can be used for good or evil, and we must learn to educate ourselves and our children and grandchildren, to use that tool for human betterment.

How is this to be accomplished? We must learn to ask the right questions, and then to seek their answers, using the same rigorous techniques which have been crowned with such conspicuous success in our laboratories. Certainly one of these questions is how our technological progress can bring prosperity and happiness to the underdeveloped areas of the world, and to the "have not" nations. Another is how we can use science to bring us world peace, instead of world annihilation. If the dimensions of these problems appear somewhat frightening, perhaps we ought to ask ourselves whether we are using all the means at our disposal to block out the answers. Are we, for example, making full use of the human resources available? So long as there are children of superior ability who do not get an education commensurate with their ability, the answer is "No." So long as there are men and women tied to degrading jobs solely because of their color or their religion, the answer is "No." I am forced to conclude that in spite of our technological progress, in spite of our potential, our world is not advancing as it might because we are not seeking right answers to compelling questions, because we are not relating knowledge to human betterment, and because we are not utilizing the available human progress, and in the process, have freed ourselves from chains of superstition so that we understand that there is still much more to be learned and to be done.

In 1937, the major threat to world freedom came from Hitler's Germany. Today it comes from Soviet Russia. Surely it is no accident that the threat to freedom has so frequently come from the godless states, who regard man as an instrument of national politics, rather than recognizing him as one endowed by his Creator with certain inalienable rights.

Another area in which we Jews have special and bitter experience is that of minority rights. Having ourselves been members of a minority since the destruction of the temple, we have a special understanding of the role and frequently the suffering of a minority. If I were asked to pinpoint one single problem as the most serious and urgent facing the world today, I should unhesitatingly point to the problem of the world's colored populations. This is a deep-rooted problem for the United States, because every blunder we make, every setback we suffer in the area of race relations, is used by the Iron Curtain countries, and even by the friendly nations of Western Europe, to challenge the strength and the integrity of our democratic form of government. It is a problem for the world, because racial discrimination is depriving us of some of our finest minds and some of our best potential leadership and because prejudice and injustice does even more damage to those who practice it than it does to its victims.

During the period of the Hitler terror, Jews, as the victims, were quick to see that the danger was not a Jewish problem, but a problem for all civilization. The world came very slowly to a realization of the correctness of this judgment. The problem and tragic effect of racial discrimination, too, is a world problem. To refer to it as "the Negro problem" indicates either an inaccurate use of language, or a failure to grasp the basic issues involved. All men, mindful of the concept of the brotherhood of man, must play an uncompromising and rigorous part in the struggle for equal rights for all men.

There is a third area in which it seems to me that all of us, as Jews and as Americans, should assume vigorous and dedicated leadership. In this area, as in the area of discrimination, I believe that we have a unique moral responsibility. Just as the problem of discrimination should have top priority on our agenda, so what happens to the new State of Israel should be accorded high priority by all. In the struggle of the past decade to keep the state alive, some of the idealism which surrounded its creation has been forgotten. The world needs to be reminded of Israel's role—and we must remember that almost as important as national survival is the preservation of the ideals upon which Israel was founded. Israel must always fulfill its traditional role as a Messenger of Peace, an example of religious freedom for all, a refuge for the homeless, and a meeting ground for East and West.

I believe that the problems which I have outlined this evening are universal problems in a transcendent sense. By addressing ourselves to these problems, we may be able to raise the sights of our entire generation to goals which are worthy of the best human effort. Even if solutions elude us, our society will be transformed by its very concentration on such goals. Our technological discoveries will become truly our servants rather than potentially our masters. It is because the 19th century regarded scientific progress as an end in itself that we have today knowledge of the structure of the atom which may be used to annihilate society rather than to serve it.

The goals toward which man was moving in the 19th century were inadequate goals. The very fact that we passed them by is proof of their inadequacy. While men pursued such ends, he saw himself as the potential ruler of the world. Now that the goals are passed, we have the opportunity to set new and worthier goals, which will enable us once more to see ourselves as creatures in a universe beyond our powers of understanding. And too, we are freed to make constant further technological progress, because we have learned to distrust ultimates. Thus, while the 19th century scientist tended to be a mechanist, and spoke of the conflict between science and religion, the 20th century scientist is aware of an order that transcends his understanding, and finds his faith constantly buttressed by his knowledge. The newly established community of discourse between scientist and religious leader, combined with society's discovery of the folly of accepting inadequate goals, offers new opportunity to us as Jews to assume

once more our traditional role. With opportunity, inevtiably, comes responsibility—and in that responsibility lies the challenge of our society to all of us. We must put aside our factional differences, and through the teaching of freedom, through the example of human brotherhood, we must share with our society the universal values of our religious heritage.

President of American Farm Bureau Calls for Balanced Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, during the last several months little has been heard of the necessity for budget sanity. It is a treat to know that Mr. Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, calls attention to the fact that the Farm Bureau believes a balanced budget is essential.

Mr. Shuman warns against Government intervention as a cure-all and points out that after having experienced 25 years of price regulation and production controls, the Government programs have failed.

Mr. Shuman's thoughts, as reported in the Chicago Tribune of April 23, are as follows:

PUMP PRIMING UNSOUND: SHUMAN

(By Richard Orr)

LAFAYETTE, IND., April 22.—The head of the Nation's biggest farm organization today called for a halt in Government deficit spending and pump priming, and asserted that a balanced budget is essential to the welfare of the economy.

Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, said that agriculture must move toward a relatively free market and away from Government pricing of agricultural products. He spoke at the closing session of the 2-day national institute of animal agriculture at Purdue University.

Farm experts from 27 States and Canada attended the conference.

BALANCED BUDGET ESSENTIAL

"Farmers have a vital interest in Government fiscal and monetary policies, both as taxpayers and as businessmen," Shuman said. "The Farm Bureau believes that a balanced budget is essential and that it can be provided even though new emphasis seems to be necessary on certain phases of our military effort.

"The times require that Government exercise strict economy and promote efficient operation. If increases in spending are needed for some Government functions, they should be offset by reductions in other items.

"Deficit spending and pump priming by Government do not represent a sound approach to solving the problems of either recession or inflation."

Shuman asserted that farmers will have a better future if Government programs permit them to follow traditional competitive patterns.

TWENTY-FIVE-YEAR EXPERIMENT

"The family farm is secure if the Government gives farmers the opportunity to compete with each other—and that means the opportunity to go broke as well as to succeed—and earn their living under a competitive free-enterprise system," he said. "We have had 25 years of experience in attempting to establish prices and control production by Government action.

"As a result, almost everyone who has any knowledge of the subject will admit, either privately or publicly, that these Government programs have failed.

"I mention that private admission because we still have folks who have a part to play politically who will not admit it publicly."

Shuman said that among the major areas in which agriculture is lacking is the field of human nutrition. Studies show, he said, that, if the diet of the American people is upgraded and improved as it should be, it would require most if not all of the country's current surplus food production to feed the people.

Neither Suicide Nor Surrender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Norman Cousins which appeared in the Saturday Review for April 12, 1958:

NEITHER SUICIDE NOR SURRENDER

(By Norman Cousins)

The same set of facts about the ideological struggle and nuclear terror has produced two opposing and fast-growing viewpoints.

The facts are profoundly disturbing, but at least they are visible. The Soviet Union is in a considerably stronger position than it was only a short time ago and is getting even stronger with each passing year. This strength is measured not solely by scientific advances or the ability to make nuclear weapons in quantity but by the increasing acceptance of Soviet leadership by the peoples of Asia and Africa who constitute the majority of the world's people. The imaginative thrust of the Soviet in ending its bomb tests has given dramatic momentum to this claim for leadership. Within a few years the West may be confronted with the bristling and bulging reality of a Soviet sphere of influence embracing perhaps two-thirds the globe.

Meanwhile, there has been a steady and costly shrinkage of American influence in the world, especially among peoples of darker skins, which is to say, the preponderance. While we have managed from time to time to come before the world with bold visions, such as the Marshall plan and economic assistance for underdeveloped areas, by and large our standing and influence have been steadily receding. What we have said and done in our relations with other nations have not always reflected careful knowledge about the actual conditions in those nations. Indeed, it has sometimes seemed that we were actually playing to a domestic gallery with our foreign policies rather than to living history. We constructed a fantasy in which security was compounded at least partially of self-serving legends and myths of invulnerability and superiority.

Every now and then, however, a moment of stark truth punctured the fantasy and produced brief flurries of searching doubt. The Soviet's earth satellite, for example, exploded the notion of an ignorant and inept opponent. And the initiative of the Soviet Union in the matter of radioactive fallout is akin to a moral disaster for the United States. True, the Soviet Union waited until its own big nuclear tests were completed before making its dramatic appeal to the world's conscience on the issue of nuclear testing. Even so, the fact remains that the Soviet Union and not the United States acted first in this vital matter.

This political and ideological clash has been taking place in the context of a continuing military revolution. Soon big hydrogen bombs will be fitted into missile delivery systems which will bring the Soviet and the United States within 15 minutes of each other. In the name of security, both nations are fashioning continental pulverizing weapons against which no defense can possibly exist. But the result of these weapons will be to intensify, not reduce, the existing insecurity.

Two extreme and conflicting viewpoints, as we say, have grown out of these facts.

One viewpoint, now openly expressed, is that nuclear war is inevitable and that the United States is not under the obligation to wait until it is hit first. According to this argument, our only chance of victory is to be the first to drop the hydrogen bomb. Besides, it is contended that the advantage of surprise attack is so great that we can almost count upon it as certain that the Soviet Union will strike the moment it is ready. Therefore, we have to hit whether we like it or not.

The contrasting viewpoint, generally identified with Bertrand Russell, is that the West should submit to the Soviet Union as the best way of preventing a nuclear war that would expunge life on earth. The price of submission may be high, Lord Russell admits, but it will not continue indefinitely, for communism may eventually succumb to its own weaknesses. But if war should come, then all life will be expunged.

The first viewpoint leads to mutual suicide, for it precipitates the very nuclear war it ostensibly seeks to limit. The second viewpoint leads to the annihilation of the freeman, for it equates survival with surrender.

But it is false—tragically and hideously false—to say that these are the only alternatives. We don't have to be run by our jitters and drop the big bombs that could put an end to the age of man. Nor do we have to fall on our knees before a colossus in order to keep him from waging nuclear war.

What can we do, first of all, is to stop deceiving ourselves as to the nature of peace and the requirements of peace. We can recognize that peace and unfettered national sovereignty cannot go together in a world which can be circled in 90 minutes by a device that can vaporize whole cities in one blow. We can make a total commitment to the cause of a United Nations with the effective powers of government adequate to deal with the basic causes of tension and conflict.

We can emancipate ourselves from the seductive nonsense to which we have given our energies and allegiances in such large measure since the end of the war. We can decide that the most important thing in our lives is not the height and sweep of automobile tail fins but the height and sweep of our ideas on creating a world under law.

"This is what we own, this is what we believe, this is what we can do," we can say to the world. "We make a total and unequivocal commitment to a safe world and a better one. Our preoccupation is to sustain and serve the gift of life. We state our readiness to accept and support the concept of a federated world to replace the present anarchy. We will work for such a concept to any extent that may be required."

The alternative to either suicide or surrender is still sanity.

Remarks of Hon. Thomas J. Lane, of Massachusetts, Before Knights of Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a part of my remarks as guest speaker at the annual communion breakfast of Father Gabriel Druillette Assembly, fourth degree, Knights of Columbus, held Sunday, May 4, 1958, at the Tavern, Gloucester, Mass.

This assembly is made up of members of the fourth degree Knights of Columbus from several cities and towns in Essex County, Mass., and the faithful navigator of this active and energetic organization is Russell W. Parks, of Gloucester, ably assisted by Rodolph J. Pelletier, of Peabody, who acted as master of ceremonies:

Greetings. In the peaceful spring of 1914, Russia was the largest nation in the world, as measured by area, and one of the most backward.

The majority of its people were barely existing; for them there had been scant change or progress during the preceding century.

Under the harsh rule of the Czars, enforced by the secret police, Russia became known as the land where the slightest dissent meant exile to Siberia.

The people outside of the gay and glittering palaces of the aristocracy, lived out their grim and hopeless lives, sustained by black bread and cabbage soup, and faith in a merciful hereafter.

Like the bitter cold and snow which come early to Russia, and leave late, the memory of Ivan the Terrible and his successors, lay heavy upon the land:

And the people were numbed by despair.

Except for the conspirators.

Hate and terror reap the wild harvest of revenge.

Here and there throughout feudal Russia, a few people organized underground cells of resistance. There was little they could do to convince the czars of the imperative need for social, economic and political reforms. In their desparation, they resorted to hit-and-run bombings and assassinations.

Some time before, in the musty halls of the British Museum, a harmless-looking theorist named Karl Marx, had painstakingly selected the data from history to support his claim that only through international socialism, could the people of this world free themselves from their misery.

Young and ambitious radicals like Nicolai Lenin, who had managed to escape from Russia before the secret police caught up with them, were scheming and quarreling in the garrets of various European capitals.

Lenin was the first to realize the propaganda possibilities of the revolutionary book written by Marx and to use it as a springboard to power.

With instinctive cunning, he sensed that the Russian people would grasp at any straw—any promise no matter how visionary it might be—that would offer some way out of the poverty and oppression under which they and their forefathers had suffered so long that it seemed eternal.

Lenin knew that he must prepare for the moment of opportunity.

Meanwhile, from his headquarters in Switzerland he directed the propaganda seeding, and the sporadic terrorism, of his agents operating from the Russian underground.

How long would he have to wait?

In early 1914, the world was at peace.

The Czar had brushed aside the request of moderate elements for some minor changes that would lead to an improvement in the government of Russia, and in the living conditions of its people. His control was absolute. He held all the cards as did all the Czars before him. Russia was regimented and that was it.

Then it began, with a remote and unrelated incident.

A Serbian student assassinated Archduke Francis Ferdinand of Austria-Hungary. This touched off stern reprisals that—through the chain reaction of alliances—brought on the tragedy of World War I.

Nations were fighting nations, and it happened with such suddenness that no one understood why it had to be.

A student had killed a member of the royal family.

But this was no reason for plunging most of Europe into a long and exhausting war, from which some nations have never recovered.

Imperial Russia joined Britain and France against Germany and the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

For a time, the Russians fought well, even though they were poorly equipped, poorly led, and had nothing to fight for.

Defeats on the battlefield, and increasing shortages of food on the home front were more than the stolid and long-suffering Russians could stand.

Even the czar had to recognize that the situation was critical.

Under pressure from some of his advisers, and from responsible elements, he gave way to a provisional government under Alexander Kerensky. It was hoped that the effort to build a parliamentary form of government would inspire the people to carry on the war with renewed vigor.

For victory would mean a new life for the people of Russia.

Most of the people, however, with the sacrifices of war added to the privations they endured in peace, were too weary to care about anything.

Kerensky tried to organize and firm up a government by moderate methods.

But the small band of Communists, led by the fanatics who returned to Russia as soon as they heard that the moment of opportunity was at hand, were not bothered by such scruples.

They knew what they wanted.

They were a tightly knit band.

And they were sure that reasonable men would be no match for the brute force, the lies, and the treachery which they employed to gain their ends.

In the confusion and the indecision which they skillfully promoted to paralyze the moderate groups, the Communists quickly seized the nerve centers of control.

The tragedy of 1917 is that a handful of conspirators were able to take over the great and sprawling nation that is Russia; to consolidate their power; and to subject the people to the iron-handed oppression of a Stalin whose brutality far exceeded the oppressions which have stained so much of Russian history.

Although its western frontiers are in Europe, the vast distances and primitive communications had separated Russia from the European community.

The Communists, fearing the influence of western ideas during the period when they were training their people to accept the new slavery, permitted a few diplomats and technicians to enter that land of mystery, but kept them under constant watch, and allowed them to travel only within a restricted area.

In spite of all the regimentation, and the formidable power they possess, the Russian Communists are not sure that the Russian people really love them.

They saw what happened in Hungary, where years of Communist indoctrination had failed to brainwash the yearning for freedom. At the first real chance, the Hungarians rose in revolt. After days of heroic fighting they had succeeded in winning their independence. Then the Russians summoned their leaders to a conference, from which they never returned. Having betrayed the popular leaders, the Russians then moved into the country with overwhelming force to crush the Hungarian people and enslave them again under a puppet regime, backed by Russian tanks.

This lesson has not been lost upon the Communists.

Although their goal is the establishment of a materialistic society in Russia, and then throughout the world, that will be completely subservient to them, they realize that they must employ different weapons, at different times.

First it is the bloody purge of the opposition within their own country and of deviationists within the party.

Then there is the Iron Curtain period during which they force their people, by enormous sacrifices, to build heavy goods industries, and military hardware.

This is followed by a "peace propaganda offensive," a cynical but adroit campaign to hypnotize the rest of the world and to promote the complacency which makes things so much easier for the Communists.

Now, under Khrushchev, they are copying from the American book on salesmanship.

To make people forget about Lenin, and Stalin, and the facts about communism in practice, Khrushchev is smiling for all the cameras, and frequently manages to work himself into a position where he is gently patting some youngster on the head when the flashbulbs light up the scene.

They have just sent a new Ambassador to the United States who must have memorized that book on How to Win Friends and Influence People.

Exuding charm, he started out immediately on a rugged social schedule, that had him visiting every top official in the American government, and having his pictures taken with them for distribution around the world, of course, and to prove that the United States and Russia are getting very chummy.

It took some weeks for our Government to wake up to the fact that through the agency of this Ambassador, specially trained for this assignment, the Communists were beating us at our own game.

And the logical question came up: Why don't we insist that our Ambassador to Russia be given the same public-relations opportunity over there, in return for the privileges enjoyed by their representative here? If they fail to cooperate, we should restrict the activities of the Russian Ambassador in the same way that the Russians limit ours.

This American reaction is logical and fair.

It illustrates, in a minor way, the difficulties experienced in working out any agreement with the Communists that they will honor.

Having rejected Christian morality because it interferes with their lust for power and their determination to dominate the lives of others, they have become a law unto themselves.

The Soviets have solemnly signed many treaties, and have subsequently broken their pledged word on most of them.

There is no room for mutality in their policy, which is based on one factor and only one factor; whatever is done, or undone, must always exploit others for the benefit of Soviet Russia—first, last, and always.

The Communists insist on a suspension of nuclear tests, and on the strength of this they fool many gullible people who have not yet learned the basic treachery of Soviet foreign policy.

When the United States speaks up for a system of mutual inspection to guarantee that any agreement will be kept on both sides, the Kremlin delays, injects new issues, or changes the subject.

Unfortunately, there are hundreds of millions of ignorant people in this world, and the Soviets are playing on their credulity. The Reds know that these simple and unsuspecting souls, without the training to observe, and compare, and separate the true from the false, are easy game for their never-resting propaganda barrage.

Did I say ignorant people?

At least they have an excuse.

But what about those who have had the advantage of an education, and still are taken in by the Communist line?

Or the officials in some nations who should know better because the record of Communist cruelty and betrayal is no secret who cling to the hope that the Communists will reform?

This leads us back to the question: Why does any human being become a Communist in the first place?

We can understand why some underprivileged people in backward countries who have never known anything but misery all of their lives, will be attracted by the Communist promises, because anything seems better than their present lot.

We are also aware of the radicals who could never get along with anybody, and who see communism as the short cut to positions of absolute power over their fellowmen.

There are also the self-seekers who, without a qualm of conscience, would jump on any bandwagon that seems to be going places.

Saddest of all are the idealists who believed the false promises of communism, and became so deeply enmeshed before they woke up, that it was too late to turn back.

The plans of Karl Marx called for an international revolution by the workers, and the abolition of private property.

This was supposed to lead to a "withering away of the state."

How has Communist Russia carried out this objective? It maintains the largest bureaucracy, and army, and secret-police force, in the peactime history of the world.

Marx proposed a leveling-out or the elimination of distinctions between cities and towns. In Russia today the cities are swollen by the influx of millions from the countryside who exist one family to a room.

Marx wrote of a future society where all would work according to their ability, and receive according to their needs. In Russia today, the gap between the standard of living enjoyed by the top bureaucrats, and the wretched condition of the peasants, mocks the Marxian dream.

According to him, exploitation of one human being by another was going to be eliminated. His Communist pupils, through the power of the state, have kept wages far down and prices up high. That's how they live lavishly, maintain a huge military machine to further their ambitions; and build the heavy industries to catch up with and surpass American production, not to provide consumer goods to improve the lives of their people, but military hardware to enslave the world.

This is not all. Never were so many people tortured and murdered and driven to exhaustion under cover of hypocritical slogans about the abolition of exploitation and oppression as in Soviet Russia during the 40 years of the Communist Party's tyrannical rule of that country.

Marx was convinced that socialism would bring a classless society.

If he could come back from the grave, he wouldn't recognize his theories as the Communists have put them into practice.

Under the guise of the great deceit, they have replaced the older upper class with a new one, their own.

Some Communists have detected the fraud, and a few have spoken out against it.

The most notable was Milovan Djilas, once Vice President of Yugoslavia, and President of its so-called Parliament. He was the right-hand man of Tito from the days when they were fighting as guerrillas against the Nazis. Being intelligent and sincere, he could not forever lie to himself. In time he realized "that communism corrupts those it gives power, turning them into bureaucrats exerting power solely for their own ends."

His conscience would not let him rest.

In 1954, he resigned from the party.

He began to speak and write in a manner that did not parrot the Communist line. He was warned, but he continued to speak his mind. Because he had been one of the top Communists, he was not liquidated. That would be too obvious. Instead, he was thrown into the silence of a prison.

Before this, he had been working feverishly to put his thoughts down on paper. The book he wrote was smuggled out of Yugoslavia, and was published in this country.

Fittingly, it was titled "The New Class."

He describes his growing distrust of communism, as he saw it operate, from a high position and from the inside.

"For what doth it profit a man or a group to gain the whole world and lose its soul?"

Torture, and murder, and grinding tyranny, are no excuse for building up the material power of a nation to serve the whims, or ambitions of a few.

Thousands of slaves died under the lash in the building of the Pyramids, but what happened to ancient Egypt?

The millions who toil for bread alone in the labor camps of Russia, and the millions more outside who are cruelly exploited by their Communist masters will not forever resign themselves to this death-in-life.

And what about the scientists, and writers, and artists, and engineers, and managers of industry? In its drive to become an all-powerful state, and the ruler of the world, the Communists must develop and encourage these skills. Here they run their greatest risk. For people of intellectual ability who are trained to think cannot help but compare the life in Russia with the life outside. The Soviets give the greatest honors and awards to these people, but their greatest need is for freedom in which to develop their talents. Some observers in the Western World count on this group, whose influence is increasing, to bring about a moderation in the rigid controls and the expansionist policies of Russian communism.

This may, or may not happen, sometime in the future, but it would be folly on our part to sit back and wait for communism to disintegrate from internal pressures.

Communism is gambling, cooly and cleverly, for nothing short of world domination.

The Russians have extended their control, and have increased their prestige among the uncommitted nations, at a small cost to themselves.

Communist propaganda is wide awake.

It is constantly harping on peace out of one side of its mouth, while stirring up trouable of all kind from the opposite corner.

It is not enough to point out that some of its charges are ridiculous.

They have a psychological impact that fools many people, and keeps the free world on the defensive. They are designed to keep us so busy answering these accusations, that we have no time to put forward those constructive proposals that would appeal to world opinion.

The man who coined the phrase "cold war" sized up Russian policy in these 2 words.

The Communists are trying to wear us down by every stratagem short of war. Being realists, they are aware that we have the power to retaliate, which they could not knock out at one blow. Hence, their diplomacy is maneuvering for some trap to disarm us, while they secretly increase their own strength to the point where it would become overwhelming, and we would have no choice but surrender.

Our officials see through the twists and turns of Soviet policy to its central purpose.

We hope that the American people, and the people of the whole free world, will never "be taken in" by any Communist offer, no matter how relaxing it may appear on the surface.

Communism never relaxes.

It is always probing for a weakness to exploit.

Remember how Hitler did it for awhile?

Then he became impatient and overreached himself, plunging most of the world into a long and destructive war that finally revealed his own weaknesses, and the defects of a totalitarian system that he had imposed on his own people.

It is doubtful if the Kremlin will repeat his mistake.

They will not resort to war until they are certain they can win it.

While they carry on a relentless campaign to confuse, divide, and paralyze the free world, they are concentrating on the production of intercontinental ballistic missiles, and a huge submarine fleet. Under this plan, our cities could be devasted, and our allies would be cut off from our reinforcement and supply.

Basically, of course, the Communist menace depends on blackmail, and intrigue, backed by the means to destroy.

Allen Dulles, Director of our Central Intelligence Agency, has recently warned us that the steel production of the Communist bloc exceeded ours during the first quarter of 1958.

In 1917, Russia, as an industrial nation, was 50 to 75 years behind the rest of Europe.

Now it is in second place, and is making every effort to surpass the United States.

This backbreaking demand has taken its toll of the Russian people, who are beginning to groan and grumble under the load.

Khrushchev is not blind to this.

He may consider it expedient to work for some disarmament agreement that would result in a cutback of conventional armed forces. He needs more civilian manpower for agriculture and industry in order to provide the Russian people with more food and consumer goods, so that they will work even harder in the service of communism and its global objectives.

We must never forget that communism, being atheistic, demands complete and slavish obedience to the state.

Hoving no scruples, it is tricky.

The Communists look at other people, not as human beings endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights and responsibilities, and with a soul that is answerable only to God.

To them, people are just mechanical parts to be assembled, and run until they break down, when they will be replaced by other parts to serve the complex machinery of the state, and the new class that sits in the driver's seat.

Religion, democracy, humanism, reverence of God, respect for the dignity of man, kindness, and cooperation—all the values that helped us to climb from the Stone Age to the present level of civilization—are threatened by this evil force.

What can you and I do about it?

As Americans of the Catholic faith, we must, in all our actions, work to promote the spiritual as well as the material strength of the United States, which is the champion of freedom.

It is necessary that we give greater support and encouragement to the education of our youth, so that mental and spiritual power shall build for us the strength that communism can never challenge.

It is our duty to help those peoples less fortunate than ourselves. Surely we can give some assistance to backward and undeveloped nations, particularly those that have recently won their freedom. Like infants just learning to walk, they are a little unsteady. If we give them just a small portion of our strength so that they may develop theirs, we will win their trust and confidence. For the greatest virtue of democracy is not merely the life-giving freedom and opportunity that it has created for us. It is, rather, in the generous spirit that would lend a hand to others so that they, too, will be able to earn these blessings.

When we speak of the United States and its resources, we mean more than its material progress.

More than its scientific farms and its amazing industries.

More than its government which is the agent of the people.

We mean its churches, and schools, and homes—and the American character that is developed by their example and their inspiration.

Here is the real strength for good of our new world.

I do not underestimate communism. It is powerful and dangerous. It is determined to enslave us or destroy us by one means or another.

But we have the greatest resource of all—our faith in God and in freedom.

If we truly live this faith, we shall seize the initiative, and we shall find the means to reach through to the Russian people.

That is the challenge and the responsibility.

As Knights of Columbus, we, too, place our faith in God, as we set out to discover a way of reaching our brothers in Christ who suffer behind the Iron Curtain.

There is no convenient compass, or road map, to guide us.

And the unknown obstacles in the way will prove to be many.

But, like Columbus and the pioneering spirit that he brought to America, we must, and will establish contact with the Russian people.

The secret fear of all Communists is that Russians and Americans will meet and discover their unity as human beings.

When that day comes, communism is doomed.

Conservation of High Seas Salmon Fishery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 28, 1958

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, Japan and Russia have concluded their discussions on the subject of a 1958 fishery agreement. Now our State Department should press the Japanese to abstain from taking Alaska-spawned salmon on the high seas in the spirit of their treaty with Canada and ourselves.

In this connection, under unanimous consent, I include the views of the editor of the Fishermen's News, John H. Wedin, on this subject which are realistic and timely.

A LESSON IN RESPECT

Though Japanese fishery authorities are hastening to minimize any importance in the proposed closure to their fishing fleets of the Okhotsk Sea area beginning in January of next year, their undue emphasis should serve to convince the doubting United States State Department.

Japan has clearly established a precedent. They have agreed to refrain from fishing the Okhotsk Sea because there is reason to believe they are causing depletion. They may answer that the Russians have agreed to withdraw also, but the argument does not alter the parallel between the Okhotsk area and our own north Pacific problem with the Japanese mothership fleets, for United States fishermen are also banned from the high seas area.

The soft United States State Department policy in allowing the Japanese to violate the basic rules of conservation to deplete Bristol Bay, is justified in our efforts to keep the respect of Japan in the more important battle of international defense.

We, therefore, let the Japanese go scot-free in a few days at Vancouver, B. C. late last year. The Russians have negotiated 4 months and the Japanese came away less than satisfied.

And, in Japan, which nation now commands the most respect?

The Late Lorenzo Caputo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, today, Tuesday, May 6, is a very sad day in my life, probably the saddest since I first came to Congress in 1950. Today a very dear friend of mine, Lorenzo Caputo, is being bought to his eternal rest in New York. The Commandatore, as he was affectionately and respectfully called, was more than a friend to me—he was like a brother.

Lorenzo Caputo would have been 59 years old this month. He was born on May 27, 1899, in Italy, and came to this country in 1921 as a youth of 22. During those early years in the United States he had his share of difficulties in adjusting himself economically and in becoming assimilated in this great land of ours. He started out as an iceman, delivering ice from door to door to people of humble means. The friends he made in this early period he has never forgotten. Later he was in the pastry business, then in the jewelry business. In 1934, during the depression, he founded the Rite Fuel Corp., worked hard, almost around the clock, and made a success of it. Ten years later he established the Caputo Bros. Coal & Fuel Corp. Last year he became head of the Waterway Fuel Transportation Corp., which operates in New York Harbor.

These brief facts in the life of Lorenzo Caputo, however, do not tell the full story of the man, who he was, what he did, how he helped the community and his fellowmen. His religious and civic activities began almost from the day of his arrival in this country. In 1923, only 2 years after his immigration to the United States, he founded the St. Joseph's Society when his dear friend, Msgr. Ottavio Silvestri, was the pastor of St. Joseph's Patron Church. He and other stanch supporters helped Monsignor Silvestri build the church and its youth center.. He was for many years in the forefront of every activity connected with the church and the society, and later became life president of the St. Joseph's Society. Even after he had moved to Douglaston, Long Island, in 1952, he would come every Sunday to his old beloved parish of St. Joseph's Patron Church. I was privileged and honored to take up the collection with him at the 12:15 p. m. mass.

As for his civic and charitable activities, he spared neither time nor effort nor money. He was president of the Federation of Pugliesi Societies of Greater New York and New Jersey. He was an honorary member of St. Anthony Society of Oceanside, Long Island. He was a fourth-degree Knight of the Bushwick Council, a member of the Holy Name Society, the Italian Charities of America, the Italian Board of Guardians, the Catholic Charities of Brooklyn, and others.

Lorenzo Caputo visited Italy many times and sought in every way possible to help his kinsmen. In 1948, he sent an ambulance to his hometown of Palo Del Colle, in the Province of La Puglia, where he was born. On other occasions he arranged for shipments of flour and medicines to help alleviate the distress of the poor and the needy, as well as to aid the cause of the Democratic Christian Party which he felt is best able to steer Italy into the direction of western democracy.

Caputo was an implacable foe of communism, and was particularly anxious to see that it made no great inroads in Italy. He believed that if communism could be routed in Italy, it would strike a deathblow to it in other western European countries. In 1954 he was awarded the Medal of Solidarity by the then Premier Alcide De Gasperi on behalf of the Republic of Italy for his fight against communism.

He was the recipient of other awards, the most cherished of which was the decoration of Knighthood of St. Sylvester in 1952 by Pope Pius XII. Lorenzo Caputo was a close friend of His Eminence, Marcello Cardinal Mimmi, Archbishop of Naples.

These are but a few facts and highlights in the life of Lorenzo Caputo. Men like him, with his tenacity and character, are not born every day. When such a man passes on, the whole community is shaken to its depths and feels the great loss. He was a pioneer and an adventurer in the great tradition of his forebear Christopher Columbus and in the spirit of the great founders of our country.

Lorenzo Caputo is survived by his dear wife Antoinette, by his 5 children Frank, Pat, Jack, Angelo, and Beatrice—my adorable godchild—and by 9 grandchildren. He also leaves behind a sister, Mrs. Laura Schiraldi, and 4 brothers, Jack, John, Michael, and Joseph. To all of them and to his myriad of friends his death is a terrible and tragic blow.

Already his family and many of his friends are planning a memorial for Lorenzo Caputo in such a manner that he will live forever in the hearts and minds of those he left behind. Said his oldest son, Frank:

He will never die. He will be an inspiration for all of us. He will guide us from Heaven.

I find I have not the words with which to properly extend my condolences and my deepest sympathy to his dear wife and children and to the others of his family in this hour of their great bereavement. I, too, who had the great benefit of his friendship, will always cherish his memory. I shall always remember him for his sincerity and kindness, for his untiring efforts in behalf of many people less fortunate than he was. I am consoled, as I hope his family will be, by the thought that he leaves behind an honorable name and a monument of good deeds for his fellowmen, of which they can be justly proud.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no more apt prayer on this occasion than the famous Prayer of Peace of St. Francis of Assisi:

Lord, make me an instrument of Thy peace.
Where there is hatred, let me sow love.
Where there is injury, pardon.
Where there is doubt, faith.
Where there is despair, hope.
Where there is darkness, light.
Where there is sadness, joy.
O divine Master, grant that
I may not so much seek
To be consoled, as to console;
To be understood, as to understand;
To be loved, as to love;
For it is in giving, that we receive.
It is in pardoning, that we are pardoned.
It is in dying, that we are born to eternal life.

The Attorney General Declares War on Organized Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, no problem facing this Nation today should cause greater concern than the rise in power of organized crime organizations. These gigantic octopi have stretched their tentacles across State borders until they have enveloped our Nation, reaching into the homes and businesses of Americans everywhere. Unless a death blow is struck at the heart of these monsters they can stifle our whole economy and threaten our very existence as a nation.

No State alone is equipped to deal effectively with these nefarious organizations. What is needed is a national crusade spurred on by the combined efforts of top crime fighters in both State and Federal Governments.

The Attorney General of the United States has announced his determination, as head of the Department of Justice, to conduct the kind of concentrated, coordinated, and sustained drive against organized crime that is needed to rid it from our land. In a speech delivered last night before the Advertising Council, Inc., he ably identified the target and outlined the plan of attack. It is a speech which every Member of Congress and, indeed, every American should read.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot expect the Department of Justice, any more than our Armed Forces, to fight effectively without the proper weapons. Existing laws do not provide an up-to-date arsenal, and for some time I have urged Congress to supply one.

There are several bills, which I have introduced for a number of years, pending before the Committee on the Judiciary now. I intend to offer several more in the near future. The Department of Justice no doubt will have additional proposals.

I am especially pleased to note the indications in the Attorney General's speech that the Department is swinging around to the view that legislation embodying the principal of my bill, H. R. 258—to permit the Federal Government to crack down when interstate conspirators are breaking State felony laws—is the most effective and direct means for annihilating organized crime.

I am confident that this Congress will want to join in the battle against crime by giving early and favorable consideration to such measures before it adjourns.

I commend the Attorney General for his courage and determination in undertaking this enormous and vital task. I am sure that law-abiding citizens everywhere wish him every success, and will cooperate in every way possible.

Under leave previously granted, I insert Attorney General Rogers' fine speech at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM P. ROGERS, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE ADVERTISING COUNCIL, INC., HOTEL STATLER, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 5, 1958

Tonight I want to talk about a problem which I believe requires serious attention. These days, quite naturally, we are concerned with the economy of our country and our national defense. In a very real sense, the problem of crime is related both to our economy and to the future strength of our Nation.

As you know, this year the Nation will spend more than $40 billion on national defense. But how many people know what crime costs our country? Most people are wholly unaware of the staggering proportions to which it has grown—unmindful of the fact that it is second only to national defense in terms of cost. The estimated cost of crime in the United States in 1 year is about $20 billion.

Twenty-five years ago the Attorney General was appalled by the fact that in 1933 1½ million major crimes had occurred—one for each 84 persons in the Nation. In 1958, it appears now that about 3 million major crimes may be committed—twice as many as in 1933. This means that in 1958 one major crime will be committed for every 60 persons in the United States.

Since 1950 the rate of crime in our country has been exploding at a rate four times as fast as the rate of growth of our population. The rate of crime in 1957 increased 9 percent over 1956.

These statistics only begin to tell the story. One of the facts which stands out in bold relief is the alarming increase in the number of crimes committed by young people. Almost half of the persons arrested for major crimes last year were under 18 years of age. Somehow there has been a failure properly to inculcate our people, particularly our young people, with a sense of moral values—with an awareness of how destructive crime is to them and to the country. These figures indicate that there is a tremendous job to be done by schools, churches, parents and organizations such as this in the years ahead.

Tonight I want to talk not about general problems relating to crime but rather about some of the things we hope to do in the field of law enforcement. Let me mention that I would hope too that this influential organization which has contributed so much to solving important problems of our Nation in the past, will want to give its thoughtful attention to what it can do to help reduce the rate of crime in our country.

What is one of the most obvious facts about the growth of crime in our country? It is the growth of organized crime and the success of its operation.

Syndicates made up of criminals have coordinated and extended their operations over many States and in many cases, across national boundaries. Why is this true? It is true because organized racketeers and hoodlums have learned how to make crime pay.

The top echelon of organized criminals have been able to remove themselves from exposed positions and now operate by scheming, directing and organizing. Organized criminals exert general control over those types of criminal activities that yield the most profits—gambling, narcotics, and extortion, to name the big three. And obviously they pay only a small portion of their taxes on these activities because if they paid all of their taxes as ordinary citizens do, a life of crime would not pay.

In order that you may have a better understanding of the problem from the standpoint of a law enforcement official let me make some general observations.

First, I notice that there is a widespread lack of awareness as to the respective roles of Federal responsibility as compared with the State and local responsibility in the field of law enforcement. Generally speaking responsibility for law enforcement in our country rests in large measure on the States and localities. The fact is that less than 10 percent of all crimes violate Federal law.

Yet almost every time a serious local crime is committed which gets national publicity some senator, congressman, governor, or civic group will immediately demand that the FBI investigate it. This is a very fine tribute to the FBI but it demonstrates a lack of understanding of the law and tends to shift the responsibility away from the States and localities where it belongs.

Consider the recent atrocious bombings of schools, churches, and synagogues which have occurred in Florida and other Southern States. At first there were demands that the FBI take over the investigation. The Federal Government did not have jurisdiction in those cases because no Federal law was involved. The Federal Government does not have jurisdiction merely because the perpetrators of the crimes may have crossed State lines or because a conspiracy may be involved or because a series of crimes are involved. Unless a Federal law has been violated the FBI has no jurisdiction to investigate.

The law enforcement officials of the States and localities involved have recognized their responsibility. Officials from 29 southern cities have conferred for the purpose of taking cooperative action to solve these shocking crimes. Those responsible are to be complimented for taking this affirmative, determined action.

The FBI stands ready to help the local authorities in every way possible. Its laboratories, identification facilities, information from its files, etc., have been made available. It is maintaining the closest liaison with the responsible authorities and will give them every assistance possible.

The point I hope you will remember is that it is important for the public to place responsibility where it belongs. Communities get the kind of law enforcement they deserve and the public must know where the responsibility lies.

Another fact which is not always fully appreciated is that within the Federal Government itself jurisdiction for investigating crime is divided. The jurisdiction of the FBI is limited to general crimes and crimes involving national securty. Internal Revenue has its own investigating staff which has jurisdiction of matters pertaining to tax frauds. The Narcotics Bureau in the Treasury Department has primary responsibility for investigating narcotics violations. The Secret Service is responsible for investigating counterfeiting and crimes relating to the public moneys. The Post Office investigates misuse of the mails.

All of these investigating agencies have compiled outstanding records in their respective fields but organized criminals have not seen fit to compartmentalize their activities so as to fit neatly into these niches. The Department of Justice has complete and sole responsibility for the prosecution of all crimes. It seems obvious then that the information obtained by separate investigating agencies must be fitted together more effectively by the prosecutors than in the past if we are to meet today's crafty challenge of the organized criminal.

About a month ago, I announced a long-range program for combating organized crime in this country. Although as I have mentioned, the Federal Government has a limited jurisdiction we do have some powerful weapons. The main ones are the income-tax laws, the tax laws relating to narcotics, and the Hobbs Act and the Taft-Hartley Act relating to extortions and payoffs in union activities.

Let me briefly sketch the three main points of the program.

1. The program will be concentrated.

We will give top priority to 100 of the top racketeers in the United States. That is not to say we will ignore the others for we plan to attack crime on as many fronts as we can. It does mean, however, that we will give immediate and concentrated effort to the 100 worst hoodlums and racketeers in the country.

The list of names will not be made public for two reasons. In the first place, it would tip our hand and make the investigative work more difficult. In the second place such publication of the names might be attacked as prejudicial in the event of trial. After there have been convictions or deportations we will announce the names and will replenish the list with others who are deserving.

You may wonder why a list of 100. Of course, it is an arbitrary figure to be used principally for purposes of concentration of effort. A brief discussion of how organized crime functions today will indicate why this concentration, I believe, will be effective.

Last November at Apalachin, N. Y., a meeting of 64 top racketeers and hoodlums took place. A majority of those in attendance came from New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, but there was a fair representation from the South, Midwest, and even the west coast. A few of those in attendance had been in a similar meeting as far back as 1928 in Cleveland. Many of them were in attendance at a meeting in 1952 in the Florida Keyes, in 1953 at Miami, in 1954 at Chicago, and in 1956 at Binghamton, N. Y. Meetings such as these at Apalachin, attended by what amounts to the board of directors of organized crime for a given area, serve many nefarious purposes. Lines and means of communication are established, methods of distribution are agreed upon, territorial arrangements are made. As a result, gang wars of the twenties and thirties have been almost completely eliminated.

The members of these top-level planning boards are also the key figures in organizations with headquarters in New York, Miami, Chicago, and other cities in the United States. Here the multimillion dollar businesses take shape. Those on top seldom come in contact with the local hoodlums who are responsible for maintaining discipline, bribing local officials, or actually dispensing the products of crime. But through strong arm tactics carried out through subordinates in a chain of command and with the power to shut off necessary financing, production, and sources of supply, they exercise control over most of the profitable forms of illegal activities. The dope peddler, the bookie, the numbers runner, the vender of obscene magazines, are all largely dependent for their illicit merchandise and for permission to engage in these activities upon these overlords of crime.

These overlords of crime in many instances have invested their ill-gotten gains in hotels, night clubs, coin-operated machines, scrap iron trucking, etc., and hide behind these legitimate fronts while directing their criminal activities.

It is our purpose to concentrate on these overlords. We plan to find out everything that we can find out about them—their sources of income, their present activities, how they invest their money, and how they avoid paying their taxes. Without in any way denying them any of the rights which our citizens have under our system of justice we will attempt to find out what Federal law they have violated and to obtain the necessary evidence to prove it.

2. The program will have a Government-wide coordination of effort.

After consultation with the Secretary and Under Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the FBI, the Commissioner of Narcotics, the Commissioner of Immigration, the Secret Service and the other investigative agencies we concluded that we would turn the combined strength and resources of all Federal investigative and law enforcement agencies in a common effort against the organized criminal.

Of course we have not been oblivious in the past to the activities of organized crime and the need for cooperation. What seemed to be lacking and what we are in the process of establishing is a unified prosecutive command, where all information on racketeers from all investigative agencies will be correlated, studied and acted upon.

Let me cite an illustration of what I mean. The distribution and sale of narcotics, particularly to young people, is one of the most reprehensible of all crimes. Almost all of it is imported, and it lends itself peculiarly to the control and distribution practices of the organized criminal conspiracy. Most heroin comes from Turkey, Syria, and Iran in the Near East and China in the Far East. Organized crime has built up a giant transmission belt for securing this drug, for providing for its safe importation, and ultimately for its distribution to the dope peddlers. One pound of heroin is worth about $150,000. The Bureau of Narcotics seized about 1,700 ounces of heroin in 1957.

Most marihuana comes from Mexico. Over 26,000 ounces of marihuana were seized at ports and borders, and over 11,000 ounces were seized within the United States in 1957. So you can see that the sale of narcotics is a huge business.

In many instances it is possible to identify top racketeers who traffic in narcotics but not to obtain the necessary evidence to seek an indictment. Now the important thing is to put this criminal out of circulation—the crime for which he may be convicted is of secondary importance. So we will study all the evidence which the Government has in its possession from all the investigative agencies. Perhaps we can prove a tax-fraud case, possibly he may be subject to deportation, the FBI may have information which, placed together with all other information obtained from the Narcotics Bureau, may show the violation of some other Federal law, or in some instances we may be able to supply local law-enforcement officers with evidence sufficient to convict for a local crime.

3. It will be a long-range, sustained program.

From my experience in law-enforcement work I have noticed that efforts directed on organized crime are apt to be sporadic. A series of vicious crimes occur or a congressional investigation is held and a drive on crime is started. When the excitement dies down the drive is apt to die down.

The program we have in mind is not intended to produce quick or sensational results. Rather, it will be a long-range program built on policies which will be lasting and intended to meet a continuing and constantly changing problem.

Recently we have seen instances of how effective racketeers have been in taking over control of a few powerful labor unions. They not only steal money from the union treasury but they use the unions to extort huge sums of money from contractors.

Obviously, the efforts of the racketeers to penetrate these unions are well planned and sustained. A few years ago the most powerful racketeer in southern Illinois was Evan Dale, who was president of a union of hod-carriers and common laborers. For years he exercised complete control over the rank and file of his union, responsible to no one. During his trial for extortion Dale described himself in the following language:

"I am a Chicago boy. When I left Chicago I threw away my shovel for a blackjack and I have been using it effectively ever since. I came to southern Illinois 15 years ago to carve out an empire. I have carved out an empire. I have 38,000 laborers and 28 business agents under me."

For his part in the multi-million-dollar shakedown of contractors during the construction of a powerplant for the Atomic Energy Commission, he was sentenced to 15 years in jail.

There is only one way to combat successfully the activities of such racketeers who have taken over a few labor unions—and that is with a sustained and long-range program of law enforcement. Of course it is not possible or desirable to spell out in any detail all the plans of the Department in this field. What I have said represents a general approach to the problem.

The policy of the Department of Justice can be expressed this way:

1. We will attack the problem of crime on all fronts within the limit of our jurisdiction.

2. We will give top priority to concentrating on the top 100 racketeers.

3. We will urge the courts to impose maximum penalties and within the procedures laid down by the law will seek to expedite the trial of cases.

4. We will urge Federal legislation to give the Federal authorities more weapons to cope with organized criminal activities that have interstate ramifications.

5. We will cooperate with State and local authorities to the greatest extent possible.

The program which I have discussed this evening deals only with one phase of the crime problem in the United States. The problem is a much broader and more serious one than anything that improved law enforcement alone can solve.

There are many things which must be done. For example, the public must be more alert to the tieup between crime and local politics. Experience shows that organized crime on a profitable basis cannot exist for long in any area without the connivance of local law enforcement officers.

Then too the public must be made more aware that their support and cooperation in giving information about crime especially in the field of extortion is essential if our law enforcement agencies are to cope effectively with the ever increasing rise of crime in the United States.

Finally, there is a heavy responsibility which rests on all of us more effectively to instill young people with the basic traits of character which are so vital to our free way of life.

The Advertising Council, which has given so generously and so successfully of its time and talents to programs for human betterment, may want to give some of these and other broader aspects of the problem its future consideration. If you do I assure you that all of us in the Department of Justice will give you our enthusiastic cooperation. I can think of nothing which would be more helpful to the Nation than to have the benefit of your thought and counsel and your active participation in helping to solve this grave national problem.

Senator Humphrey "Going Strong"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, since Minnesota's great Senator, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, is a native South Dakotan and also my next-door neighbor in Washington, I have taken a special interest in his remarkable career. His political courage, his dedication to the public interest, and his ability to speak with force on the central issues of the day have been a challenge to me and to countless other citizens.

Recently I have noted several articles which recognize the unusual ability and energy that Senator HUMPHREY displays in his role in the Senate. In the April 28, 1958, issue of the New Republic, the editors have described the Minnesota Senator as a "pace-setter for his party" who is "proving himself on issue after issue to be one of the most impressive members of the United States Senate." William V. Shannon, writing in the April 23, 1958, issue of the New York Post, said that Senator HUMPHREY has enhanced his reputation in this session of the Congress "probably more than any other figure."

The New Republic article referred to above was included with the remarks of Senator NEUBERGER, of Oregon, in the RECORD of April 26, 1958. Under leave previously granted I include the following article by Mr. Shannon:

GOING STRONG
(By William V. Shannon)

WASHINGTON.—The time is nearly midnight. Those gathered in the hotel room are growing weary; the pace of conversation slows as the mounds of cigarette stubs grow in the ashtrays and the glasses are repeatedly refilled.

At this point, a dark-haired, still young man of medium height and build with a high, prominent forehead enters the room. Within 3 minutes, he is sitting on the edge of a chair, expounding, exhorting, gesturing.

The other persons present have revived and are sitting forward in their chairs, listening with a new alertness to this tireless, bemusing, fluent outpouring of words. The evening has come alive again. The visitor responsible for this transformation is the pride of Minnesota Democrats, HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY, JR.

HUMPHREY, now 47 and a veteran of 10 years in the Senate, is no longer a boy wonder. The junior Senator from Minnesota, the dominant leader of the Democrats in his home State, the foremost spokesman in the Senate on disarmament policy, a key strategist in both the farm and labor blocs, still a durable day-to-day battler for civil rights, and a figure with fair, though not brilliant, prospects for national office in 1960, HUMPHREY has become one of the half-dozen movers and shapers of the Democratic Party today.

Probably more than any other figure he has enhanced his reputation in this session of Congress. His gains have not been spectacular; he is not leading any public opinion polls. But by serious, substantial work on several issues he has grown in stature and respect.

He is a man worth watching. What makes HUMPHREY tick?

The scene described above is hypothetical but it is very much grounded in fact. HUBERT HUMPHREY has such unflagging energy, such zest, such fluency that he makes everybody else in a room seem tongue-tied or victims of "tired blood." He can dictate correspondence, attend a committee meeting or two, and film a television interview before lunch, make an appearance on the Senate floor, fly out of town, address a convention banquet (an hour talk is a routine effort), tour the hotel rooms shaking hands of convention delegates, and wind up around midnight in some smoke-filled caucus where he will go strong for another couple of hours. What is more, he will be up at 7 or 8 the next morning ready to start the same routine over again. All this is done without stimulants; HUMPHREY quit smoking several years ago and drinks very little.

The ceaseless drive in generated from within; it originates in a happy union (less common among major politicians than one might expect) of the ego and the dream. On the one side, he wants power, likes to run things, is competitive, ambitious, and normally vain. On the other side, he has a relatively clear, uncomplicated picture of the good society and what he ought to do to help bring it about.

He is an unreconstructed liberal with few doubts or hesitations. He functions at high efficiency and because his personal ambition gives an edge to his ideals while his ideals, happily vivid and unspoiled, provide the gusty enthusiasm that refreshes a man convinced he is doing the Lord's work, and that it is very, very important.

HUMPHREY is not, of course, a stranger to the traffickings and expediencies of politics. Over these 10 crowded years, however, he has shown a rather high level of consistency.

He came to the Senate in 1948, the year of the false dawn of postwar and post-New Deal liberalism. In the lusty spring of 1949, Harry Truman was calling for FEPC, compulsory health insurance, the Brannan farm plan and repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. Freshman HUMPHREY was in the frontlines on these issues in the Senate, adding swipes of his own at HARRY BYRD's Joint Committee for the Reduction of Non-Essential Expenditures, and other conservative sacred cows. Serving at the same time as national chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, HUMPHREY literally personified the new liberalism.

But 1948 proved an afterglow, not a dawn. One by one the lights guttered out; 4 years of McCarthyite obscenities overlapped 5 years of Eisenhower apathy and smugness.

HUMPHREY, the young Lochinvar who rode out of the West, found himself fighting many more rear-guard withdrawals and delaying actions than glorious advances.

The portents of political change now suggest that events are finally beginning to move with rather than against HUMPHREY. If a liberal trend persists and gains force, can he personally capitalize on it?

HUMPHREY makes no pretense of unavailability. He actively wooed the Vice Presidency in 1956. He will probably be a regional favorite son in the next convention.

His plans have naturally not matured this far ahead, but his activity may include entering the tactically important Wisconsin and Nebraska primaries. These States, together with Minnesota and the Dakotas, could give him approximately 100 delegates, almost one-sixth the number needed to nominate. A bloc of this size would make him a person of power in the convention.

Israel's Position in the World's Eastern Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, today, we hear much regarding Israel's position in the world's Eastern problems. I was very much impressed with the address made by the Honorable Abba Eban, Ambassador of Israel, at the B'nai B'rith awards dinner on April 20, 1958, at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.

I believe that he expresses very sincerely, and in exacting words, the position that Israel is to take to solve the many problem that are so necessary, not only to Israel, but to the world at large.

Israel's approach is one of peace, of good will, and of friendship to her neighbors in the Far East as well as to the other countries throughout the world.

It is most important, I believe, that the Members of Congress should read the sentiments expressed in this speech by Israel's capable Ambassador to the United States.

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR ABBA EBAN, OF ISRAEL, AT B'NAI B'RITH AWARDS DINNER, APRIL 20, 1958, WASHINGTON, D. C.

I shall never cease to be moved by this testimony of your abiding friendship. Even to those of you who have endangered the balance of my sanity by the excess of their praise, I offer my complete forgiveness. If I really possessed the radiant qualities ascribed to me this evening, I should be unfit to live not only within the human race, but

even in our diplomatic corps. But it is not my function, Mr. Chairman, as your guest, to come here and quarrel with your judgments. It is not for me to exclude the possibility that you may be right. So, when I go home this evening, I shall put out the lights and look into the mirror and if a phosphorescent halo gleams about my head, I shall be the first to acknowledge your perceptiveness; if not, I shall still think tenderly of your generous intention and strive, within human imperfection, to deserve something of what you have said and done this night.

I shall, especially, treasure this emblem of your tribute. If you observed a certain anguish in my countenance when you presented it to me, it is because I was gripped by an icy fear lest you propose to accompany it with that intimate embrace which my colleague, the French Ambassador, uses when he adorns deserving recipients of his country's honor.

I should like, also, to endorse whatever has been said this evening about the supremacy of the female sex. I do so not only in sheer masculine prudence and self-defense, but, also, because there are ample foundations for that belief in our tradition. To the women's division of B'nai B'rith I bring the tribute of gratitude and appreciation for that which they have done for us tonight. To the women of your great movement I can only recall the wisdom of our tradition which describes a woman's valor in deathless words: "Honor and glory are her garment, and she shall rejoice in the latter end." These words are attributed by our history to King Solomon—and if that remarkable potentate was not the world's greatest authority on women, it is not because he deprived himself of any opportunity so to become.

My friends, I stand before you as the recipient of your praise because our people's history has set me, in this past decade, at a special point of vantage where I have seen the impact of Israel's resurgence on the mind and conscience of the world. Within the pattern of that tempestuous decade, it has been my task to give utterance to the impulses which have moved Israel in this hour of her transition. Nobody can seek to interpret Israel's renascence without moving into the vast hinterland of eternal Jewish history.

Stretching back beyond that summer morning, 10 years ago; far into the midst of antiquity, the journey of our people across the stage of time has been full of sharp and vivid transitions. Pain and anguish have walked with us, but their companion has been an everlasting hope—the deathless, poignant desperate hope of eventual restoration to a creative and normal dignity. In our day, this hope has been fulfilled.

At this anniversary season we now pause in memory before the most exalted decade amongst all the Jewish epochs. Its people multiplied, its land revived, its institutions strong and constant in their freedom, its kinsmen gathered in from lands of havoc and cruel memory, its frontiers defended, its enterprise and commerce in full spate of growth, its soil redeemed for ever richer harvests, surrounded by the friendship and recognition of many nations, sustained by the love and fraternity of its kinsmen throughout the world, Israel enters its second decade.

We enter it in perfect confidence that what has been built in these 10 years, is destined forever to flourish and endure. Never in history has any purpose been achieved against heavier calculations of chance. All the circumstances of time and of place argued against our success. The people were scattered, its land distant, its sons alienated by time and strangeness of tongues from the original sources of their union, its morale shattered by grievious martyrdom, and the very connection between this people and that land had no status or recognition in the jurisprudence of nations.

Rising up in revolt against these towering obstacles, this people has, within our own lifetime and memory, achieved its reunion with the land and the language of whose previous coalescence the deepest message of human salvation was born. The perspectives of history enlarge the dimensions of this achievement. It is well that on such a milestone in our journey we should pause for a backward glance of historic appraisal. Envisage and think what has happened here:

Thousands of years ago, in the darkness of barbarism and paganism, a people lived in the cragy rocks of the small land on the shores of the east Mediterranean, amidst the darkness of apathy, resignation, and determinism which surrounded it. It saw a sudden vision of the universal order. The cosmic pattern in the eyes of these people was revealed not as a wild chaos of arbitrary, ruthless, incalculable forces, but as a system of order and progress governed by a merciful intelligence and an articulate law. From this concept of order and progress in the universal design, this people evolved the revolutionary doctrines of individual morality, social justice, and international peace. The original stream of this tradition nourished the great rivers of Christianity and Islam while keeping its own native waters of Judaism refreshed.

Crushed by great empires and scattered to all the four winds, this people remained the custodian of these original ideals. In exile it longed for restoration of the conditions of its previous creativity. It hung its harp upon the willow tree and wept when it remembered Zion. In our own day and age, at the very ebb and climax of its weakness and agony, it summoned up the courage, the resilience and the vitality with which to turn the wheel of history full circle, and to become again the master of its destiny in the conditions of its original greatness. This, then, is the majestic pattern of this people's history. It is at the end of such a cosmic revolution that this people has become the master and no longer the victim of its fate.

Sometimes we are deeply moved by the concern which others feel for us. Doubts have recently been expressed at a peak and pinnacle of world authority, whether this people possesses creative collectivity, whether its intellectualism has not sapped the original sources of its vitality. My friends, when I see in other people accomplishments against the obstacles and torments of history that can rival this in sheer potency of will and tenacity of purpose, I shall listen to these lectures with a deference which, at this moment, I find it difficult to command. The world is obeying a true instinct when it, therefore, heralds the epic of Israel's endurance and revival, gives to it the fruit of its works and let its praises declare themselves in its gates.

The central theme of this anniversary celebration is, therefore, the stability and permanence of Israel in the life and law of the world community. The issue that faces us is, in our view, no longer survival, for this is assured. We believe that the judgment of history has fallen beyond recall. The choice is between survival in peace, as we would prefer, or survival in stress and turmoil, which we shall accomplish if we must.

We could not always speak with such candor and confidence about our very prospect of endurance. At this anniversary season we evoke that perilous and glorious morning, 10 years ago, in which Israel's statehood was proclaimed. Those were hours when our independence seemed a fragile thing. Faced by threats of massacre, threatened with destruction of our people's redeeming hope, cut off from any sustaining contacts with the world by land, sea, and air, Israel fought breathlessly for sheer life itself in the greatest hazard of all its history. There was no measure to the price of our success or to the consequences of failure. A solitude at once dreadful and sublime attended us in that incomparable hour. These memories come vividly before us at this season of festivity, when we measure the sacrifice by which our statehood was born. This is to be measured not only in terms of millions, out of whose immaculate martyrdom the world's conscience was aroused. It is our custom at this anniversary season to have the armed forces of Israel parade before us in proud review, but, alas, there are missing faces in those marching columns of thousands who have marched away forever, and consecrated Israel's statehood with the highest sacrifice which any man can bring. These memories attend us when we express the ardent hope that the next decade will have everything that the first decade possessed in creativity, without the violence, the bloodshed, and theanguish which marred and disfigured its career.

In the 10 years which have passed since Israel's independence was proclaimed, every possible device has been tried for our undoing. It is hard to imagine that Israel can ever, in the future, face a peril the like of which she has not met and surmounted in the past. But, if our dangers have not changed, surely, a sharp transformation has occurred in our capacity to meet them. Then, after all, we were a mere 650,000; now we are 2 million. Then we were a slender piece of territory along the coastal plain and its adjoining valleys. Now the rhythm of a nation's life is felt across the land from the upper Jordan to the approaches of the Red Sea. Then we stood for many weeks outside the shelter of the international law. Now we live so organically within it that we could not be swept away unless the foundations of international order were themselves engulfed. Surely, then, there must be thoughtful minds in the neighboring world which will soon begin to compare the sterility of conflict with the rich, untasted fruits of tolerance and peace.

We pray that every peace-loving nation will measure its policy in our region by one single standard: Does any proposed action help to confront the Arab world and Israel inexorably with the historic compulsion of living together in peace? Standing at a point of observation in this drama, where it intersects with the opinions of mankind, I have been impressed with the conclusion that the rise of Israel must not be understood as an exclusive act of self-reliance. The primary impulse came, of course, from our own people, resolved to win its just inheritance. But strong currents of international power, in diplomacy, material aid, and sentiment have carried us forward on a swift tide of progress. We shall neither honor, nor serve our future, by denying the gifts which other peoples have brought to the fulfillment and reinforcement of our sovereignty. Many of the vital forces which today sustain the balance of our strength are those which flow towards us from the outside world. The first amongst those which rallied to us, in the hour of peril and solitude, was the United States. The concept of a free Israel had lived in pious American thought and sentiment for 200 years before Israel arose to statehood. Your Founding Fathers were steeped in the ancient traditions of which Israel's eventual restoration was a central and organic part. They knew the debt which they owed to the Hebrew tradition for the truths of individual, social, and international virtue upon which their dream of a new civilization was built.

When this idea entered the domain of practical international relationships, America was the first to recognize Israel in her embattled hour. The United States was first to advocate our recognition by other nations. Joined with her two Western allies in a solemn commitment to oppose any change

in the territorial structure of the Middle East by force, it enacted a doctrine offering further aid and protection to Middle Eastern countries whose integrity and independence was subjected to certain contingencies of aggression, and reinforced its political relationship by a massive infusion of economic, social, and technical aid. And thus, within the past 7 years, we saw the spectacle of a great nation not contenting itself with the formalities of diplomatic relationships with us, but actually taking off its coat and rolling up its sleeves and going down with us into farm and valley and factory to build the physical fabric of a reviving democratic civilization.

In this country, governmental relationships were deepened and enriched in special measure by the deep impulses of public sentiment and support. The special intimacy of these relationships, even in times of transient divergence, have helped to determine the contours of Israel's relations with the whole of this American hemisphere, from its Canadian north, to its Latin south.

Across the seas, the continent of Europe has awakened, more and more acutely to a sense of common destiny with us. Not only because its civilization is born of Israel's original ethical insights, but also because the facts of geography and strategy have created an affinity of fate. It is difficult to see how any threat could engulf either Israel or Europe while the other was left immune from its impact.

In recent months, this pattern of friendships in America and in Europe has been further extended by the first warm winds of harmony and fraternity reaching us from the awakening continents of Asia and Africa. Nations arising to the responsibilities of their freedom, many of them younger, in independent statehood than we ourselves, are integrating something of our pioneering experience and surplus technical and scientific skills into the pattern of their own renascent nationhoods. This intricate pattern of international friendships also has its collective expression. Membership in the United Nations is the foundation of Israel's status in international law. It determines our personality as an evolving unit in the law and life of nations. It determines the responsibility of all others to help us in the extremity of attack. Above all, the presence of our flag in that union of sovereign peoples is, perhaps, the greatest psychological obstacle to the pretense of certain states that we do not exist, or that if they pray hard enough, we might fade away.

The great tribunal of nations, despite the weaknesses and imperfections which have attended its development, has written its story large upon the fabric of our history. In its work for an armistice, in denunciation of the doctrine of nonbelligerency, and, above all, in that undoubted equality which it gives us in the juridical structure of the world community, the United Nations has played an affirmative role in all the movements which have brought Israel to her present stability and strength.

Moreover, any idea, however imperfect in its implementation, must, in the eyes of our people, have its own transcendent identity. No concepts in the modern world of ideas conforms more closely to Israel's ancient heritage or to her modern hope of freedom than this vision of the family of nations united in links of restraint and of law. Striking this balance sheet in Israel's international evolution, I cannot endorse those appraisals of Israel as a kind of orphan of the international storm, a waif thrown up upon the doorstep of nations, subjected only to misunderstanding and to frustration. Many nations longer established than we and greater in material power have languished in ostracism and isolation long after the facts of their sovereignty and their regimes were firmly established.

Those who accomplished the American, the Russian, and the French revolutions had to wait many years before the concert of nations accepted the legitimacy of their power, or regarded them as fit for orderly international intercourse. There are many reasons then why we should abandon an unduly negative appraisal of Israel's international fortunes. First, a people which goes around proclaiming that it is weak and frustrated and that its existence hangs on a fragile thread, is more likely to invite compassion than support; for in this hard world the race belongs to the swift. Second, the decisions and conclusions reached by a nation on the assumption that it is everywhere betrayed and nowhere cherished, are not likely to be correct judgments or wise decisions; despair is not counselor of prudence. Above all, these descriptions of Israel's international status in terms of weakness must be discarded for the cogent, if old fashioned, reason that they are not true. At the peak of this edifice of world support, there stands the faithful Jewish dispersion, sustaining Israel in all the elements of her strength and spirit. The rise of our Nation, in this special context of its universal history, has fascinated the writing and the intellectual preoccupation of our age. But it has, of course, made a special appeal to millions throughout the world who share with us the matchless dignity of descent from the Hebrew faith and tradition.

We are reminded on an evening such as this that Israel, as a historic idea, is much broader than Israel as a geographic fact. And Israel will prosper to the extent she can live within the terms of her history. She is comprehensible, after all, only as a climax in the history of the Jewish people, as the sanctuary of a Jewish civilization, eternal in time and universal in space. We should be making a profound error if, in the quest for normal geographical statehood, we were to cut ourselves adrift from this great enriching complex of sentiments and associations.

As we enter the second decade, Israel's sentiment for American Jews is exclusively one of gratitude, pride, and deep undying brotherhood. We respect the fruitful impact of your zeal and spirit on the life of this great Nation. We admire the unparalleled measure of confidence and creativity to which your community has attained within the vast scope of American history. to which your community has attained America is the citadel of freedom's embattled cause, and your community has fortified its foundations with the strength of the Hebrew ideal. We pray, therefore, for the continued welfare, pride, and strength of your institutions. I fail to imagine any circumstances in which weakness or disaster could come to the main bodies of Diaspora Jewry without weakness and disaster coming to Israel as well. We are truly sons of a single uniting covenant.

Within this broad and common historic fidelity, I bring the tribute of Israel's gratitude and appreciation to the great movement of B'nai B'rith. It has, throughout the years of its growth and service, given faithful support to the basic ideals of democracy, of civic equality, or fundamental human rights, of international peace. Two great traditions merge in the life and consciousness of your movement. The ancient Hebrew pieties with their insistence upon moral standards, with their strong family solidarities, with the deep and impregnated memories of other lands—and this stream of experience converges with the American spirit, with its great fidelity to the concept of enterprise, with its deep passion for liberty, its belief in the forward-looking, progressive character of scientific and technological progress, and its constant sense of lineal derivation from the ancient moral civilization which first flourished in the hills and valleys of our land. It is natural that a movement such as this should have been uplifted by the spectacle of Israel's resurgence, and that it should have played a role of alleviation and of harmony in the relationships between America and Israel in many crucial days.

My friends, the first decade of Israel hangs on the unfinished task. It will never be eclipsed in Israel's memory, for in the eyes of a weary people it kindled the glory of a youthful dawn. But this decade is a prelude, it is not a climax. Before us stretch the challenges of the future. The chief amongst them is the need of progress toward some harmony with the neighboring world. Justice and advantage both command that the second decade shall see us emerge from the rancors and antagonisms which have beset us in the years which have so far unfolded. I say justice, because Israel's existence in her territory of 8,000 miles inflicts no hardship, incurs no injury, justifies no grievance, in the neighboring world. We look without any grudge or envy upon the great pattern of their emancipation.

Ten years ago we came to birth in the Middle East which contained six independent Arab states. And even then the world conscience was so impresed with the disparity between their vast domain of freedom, and the absence for the Jewish people of any sanctuary of life and spirit that it sought an act of remedy through the establishment of Israel's statehood. Since then five new vast sovereignties have been added to the Arab domain, and in each case Israel's hand has been uplifted to admit them by unanimous consent into the family of nations. Surely the world, and especially those nations of the world who have done so much, rightly, to promote this vast emancipation, can rightly expect that our neighbors will not find it difficult, in the triumph of their own political victory, to live at peace with a little nation established in a small corner of their huge domain.

This it is which argues the basis inequity for Israel's approach to the all tormenting problem of its regional relations. We have no ambition to expand, but we are determined not to contract. We do not believe that any statesman in all the five continents of the world, need lose any sleep at night wondering whether Israel is too big.

But even if the vision of peace commands our fidelity, there may be wisdom, at this stage, in a moderate approach toward the problem of its attainment. Peace cannot be imposed. Peace cannot be dictated. Peace is a voluntary impulse of the human will. It may be that Israel's emergence has created wounds that impact too deep to be healed without assistance from the passage of time. In these circumstances, we doubt the wisdom of a constant impatient rush for what is sometimes called a peace settlement. Peace will not be achieved by brooding on its absence or by artificially forcing the pace of its attainment. In the years to come, the beginning of wisdom in international diplomacy may lie not in the pursuit of the ultimate ambition of peace, but rather, in the pursuit of a more modest but crucial ambition—that of security. The greatest need, in my government's judgment, is for greater clarity and precision to be given to existing international commitments to prevent the change of the existing situation of fact and law by force.

This perhaps, if achieved, can lead to an eventual affirmation of common kinship between us and our neighbors. Peace is more likely to arise out of prolonged tranquillity, carefully nurtured, than by some spectacular acts of diplomacy or the clash and thunder of public debate.

Whether the pursuit of this ambition takes short or long time, our hands are full of work. The second decade beckons to us with the challenge of its opportunity.

There is the Negev wilderness to be revived and settled. There is the Jordan River, now running wantonly to waste, to be developed for the sake of greater productivity in field and farm, in Israel and in neighboring states. There is the domain of international communications, in maritime and aerial enterprise, in which we seek a rank which many small nations before us have achieved. There are friendships in the world to be fortified and won. There are vistas of industrial and commercial progress which we have so far barely approached. And there is, above all, the unlimited horizon of intellectual and spiritual effort, the search for symmetry in form and harmony in sound, and the ageless quest of the Hebrew mind for some answer to the question of purpose in the life of nature and the journey of man.

Israel, in her modern revival, cannot promise you that she will rise to her previous levels of inspiration. But at least we have restored to these people the conditions of a creative culture, pride of soil, deep roots in a superbly aristocratic cultural tradition, the possibilities of interaction with other cultures and civilizations and the special dynamism which attends a people in the formative period of its youthful growth.

What we offer you, then, is the spectacle of Israel as a 10-year-old possessing most of the qualities which 10-year-olds of human origin possess. That is to say, we are still growing, but no longer of negligible size. We are full of youthful wonder, but our innocence is not complete. To our elders, amongst the nations, we give a deference that sometimes falls short of adulation. And, of course, nobody really knows, or understands our innermost thoughts.

But with all these 10-year-old qualities there is much in mature accomplishment which justifies thanksgiving and praise. The roads that we have built in these 10 years, the trees that we have planted, the soil that we have redeemed from desolation, the water that we have made gush forth in desert places, the enterprise of commerce and industry that we have promoted, the Hebrew life and letters that we have fostered, the friendships that we have made with other nations, the Jewish pride that we have everywhere exalted—all these pass before us in the panorama of our memory. Perhaps it is fitting that, looking back upon this rich harvest, we might echo the words of your Founding Fathers, the pilgrim fathers, which they uttered when they had endured the rigors of their first winter upon these shores. They said, "We have made a clearing in the wilderness, and another year will see a larger clearing, a better land. We have made a good beginning in an arduous world."

In echoing these words of thanksgiving, we are convinced that you and all your fellow citizens will continue, all your lives, to be moved by the revival of our civilization in that land where the arts of morality were born, and whence the call for universal brotherhood came down across the ages to successive generations of mankind.

Statement on Proposed Area Redevelopment Act Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the big show before the House Banking and Currency Committee, staged, not so much by the committee or its chairman, but the political management of the Democratic Party, involving testimony from ex-President Truman, some 10 governors, radical labor leaders, including Walter Reuther, and radical economists and spokesmen, included in the way of honorable mention 1 or 2 business groups.

There was no space for the testimony of the Investors League, for instance. Under unanimous consent, I include the statement by William Jackman, their president, in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF INVESTORS LEAGUE, INC., TO THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, ON PROPOSED AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT BILLS, H. R. 6215, H. R. 5459, AND H. R. 5468 MAY 7, 1958

My name is William Jackman. I am president of Investors League, Inc., a nonpartisan, nonprofit, voluntary membership organization of individual investors, large and small, residing in every State, with national headquarters at 234 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

I wish to thank the chairman and other members of the committee for the privilege of presenting the views of the American investor on the bills now before you which propose methods of extending Federal aid and assistance to areas suffering from chronic unemployment. The investor has a great interest in seeing the manpower of the Nation fully and profitably employed in the production of goods and services that are needed and wanted by our steadily increasing population. It is the utilization of such productive capacity that brings general prosperity to all of our people and creates that favorable climate under which the investor will gladly risk his capital in providing more and more job opportunities not only for our present working force but for those millions of our citizens who are being added to it every year.

It is unfortunate, indeed, that the problems of how best to help the chronically depressed areas have now become so seriously compounded by the present general business recession which seems to be feeding on itself each day.

Gentlemen, the owners and managers of business, whether large or small, need today as never before, constructive assurance from government at all levels, that hard and intelligent effort, inventive genius, risk-taking and bold ventures into new enterprises will bring them real rewards that will not be siphoned off by incentive-destroying methods of taxation, extravagant waste in government spending, further encroachment of government into private business, outmoded and unnecessary government controls and regulations, and a timid national labor policy which permits and coddles coercive practices and disregard of law enforcement in labor and management relations.

There is ample legislation pending in this Congress which would largely remove these shackles of business and industrial progress and open the floodgates of a new era of job abundance and prosperity.

The most effective force for checking the recession and putting the worker back on the job would be provided by immediate enactment of a sound tax reduction bill—one that would be considered permanent, not just a temporary shot in the arm. Tax reduction bills proposing increases in personal exemptions to be made up by further soaking investors and corporations would further ruin business and investment incentive and help feed the fire of unemployment.

The tax bill before Congress that would cost the Treasury the least, and would instill the greatest business confidence, is the bipartisan Sadlak-Herlong bill which would provide for a gradual reduction in both individual and corporate income taxes over a 5-year period whereby at the end of the period, individual rates would start at 15 percent as against 20 percent as at present, and individual maximum rates would not exceed 42 percent as against 91 percent at present and maximum corporate rates would be reduced to 42 percent as against 52 percent at present. To this bill there could be added provisions to completely eliminate, or cut drastically, the excise taxes on automobiles, communication, and railroad freight and passenger transportation, and last, but not least, a provision that would cut the maximum tax on long-term capital gains from 25 percent to 12½ percent.

This cut in the capital-gains tax would do more than anything else to free billions of locked-in capital for investment, large portions of which would find their way into new and small businesses. And this is one tax cut that would bring increased revenues to the Treasury and help substantially to make up any loss in revenues to the Government resulting temporarily from the other tax cuts.

Several weeks ago the Investors League conducted a limited survey of its average membership, to determine what action investors would take if the long-term capital-gains tax were cut in half. To date we have received 300 replies to our questionnaire indicating that if this tax cut were made 300 individual investors, scattered across the country, would sell stocks having a market value of $25 million, which were acquired at a cost of $10 million and pay a tax of over $1,850,000 on the profits. We are confident that such a survey, conducted on a far broader scale, would indicate that the wealthy investor could be tapped immediately for several billions of taxes which he otherwise wouldn't pay, because, after all, he doesn't have to take his profits.

It is our considered opinion that the Proposed Area Redevelopment Act bills (H. R. 6215 and 5459–5468) should not be acted upon until other legislation designed to relieve overall national unemployment has been disposed of. Otherwise, there is grave danger of opening floodgates of billions of such Federal aid that might be claimed by thousands of additional communities suffering drastically from temporary unemployment which the proposed acts were not designed to cover.

Furthermore, there still remain the gravest doubts as to whether the proposed Federal aid to chronically depressed areas will do more harm than good. There are basic economic and social reasons for the existence of these areas. The industrial frontiers of the Nation are constantly shifting and will continue to do so as new sources of old and new raw materials are discovered, new techniques are employed and new industries are born. New energy resources, shifting methods of freight transportation, overcrowding of big cities, an increasing population, area dispersion of basic defense industries—all these factors and a myriad more must determine plant locations. Proximity to raw material sources, proximity to markets, transportation facilities, adequacy of water supplies, attitudes of local labor unions, courts and law enforcement agencies, and of zooming importance, local business tax attitudes—these are the more important considerations that must be evaluated before determining where to build that new factory or research center. Federal aid cannot change the natural laws of nature and economics. If an area has become chronically depressed, there is invariably a basic economic cause which cannot be cured by well-meaning Government largess.

Vocational training of unskilled workers and financial assistance in moving such workers from the depressed areas to areas where their services could be profitably employed would seem to make better economic sense than moving factories to or building new ones in, these areas which have become economically unsuitable for their existence.

It would seem that such programs, however, could be financed much better by the States and municipalities involved, and by the businessmen of the areas to be benefitted, than by Federal grants and loans.

There are many case histories of depressed communities in which the economic climate has shifted and where new industries can be operated at a profit. These communities through local bootstrap operations have largely recovered. Many more would be able to recover if Federal tax policies were changed in such manner that some of the risk capital of local investors, now sterilized by the high capital gains tax rate, were to be made available for local investment.

Various agencies of the Federal Governmen already have in effect various programs to assist labor surplus areas. The Office of Area Development of the Department of Commerce has a technical assistance program. Various programs of the Defense Department, the Department of Agriculture, the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Small Business Administration are in part devoted to special assistance to depressed areas.

We seriously doubt whether additional Federal assistance such as provided in H. R. 6215, H. R. 5459, and H. R. 5468 would be of any real help.

H. R. 6215 calls for Federal loans and grants and provides for another new independent executive agency to administer the program.

H. R. 5459 and H. R. 5468 call for loans only and would give the responsibility of administering the program to the Department of Commerce.

For obvious reasons we would highly favor H. R. 5459 and H. R. 5468 over H. R. 6215 although we are far from convinced that any of these bills would go far toward curing the patient.

Gentlemen, I wish to repeat most emphatically my earnest conviction that the distress of the unemployed in all areas can be alleviated most effectively and most promptly by quick passage of a sound tax reduction bill such as outlined above. When general unemployment is checked and when America is back on the road to prosperity, the problems of the depressed areas can best be studied calmly and deliberately, and preferably in an atmosphere removed as far as possible from partisan political considerations. Believe me, gentlemen, I personally am, and I am sure each of the members of your committee and each of our members is deeply sympathetic to the plight of the unemployed. All of us being human, we are all selfish to some degree. But being human, we are all more or less humane. I know of no one who is not anxious to help, in one way or another, to obtain employment for any jobless fellowman who is able, ready, and willing to work.

A Tribute to Former South Dakota Governor Tom Berry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr, McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, Miss Eleanor Parker, a senior journalism student at South Dakota State College has written an excellent historical sketch on the role of one of South Dakota's most colorful and illustrious governors, former Gov. Tom Berry. The Cowboy Governor, as he was known, gave the people of South Dakota hope and courage at a difficult time when the State was plagued by drought, depression, and fiscal bankruptcy. Assuming office when the credit of the State was worthless, Governor Berry reestablished the fiscal foundation of the State.

Miss Parker's article appears in the April 1958 issue of the State College Dakotan, a monthly publication of the department of printing and rural journalism of South Dakota State College. Her article follows:

SODBUSTERS—TOM BERRY, DEPRESSION "DOCTOR" DURING DARK 1930'S—HAD PLAN FOR WATER CONSERVATION

(By Eleanor Parker)

Tom Berry was Governor of South Dakota during its most desperate era, the depression years of 1933–36. In this period, dust-storms, hot winds, and grasshoppers destroyed crops. The State's credit was worthless.

Berry's first job as governor was to restore the State's credit, which meant providing treasury funds. With the cooperation of the legislature, he succeeded in reestablishing the State on a sound financial basis.

PHOTOGRAPHED DISASTER

Governor Berry knew South Dakota needed help and was incapable of helping itself, to any degree. The former Jackson County rancher went about convincing President Franklin Roosevelt the State should receive Federal aid.

Berry hired a commercial photographer from Pierre to take pictures of farm damage by the drought and grasshoppers. On the back of each picture was a description of the damage and a history of the family. Many of the families had been on the land for years and had, in most cases, derived good incomes from their farms. But in 1932, the bottom fell out of farm prices, and in 1933 the crops were destroyed. The families now faced starvation.

MILLIONS FOR DAKOTA RELIEF

Governor Berry went to Washington, armed with pictures taken in a dozen counties. He showed the pictures to the President and explained the plight of South Dakota.

Berry succeeded in getting the financial aid of millions of dollars for the State and the cowboy Governor acted as the first administrator of the funds, serving without salary.

The drought taught South Dakotans a lesson their Governor had already learned—water conservation. During second term, Berry insisted that men working for Federal wages build dams, wherever practical. Hundreds of dams were constructed in all parts of the State. Each now serves as a monument to the wisdom of a rancher who learned the value of water.

The First Annual World Brotherhood Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity."

This ancient biblical admonition symbolizes the expressions in all the great religious faiths of mankind on the need for cementing the ties of the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God.

In carrying out the great tradition of brotherhood, I am pleased to note the fine work of World Brotherhood, which was established in 1950 by men and women who believed in a spiritual or moral interpretation of the universe, so as to promote understanding, justice, and cooperation among people differing in religion, race, nation, social status, or culture.

On April 29 two outstanding champions and practitioners of brotherhood, Philippine Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo and Dr. Arthur H. Compton, cochairmen of the World Brotherhood Organization, announced the winners of the World Brotherhood award for communitywide activities promoting international understanding and friendship with communities overseas.

As a senior member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, it is my pleasure to salute World Brotherhood, and to commend the winning cities: Rochester, N. Y., and Worthington, Minn.

On other occasions on the floor of the Senate, it has been my pleasure to point up other activities by dedicated individuals and organizations which have been aiding the cause of world peace, by like-minded efforts to transcend the barriers of misunderstanding and unfamiliarity.

I send to the desk the text of the release from World Brotherhood, describing the awards. I append to it the statement of the judges, describing the worthy reasons for the selection of the prize-winning communities. I include thereafter a list of the distinguished officers and members of the general assembly of World Brotherhood. The high caliber of these individuals bespeaks the worthy background of this organization. I ask unanimous consent that these materials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD BROTHERHOOD,
New York, N. Y., April 30, 1958.

TWO AMERICAN CITIES RECEIVE AWARDS FOR INTERNATIONAL ACTION PROGRAMS

The cities of Rochester, N. Y., and Worthington, Minn., have been named as winners of the first World Brotherhood award, for community-wide activities for promoting international understanding and friendship with communities overseas. The announcement was made today by Philippine Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo and Dr. Arthur H. Compton, cochairmen of the World Brotherhood organization from its headquarters in New York City.

The brotherhood awards were divided into two categories, one for cities of less than 100,000 population and one for cities of 100,000 or more. The selection was made after a nation-wide survey of community programs of international action in such fields as student exchange, hospitality for foreign visitors, foreign affairs education, town affiliation, and other areas of international human relations. In addition to the Rochester and Worthington awards, special citations were also announced for San Jose, Calif., Montclair, N. J., and Hagerstown, Md. Judges in the competition were Edward H. Barrett, of the Columbia School of Journal-

ism; Mrs. Ogden Reid, of the New York Herald Tribune; Mr. A. L. Cole, of the Reader's Digest; Mr. John Loeb, of Carl M. Loeb, Rhoades & Co., and Dr. Everett R. Clinchy, president of World Brotherhood. The presentations will be made by General Romulo at a reception on June 3, 1958, at the World Affairs Center in the Carnegie Endowment Building in New York City.

A special feature of the ceremonies at the World Affairs Center will be the presentation, through World Brotherhood, of a Pan American World Airways community friendship grant which will provide each city with the opportunity to send a community affairs leader on a visit to a selected overseas city, plus a reciprocal visit to the winning American city by a community leader from abroad. The American communities are being asked to explore the possibility of arranging these exchanges with cities in underdeveloped areas or behind the Iron Curtain.

In a joint statement prepared by the panel of judges and issued by Dr. Everett Clinchy, the records of Rochester and Worthington were described as "impressive testimony to the idealism, energy, and organizational ability of the citizens who make up these communities * * * a source of profound hope to all who have had the privilege of reviewing this material." Stressing the difficulty of singling out activities of specific organizations, the judges cited as samples of Rochester's achievements the work of the Rochester Association for the United Nations, the teen-age diplomats plan, the Rochester Museum's Asian Month, the Industrial Management Council's foreign visitors hospitality program, the Rochester Chamber of Commerce and its program for new citizens, Rotary's United Nations fellowships, the university's world-awareness project, and the many contributions of Rochester's churches and public schools to international understanding. Special tribute was also paid to the Rochester press for its coverage of the international scene and to Eastman Kodak and other Rochester industrial concerns.

Worthington, which has a population of less than 10,000, was selected for its successful 10-year-old program of affiliation with Crailsheim, Germany, and for its unique program of hospitality for foreign visitors—a program which has included a Russian farm group, Rumanian election observers and distinguished journalists, teachers, etc., from many continents.

Among the runners-up, San Jose was cited for its Pacific neighbors program which includes a citywide exchange with Okayama, Japan; Hagerstown for its program with Wesel, Germany, and the work of its public schools; and Montclair for its overseas neighbors program with Graz, Austria.

World Brotherhood, which has headquarters in Europe and Asia as well as in the United States, is a nonprofit organization devoted to international human relations. Its international directorate includes the 5 cochairmen, Arthur H. Compton, Nobel prize physicist; Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo; Paul-Henri Spaak, and Mme. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, and Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, as well as distinguished citizens of 21 countries.

The international community award will be given annually, and after this year will include consideration of communities in other countries which have developed similar programs of action for creating international and intercontinental bonds of friendship and cooperation.

[World Brotherhood, established in 1950 by men and women who believe in a spiritual or moral interpretation of the universe to promote understanding, justice, and cooperation among people differing in religion, race, nation, social status, or culture; Building for Brotherhood, 43 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.; Telephone: MUrray Hill 8-7530; cable address: NYWORLDBRO New York. Cochairmen: Arthur H. Compton, Paul-Henri Spaak, Carlos P. Romulo, Konrad Adenauer, Mme. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit; administrative president, Everett R. Clinchy; executive secretary, Margaret Grant]

STATEMENT BY JUDGES IN CONNECTION WITH WORLD BROTHERHOOD AWARD TO THE CITIES OF ROCHESTER, N. Y., AND WORTHINGTON, MINN.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS

It can be stated without qualification that the selection of 2 winning cities out of the 5 nominated for the World Brotherhood community awards was a difficult and almost impossible task. The record of accomplishments by all of these five cities, as evidenced by the material submitted to World Brotherhood is impressive testimony of the idealism, energy and organizational ability of the citizens who make up these communities and a source of profound hope to all who have had the privilege of reviewing this material.

In making our final choices we had, of course, to establish certain carefully thought out criteria based upon the objectives of World Brotherhood as developed by the founders and administrators of this organization. For example, although recognizing fully the potential impact of these programs abroad, as they reflect favorably upon the American scene, or serve to advance our national interests, we felt called upon to give an even higher priority to international community action as a two-way street leading toward a mutuality of interest, with concern and respect for mankind as a single family unit. Thus, in examining the local "hospitality" programs for foreign visitors, we looked not only for evidences of "impact" upon the foreign visitor, but also for evidences of opportunity for both parties to share their ideas, traditions and experiences. We also found ourselves concerned with each community's efforts, through press, radio, television, and public meetings, to supplement the action phase of its program with broader aspects of international education. In this connection, we tried to pay particular attention to the extent to which each community had utilized the resources of national nongovernmental organizations specializing in areas of international action.

Another point which came up frequently in our deliberations was that of "community-wide participation." In other words, was the continuing burden of the overseas program carried by a limited group of enthusiasts, or was it an "across the board" operation involving a true cross section of the community? Was leadership diversified, or did it seem to fall upon 1 or 2 individuals or organizations? What efforts had been made within the communities in question to utilize the resources of local minority groups whose experiences reflect, in microcosm, the worldwide problems of understanding?

It was felt that the 2 awards should be given to cities in different categories, 1 to a city with population over 100,000, the other to a smaller city. Thus the awards would point up the fact that a city need not necessarily be large to achieve real results in international relations.

In short, in addition to all the obvious criteria for selecting a winner, many factors were involved which caused a considerable amount of soul searching on the part of the five judges. Recognizing this fact, we were surprised and frankly pleased to find that we had, somehow, each in our own fashion, reached similar conclusions as to the cities of Rochester, N. Y., and Worthington, Minn. Here are those conclusions:

ROCHESTER, N. Y.

Rochester is unique in that no single project, such as an affiliation with a specific overseas community, was needed to mobilize its resources in a community effort which, in the opinion of the judges, has few parallels in the history of peacetime international action. By the same token no one community leader, organization, or industrial group can claim credit for launching or maintaining the total program. It is true that the Rochester Association for the United Nations has provided the community with competent and highly valuable guidance, and that Rochester has had unique advantages in developing world perspectives through its great university, its Eastman School of Music, and the presence of outstanding international industrial institutions. The fact remains, however, that the sense of international responsibility which permeates the Rochester scene is intrinsically the product of individual citizen response to the challenges of the world outside. Rochester's highly successful Teen-Age Diplomats plan originated as a result of a car-pool discussion. Its program of scholarships for young people to study the workings of the United Nations came out of a series of Rotary lunches. Its concern for the American Farm School in Greece and the Salzburg Seminar in American Studies (to mention but a few of Rochester's specialized overseas interests) grew out of the experience of local citizens, and Rochester's pride in their accomplishments.

In view of the variety and scope of Rochester's international effort, we find it difficult to single out individual projects for special attention. The Rochester Association for the United Nations, with some 4,000 members devoting themselves to various international activities, is an obvious source of energy and enthusiasm with the city. Rochester University's world awareness study program has made a unique contribution, as has the accelerated foreign-language program of the city's school system. Rochester's support, through its churches, of the program of the World Council of Churches, is matched only by that of New York City; its UNESCO-sponsored Asian Month, held at the Rochester Museum, leads the Nation as far as local support is concerned.

Furthermore, in Rochester, the judges were impressed by the quality and extent of industrial participation in Rochester's international life. This is manifest at once through the many corporate gifts to worthy international causes, but also through the initiative and leadership shown by employee and management groups in inventing and carrying out specific plans for the international exchange of people, ideas, and friendship.

We wish it were possible to pay tribute to each and every group or individual who has contributed to the story of Rochester and World Brotherhood, but that is manifestly impossible. To sum up the case, we would like to give hearty endorsement to the words of Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, Congressman from the 28th District, New York. Congressman KEATING when informed of

Rochester's nomination for this award, wrote:

"The city by promoting brotherhood on a local level, and through its cognizance of the need for the worldwide extension of this concept, is making a substantial and effective contribution to world peace. Rochester is truly an example of living brotherhood in action. It is certainly worthy of the recognition of the World Brotherhood community award."

WORTHINGTON, MINN.

Worthington is one of many small American communities which, shortly after World War II, experimented with a new formula for international understanding called town affiliation. As early as 1947, it paired off with the city of Crailsheim, Germany, and began the first American community exchange of friendship and ideas with the citizens of a former enemy country.

Today, 10 years later, the Worthington affiliation with Crailsheim is still going strong, and is recognized throughout America as one of the most successful and promising programs of this type. Its impact in Crailsheim and in Worthington alike, as evidenced by the material sent in from Worthington, is growing steadily.

The judges were impressed by the tone of this affiliation. The initial statement of purpose drawn up in 1947 is a solid and impressive outline of Worthington's determination to organize its efforts along realistic lines, avoiding undue fanfare, and stressing the mutuality of interest that must be cultivated before people can learn to appreciate and understand one another. Worthington has not deviated from these basic principles. When, during the early stages of the program, the emphasis was upon material aid, Worthington gave generously without condescension, and with a deep sensitivity to the pitfalls of overdone charity. In 1957, when they sent their two community ambassadors to Crailsheim to live for one year, these young men were given comprehensive and successful training, before their departure, in the German language and in backgrounds of German history and life. The Worthington newspaper and radio station have utilized this affiliation to present the broader aspects of German-American understanding in a lively and comprehensive fashion. German visitors have become one of the family, and one gets the impression that the distances separating these sister cities has somehow lost meaning.

In considering the Worthington story, the judges soon realized, however, that the Crailsheim affiliation, remarkable as it has been, was merely the triggering mechanism for a communitywide response to world issues which, as documented in the Worthington exhibits, left several of the judges wondering how the people of Worthington found time for anything else. Foreign student hospitality programs, a continuous stream of distinguished foreign visitors (including Russian farmers, Rumanian election observers, Indian editors, etc.), Hungarian refugee programs, pen-pal activities, and overseas exhibits are merely a few of the specialized activities which Worthington seems to take as a matter of course in the pursuit of international brotherhood. Here, again, in all of these programs the judges noted a genuineness, a desire to be impressed rather than to impress and an almost total lack of self-consciousness in dealing with men and women from every corner of the world.

As in the case of Rochester, Worthington seems to be thoroughly self-reliant in the conduct of its international affairs, calling upon the appropriate governmental and private national agencies when they are needed, and knowing exactly where to turn to find them. There is evident desire, however, to remain unexploited for any but the broadest international purposes, and a healthy insistence on deeds rather than words with respect to the large amount of national and world publicity Worthington has received.

With regard to the communitywide aspects of the Worthington story, there is no question whatever but that leadership and initiative is built upon the broadest possible foundations. The list of participating organizations and individuals is a roster of the community itself.

As for the extent of Worthington's challenge, the judges could not fail to note the amount of intelligent self-questioning that went on in the 1947 selection of an enemy city; they noted Worthington's comparative isolation from the great cosmopolitan centers on either coast, its lack of large industrial resources or habitual world travelers and the predominately rural background from which these manifestations of world responsibility have developed.

Worthington, in short, was a source of deep inspiration to the entire committee. It was a privilege to review its remarkable story and to select it as the winner of the World Brotherhood Community award for towns within its population range.

SPECIAL CITATIONS

Having chosen Rochester, N. Y., and Worthington, Minn., as recipients of the first annual World Brotherhood Community Awards, we were not content to close the case without expressing our recognition of the impressive records of 3 other communities—Hagerstown, Md., Montclair, N. J., and San Jose, Calif. These cities, each in its own way, have developed magnificent programs which bid fair to go on paying handsome dividends, in terms of goodwill, mutual appreciation and enjoyment, to their own citizens and to the citizens of the communties with which they have developed bonds of friendship.

In fact, we felt that each of these communities merited a special citation for the prodigious efforts put forth and the results achieved.

HAGERSTOWN, MD.

For its enduring and energetic program with the city of Wesel, Germany out of which has developed, among other things, a 2-way exhibits program which is unequalled by any other community in the United States;

For a school participation program in world affairs that is unique in the experience of the World Brotherhood judges;

For its energy and warmth in the development of local hospitality programs for foreign visitors, and for the many ambassadors it has sent abroad;

For its enthusiasm in providing the facilities and community background to meet the program requirements of United States governmental agencies and private organizations working in the field of international citizen diplomacy.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.

For exceptional imagination and progress in the development of an outstanding program of affiliation with the city of Okayama, Japan during the year 1957;

For its long and expanding tradition of education in world affairs; its attention to local minorities and their inclusion within its overseas programs;

For having given, during the past year, exceptional meaning to the name "Pacific neighbors," by the staging of impressive ceremonies and the development of hospitality and exchange programs with the Far East which give promise of producing immediate and continuing contributions to citizen understanding between East and West.

MONTCLAIR, N. J.

For initiating and developing since 1950 an "overseas neighbor" program with citizens of Graz, Austria, which has become a model for many cities of the world and which has unfailingly demonstrated the oneness of the family of man wherever human beings can meet face to face and freely exchange their thoughts and aspirations;

For its modest but highly effective programs in the field of student and trainee exchange; and for the warmth of its hospitality to foreign visitors and foreign students in nearby universities;

For its joy and exuberance in promoting appreciation of differing world cultures through folk dance, music, and all the arts, and for sharing its technical skills in the field of medicine, government, and social organization with others in many areas of the world.

Mrs. Ogden Reid,
New York Herald Tribune,
Mr. Edward W. Barrett,
Dean, Columbia School of Journalism,
Mr. John L. Loeb,
Carl M. Loeb, Rhoades & Co.,
Mr. A. L. Cole,
Business Manager, Reader's Digest,
Committee of Judges.

(General Assembly: Hermann J. Abs, Frankfurt; F. Albert-Buisson, Paris; Roger Auboin, Basle; Charles E. Beard, Dallas; Marcel Bélaiche, Alger; G. D. Birla, New Delhi; F. Bender, Amsterdam; Pierre Bonvoisin, Bruxelles; Sam Bronfman, Montreal; Baron Collot d'Escury, Amsterdam; Alphonse Dain, Paris; Albert DeSmaele, Bruxelles; Allen W. Dulles, New York; Lady Eaton, Toronto; Abderrahmane Farès, Alger; Ferdinand Friedmensburg, Berlin; Ejnar Glashof, Kobenhavn; John D. Hayes, Toronto; Robert Hentsch, Genève; Paul G. Hoffman, Pasadena; Barbara Ward Jackson, London; Rajkumari Amrit Kaur, New Delhi; Guill Konsbruck, Luxembourg; Blair Laing, Toronto; Franz Landertshammer, Wien; Herbert H. Lehman, New York; Trygve Lie, Oslo; Victor Loeb, Bern; Henry R. Luce, New York; H. N. MacCracken, Poughkeepsie; Alfred Mayer, Wiesbaden; Sir Robert Mayer, London; John J. McCloy, New York; George B. McKibbin, Chicago; T. H. McKittrick, New York; George Meany, Washington; Leo Model, New York; Emmanuel Monick, Paris; Ludovico Montini, Roma; Luigi Morandi, Milano; V. V. Narlikar, Banaras; Heinz Nordhoff, Wolfsburg; Per Norlin, Stockholm; Basil O'Connor, New York; Adriano Olivetti, Ivrea; Giulio Pastore, Roma; Warren Lee Pierson, New York; Alfredo Pizzoni, Milano; P. Kodanda Rao, Bangalore; Eberhardt Reinhardt, Zurich; Paul Reynaud, Paris; Eleanor Roosevelt, New York; Ramon del Rosario, Manila; James N. Rosenberg, New York; P. Rossy, Bern; F. J. Th. Rutten, Nijmegen; P. J. S. Serrarens, Luxembourg; M. Raziuddin Siddiqi, Peshawar; Gregg M. Sinclair, Honolulu; Gurbax Singh, New Delhi; Spyros Skouras, New York; Robert A. Solborg, Paris; Hilel Storch, Stockholm; John L. Sullivan, Washington; Vidal A. Tan, Quezon; Kotaro Tanaka, Tokyo; Gaston Tessier, Paris; Norman Thomas, New York; Francisca Tirona-Benitez, Manila; Wilfred Tsukiyama, Honolulu; E. de la Vallée-Poussin, Bruxelles; Prince Wan Waithayakon, Bangkok; Marcus Wallenberg, Stockholm; Jean Willems, Bruxelles; Lars Wirström, Stockholm; Arthur W. Woo, Hong Kong; Sir Zafrulla Khan, Karachi; Umberto Zanotti-Bianco, Roma; Walter A. Zimmerman, Seattle. European division: European executive committee chairman, Albert De Smaele; divisional executive secretary, Pierre A. Visseur; Centre International, Geneva, Switzerland. Asia-Pacific division: divisional secretaries, Dr. and Mrs. William A. Shimer, in care of Oo Thein, 340 Maha Bandoola Street, Rangoon, Burma. North American division: United States executive committee chairman, George B. McKibbin, 43 West 57th Street, New York; Canadian executive secretary, Richard D. Jones, 221 Victoria Street, Toronto, Canada.)

Appendix

Law Is a Way of Life for Charles I. Francis, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, when the University of Texas School of Law recently observed its sixth annual Law Day, the program carried the following dedication:

Law Day, 1958, is gratefully dedicated to Charles I. Francis, who, because of his unselfish and tireless efforts in behalf of our law school, has been recognized by the faculty and students as the year's outstanding alumnus.

The recognition is well deserved, as those of us who know Charles I. Francis readily understand. He is a Texan of whom other Texans are proud. He is a man of knowledge and understanding, an attorney of distinction, an American patriot of great vision, and my genuine and valued friend.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article outlining the career and dealing with the personality of Mr. Francis, published in the Houston Post, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post of April 27, 1958]

LAW AND UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS ARE WAYS OF LIFE FOR CHARLES FRANCIS

(By Nathan Broch)

The skipper of the German freighter *Kassel* was probably livid with rage.

But Charles Inge Francis didn't care.

He was swimming ashore with all his might. From buoy to buoy. Reaching toward the German shoreline and the city of Bremerhaven.

When Francis finally got into town that July day of 1914, his Galveston-bought seersucker suit began to shrink fast under the onslaught of the summer sun.

"I looked like someone in a Buster Brown suit," he chuckles. "Particularly after I got on one of those Bremerhaven streetcars. You see, I had made arrangements to have my baggage brought ashore through a friend. So I had to wait a little while * * *."

While waiting, Francis purchased a bicycle. He used it for his first tour of Germany and other parts of Europe.

The Francis who literally jumped ship at Bremerhaven was a 20-year-old Texan from Denton, a junior at the University of Texas, eager to see the world—even if he had to sign on as a humble hand abroard a freighter to do so.

The Francis who told the story of that adventure is 64 years old, a fascinating combination of country lawyer, criminal defense attorney corporation counsel, and scholar.

He was destined to return to Europe several times in the next 44 years. But he would never have to jump ship again. He would be traveling in comfort to the Old World as one of the most distinguished legal minds of the New World.

OUTSTANDING UT LAW ALUMNUS

The distinguished Francis career found high recognition Friday when the Houstonian was the center of attention in Austin for Law Day of the University of Texas Law School. The school dedicated the day to Francis. What's more, it named him the outstanding alumnus of the year.

This is as it should be. Francis' life and career have been closely tied with the university where he obtained his bachelor of arts, bachelor of law, and master of law degrees. He also played on the university's baseball teams and served on its debating groups.

Also, Francis is directly responsible for one of the most unusual funds in the country: The University of Texas Law School Fundation, which, so far, has raised some $400,000. Proceeds from this fund are used to supplement the salaries of distinguished professors of the law school.

"We have to stop the migration of our finest faculty members to such places as Harvard, Princeton, and Yale," says Francis. "If we can keep them in our law school, it's worth supplementing their salary. That's what the foundation is doing, mostly upon recommendation of the school's dean."

But these salary supplements are not handouts.

"A professor must really do something for the money," says Francis. "He is usually engaged in some special research or busy writing a book. A good teacher is always doing some research."

FIRST, LAST, ALWAYS A TRIAL LAWYER

Francis' attachment to the law school is more than the traditional affection a man feels for his alma mater. It is an integral part of his ever-searching love and respect for the law as a living thing, a part of America that keeps growing in scope and refinement along with the growth of the country.

The widening scope of the law was found by Francis in oil and gas litigation, a field of deepening complexities that has many of its roots right here in Texas. It is here that the country lawyer and corporation counsel combine in Francis to explore America's youngest legal frontier.

This is also the foundation on which he built his association with the Texas Eastern Transmission Corp., which he serves as counsel, vice president, and director. Francis will retire as an officer of the firm when he reaches 65 in September.

"I'm only the legal quarterback of the team that started and runs Texas Eastern," he says with a smile.

The same thing was the driving force behind his efforts to modernize the Texas judiciary in 1954, when he served as chairman of the special State bar committee on constitutional revision. The modernization effort failed when a majority of Texas lawyers voted against it. But Francis remains convinced that the State "one of these days" will revamp its judicial system.

It is only natural that a man so deeply and broadly concerned with the law should have formulated a distinct view on the South's problem of desegregating its public schools.

"I agree with United States District Judge Ben Connally that desegregation must proceed with deliberate speed," says Francis. "However, if it's done too fast, it will hurt the Negroes and if it's done too slowly it will hurt all of us."

Despite his immense scholarly background—or possibly just because of it—Francis is first, last and always a trial lawyer.

He was the defense attorney in the first Texas murder trial ever to bring special reporters down here from such places as New York and Chicago.

That was in the twenties when a mayor of Wichita Falls, where Francis practiced law for many years before coming to Houston in 1934, was on trial for murder in the killing of his son-in-law. The mayor's wife was tried separately.

PAYS TRIBUTE TO CRIMINAL LAWYERS

When Francis completed his defense of the mayor, his client drew a manslaughter conviction but was paroled by the governor after serving a very short term. The mayor's wife was later tried and convicted. She never served her sentence, as the governor pardoned her.

Says Francis after many years in the ranks of corporation law, "I don't know of any higher calling a lawyer could have than the practice of criminal law."

James V. Allred, who was to become attorney general and later Governor of Texas, was the prosecutor in the famous Wichita Falls murder trial.

Years later, Allred was to retain Francis as his defense attorney before the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate when Allred's appointment to the United States fifth circuit court of appeals was being contested.

Francis pioneered as a codiscoverer of the important Church-Fields Pool in Crane County in 1926. A sand-stuck driller brought in a profitable well at 3,100 feet. This was in west Texas, the really wild and woolly west, and there wasn't anyway to get the oil out of the place economically.

"So, we sold out to Magnolia Petroleum Co.," says Francis. "Sure we made a good profit—but they made many, many millions on the deal in the years that followed."

Does he consider himself a lawyer-oilman?

"No," smiles Francis, "I'm a lawyer—that's all."

And that's plenty, the way Francis breathes and lives the law. Just take a quick look:

Admitted to the bar in 1917, he joined the Wichita Falls law firm of Weeks & Weeks in 1919, soon rising to partner in the team of attorneys. By 1933 Francis was established as a noted legal specialist in oil and gas matters. He had married the former Adelle Adickes of Wichita Falls and had become the father of two daughters. Now Mrs. S. P. Farish, Jr., and Mrs. Jack R. Winston, both live in Houston and each has three children.

In September 1933, Francis was appointed special assistant to the United States attorney general and served as counsel for the Petroleum Administrative Board in Washington. He represented the Federal Government in some of its most important oil and gas litigation. In 1934 Francis took the

advice of a fellow Denton County man, Hugh Roy Cullen, and moved to Houston, where he was a partner for 16 years of one of the biggest law firms in the Nation, Vinson, Elkins, Weems, and Francis.

In 1940 Francis served as a special consultant to the secretary of war and in 1941 he served another stint as special assistant to the United States attorney general. In 1944 he was on duty as an expert consultant to the United States Department of the Interior. Intermittently he also represented the State of Texas in important cases involving oil and gas conservation.

While doing all these things, Francis also served as a regent of the University of Texas for several years and was chairman of the university's land committee. He was twice elected president of the university's ex-students association and of the alumni association of its law school. He has also given of his time as a regent of Denton's North Texas State College and trustee of Dallas' Hockaday School.

Francis is very modest about his major achievement, the part he played in the creation of the Texas Eastern Transmission Corp., one of the world's pipeline giants. "I did my little bit," he says. "We worked as a team."

The story of the company's purchase of the Big and Little Inch pipelines from the Federal Government for $143,127,000 is now American industrial history. Texas Eastern was the highest bidder on the pipelines and won the award. The property consisted of 3,182 miles of pipeline and 1,993 miles of valuable right-of-way, extending from Texas to the east coast.

"It is rapidly becoming one of the Nation's largest pipeline systems," says Francis.

But Francis feels now that the gulf coast's traditional markets in the East are being cluttered up by imported oils. He sees Texas Eastern's future as a product carrier in America's heartland, the Midwest.

The aggressive sales policies of Texas Eastern were demonstrated recently when the company offered reduced rates for oil shipments scheduled over the lines 2 to 4 months in advance.

Francis has come a long and enviable way from the swim toward Bremerhaven to his near-austere offices in the Mellie Esperson Building.

But somehow, the young Texan in the shrinking seersucker suit and the mature attorney and grandfather, clad in conservative brown, are still very much in the swim of those things that are essential to make a good, full life.

Remarks of the Honorable John E. Fogarty at the 75th Annual Meeting of the Maryland State Dental Association, at the Lord Baltimore Hotel, Baltimore, Md., on Monday Evening, May 5, 1958

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

Last winter when I had the opportunity of addressing the annual meeting of your parent organization in Miami I also had the pleasure of meeting your own Dr. Joseph P. Cappuccio, who as you probably know has roots in my own State of Rhode Island. Dr. Cappuccio comes from a well-known family in the town of Westerly, R. I. His mother and father are among the most respected people I have been privileged to know. His two brothers, Frank and Louis, enjoy a statewide reputation in the field of law and are considered to be two of the outstanding attorneys in our State. Dr. Cappuccio very kindly invited me to meet with you here at your 75th anniversary, and I somewhat eagerly accepted for a number of reasons.

The first set of reasons has to do with my own particular view of the dental profession. I know your field, of course, from personal experience not only as a husband and father, but also as an individual who has benefited from the professional care I have received. As a Member of Congress, I can perhaps represent with a fair degree of accuracy the attitudes toward dental health of my own constituents in the State of Rhode Island. I also chair the committee in Congress which bears primary responsibility for the health appropriations of the Federal Government, and thus have gained some insight into both the past accomplishments and the future problems of your profession.

The second set of reasons has to do with my own attitude toward annual meetings, especially those of a professional nature. Annual meetings are a time for interchange of knowledge, a time for solidifying professional and organizational relationships, a time for comradeship and relaxation, a time for rededication by the individual to the goals and principles of the group. And they are a time for looking ahead for definition of tomorrow's problems, and for consideration of how those problems can best be met.

I would not presume to discuss or even to state what those problems may be; but I do have some thoughts to share with you observations and questions reflecting my views of dental health.

In my 15 plus years in Congress, serving on a committee considering, among other things, the national support of medical and dental public health programs conducted through the Public Health Service, one thing stands out prominently in my mind. It is this: tremendous progress has been made in those years toward the concept of man as a single biological entity and not merely a conglomerate of parts. Associated with this has been progress toward a concept of the interdependence of all science that seeks to protect man in this increasingly complex environment that he has created. This unity, strangely enough, becomes more apparent even as the range of the problems and the number of approaches to their solution increases. Thus we see around us today a proliferation of specialties and subspecialties, of disciplines and subdisciplines. We see categorical programs, both public and private, and subcategories within each major group. And yet, with all this, as man's knowledge grows, the artificial boundaries tend to disappear.

I have observed in the past few years that those who comprise the specialties and disciplines of the dental profession are gaining ever-increasing stature in the health field. Associations such as yours, as well as the smaller and larger ones in your field, share in bringing about this justly deserved measure of prestige. I am sure I need not remind you that recognition such as this is of a somewhat temporary and fleeting nature. The lasting image of your profession, I am sure you will agree, depends upon demonstrated competence and thoughtful leadership and quality service. If you find your image to be to your satisfaction today, it means that you must redefine your goals, set them at a higher level, and plan their achievement in the years ahead.

As I mentioned at the Miami meeting, the American dental profession has a peculiar added responsibility, especially when dentistry is considered as a categorical disease problem along with others such as heart disease, cancer, arthritis, and others. Most of the disease categories are represented nationally by voluntary health agencies, which, among other functions, help the profession in obtaining public understanding and support for needed activities. There is no voluntary organization for the dental profession, and I am sure that the American Dental Association recognizes this fact by acting both as the voluntary agency and the professional group. State, district, and other regional professional organizations should also give special emphasis to the inherent voluntary aspects of their respective roles.

Several questions come to mind in this connection. Do the people of Maryland know the nature, the extent, the importance of dental illness? Do they know what you have done, either as a group or as individuals, to improve the quality and distribution of trained individuals who can help them achieve better dental health? Apart from tooth decay, do they understand the meaning of dental illness? Have they been given every opportunity to be informed concerning the scientific evidence in support of fluoridation of public-water supplies, the topical use of fluorides, and other measures for the prevention of tooth decay?

Questions such as these suggest the rapid changes that have been taking place in dental practice. Just a few years ago, one had to be almost fatalistic about tooth decay and other types of dental diseases. In recent years, as advances in dental science have been applied in dental and public-health practice, we know that there is much that can be done. Even in the face of revolutionary advance in scientific knowledge, remnants of the fatalistic view remain. This view should be combated, primarily for the sake of the people who, if they understand, will find ways to support both your professions and your practices in order to achieve better total health for themselves and the members of their families.

Communication immediately suggests itself as one means of overcoming the fatalistic view; communication not only within your profession, but also between your profession and the people you serve. The soundest basis for this type of activity perhaps begins, as charity, at home. Once having established an effective means for communication within your organization, it becomes much easier to proceed to effective communication with those you serve. I am happy to know that the Maryland State Dental Association has established a fine professional journal of its own. I am sure that all of your members and, in turn, their patients will benefit from this very effective medium of communication. As I paged through the first issue of the Journal, I was impressed by the role that Maryland has played in the development of dental literature. In fact, I found that the first dental periodical, the American Journal of Dental Science, was edited and published here in Baltimore over a hundred years ago. Although that journal yielded to others, many of which similarly were published here, each made its own contribution to better understanding among the dental profession in Maryland and throughout the Nation. As the first issue of the new Journal states so aptly: "The altered conditions of the present day have been created by revolutionary developments that have come to the world during the past quarter of a century. Every social institution of service to mankind has been affected by the changes that have taken place in the social, scientific, economic and political attitudes of the people of the world. The Journal is coming on the scene at this opportune time to take its place and to do its part in the

adjustments which must be made to fit dentistry to the demands of the modern era."

Now I should like to focus a bit more closely on some of the altered conditions and revolutionary developments referred to in that editorial. They have to do with the relationship between you, your profession, and the Government. This is a matter of deep interest and concern to me, and elements of that relationship have been revealed to me with increasing frequency as each year for the last 16 years I have considered the Public Health Service's dental program in terms of their appropriation needs.

I have found that there has developed in the dental field during this period of time a pattern of cooperation which assures rapid progress toward objectives which the Public Health Service and the dental profession share. I have found that the Service seeks in all of its activities to supplement, and to complement, and not to duplicate or dictate. One measure of how well it achieves this goal is the degree to which it receives the support of your association, other State associations, and the national organization.

One program of the Public Health Service is concerned with developing methods for relieving personnel shortages in the dental field and extending services to patients. These studies include the educational resources for dentistry and dental hygiene, techniques for determining the efficiency of specific dental operations, and devices for better recording of dental services and needs. One of the studies in this program was conducted in my own State of Rhode Island, where over 5,000 children were followed for a 7-year period to see how the problems of accumulated and maintenance dental care were met in a specific segment of the population. The study provided evidence that dentists can be utilized more effectively if there are three dental asistants available to support every 2 dentists. It also showed that regular dental care, including application of topical fluorides, reduces the amount of teeth decay dramatically.

As a footnote to this problem of personnel needs, you may be interested to know that the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee conducted a study of medical and dental schools, which included a summary of practicing dentists related to the population of each State. In Maryland, for example, we found that for the period included 1900 to 1955 the ratio stood at the lowest level in 1955: some 34 dentists per 100,000 population as compared with 56 in 1900 and 50 in 1930. The pattern I have cited for Maryland was generally repeated throughout all sections of the country. For the United States as a whole, the number of practicing dentists declined from 58 per 100,000 population to 46 in 1955. These facts are all the more serious today when more and more people are becoming aware of the need for more and better dental care.

The American Dental Association, through its Council on Dental Education, has taken a realistic view of the current and impending national shortage of dentists. Several steps have been taken and are being planned to meet this problem. One step has been in the establishment of new dental schools. Since 1946, seven new dental schools have been opened, and another four are currently being planned. Based upon the assumption that the number of dental graduates will increase to 3,360 by 1961 and continue at that level through 1975, and that the United States population will rise to about 221 million by 1975, the disparity between the number of practicing dentists and the number needed to regain 1930 levels will be even wider.

Another facet of your profession that can be supported to improve the level of dental care in this Nation is in the improvement and expansion of research facilities. A relatively new program, now in its second year, is giving asistance to dental schools under the Health Research Facilities Act. Under this program, 9 grants in the amount of 938,000 were made to dental schools to aid in the construction of research facilities; in addition a few grants have been approved for combined medical and dental research facilities. This $90 million, 3-year program is limited to research construction. In the last session of Congress I introduced a broader bill under which $300 million would be available under a 5-year period of either teaching or research construction. Under this plan $40 million would be earmarked for dental schools. Legislation of this kind is badly needed, and I intend to continue to press for passage of this bill.

Another area of Public Health Service responsibility is in the support of research projects through grants. Since 1950, through the National Institute of Dental Research, dental schools and other non-Federal institutions have received research grants, and more recently, fellowships of various kinds. Two years ago, in the hearings held by the Appropriations Subcommittee, we found general agreement that the ultimate answers to the problem of dental disease must be found by research on etiologic factors, fundamental tissue changes, metabolism, heridity and epidemiologic techniques. We heard many good reasons for the expansion of the research grants program, stimulating the individual participation of dental schools, hospitals, and other scientific institutions.

We found that under the dental research grant program that then existed, it was possible to support only about 1 of every 6 projects that the National Advisory Dental Research Council recommended for approval to the Surgeon General. Consequently, in fiscal year 1956, only 45 projects were supported in some 22 non-Federal institutions. My committee in the House of Representatives recommended a 5-fold increase to about $2.5 million for dental research for fiscal year 1957. The National Advisory Dental Research Council set up a special committee, in light of this new support, to encourage and stimulate research in neglected areas. In the 12 months that followed, the number of pending requests for research project grants increased more than 10-fold, and the number of projects supported rose from 45 to 240. We found that not only the number of grants increased, but there was also a very striking increase in the number of different types of institutions participating in the research program. Today, the number of research projects now supported is at about 300, distributed among 82 institutions in 32 States and 3 foreign countries. I am happy to see, too, that over 90 percent of the dental schools now have active research projects.

It seems clear that the increased opportunities which have been provided during the past 2 years will deeply affect the course of research in dental schools, and, in addition, also have a significant effect on the quality of dental education. Another benefit of this special effort is that presently available funds have been expended largely for the purpose of continuing, on a broader and firmer base, the support of individuals who had received grants in prior years. Thus investigators, for the first time, now benefit from the assurance of stability through long-range support.

Now I would like to turn for a moment to the dental research program conducted at the National Institute of Dental Research in Bethesda. In the past few months, I have found that dentists throughout the country are aware of this program and its future needs. I, and members of my committee, have received countless letters from members of your profession in practically every State, urging construction of the Dental Research Building in Bethesda. Despite a lack of suitable laboratory facilities, the scope and variety of dental research there has grown appreciably. The committee has been particularly impressed by studies showing that many dental defects are heriditary, studies using the electron microscope indicating the precise way in which tooth decay attacks tooth enamel, and studies of the chemical composition of saliva in persons with and without dental caries.

It was somewhat distressing to the committee, therefore, to note that the administration's proposed budget for fiscal year 1959 omitted this project in spite of the fact that it had already been authorized by the Congress, that the final plans would be completed before July of this year, and in spite of the present high rate of unemployment and generally depressing economic outlook. In response to the need, expressed by the general public and members of your profession, the House Subcommittee on Appropriations has included $3,700,000 for construction of this greatly needed facility authorized by the 80th Congress.

In closing, I would like to leave you with this thought relevant to the Federal Government's role in all health programs. I sincerely believe that the primary responsibility for all activities designed to provide better health and care for people rests with States, communities, individuals, and their institutions and organizations, such as this one. We know, of course that there are important areas in which the State and local resources need and must be given appropriate Federal support. The primary burden of responsibility in considering these matters is to assure that the Federal Government does not usurp those functions which States and communities must carry out themselves. Although I see for the future a continued expansion of certain Federal health programs that can best be accomplished on a national basis, I shall continue to support only those Federal programs that maintain the freedom and integrity of individuals and groups of individuals, an imperative tenet for the growth and prosperity of our democracy.

Statement on Proposed Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement I made before the Labor Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare last Monday.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF UNITED STATES SENATOR WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND BEFORE THE LABOR SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, MAY 5, 1958

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to testify in behalf of S. 3068, the legislation in labor union democracy which was introduced in the Senate on January 23. I want to repeat what I stated during the recent debate in the Senate, that there is no more important legislative matter that can come before the Congress this year than legislation which will assure the establishment and continuance of democratic processes in

union affairs to the 18 million men and women who now belong, and to those in the future who will belong, to organized labor unions.

If we fail to live up to our responsibilities during this session of the Congress, after the Senate's select committee expending over a million dollars investigating union officers representing 14 percent of the entire union membership throughout the Nation, the uncontested evidence of widespread corruption, arrogance, and abuses in the operations of internal union affairs will stand as a permanent indictment of the record of the 85th Congress. The citizens, voters, and union members of America will be following, with great concern, the activities of the Senate in this field in the forthcoming weeks.

At the beginning of these hearings, I want to state that I have no desire to insist on the specific language of the legislation I have introduced. If the committee or the Senate can improve upon S. 3068, this should, of course, be done. Further, I am prepared to support any constructive legislation designed to remedy existing evils in the internal affairs of unions, or to carry out the recommendations of the Senate select committee.

I do want to point out that, in my judgment, there is an immediate and pressing need for legislation guaranteeing to union members in America the following minimum rights and protections.

1. The right periodically to elect union officials by secret ballot.

2. The right to recall union officers who misuse their positions of trust and responsibility.

3. Protection against arbitrary control of local unions by their national or international unions through trustees.

4. The right to amend or modify, revise, or repeal any provision of the constitution, bylaws, or rules of their unions.

5. The right to control decisions of their union officers concerning the collection or use of union funds.

6. The right to a voice as to strike activities of their union.

7. Protection against conspiracies between management and union officials against the interests of union members.

8. The right as workers represented by a union, to become and remain a member of that union without discrimination.

To assure the establishment of the democratic processes in union internal affairs, it is my strong belief that this objective can be accomplished with a minimum of Federal regulation and a maximum of membership initiative. This philosophy is in keeping with our traditional concepts of a limited Government jurisdiction over the activities of free men, and such principles are embodied in the legislation I have now pending before your subcommittee.

It has been discouraging and incomprehensible to note the criticism and opposition of the leaders of national and international unions to the constructive efforts being made to establish minimum guaranties of union democracy.

The Senate's Select Committee hearings have made clear and irrefutable principle of Government, that when special privileges and protections are extended to a special group, these must be balanced by adequate safeguards to prevent their abuse. Laws which do not contain such checks and balances, in reality retard, not promote, the aims and legitimate objectives of the groups they are designed to benefit.

The Taft-Hartley Act, approved over a Presidential veto by the Congress in 1947, was a major step forward in restoring a semblance of responsibility in collective bargaining controversies. Union membership has increase over three million members since its enactment, and labor disputes have been reduced in scope and number. Today, our citizens and union members demand that we take another constructive step forward and, by establishing a bill of rights for labor, guarantee that the democratic rights of our working men and women are protected by responsible authority.

It cannot be any longer contended that union organizations are purely voluntary associations and therefore exempt from internal supervision or regulation. Unions, in fact, although necessary to our society, are organizations which have been granted an extensive variety of Federal, State and local immunities and, therefore, stand forth in a privileged position:

1. They are exempt from our antitrust and monopoly laws.

2. They are exempt from taxation.

3. They have been declared, legislatively and judicially, as protected from the injunctive process in our courts.

4. They have been granted the rights of exclusive bargaining.

5. In the vast majority of collective bargaining units, they have been allowed to violate freedom of individual contracts under compulsory-membership agreements.

The economic power of organized unions has been accelerated through the enactment of law. We must now, through the enactment of law, make certain that with such power, responsibility goes hand in hand.

I would now like to explain the specific provisions of S. 3068.

1. ELECTION OF OFFICERS (SEC. 402)

As members of this subcommittee are aware, there is presently no requirement in our labor laws that democratic procedures be complied with in the election of union officers. Section 402 seeks to remedy this defect. Under its provisions, the membership would be assured of the right to choose their officers at least once every 4 years by secret ballot.

(a) To be eligible to serve as the officer of a labor organization, that officer must have been elected by popular vote of the union membership at an election held within the preceding 4-year period, and further that the voting at such elections shall be done through the medium of a secret ballot.

(b) The National Labor Relations Board will have the authority to receive petitions filed by any member or groups of members of the labor organization in question, or any nonemployer representative of such union members, alleging violations of the election provision, and the Board upon sufficient supporting evidence shall proceed in the matter as in the case of an unfair labor practice charge.

(c) If the Board discovers that under the petition the individual in question is serving illegally as an officer of the labor organization, the union in question, as long as it shall continue to maintain such an illegally elected individual as an officer, will be deprived of the privileges and benefits granted to it under existing law. Specifically, this will result in the loss of its certification under the National Labor Relations Act as the representative of such members, the exemption from Federal income tax laws under section 501 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, and the exemption under the antitrust and injunction protections of various Federal statutes. The amendment also provides that the individual who knowingly serves as a union officer while ineligible to serve shall be subject to prosecution and, upon conviction, punishment and a fine, for the commission of a misdemeanor. There is also a provision to protect the right of individual union members to file a petition under this proposed law.

(d) The final provision in the pending amendment authorizes that wherever a union is deprived of its representation protections under existing law for being in violation of the election provisions of this amendment, another election for union representation of the employees may be held despite the prohibition in existing law which limits to 1 the number of such elections that can be conducted during a 12-month period.

2. REMOVAL OF OFFICERS (SEC. 403)

Labor unions are organizations formed by the voluntary action of workingmen and women. They are organizations established for the purpose of being of direct benefit to the membership. Under these circumstances, the membership is certainly entitled to control the activities of the union. Such activities are carried out by elected officials. Therefore, if, in the opinion of the membership, those officials are not properly carrying out their duties, a right to remove them must exist.

Many unions presently provide for the recall of officers. Others do not, or if they do, the mechanism is hazardous, not for the offending union officers but rather for the instigators of the recall procedure.

Section 403 of my bill would remedy this situation. It would provide a workable method by which the membership can recall officers for misconduct by submitting to the National Labor Relations Board a petition signed by 15 percent of their number. The NLRB would then conduct a recall election by secret ballot.

The Federal Constitution provides a means by which even so important an officer of our Government as the President may be removed from office for misconduct. Needless to say, inferior Federal officers, judges and Members of Congress may also be removed or expelled.

The recall procedure provided by the amendment is as follows:

(a) Upon a petition filed by 15 percent of the members of the labor organization, the National Labor Relations Board shall conduct an election by secret ballot of the membership of the union on the recall of official or officials named in the petition. The election shall be decided by a majority vote of the membership voting and if the official or officials voted upon are recalled, the Board shall declare such office vacant.

(b) Not more than one election for recall of any one officeholder can be held during any 12-month period.

(c) If a recalled union official continues to hold his office, the Board, on the petition of any union member, shall proceed, after investigation, against the union as in the case of an unfair labor practice.

(d) The Board is granted permission to delegate to public or private agencies its authority to conduct recall elections under this amendment.

(e) Where a union member is disciplined by his union organization so as to deprive him of his right to vote under the constitution and bylaws of his union or under the recall procedures set forth in this amendment, the Board can proceed on prima facie evidence against the union and if the results of the election were affected by the vote or votes suppressed, it shall set aside such election.

(f) Any individual who, after being recalled, continues to serve as a union officer is subject to prosecution, punishment, and fine for the commission of a misdemeanor.

(g) Any individual, group, or organization who willfully coerces an individual from initiating or participating in the recall procedures established by this amendment is subject to prosecution, punishment, and fine for the commission of a felony.

(h) Whenever a union permits a recalled union official, or an official convicted of a felony under article G to continue his office, the union upon determination of that fact by the Board shall be deprived of its protections of representation, income-tax

exemption, and antitrust and injunction exemptions under existing laws.

3. INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM ON INTERNAL AFFAIRS (SEC. 404)

Section 404 of my bill of rights for labor provides a means whereby 15 percent of the membership may initiate a referendum at which they may democratically vote on questions of importance to union members. Matters upon which such a referendum may be held include changes in the governing rules of the organization, decisions by union officials affecting financial activities of the union, and matters relating to the disciplining of the membership.

Collective-bargaining negotiations and matters authorized by the governing rules of the organizations are, however, exempt from the referendum procedure, as are those governed by the constitution, rules, or regulations of a national or international union to which the local is affiliated.

(a) Fifteen percent of the membership of a union may initiate a referendum at which they may vote to determine the will of the entire membership on questions of importance to the union.

(b) Matters on which such a referendum may be held involve changes in the governing rules of the union as well as decisions of the officers of the union which affect the financial affairs of the organization, certain activities of the union, and matters relating to the disciplining of the membership.

(c) A referendum would not be authorized to change or modify decisions made by a union representative during collective-bargaining negotiations, or those which are authorized by the governing rules of the organization or by law. Additionally, no referendum would be allowed among the membership of a local union alone on any matter governed by the constitution, rules, or regulations of a national or international union to which it is affiliated.

(d) A mechanism is provided to insure the enforcement of the will of the union as expressed in such referendum, whereby any violation of the referendum would be investigated as an unfair-labor charge as defined in section 10 of the National Labor Relations Act.

(e) Any member of the union or his representative may file a petition with the Board alleging noncompliance.

(f) Failure of a labor organization to comply with the results of a referendum would, under the amendment, result in the union's loss of existing privileges as the representatives of its membership under the National Labor Relations Act, its special position under the antitrust and injunction laws, and its income-tax exemption.

(g) Further, special criminal penalties are provided against individual officers of the union who fail to follow the results of a referendum or who coerce union members seeking to initiate Board action against such conduct.

This amendment in no way affects the laws of any State.

4. STRIKE BALLOTS (SEC. 405)

At present, the National Labor Relations Act contains no requirement that notification be given by a union to its members, employer, and to the NLRB of its intention to strike. Section 405 would impose such a duty. Under it, 30 days' notice would be required to all parties concerned.

Additionally, this section would provide a means whereby employees in the bargaining unit could vote to determine the will of the majority on the issue of whether or not to strike after the notice to strike had been given.

It is plain that in the ordinary case, where a union truly represents its membership, there would be no strike referendum. Only in the case where very real opposition to the decision of the leadership to strike existed can I conceive that a petition would be filed. And, it should be remembered, the filing of the petition would in no way affect the strike call. Only after the majority of the employees in the bargaining unit thereafter voted to reject the decision of the leadership would a strike be postponed.

Nor have privileges been extended in this section without corresponding protection against abuse. Section 405 has safeguards built into it. First of all, a decision by the majority against a strike would only postpone that strike for a 90-day period. Thereafter, the leadership could again resort to the strike procedure if they felt it to be in the interest of the union. A majority vote in favor of a strike could likewise not be challenged for a 90-day period and then only if 30 percent of the employees in the bargaining unit signed a new referendum petition.

It is my purpose, in including this section in my bill to strengthen the right to strike by returning the power to its proper sphere—those represented by the union—in a working partnership with the leadership of the union. I believe it is the American tradition to give all persons notice and an opportunity to be heard on all matters affecting them—especially where their economic livelihood is at stake. Section 405 accomplishes this purpose.

(a) This amendment would require the notification, by specified means, of the membership, the employer, and the Board, of a labor organization's intention to strike at least 30 days prior to the commencement of such strike.

(b) Upon the submission to the Board of a petition, signed by 15 percent of the employees represented by the union in opposition to the strike, a referendum would be held. A majority voting against the strike in such referendum would require its postponement for at least 90 days.

A vote in support of the strike would, on the other hand, prevent the filing of a new petition for a second referendum for an additional 90 days. Any such subsequent petition would also require the endorsement of at least 30 percent of the employees in the bargaining unit.

(c) Participation by an individual in an illegally called strike under this amendment would result in the loss by that individual of his employee status under the National Labor Relations Act.

(d) Violation by a union of an employee's right to vote in any duly called election or referendum under this section would, on a petition of the Board, be investigated and, if a determination was made that such rights had been violated, the provisions of section 10 of the National Labor Relations Act would apply as in the case of an unfair labor practice charge. If the findings of the Board supported the allegations of the member that his voting rights had been denied, the union would be ordered to desist from its action and, where the deprivation of the voting right had affected the results of an election, that election would be set aside.

(e) Any violations by a labor organization of the provisions of the amendment would result in the union's loss of its existing privileges as the representatives of the employees in the bargaining units under the National Labor Relations Act, its special position under the antitrust and injunction laws, and its income-tax exemption.

(f) Further, special criminal penalties are provided against individual labor union officials who violate the provisions of this amendment.

5. PROCEDURE (SEC. 406)

This section spells out who may file petitions under sections 403, 404, and 405. Only employees, union members, or their representatives have a right to do so. No rights are extended to employers under the foregoing provisions except the right to a strike notice.

6. TRUSTEESHIPS OVER LOCAL UNION AFFAIRS (SEC. 407)

A rank abuse uncovered by the select committee in its investigations was the use of the trusteeship device, by national and international unions, as a means to secure and perpetuate control over the activities and funds of local unions.

There are, no doubt, legitimate reasons for establishing trusteeships, just as there are legitimate reasons for the Federal Government, on occasion, to interfere with the internal affairs of a State. In the case of such Federal interventions, the interferences are permitted only during times of extreme crisis and then only until local authority can be restored. This, it seems to me, is a good rule to follow in the matter of labor-union trusteeships, and section 407 is calculated to accomplish this result.

(a) No trusteeship can be established unless it is authorized by the constitution, charter, or bylaws of the labor organization in question. And further that the funds and assets of the local union must be used exclusively for the benefit of the local union.

(b) No trusteeship can continue for a longer period than 1 year from the date of its establishment.

(c) Where a trusteeship has been established after officers of a local union have been removed, the trustees are authorized to conduct elections for new local-union officers.

(d) Upon violation of provisions of this amendment, members of the local union are authorized to bring court action in the Federal court of the United States for equitable relief to compel compliance and to enforce restitution of the funds and assets of the local union.

(e) Where officers of local unions are removed for the purpose of establishing trusteeships in violation of these provisions, or where a trusteeship continues in violation of these provisions, the individual who willfully participates in such action is subject to prosecution, punishment, and fine for the commission of a misdemeanor.

7. PROTECTION OF MEMBERS (SEC. 408)

The most precious gift afforded by a democratic government to its citizens is the right to vote. While our own Federal Government does not have a perfect record on this score, there can be no doubt that it is attempting to insure that no American is coercively deprived of his right to go to the polls. Can we afford to do less for the laboring man?

Under section 408, any member of a labor union may petition the NLRB if he has been denied his right to vote in a union election.

(a) Any member of a labor organization may file a petition with the Labor Management Relations Board that he has been deprived, through actions of his labor organization, of his right to vote.

(b) The Board, upon the finding of prima facie evidence of the truth of such allegations shall proceed against the union as in the case of an unfair labor practice.

(c) Upon a finding by the Board that the voting rights of such members have been denied in violation of the constitutional bylaws of the union, it shall issue a cease-and-desist order against such action and shall invalidate the election if the results thereof could have been affected by the labor union's wrongful action.

(d) Any individual or group who willfully interferes with the right of a union member to petition the National Labor Relations Board under these provisions is subject to prosecution, punishment, and fine for the commission of a felony.

8. MONOPOLISTIC ALLOCATION OF TERRITORY AMONG LABOR ORGANIZATIONS (SEC. 409)

Section 409 would prohibit labor unions from monopolistic allocation of territories among themselves. As well as extending the right to all workers to join a union, we must likewise insure that they may join unions of their choosing.

We tolerate no general monopolistic allocation of markets in our society. There is no reason why we should do so in the labor field.

This section provides:

(a) Contracts or arrangements between two or more national, international, or multilocal labor organizations to divide or allocate jurisdiction for representative purposes on a geographical, territorial or area basis are declared illegal.

(b) Petitions alleging violations of this section can be filed with National Labor Relations Board and, the Board, upon prima facie evidence, can proceed as in the case of an unfair labor practice.

9. COLLECTIVE-BARGAINING AGREEMENTS FOR EXCESSIVE TERM AND WAIVER OF RIGHT TO STRIKE (SEC. 410)

Two of the most important provisions of any collective-bargaining agreement concern (1) the terms and conditions of employment, and (2) protection of the basic right of the employee to strike or refrain from such employment if the terms of employment are not satisfactory to the workers. Some agreements have bargained away these rights under the influence of "sweetheart" type arrangements between union officials and employers. When this happens the worker is subject to an almost involuntary servitude for the period of the contract. Of course, the worker may leave his employment, but then he risks his whole economic livelihood. In no event should he be required to do so.

For this reason, I believe that union members should have a voice which will permit them a measure of control over collective-bargaining agreements that may deprive them of benefits and privileges. Additionally, I do not believe the right to strike ever should be subject to surrender by management or the union in an agreement, where it has not been approved of by the membership.

This section provides:

(a) No collective-bargaining agreement for a period in excess of 2 years shall be effective beyond that period unless it has been approved by a majority of the members of the labor organization involved, voting by secret ballot.

(b) No provision of a collective-bargaining agreement which waives the members' right to strike shall be legal unless it also shall have been approved by a majority of the membership in a secret-ballot election.

This amendment is necessary to protect the interest of the employees from unscrupulous representatives of management or labor or both, who engage in a collusive agreement to sacrifice the workingman's labor for their own purposes.

10. ANTIDISCRIMINATION SECTION

Under section 9 (a) of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, the labor representative selected by the majority of the employees for the purposes of collective bargaining, is designated as the exclusive bargaining representative of all the employees in the bargaining unit. The present amendment provides that where a union organization is selected to be the exclusive bargaining representative in the plant or firm involved, this privilege will be conditioned on the union's opening up its membership to all of the employees in the bargaining unit if they should choose to join, and on the same terms and conditions which apply to the present members of the labor organization. This amendment is designed to eliminate an existing situation in certain unions where either employees are barred from taking membership in the union representing them, or where the union has in effect set up a class system of membership under which only a certain class of union members are permitted to vote and participate in its activities, but all of its members must pay the initiation fees and dues.

In order that this amendment might not be used by subversive elements, a provision is included that nothing in the pending amendment shall be construed to prevent any labor organization from denying membership to members of the Communist Party or members of organizations who advocate the overthrow of the United States Government by unconstitutional methods.

This amendment would prohibit any existing discrimination against employees on the grounds of age, sex, religion, nationality, or race. If unions are interested in eliminating discrimination practices in the United States, they should be favorably disposed to the pending amendment.

11. SANCTIONS AND PENALTIES (SEC. 412)

Up to this point, the bill I introduced has been drafted to establish a framework for union democracy. It is important, of course, to provide that the rights be protected against infringement and violation. Section 412 provides the penalties to accomplish this purpose.

Continued violation by a labor union of the rights protected under the foregoing sections could result in the union's loss of status as collective-bargaining representative under the National Labor Relations Act, and the union would forfeit its special position under antitrust and injunction laws, as well as its income-tax exemption.

The NLRB is authorized to issue orders to prohibit actions prescribed in the provisions of the bill which are found to be in violation thereof.

Special criminal penalties are also provided against individual officers of the union who willfully violated the provisions of this bill.

12. AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT (SEC. 2)

Section 2 of my bill would amend the Taft-Hartley law to bring existing provisions of the act into conformity with the union democracy provisions in S. 3068.

The first such amendment would make it an unfair labor practice to call or continue a strike in violation of the provisions of section 405, that is, without a 30-day notice of intention to strike or despite a majority vote against such strike. Employees who participated in such an illegally called strike would lose their status as employees under the labor act.

In order to preserve the right of employees to select a union of their choice, the present act is amended to permit a representation election during the extension of collective bargaining contracts. Industrial stability, under this amendment, would be preserved by the further requirement that existing collective bargaining agreements would not be affected by the outcome of such elections. These agreements would continue in effect for the remainder of their terms, unless mutually modified or terminated.

Where a union, for violation of the provisions of S. 3068, loses its representative status, another election is authorized, even though an election had been conducted within the previous 12-month period.

Finally under section 2, section 9 (g) of the National Labor Relations Act is amended to require the Secretary of Labor to make public financial and other information now required to be filed by labor organizations who seek the benefits conferred under the act.

13. AMENDMENT OF "SWEETHEART CONTRACT" PROVISION (SEC. 2)

The Taft-Hartley Act made it illegal for an employer to pay, or to promise to pay, money or anything of value to a labor official representing the interests of his employees. Receipt of such gifts or gratuities was also made illegal by the act.

The labor rackets hearings brought to light, however, violations of these prohibitions, resulting in so-called "sweetheart contract" situations. Such contracts, made use of go-betweens who entered into collusive working agreements with management or labor representatives for money or merchandise of value. These arrangements were invariably beneficial to employers and union representatives but detrimental to the membership involved.

The present amendment would fill this gap in the existing law. I do not believe either labor or management voice objections to the plugging of this loophole.

In conclusion I want to reiterate what I have said in my public remarks prior to this occasion. Neither the recommendations of the McClellan committee nor the legislation I have introduced in the Senate should be construed to constitute indictments against all labor officials. Many of these officials, past and present, have labored unceasingly in the best interest of their fellow working men and I know they will continue to do so. I believe in and support strong and free unions and I am convinced that despite the code of ethical practices of the AFL-CIO or other similar self-imposed regulations, well-intentioned union leaders are incapable of enforcing compliance with democratic practices in union affairs. Many distinguished and long supporting friends of labor itself have in the interest of labor's welfare joined in the demands for legislative reforms in union organizations.

The only ones who stand to gain by the enactment of union democracy legislation are union members themselves. Their relationship with their employers will in no way be affected. The only ones who will lose are those officials in unions where union democracy is not presently assured. I am frank to say, I do not understand how such aims and goals can be criticized in any degree as being anti-union. It has been and still remains my conviction that America grew strong, because of, not in spite of democratic traditions.

I want to end by reemphasizing that union democracy legislation needs to be approved at this session of the Congress. It should provide for limited Federal intervention and encourage membership intiative; it should cover the fundamental democratic rights which free men and free societies have always enjoyed.

Commemoration of American Civil War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Dr. Bell Irvin Wiley, at a meeting of historical societies and members of the Commission To Celebrate the 100th Anniversary of the Civil War, in Washington, D. C., on January 14, 1958.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMEMORATING THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR

(By Bell Irvin Wiley)

(Dr. Bell Irvin Wiley, professor of history, has been named by President Eisenhower a member of a 10-man Civil War Centennial Commission to prepare a program for the national observance to begin in 1961. A national assembly of representatives of historical societies, archives, patriotic groups, and civic organizations was held in the auditorium of the Interior Building in Washington on January 14–15. For this occasion General Grant, Chairman of the Commission, designated Professor Wiley to deliver the keynote address.)

Delegates to the national assembly, fellow members of the Civil War Centennial Commission, and friends, it is a pleasure and a privilege to talk to you for a short while this morning about some of the objectives and plans of the Civil War Centennial Commission. I should like to stress the fact that the Commission is just beginning to function and that we are still in the initial stages of our planning. We are delighted that you have assembled for this 2-day session to bring to us from the organizations that you represent ideas and suggestions about the character and scope of the Commission's work. We appreciate your taking the time and trouble to meet with us on this occasion. We shall listen with great interest to your discussions and give the most thoughtful consideration to your proposals.

Another point that I should like to emphasize is that the remarks that I am about to make are not to be considered as official statements of Commission policy, for I have not had an opportunity to discuss with General Grant and other members of the Commission the content of this introductory talk. These remarks should be regarded, then, as my personal impressions of the thinking of the Commission at this time concerning the principles that should guide it and some of the things it hopes to accomplish. These ideas have come in part from informal contacts withh many people interested in the Civil War and in part from my experience in studying and writing about the war.

First, I should like to stress the point that the Civil War Centennial Commission hopes earnestly to avoid any sort of activity that will tend to revive the bitterness and hatred engendered by the conflict of a century ago. Rather we want to commemorate the greatness demonstrated by both sides in that momentous struggle. The Civil War was a time of supreme greatness for both North and South—and for the American Nation. Never before or since have Americans been called on to make such enormous sacrifices as in the terrible years 1861 to 1865. The cost is tragically told in terms of human lives.

On the southern side about 258,000 soldiers made the supreme sacrifice; of these, 94,000 died of hostile bullets and 164,000 from other causes. On the Union side, deaths aggregated 360,222; of these, 110,070 were battle casualties and 250,112 were deaths from other causes. More than twice as many men, North and South, died of disease as perished from enemy bullets. The aggregate in soldier deaths on both sides in the Civil War was 618,000. Deaths of American servicemen in all other wars, beginning with the American Revolution and coming on down through the Korean conflict, totaled only 606,000.

But deaths of men who donned the uniform were only a part of the sacrifice. The deprivation, anxiety, loneliness, and sorrow of the folks at home, and especially of the lowly women left to care for large families during the absence of their menfolk, were so tremendous as hardly to be comprehensible to people of our generation.

These enormous sacrifices were made by the people of both sections with a fortitude and heroism that was nothing short of magnificent. The exemplary conduct of our forebears in this costly struggle should inspire in us the profoundest admiration and pride.

It is this sacrifice and heroism of Americans, North and South, that we Americans of today, their descendants, seek to commemorate. There is no desire on the part of the Commission, as I interpret its motivation, to give to the commemoration any sectional or partisan character. The war was America's greatest experience and the centennial commemoration of it should be an American activity, an American ceremonial, recognizing the sincerity of both contestants and glorifying in the greatness that they demonstrated in supporting their respective causes.

The most appropriate way to commemorate this great experience—and the one that will have the most lasting value—in my opinion, is to increase our understanding of it. We should seek to broaden and deepen our knowledge of the conflict, to determine the true facts and comprehend their real meaning.

There are many ways in which we may promote the enriching of our knowledge of the Civil War. And you people here, and the organizations that you represent, are especially well-situated to implement these means. I should like to emphasize a few of the specific proposals that have come to the attention of the Commission.

1. Utilization of the tremendous interest that the centennial may be expected to arouse to persuade people who still have manuscripts, newspapers, pictures, maps, and rare documents in private possession to bring these materials out of attics, basements, and strong boxes, take them to State and local depositories for evaluation and screening, and, if their value seems to merit, permit them to be microfilmed. One film copy of this material should be preserved in the local depository and another, preferably the negative, should be sent to Washington. Donation of material thus brought to light should be encouraged, but the most important thing is to obtain facsimiles and make these facsimiles easily available for the use of interested persons.

2. The collection, collation, and reproduction of Civil War newspapers is a project especially worthy of consideration. Newspapers are probably the greatest single, unexploited source for the study of the conflict of the 1860's. And they are one of the richest sources. It is not inconceivable that files of all Civil War newspapers should be built up from scattered holdings, filmed, and copies of the film placed in a central depository for use and loan.

3. Use of all types of materials ought to be facilitated by the preparation and publication of bibliographies, indexes, guides, and inventories. I should like to mention a few specific aids. Bibliography of State Participation in the Civil War, a most helpful guide compiled and published by the United States Government in 1913, should be brought up to date to include the many books and articles that have appeared in the 45 years since the work was originally issued. Indexes for the Official Records, Army, and the Official Records, Navy, ought to be revised to increase their usefulness and reissued to enhance their availability. These indexes have long been out of print, and they have become so scarce and expensive as to be beyond the reach of many people who want to make use of them. A general bibliography of the Civil War, including articles as well as books, ought to be prepared under competent direction and made available in printed form.

A considerable number of State and local depositories have no published guides to their manuscripts. Issuance by these agencies of guides to their Civil War manuscripts would be an appropriate centennial activity. It would, of course, be highly desirable if the guides to the Civil War manuscripts could be a part of a general project that would include all of the agencies' manuscript holdings.

The National Archives would like to prepare inventories and guides for the most important of its Civil War materials. All possible assistance should be given by the Commission and by the organizations which you represent to help the National Archives obtain the funds and the staff necessary for the preparation of these much-needed aids.

The Library of Congress several years ago projected the preparation of a National Register for Manuscripts. This register is to list and describe briefly important manuscript collections throughout the Nation. Implementation of that part of the national register project which pertains to the Civil War would surely be a highly desirable commemorative activity.

Another urgently needed aid for the study of the Civil War is a national photographic catalog. This should list, locate, identify, and provide a miniature facsimile of all individually issued pictures, prints, and photographs, relating to the Civil War.

Carrying this program forward will be costly in terms of time, money, and staff, and in order for the work to be completed in time to have any bearing on the commemorative observances during the period 1961–65, it must be initiated very soon. But it is to be hoped that the Commission, by stimulating interest, and pointing up with your aid, some of the things that need to be done, can help local, State, and national agencies to obtain the necessary means for carrying out this program.

Finally, I want to stress the point that we consider the primary role of the Commission to be that of stimulation and help. The Commission could not mastermind this vast and important program if we wished to do so. But it is not our desire in any exclusive or arbitrary fashion to tell the people or their agencies what they should do. Rather it is our aim and hope to help them do what they think needs to be done and coordinate their desires and efforts to the best interest of all.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, an editorial discussing juvenile delinquency was printed in the Jefferson City (Mo.) News and Tribune on April 27, 1958. It contains a number of provocative ideas which I believe are of general interest. It was of particular interest to me as chairman of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACING UP TO DELINQUENCY

From time to time we encounter interviews and other programs in which teenagers give their views on the causes and

cures of juvenile delinquency. Usually they blame the adult world for all the transgressions of youth.

A pretty substantial body of scientific and other opinion supports the idea that we adults, particularly in our roles as parents, must bear heavy responsibility for youthful misbehavior.

But this notion can be carried too far, and often is. Many other factors are involved. Great economic, social, and political forces mold us all with impersonal pressure.

It isn't enough to say, as is frequently said, that so many delinquents come from broken homes.

The really big question is: Who and what break the home?

Nor can the youngsters themselves escape all responsibility simply because the adults aren't measuring up or are being engulfed by forces they don't understand.

There is a shocking number of delinquents from good, unbroken homes. Conversely, countless youngsters from shattered families never join a gang or commit the smallest misdemeanor.

Obviously, individual character and discipline play a big part in determining who becomes a delinquent and who does not. A youngster may be pliable and impressionable, but he is not exactly putty.

Recently a teen-ager who was busy blaming the adults for everything pointed to the bad example they set with wars and threats of war.

His theme seemed to be that because the adult population has fought wars and is continuously menaced by the prospect of others, the youngsters of the world merited understanding—if not forgiveness—for their own excesses.

Basically this proposititon is fraudulent, and certainly it is fantastic. It allows room for the idea that one set of wrongs justifies another. Probably it is just a kind of brazen rationalization for bad behavior that offending teen-agers may only partly understand themselves.

But this much more they can understand: All the blame cannot be shifted to others. They have to shoulder some of the guilt, too.

The millions of good youngsters who walk among us are the the proof that delinquency need not be the only youthful response to the turmoil and error of the adult world.

Inequities to Retired Military Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, although the military pay bill has passed both Houses of Congress and is now before a conference committee to iron out the differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill, the noted military authority for the New York Times, Hanson W. Baldwin, has found serious fault with both the House and Senate versions of the bill.

One of the serious defects which Mr. Baldwin notes is that pay for retired officers and men is increased only 6 percent, while much greater pay benefits are given to those on active duty. The historic relationship which gears retired pay to active-duty pay is ended. Thus, the military pay bill discriminates unfairly against thousands of retired military personnel and raises serious questions about retirement pay for service personnel who are now on active duty.

Mr. President, in fairness to the members of the Armed Services Committees of Congress, it should be pointed out that while the Department of Defense and the administration recommend no pay increase for retired military personnel, the committees did provide for a 6-percent pay increase, and retired personnel will thus reap some benefit from this legislation.

I wish that the retired pay for military personnel could have been further increased and related, as it has been historically in the past, to a percentage of active-duty pay.

I have received numerous letters from retired military people in Oregon protesting against the unfair treatment accorded them. The ever-increasing high cost of living affects the retired personnel just as it does those on active duty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Military Pay Plan, Discrimination Against Retired Officers Is Found in Both House and Senate Bills," written by Hanson W. Baldwin, the noted military authority, and published in the New York Times of May 6, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MILITARY PAY PLAN—DISCRIMINATION AGAINST RETIRED OFFICERS IS FOUND IN BOTH HOUSE AND SENATE BILLS

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The military pay and incentive bills passed by the Senate and House contain some extremely unfortunate provisions that may nullify the usefulness of this important legislation.

The bills are intended to provide material incentives for service careers and, hence, reduce the tremendous turnover of personnel and the loss of skilled men. By increasing professionalism the aim is to raise efficiency. The increases in pay would, indeed, be a stimulus to men in uniform whose morale has been lowered since World War II by the downgrading of military prestige and slights of omission and commission.

But there are serious defects in the legislation, so serious that they should be remedied in the Senate-House conference committee, where the bills are, or immediate steps should be taken to amend the plan once it becomes law.

RETIREMENT DIFFERENCES

One of the greatest deiects is the discrimination the legislation makes possible in the pay of retired officers. For years one of the chief attractions of a service career was the provision made for retirement. The Government was, for a long time, ahead of civilian industry in this respect; retirement pay of the armed services was a powerful factor in retaining the competent and increasing the incentives for a career in uniform.

But in recent years civilian industry has provided generously, and in many cases in more adequate ways than the services, for retirement benefits.

The new service pay plan breaks with tradition. All service pay laws of the past have extended their benefits proportionately to both active and retired personnel; if the pay of the active officer was increased, the pay of the retired officer went up proportionately.

Both bills deviate from this concept. In their original forms there were no provisions for an increase in retired pay, despite increases in costs of living. The bills, as amended, extend a 6-percent sop to retired personnel, an increase entirely disproportionate to the benefits extended to active duty personnel.

More important, the plan makes possible, in fact, inevitable, entirely different rates of pay for retired officers who have served on active duty for the same number of years with the same competence. A major general of 30 years' service who retires under the proposed plan would receive $2,125 more annually than a major general of 30 years' service who retired last month.

ADVERSE EFFECT SEEN

Young officers who might make the services a career will not be blind to this discrimination; if officers already retired can thus be discriminated against in the interests of a false economy, this can happen again.

The legislation must be amended to link, as one, retirement and active-duty pay, past, present and future.

But the legislation also has other faults. Its intention certainly is not to promote premature retirements, but its effect may be just the opposite. It will be surprising if the legislation, as now written, does not encourage the voluntary retirement after 20 years of numerous lieutenant colonels and commanders.

Many of these officers will feel that it is more advantageous to retire relatively young than to remain on active duty without any assurance (unless they are selected for promotion) of adequate pay increases. The laudable intent of promotion by merit instead of by longevity may have been overdone. Certainly congressional and public comment overlooks the fact that there already is a rigid system of selection for promotion, based on merit, not longevity, in all services.

There is a gimmick in the Senate version of the plan that could have other serious repercussions. This permits extra critical responsibility pay, or proficiency, or leadership, pay for officers, which varies from $50 to $150 a month.

CORRESPONDENT QUOTED

A military correspondent writes:

"This whole business of incentive pay for ostensibly superior skills is a great big trouble breeder. Who decides what are the key jobs or skills? What about the people who were denied the opportunity to acquire these skills because of overriding needs of the service in years past?"

This provision could be used, in other words, to benefit the white-haired boys, and it could become a tool of service politics.

The correspondent adds:

"We would like to know who convinced most of Congress that the services operate under a Methuselah system. When officers have to work 4 years completing correspondence courses just for the opportunity of competing for promotions in which 25 to 50 percent of one's fellows must fail to make the grade, it seems like Uncle is being very selective indeed."

The new service pay plan, despite its good features, has not received sufficient study; it should, if possible, be changed in conference, or if that is impossible, amended to remedy some of its patent defects.

Tribute to the Late Clyde Pangborn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, one of the great pioneers of aviation died on

March 29. Clyde Pangborn, who was the first person to fly nonstop across the Pacific, died just 2 days after he was notified that he was to receive the coveted Adm. William A. Moffett Maritime Aviation Trophy. His history-making flight ended in Wenatchee, Wash., where Pangborn had lived briefly, and where his mother and brother made their home for years.

The drama of his historic flight was caught in a story published in the Wenatchee Daily World, written by Bob Woods. Summaries of Pangborn's life were also carried in the Wenatchee Daily World and in the New York Times.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent tht the three articles about Clyde Pangborn be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wenatchee Daily World of March 31, 1958]

CLYDE PANGBORN, AIR HERO, DIES

Clyde Pangborn, whose nonstop flight across the Pacific Ocean in 1931 put Wenatchee on the world aviation map, died Saturday in a New York hospital.

Pangborn, who was only 63, died of a lung condition. He was stricken 2 weeks earlier while attending a testimonial banquet for aviation's pioneers in New York.

Although he spent only a few boyhood years here, a couple of coincidences have made Clyde Pangborn Wenatchee's most famous "native son."

The coincidences were the ending of the first nonstop flight from Japan in Wenatchee, and the fact that his mother and brother lived here for many years.

Pangborn was born on a farm near Bridgeport, but he attended school in St. Maries, Idaho, and that's where he started his flying career.

After graduating from high school there he worked as a logger. But his mother, Mrs. Opal Pangborn, now of Spokane, said that career ended suddenly after he rode a log down a mile-long mountain skid into a mill pond. He was uninjured.

Pangborn studied engineering and did survey work in Idaho.

He joined the aviation forces in World War I, but the war was over before he had a chance to go overseas. He wanted to stay in aviation, and a group of St. Maries businessmen bought him an old "Jennie" biplane. Pangborn became one of the outstanding daredevil pilots of the old barnstorming days.

It is claimed that Pangborn was the first man to transfer from a racing auto to an airplane's undercarriage. One time he walked away from his cracked-up plane after it crashed on some railroad ties. He had followed the rails for 50 miles trying to fly his way out of a snowstorm.

Pangborn was only 37 when he and Hugh Herndon made the historic transpacific flight that ended in Wenatchee.

During World War II Pangborn was a ferry pilot for the Royal Air Force, taking planes across the Atlantic. He spent some time as an instructor of student pilots.

During the war he and his brother, Percy Pangborn, bought a ranch up the White River above Lake Wenatchee that Clyde Pangborn hoped to use as a "hideaway" headquarters for fishing and hunting. Percy Pangborn still spends his summers there.

Pangborn was in New York earlier this month to attend a testimonial dinner in his honor. Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle was chairman. Pangborn became too ill to attend the dinner. But Miss Ruth Nichols, first woman to attempt a solo crossing of the Atlantic, called Pangborn "one of the truly great pilots of American aviation history."

Pangborn was employed by Fleet Airlines, Inc., of Burbank, Calif., at the time of his death.

He is survived by his mother, Mrs. Opal Pangborn, in Spokane; and his brother, Percy Pangborn, of Lake Wenatchee and Everett.

[From the Wenatchee Daily World of March 31, 1958]

WENATCHEE'S GREATEST HOUR

(By Bob Woods)

Wenatchee's greatest hour in the news eyes of the world came on October 5, 1931.

That was the day Clyde Pangborn and Hugh Herndon guided a wheelless monoplane to a dusty belly landing on the unpaved runway at Fancher Field to complete the first nonstop flight across the Pacific Ocean.

It was a day for which Wenatchee had been impatiently waiting.

Pangborn was one of the flying idols of the day, along with Charles A. Lindbergh and Wiley Post. Herndon was a flying friend of Pangborn from New York who had just married the daughter of New York's boxing commissioner, one James Farley.

The two fliers had set out July 28 from Bennett Field in New York to try to better the round-the-world record set a few months earlier by Wiley Post and Harold Gatty. By the time they reached Siberia, Pangborn and Herndon were 17 hours behind Post and Gatty's mark. A wing was damaged landing in Russia. And when they reached Japan, August 3, they were so far behind the record time they abandoned the attempt.

The round-the-world record was out of their grasp, so they decided to try for another. A Japanese newspaper, Asahi, had offered $25,000 to the first plane to fly nonstop from Japan to the United States. Pangborn, just 37, and Herndon, 10 years younger, decided to go after it.

But on August 8 they were arrested by the Japanese for flying over a fortified area and taking photographs. The fliers were jailed for a week until backers in the United States could raise $2,050 to bail them out.

By the end of September their flight plans were known. They planned to leave Samishiro Beach near Tokyo, fly the Pacific via the Aleutians, and come down the Alaskan coast over Canada to the United States. Their flight plan would bring them down to Seattle, then they'd turn inland with hopes of flying to Salt Lake City. If they reached Salt Lake they would break the nonstop distance flight record and win an additional $25,000.

With Clyde Pangborn's brother, Percy, and their mother, Mrs. Opal Pangborn, living in Wenatchee where Percy ran a jewelry store, hopes were high that the fliers would accept the Wenatchee Chamber of Commerce invitation to land here.

On Saturday, October 3, the Associated Press from Japan flashed the news that Pangborn and Herndon had taken off at 2:01 p. m., Pacific time.

They had installed a special cotterpin arrangement so they could drop their landing gear, once they were in the air. The landing gear weighed 300 pounds, and Pangborn said that eliminating it would give an additional 12 miles per hour cruising speed. They dropped the gear 8 miles out.

The fliers tried to stay at 17,000 feet, but had to dip and climb to try and remove ice that was coating the wings over the Aleutians. At 3,000 miles they had a scare when the motor conked out; one gas tank was dry but they switched on the other and the motor caught again.

Deafened by the continual motor noise, they had to write notes to each other. But they weren't hungry. They were traveling with a 50-gallon drum of food, complete with chickens, bread, sweets, and beef. They were prepared for a forced landing en route.

They flew on unreported, but when the sun came up Monday morning, an unofficial welcoming committee, including Daily World reporters, was waiting at Fancher Field in Wenatchee, just in case.

The crimson Bellanca, powered by a single engine, was flying down the coast. The ground was obscured by fog. Pangborn later said he had to fly around Mt. Rainier three times before he finally got his directions right. But he did, continuing up to Seattle and couldn't break through the fog bank. They headed east, reached Spokane, only to find it fogged in. Gas was running low, they couldn't make Salt Lake City, so Pangborn and Herndon turned west.

A few miles east of Wenatchee they spotted the Columbia River, came down to it, and on in over the city. They circled Fancher Field 3 times at 500 feet, studying the landing possibilities. Then they gained altitude again, and cut the motor, hoping to stop the propeller. They came in from the south and a fire truck and ambulance raced alongside the silent plane as it glided down the runway. Pangborn was at the controls. The wheelless belly of the ship hit the ground. Pangborn fought to keep the nose up.

The ship careened on for 50 feet, hit a rock, and nosed over. The tail hovered, almost straight up, then eased back in a normal position.

Forty-one hours and thirteen minutes after leaving Japan, Clyde Pangborn and Hugh Herndon had spanned the Pacific Ocean for the first time, and the eastern terminus of the flight was Wenatchee.

"Boys, you have performed a miracle, and neither I nor the people of this city can express in mere words our congratulations and our appreciation. I want you to know that you have only to ask it, and the people of Wenatchee will do our best to provide it," were the words with which Lt. Gov. John A. Gellatly officially greeted the two pilots as they climbed out of the plane. Blossom Festival Queen Carol McGough (Mrs. Gordon Congdon) presented apples.

So great was the traffic jam caused by Wenatchee cars trying to cross the bridge to get to the airport, that the flying heroes were unable to get over to the hotel until almost 11:30 a. m.

For a week Wenatchee and the State of Washington staged a celebration meant to rival Lindbergh's welcome after his flight across the Atlantic 4 years earlier.

After 41 hours without sleep, the fliers were allowed to spend the day in bed at the Cascadian Hotel, then were paraded up and down in an impromptu celebration at 4 p. m. They attended banquets and luncheons until Thursday, then went to Seattle for another gala welcome, and returned over the weekend.

By the next week the first transpacific fliers started back to New York, flying their plane, Miss Veedol which was equipped with a new propeller and new landing gear.

The old propeller, bent back during the landing, was given to the city of Wenatchee, which later gave it to the North Central Washington Museum, where it is on display today. The red single-engined plane hangs in the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D. C., with the placard, "First plane to fly the Pacific Ocean nonstop, Samishiro Beach, Japan, to Wenatchee, Wash., October 3–5, 1931."

[From the New York Times of March 30, 1958]

CLYDE PANGBORN, FLIER, DIES AT 63—EARLY BARNSTORMER SET MARK ON 1931 TRANS-PACIFIC FLIGHT—NOTED FOR HIS DARING

Clyde Pangborn, who set an early flying record with a nonstop flight across the Pacific Ocean in 1931, died yesterday of a pulmonary condition. He was 63 years old.

Mr. Pangborn's historymaking flight was the first nonstop hop across the Pacific. It started in Tokyo and ended in Washington State.

He had been notified Thursday that he was to receive the Adm. William A. Moffett Maritime Aviation Trophy on Maritime Day, May 22, in ceremonies sponsored by the National Maritime and Aeronautical Association at the United States Custom House here.

The rarely awarded trophy was given to Charles Lindbergh in recognition of his first nonstop flight across the Atlantic.

Mr. Pangborn was one of the early aviators who emerged from the barnstorming era to capture the fancy of the world with the unbelievable machine called the airplane.

His exploits as a transpacific flier and long-distance speed pilot won him a place of honor in aviation alongside such names as Wiley Post and Harold Gatty, the pair whose record flight around the world in 1931 Mr. Pangborn sought to outdo.

The extraordinary flying skill that earned him many honors had also brought him safely through any number of brushes with death.

Such an occasion was the takeoff on July 17, 1931, from Roosevelt Field on Long Island that was to have launched Mr. Pangborn and Hugh Herndon, Jr., his flying partner, on their attempt at the Post-Gatty mark.

The loaded Bellanca monoplane struggled the length of the runway to gain the air until last-minute dumping of fuel averted a disaster by lightening the little craft just enough to clear a gully and a barrier of high-tension lines.

Eleven days later the pair took off successfully from Floyd Bennett Field, Brooklyn. But after 5 days of racing across the Atlantic and over Europe and the Soviet Union and being forced down by a storm in Manchuria, they gave up trying to best the record of 8 days 15 hours 51 minutes of Mr. Post's Winnie Mae.

Alert to opportunity, Mr. Pangborn and Mr. Herndon flew to Tokyo for a chance at $25,000 prize money being offered by the Tokyo newspaper Asahi for the first nonstop trans-Pacific flight. Their arrival was less than auspicious, however.

TRIED FOR ESPIONAGE

Japan then was at war in Manchuria. Mr. Pangborn and Mr. Herndon flew in over Japanese fortified territory taking motion pictures.

Though Mr. Pangborn insisted that no pictures were made of military sites the Japanese tried the two as spies. The trial lasted 21 days. Each was fined $1,025. They spent another 5 weeks of bartering with authorities before being permitted to take off from Samishiro Beach, 300 miles northwest of Tokyo, on October 3.

En route, Mr. Pangborn's daring sent him clambering out on a wing over Dutch Harbor, Alaska, to remove dangling struts that might have pierced the plane in the prospective belly landing. The struts were left hanging when the craft's landing structure was jettisoned a few hundred miles out from Japan in a move to gain speed. This was before retractable landing gear.

On the morning of October 5, after flying 4,600 miles in 41 hours 13 minutes, Mr. Pangborn set the red Bellanca down in Wenatchee, Wash., the home of his mother and brother. It was a spectacular wheel-less landing on a dirt runway on which the craft skidded along on its nose in a cloud of dust. But Mr. Pangborn and Mr. Herndon hopped out to accept their $25,000 check. Mr. Herndon had cut his brow during the landing. Both were shoeless—a practice, they said, they had picked up from the Japanese.

Mr. Pangborn and Mr. Turner got lost once over the jungles of India and their engine faltered over the Timor Sea, but they managed to coax their Douglas transport to a safe landing behind the winners, C. W. A. Scott and T. Campbell Black of England, who were timed in 70 hours and 54 minutes 18 seconds.

In contrast to the ignominy of their stay in Japan, they were acclaimed publicly in this country by authorities of both nations. Seattle welcomed them wildly. Mayor James J. Walker of New York decorated them. In Washington, President Herbert Hoover and the Japanese Ambassador, Katsuji Debuchi, accorded their personal tributes.

Mr. Pangborn flew with Roscoe Turner in the England-to-Australia race of October 1934, in which twenty planes from many nations took part. Mr. Pangborn and Mr. Turner finished second in the speed section of the contest, winning $7,500 for an official time of 92 hours 55 minutes 38 seconds on the 11,325-mile course between London and Melbourne.

Mr. Pangborn was born October 28, 1894, on a Douglas County farm in Washington State. His family moved to Idaho when he was a boy. He enlisted in the aviation section of the Signal Corps in 1917 during his sophomore year at the University of Idaho. He was commissioned a lieutenant and spent his entire service until his release in May 1919, instructing students at Ellington Field, Houston, Tex.

After the war he became a barnstormer, making exhibition flights at carnivals and taking passengers for short hops at fairs. He later joined the renowned Gates Flying Circus, an organization of stunt fliers, wing walkers, and parachute jumpers that enthralled crowds in the 1920's. He was a flight leader in that group.

After the England-to-Australia race Mr. Pangborn spent several years attempting a second flight to beat the Post record but nothing much came of this. He spent a couple of years in Europe as a test pilot, during which time he married Swana Beauclaire Duval, a French dress designer.

Returning to this country in 1939, Mr. Pangborn became a representative of the Canadian Government, enlisting pilots for service in the Royal Air Force. During World War II he was a ferry pilot.

Mr. Pangborn made more than 170 transocean flights taking bombers and transports to Britain from the United States and Canada. Since the war he had flown airplanes on delivery flights to many parts of the world.

The Kennan Fables

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD The Kennan Fables, by Hon. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Member of Congress from Ohio.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KENNAN FABLES

(By Hon. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Member of Congress from Ohio)

Last November and December the British Broadcasting Corp. featured George F. Kennan in a series of six lectures titled, "Russia, the Atom, and the West." This series of lectures was spread over a 6-week period, the last one given just as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was meeting in Paris in an emergency setting caused largely by the worldwide propaganda victory achieved by the Russian success in launching an earth satellite. This Russian feat led to wide speculation as to the military significance of the sputnik with consequent doubts as to the adequacy of NATO to meet the Russian claims of overriding superiority in the missiles field, including the intercontinental ballistic missile. This was the setting for the NATO Paris meeting just as it was the setting for the Kennan lecture series over BBC.

A reading of the Kennan lectures leaves one with the feeling that here is a modern-day Pied Piper of Hamlin. He produces what appear to be nice, easy solutions to very complex problems—much like the sweet note on a flute—but as he rushes his listeners into an angry surf he fails to give fair warning of the relentless undertow that will pull them far out to sea. There is also a touch of Aladdin and his lamp, the magic rug and Yogi the mystic in Mr. Kennan's London performance. Yes, there are even bits of Potemkin's sleight-of-hand, skillfully interwoven with some sentimental appeals to questionable objectives.

These lectures, now published in book form, are valuable as a key to what is wrong with the foreign policy of the United States and how it got that way. Mr. Kennan once occupied positions of high responsibility and trust in the United States Government. As director of the policy planning staff of the Department of State, he was in a position to lay down deep roots both as to policy and personnel sympathetic to its implementation. As Ambassador to Soviet Russia, his evaluation and impressions of the Moscow scene were used as authoritative guides in meeting day to day problems in our Government's dealings with the worldwide Russian problem. Such influence has left its mark and accounts in a major sense for the fact that today we do not have a carefully defined, positive and dynamic national policy toward the Soviet Union. In its stead, our approach to the problems created by Russian Communist imperialism is bogged down with misconceptions about the Russians and their new empire, contradictions, self-defeating concepts and the negativism which goes with marginal goals. All these handicaps to a sound national policy toward the Soviet Russians are evident in Kennan lectures.

The Kennan discourse begins with a tribute to the Rusisans for what he describes as impressive economic success during the 10-year period since his "Mr. X" article was published. He concludes that the Russian success in launching an earth satellite is a dramatization of that program. The assumption he makes is that this success was a general end product of impressive industrial development and the result of Russian scientific and technological genius. Nowhere does he take into account the major role played by captured German scientists in developing the Russian earth satellite, a fact generally acknowledged in the free press. Also, he fails to point out the peculiar ability of the tightly controlled industrial capability of the Russian empire to put all its eggs in one spectacular basket. The Russians needed a sensational success in the field of science, and one which the free world would be able to see and evaluate.

Events of the past years such as the Marshall plan, the resolute action taken at Berlin and in Korea, the East German uprising, the Hungarian freedom revolution, and the general political unrest in Eastern Europe had seriously blunted the wave of the future long claimed by the Russian Communists. It is altogether probable that the Kremlin leaders put all their eggs in the sputnik basket. Time will tell, but it is too early for us to equate the sputnik feat with Russian impressive economic success.

In examining what he calls "the Internal Soviet Scene," Mr. Kennan sees only two problem areas from what he views as the political side. The first is the struggle at the top, in the presidium and the central committee and the second is the intelligentsia as represented by academic youth and cultural intelligentsia. As he sees it, the struggle at the top is caused by pressure from the cultural intelligentsia who are to a large extent outside the apparatus of the Communist Party. Thus he appears to be completely unaware of the fact that the greatest political problem within the entire Russian Communist empire is nationalism. The powerful political drive of nationalism is caused by the ever-increasing demand of the non-Russian nations within the empire for recognition and complete independence of action from the bureaucracy of the Russian overlords. Even the Communist elements and the managerial class within the non-Russian nations have been swept up by this political movement. This movement begins with the masses of people who refuse to become Soviet citizens, as Mr. Kennan loosely refers to them. The non-Russian people of the empire are no less in tune with the era of nationalism in which the world finds itself than the people of Asia or Africa. People the world over today want to be recognized for what they are and not what some imperialists call them as a blind for the continued enslavement of nations. In his fifth lecture, however, Mr. Kennan takes note of the force of nationalism in the non-European world and sees it as irresponsible new nationalism.

In this connection it is important to note the drastic step the Russian Communists have been forced to take as a consequence of the drive of nationalism within the Soviet Union. At no time during the 40 years since communism became the doctrine of the Russian imperialists have there been so many non-Russian figures on the presidium or in key positions of the central committee. This trend began shortly after Stalin was liquidated and Khrushchev has given great emphasis to it during the past year. Yet, in the face of these facts which Kennan ought to know as a reputed expert on Russia, he sees the struggle within the Russian empire as no more than an effort of the intelligentsia to win a few concessions from the ruling clique at the top. His reference to the Russian cultural world as a positive factor moving toward "complete intellectual and cultural freedom" discloses a deep-seated ignorance of the Russian character and some 300 years of history.

The Kennan lectures more than anything else carry a plea for a recongition of the status quo, which is, of course, the underlying objective the Russians now seek through another summit conference. In his first lecture he concludes on the note that we should show greater detachment toward events taking place within the Russian Empire. He holds that their world is not our world; which is a reserved plea for a world divided as it now is by virtue of Russian conquest and the police state. In this third lecture he advances the argument that we write off the captive nations of Central and Eastern Europe by adjusting ourselves to Russian domination of these nations. This also is a stated objective the Russians have for calling another summit conference. Here is what Kennan has to say on the subject: "There will simply have to be some sort of adjustment (to Russian occupation) on the part of the peoples of Eastern Europe, even if it is one that takes the form of general despair, apathy, demoralization, and the deepest sort of disillusionment with the West." He states as an argument for this writeoff of the once free nations: "The failure of the recent popular uprisings to shake the Soviet military domination. * * *" Here again he fails to understand the genuine political and psychological victory won by the Hungarian freedom fighters and the concessions the Polish people have been slowly but surely wringing from Gomulka and his Russian masters. It is the pressure of nationalism exerted by people of the captive nations coupled with the same type pressure which is being exerted by the people of the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union which offer the best chances for peace and an end to the present unnatural division of humanity. Anything we might attempt to do to slow down or reduce these pressures would constitute unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of those many nations. The roots of Kenpanism within our Government have already reduced Voice of America broadcasting behind the Russian Iron Curtain to a faint and neutral whisper. There is far greater danger to our national security in broadcasting the theme of political evolution, which is a polite way of telling the enslaved people they must make accommodations to Russian occupation, than there is in the theme of individual liberty and national independence. There is little we as a Nation can do to stop the new tide of human events which had been set in motion behind the Russian Iron Curtain, a tide which originates in the headwaters of nationalism. Our long range national interests and the cause of peace strongly urge that, at minimum, we take steps to associate ourselves with the coming victory of the non-Russian nations and people.

The second Kennan lecture suggests that the United States negotiate secretly with the leaders of the Kremlin, without regard to our NATO allies or the chartered role of the United Nations as an instrument for peace. He holds that NATO is too complex and inhibited to be useful in any negotiation with the Russians. This is the same line the Russians have been pushing ever since NATO came into being. He expresses the highly personal opinion that since the United Nations did not come into being until after the predicaments of the present were well along, therefore it should not be called upon to resolve such predicaments even though the peace of the world is at stake. To begin with he is historically incorrect in the assumption that the U. N. was created after these predicaments arose. The hard, cold facts are that the U. N. was created because of the prospect of the serious problems which now confront us and with the hope that they could be resolved peacefully on the basis of justice for all nations and people. It is also important to recall at this point that the Russians also maintain that the United Nations is unsuited to bring about peaceful solutions to world tensions. The Russians, like George Kennan, are doing their best to drag the United States into secret negotiations on a bilateral basis, a course certain to wreck the defense structure of the free world and to put the United Nations out of business. The United Nations has not fulfilled all the hopes and expectations of the American people but it has served as a basis for uniting free people as in the case of Korea and in the case of Russian inhumanities in Hungary. Every time the United States has been party to secret negotiations with the Russians or any of their Communist henchmen, we have come out on the short end. Secret negotiations invariably lead to deals in which the interests of the common man are sacrificed to satisfy the vanity of the despot. The United States as a constitutional democracy is uniquely unsuited to the game of power politics but is ideally suited to the strategy of open covenants, openly arrived at.

The German people and their leaders were also struck a severe blow by Mr. Kennan in his BBC lecture series. Here is what he had to say on the question of a free and united Germany: "I wonder, in the first place, whether it is actually politic and realistic to insist that a future all-German government must be entirely free to determine Germany's military orientation and the obligations, and that the victor powers in the recent war must not in any way prejudice that freedom by any agreement among themselves." This obviously suggests that the Russians be allowed to limit the freedom of action of a united Germany to choose on which side of a divided world it will aline itself. This is so because of the finality of Mr. Kennan attaches to the present division of humanity and the fact that the people of that part of Germany, free to chart their own course overwhelmingly chose the side of free men. As to East Germany, Mr. Kennan sees little desire on the part of the people there to adjust themselves quickly to the free institutions of the German Federal Republic as he dismisses their case in the following words: "The long period of Communist rule in East Germany will have left strong marks on the structure of life there." It is interesting to note in this connection that Kennan drags in the Gomulka promise to the Polish people "that the day the Americans leave Germany he will take up with the Soviet Government the question of the departure of Soviet forces from Poland." He fails, however, to disclose just how this Aladdin lamp will close the huge gap between Communist promises and performances which has contributed so much to the present critical division of the world.

Mr. Kennan has also concocted a bitter pill for the west Europeans, even though it is sugarcoated with mysticism. He sees that scene as one in which the people are detached from the stabilizing influences of their rich heritage, reaching out for new and vague values which he fails to describe. This thesis flies in the face of the reality that Western Europe is saving itself by a return to the old values, moral and political, which had been denied them by former leaders whose materialistic philosophy led them into the unrewarding game of power politics. It is true that American economic assistance programs lent a mighty helping hand in this process but the western European people produced the leadership and moral fiber without which all of Europe would likely now be floundering in neutralism or attached to the Russian power bloc. Moreover, it was the determination of the European people to defend these old values which led to the establishment of NATO.

But this is not the way the self-designated historian, Mr. Kennan, sees the recent past. He sees the constructive purposes of the European recovery program overtaken and swallowed up in the space of a mere 2 or 3 years by programers of military assistance based on a wholly different concept of the Soviet threat and of Europe's needs. This suggests that it was not really necessary for the western European nations to construct a collective defense system or to keep it in a state of beieng comparable to the increasing Russian military threat posed in that area of the world. It seems he feels there is no geopolitical connection between the Berlin blockade and Communist aggression in Korea and Vietnam. Nor does he sense the critical shift in the balance of power caused by the Communist conquest of China, a development which forced responsible western lead-

ers to create new situations of military strength capable of deterring further Russian aggression and conquest. One can readily see that it is Kennan's limited conception of complex events taking place in the world arena which has led him into making proposals that have the ring of a wide-eyed, high-school sophomore.

After lengthy treatment of the unhappy prospect of atomic warfare, Kennan repeats his belief that possession of this weapon of defense by the United States did not prevent the Russians from overrunning Europe in 1948 or at any other time. He also argues that the Russians never wanted and do not now want a general war, therefore, they would not have moved to occupy all of Europe even if we did not have the atom bomb. Why then, it is fair to ask, did the Russians keep in being since the termination of the war, a massive military striking force and dispersed in a manner to give them a huge initial advantage had they chosen the course of sneak attack? The western nations, particularly the United States, quickly dismantled their wartime Military Establishments. So rapid and complete was the disarmament that we were caught flatfooted and ill prepared when the Russian-inspired Communist war of aggression broke out in Korea. There never has been any threat of aggression from the West so what motivated the Russians to keep such a massive military striking force in being?

Mr. Kennan also advances the idea, contrary to the reasonable estimates of responsible leaders in the free world, that the Russians are sincere in their claims for banning use of the atomic bomb, both as a military weapon and a diplomatic aid. He had this to say on the matter: "Surely everyone, our adversary no less than ourselves, is tired of this blind and sterile competition in the ability to wreak indiscriminate destruction." All sane men wish this were true but the realities of fact do not support this sweeping statement. Not quite 4 years ago the Russians launched a propaganda offensive in which they attempted to convince free people that the only alternative to an atomic war was what they called "peaceful coexistence." They used the same loose generalities peculiar to Mr. Kennan in explaining what they meant by "peaceful coexistence." The well informed on Communist doctrine knew that this was a tactic developed by Lenin to lull the non-Communist world to sleep, to cause free men to drop their defenses and thus to be easy prey to internal subversion and armed attack. More lately, Khrushchev announced that the first step necessary to peaceful coexistence was accepted by the free world of the status quo. By way of enforcing acceptance of this condition, Khrushchev threatened the people of Europe with the specter of atomic warfare unless they agreed. Even as Mr. Kennan was delivering the last of his lectures over the BBC, in which he pleaded the sincerity of the Russians, the Russians were engaged in delivering diplomatic notes to European members of NATO, the essence of which were thinly veiled threats that if they strengthened their defense capabilities they would be marked out for early treatment by atomic warfare launched from the Soviet Union by missiles. It is only fair to ask who is rattling the atomic bomb and who is threatening atomic warfare unless a settlement of differences is entered into, on terms dictated by the Russians? Mr. Khrushchev's recent demonstration of diplomacy by ultimatum can hardly be taken as proof of the peaceful intentions of the Kremlin leaders.

Mr. Kennan's greatest weakness lies in his inability or unwillingness to recognize that basic Communist doctrine calls for world conquest by any and all means. The Russian leaders reaffirmed this doctrine as late as last October by a manifesto issued in connection with the 40th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution. This objective coincides with the centuries-long dream of the Russians, a fact which Mr. Kennan also refuses to accept. In speaking of the prospects for a political settlement in Europe he makes this startling observation: "I do not think we know what the Russians do want." He would have been in much better grace and surely more accurate had he said: "I do not think I know what the Russians do want." It is distinct disservice to thinking Americans to say that they do not know what the Russians are up to.

The BBC lecture series by Mr. Kennan leave no doubt as to what he personnaly wants at this stage of world affairs. He wants a "clean slate." But he offers no practical formula for acquiring this much-desired state of world affairs. It would be quite unfair to criticize him for not coming up with such a formula because it would require the instantaneous wiping out of the long history of man and the immediate rebirth of all mankind. Mortal man does not have that power. It can be said for the Russians that they have been engaged for several centuries in the rewriting of history to their liking and more lately have been engaged in efforts to create a new type of man called Homo Sovieticus. We trust that Mr. Kennan will henceforth not engage in the same kind of activity.

These are the main trends of thought, as I see them, expressed in the Reith lectures delivered by Mr. George Kennan. There is much marshmallow and honey interspersed between the lines, but this is the basic message he intended for his listeners.

There undoubtedly is confusion in the minds of a considerable number of people in Great Britain as to just who Mr. Kennan, former American career diplomat and now assuming the role of historian, represents. He does not carry any influence in the councils of either the Democratic or the Republican Party, the two major political parties. His containment policy was draped around the neck of the Democratic Party by the Republicans in the 1952 national elections, a maneuver which cost the Democrats the support of many millions of thinking Americans. He has never stood for public office in the United States, though it is said he did offer to do so if he could be assured of nomination with no opposition. It appears that he is rapidly losing what few public supporters he had through his newly assumed role as historian. A real disservice to Anglo-American relations will result if the BBC listeners assume that the proposals advanced in the Kennan lectures have any credibility on the American public scene.

In these circumstances, the British Broadcasting Corp. might well give thought to sponsoring another series of lectures titled "The Kennan Fables." This would clear the air and provide a basis of much good humor, because Mr. Kennan has forfeited the right to be taken seriously on the Russian problem.

Food Stamp Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the April 30 edition of the Clinton Daily Democrat, of Clinton, Mo., carried an editorial on the subject of food-stamp plan. I believe this editorial to be a significant analysis, and worthy of being brought to the attention of the Members of Congress. It pays much deserved tribute to one of the Congress' outstanding legislators, LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, of Missouri's Third Congressional District. For years I have backed her food-stamp plan, which would certainly prove valuable today if it could be enacted.

I therefore ask that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BETTER THAN FOOD LINES

St. Louis this week started the distribution of free cheese, flour, cornmeal, rice and dried milk to those on the public assistance rolls or otherwise eligible to receive these Federal surplus commodities. The items hardly represent a balanced diet. They are nevertheless a godsend to the hungry, and the city government deserves credit for making them available.

Standing in a food line, however, is one of the most searing aspects of involuntary unemployment. The handout would not be so grim had Washington adopted the food-stamp plan advocated for 4 years by Representative LEONOR K. SULLIVAN of St. Louis. After being certified by a suitable agency, these same people would receive, by mail, stamps to be traded in for surplus commodities, preferably at a grocery.

As a matter of fact, food-stamp legislation adopted two decades ago is still on the books. It could be used by Secretary of Agriculture Benson without waiting for a new law. More varieties of food could be made available. Under existing law, Benson receives 30 percent of all customs receipts for the purchase of perishables—meat, fruit, vegetables, etc.—when surpluses threaten to depress farm prices. And he is authorized to carry over $300 million of these receipts from year to year. But Secretary Benson annually has allowed a considerable part of this money to revert to the Treasury.

These have been prosperous years, on the whole. Still, about 6 million persons in the United States have not been getting the right kinds of food, nor enough of it for decent nourishment. Thus, the food-stamp plan is justifiable, on a small scale, even in good times. Surely it should be put into operation during a recession in preference to the dumping of a few storable commodities.

American Prestige Advanced in Yugoslavia Through USIA Efforts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the United States Information Agency has recently advised me of the excellent work done on an individual basis by one of its officers in Zagreb, Yugoslavia. I am calling it to the attention of the Senate because I believe it to be an interesting example of the role played by our information officers abroad in creating a climate of respect and understanding for our country.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the citation of Philip W. Arnold, of the United States Information Service, at Zagreb.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENDATION FOR PHILIP W. ARNOLD

United States Information Service Zagreb commends Philip W. Arnold for his contributions to the USIS program in the field of personal contacts. Mr. Arnold arrived in Zagreb in May 1957 as public affairs trainee and lost no time in getting acquainted, on a friendly and social basis, with many people in the fields of press, drama, ballet, radio, television, and other cultural groups. His basic knowledge of the language acquired during 18 months with CARE in Yugoslavia, and his continued study of Serbo-Croatian, has been extremely valuable in enabling Arnold to further such acquaintances.

The following is offered as an illustration of this acceptance of the American community and Arnold as an individual in Zagreb by the theater element, as well as evidence of their appreciation of social contacts and cultural facilities offered by USIS and the consulate.

The Komedija (Comedy) Theater held its annual ball on February 4 at the Hotel Esplanade, which is considered the social event of the season and was attended by some 300 guests, including members of the consular corps. It is customary at this function to end the entertainment with a ceremony which would determine who would be the guardian of the Komedija cup for the following year. This involves a contest of wit between a master of ceremonies and three contestants. This portion of the program is planned in advance, including the contestants who are supposedly chosen by chance, the types of questions asked, and probably the ultimate choice of guardian.

This year Mr. Arnold was chosen as one of the candidates. He distinguished himself most commendably; his answers were extremely amusing, and, since the entire ceremony was conducted in Croatian, the audience was obviously delighted an American was able to hold his own so well in their language.

At the close of the contest, and amidst much applause and calls of "Amerikanac," Mr. Arnold was selected the winner. His award was a handsome scroll, 5,005 dinars, and an enormous sham cup full of beer. (The money award was returned to the theater to help defray a 17-million dinar deficit which was the subject of one of the questions asked. Arnold was asked what he—as an American business man and all Americans were businessmen—would suggest they do to eliminate this debt. Arnold suggested they close down the National Theater and the Drama Theater and cut out the competition.)

The American Consul and Branch PAO in Lagreb feel that Mr. Arnold contributed much to this event and that his selection was a personal tribute as well as appreciation of American representation in Zagreb. We would appreciate this report being made a part of Mr. Arnold's dossier.

School of Journalism of the University of Missouri, and Missouri School of Mines and Metallurgy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, recently two schools in Missouri have received wide attention for their distinction in two widely divergent fields of activities. I should like to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD two excellent editorials with respect to them.

The first is from the Los Angeles Times, and describes the excellence of the school of journalism of the University of Missouri. There seems to be a consensus that Missouri has the best school of journalism in the country. It is something in which all Missourians can take pride.

The second is an editorial from the Sikeston (Mo.) Daily Standard, describing Federal grants to Missouri's School of Mines and Metallurgy for the installation of a nuclear training reactor.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM

Journalism is something like motherhood: it is neither a trade nor a very formal profession, yet it requires great skill and understanding from its superior practitioners, and these are hard things to teach. Consequently journalism schools, with a few honorable exceptions, are vacuous places, manipulated by teachers with little newspaper experience, much flam and no flair, who stand in the same relation to their students as the spinster social worker to the troubled bride.

Today we wish to salute one of the honorable exceptions, the University of Missouri School of Journalism, which has just weathered its first 50 years. Even disenchanted old editors show a gleam of interest when a Missouri alumnus comes along and some newspapers operate a sort of futurity stakes, picking their entries before they graduate.

The school is making quite a thing of the anniversary—a 10-month celebration beginning in August with a noble theme: "A Stronger Free Press for a Better Free World." President Elmer Ellis of the university and Dean Earl F. English of the School of Journalism said in their joint announcement:

"We believe that today the free world is confronted with the most serious threat to its existence since the dawn of western civilization, and that, more than ever before in history, the preservation of this free world depends on the ability of its citizens to exchange information and opinions openly without fear of retribution.

"We believe that the primary responsibility for keeping these avenues of expression open lies not with the Government or with any other agency or group, but with the journalism profession itself.

"We believe that the immense contributions of the communications field are too often taken for granted in democratic societies and that there is a need to emphasize these contributions through a series of events which can earn worldwide attention."

The United States has some pretty poor newspapers along with the great ones and good ones, but the lot of them averages out as the best of the free presses of the world. The Missouri School of Journalism has surely done as much as any single instrumentality of education to help the American press, and if it can, during its golden jubilee, teach a larger part of the public to believe what President Ellis and Dean English believe, it will do more for newspapering and the free world than it, or any other school, has ever done before. The enterprise has promise, for the Missouri school has the prestige to make itself heard.

Missouri's famous School of Mines and Metallurgy, at Rolla, has been designated as 1 of 3 colleges in the Nation to receive Federal grants for the installation of a nuclear training reactor.

Approximately $300,000 have already been received from the Atomic Energy Commission for the purchase of the atom trainer, and the State legislature has approved the appropriation of $50,000 for the construction of a building to house it.

Rolla's school, which is a division of the University of Missouri, along with Ohio State and UCLA, were chosen as institutions best qualified to teach the youth of America new concepts in peacetime uses of atomic energy.

The Atomic Energy Commission has long expressed a desire to get out of the education business and place nuclear engineering and science training in the universities.

Plans are rapidly being developed at the Missouri School of Mines for housing and installing the 10 kilowatt, nuclear training reactor of the open pool type. Mid-America's first atom trainer will be similar in concept to the 1955 device built by the United States in Geneva, Switzerland, for the atoms for peace international conference. In a pool of purified water, 26 feet deep, science students will study and observe effects of nuclear radiation; the development and utilization of isotopes in medicine, agriculture, engineering, and industry. The Atomic Energy Commission will supply enriched uranium on a loan basis along with other necessary supplies. Delivery of the equipment for construction of the nuclear trainer has been promised within 11 months, but work on a building to house it will start immediately.

About 3 years ago the challenge was accepted by the Missouri School of Mines and Metallurgy to teach in the field of nuclear engineering. A committee of five faculty members, headed by Dr. Daniel S. Eppelsheimer, was appointed to study the program, keep up-to-date with the latest developments and make recommendations to Dean Curtis L. Wilson. The committee decided that with the existing engineering departments and facilities, the school could provide excellent training in the various phases of nuclear engineering. A program was approved which paved the way for graduate students to work for a Master of Science degree. This included courses in nuclear physics, reactor engineering technology, radio chemistry, heat transfer, and metallurgical and ceramic problems in nuclear engineering. Special fellowships in nuclear energy science and engineering courses have been approved by the AEC, and several appointees will be attending the Rolla school during the year 1958–1959.

At present 47 students are taking nuclear engineering options, but with installation of the AEC trainer, enrollment in the field should rise rapidly.

Members of the school committee, responsible in large part for securing the AEC trainer, are as follows: Dr. Daniel S. Eppelsheimer, chairman, department of metallurgy; Dr. W. H. Webb, professor of chemistry; Dr. H. Q. Fuller, chairman of physics department; Dr. A. J. Miles, chairman of mechanical engineering; and Dr. T. J. Planje, chairman of ceramics engineering.

Junior Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have

printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an excellent article entitled "Junior Colleges: Low-Cost Answer to Crowded Campuses?" from the May 2, 1958, issue of U. S. News & World Report.

This article reinforces the desirability of this type of college, and I hope, therefore, that the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee will soon act on my bill, S. 2810, providing a program of financial assistance to the States for construction of public junior or community colleges.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNIOR COLLEGES: LOW-COST ANSWER TO CROWDED CAMPUSES?

With college costs going up and classrooms jammed are junior colleges the solution? A lot of communities think so. There's a big boom in these 2-year schools.

Why? What is it they offer?

This nationwide survey shows how much they cost, what they teach, how they operate and why they are growing.

As this country heads into a crisis of overcrowding in the colleges, you hear an increasing amount of talk about junior colleges. They are being suggested as a possible answer to the problem of providing enough classrooms for the flood of United States youngsters now approaching college age.

Already, junior colleges have had a tremendous and rapid growth. Just 25 years ago there were only about 300,000 junior-college students in the entire United States. As late as 1952, there were only 568,000. Today, there are nearly 900,000 enrolled in 637 junior colleges located in every State, as the chart on page 79 shows.

Now, another big boom in junior colleges is seen developing as State after State turns to these 2-year schools to help handle mounting enrollments. In 22 States, publicly controlled junior colleges have won financial aid from State governments. Federal aid is also being proposed in a bill now pending.

Just what is it about junior colleges that is attracting so much attention?

RESULTS OF A SURVEY

To find out what junior colleges offer, U. S. News & World Report made a nationwide survey. Questionnaires were sent to presidents of junior colleges. From their replies you get the following picture:

Junior colleges offer the same courses usually taken by freshmen and sophomores at a university. Their credits usually are accepted by 4-year schools.

In addition, most junior colleges offer courses not found at the average 4-year college of liberal arts. They train technicians, offer night classes for adults, give job training for young or old. According to the American Association of Junior Colleges, there were 335,000 adults and 106,000 special students in junior colleges last year.

All this is done, junior college officials say, at a big saving in money. Students save because most of them can live at home. A junior college is usually a community institution, drawing its students from close by. Savings to taxpayers also are claimed by some educators, who say that junior colleges cost less than 4-year schools to build and operate.

The growing trend is toward public junior colleges, supported jointly by the community and the State. Almost 90 percent of the junior-college enrollment today is in publicly supported schools.

RELIEF FOR UNIVERSITIES

The idea, expressed by numerous educators, is that junior colleges can take over the bulk of the task of providing the first 2 years of education beyond high school. This, it is said, would create more room in universities and let them concentrate on advanced studies.

Dean John E. Tirrell, of Grand Rapids, Mich., Junior College, makes this forecast: "I personally foresee the day when almost every youngster desiring post-high-school education will have to prove his capabilities and ambition by a year or more in a 2-year community junior college."

"If such a plan as this were adopted," says Director A. G. Umbreit of Muskegon, Mich., Community College, "the usual crowd of social climbers, prestige seekers and others who flock to the universities and who are eliminated during the first 2 years would have to exercise their talents elsewhere. It would leave the universities free to do a real job with people who have the mental capacity for college work."

COLLEGE AT HOME

One big advantage, stressed by educator after educator, in the U. S. News & World Report survey, is this: Junior colleges, serving a community instead of a State, bring the opportunity for college training to millions of people who are not reached by universities.

Records are cited to show that, when a junior college is established in a community, a larger percentage of the high school graduates continue their education beyond high school.

Dean M. F. Griffith, of Cosper, Wyo., college reports: "Fifty to sixty percent of our local high-school seniors are now enrolling in Casper College. Thirty percent went on to college before the local school was organized."

HOW STUDENTS SAVE

Educators' reports show how much a student saves by going to college in his home town instead of going away to school, where he would have to pay for room and board.

According to a recent study by the United States Office of Education, living expenses represent about five-sixths of the total cost of a student's education in a State college away from home, about two-thirds of the total cost in a private college.

One junior-college president Isaac K. Beckes of Vincennes, Ind., University, summarized it this way:

"Families using a community institution will be able to save some $800 or more each year in costs that are almost unavoidable in an institution away from home. Away from home, the largest cost to the families of the students is not for education, but for board and room."

HOW TAXPAYERS SAVE

Economy for taxpayers is claimed on the ground that junior colleges do not require as expensive buildings or equipment as 4-year schools. For instance, at a junior college where students live at home, there is no need to build dormitories.

For educating freshmen and sophomores, a school can get along without some of the costly laboratory and research equipment which universities require.

Often, also, a junior college can use facilities that already exist—share buildings and stadiums and auditoriums with the local high school.

On the whole, junior-college officials surveyed estimated their costs of operation as ranging between $300 and $550 per year per student. Many claim that this is less than half the cost per student in most 4-year colleges.

Here are some sample costs reported by junior colleges: Bakersfield, Calif., College, $450 per student per year; Belleville, Ill., Junior College, which shares facilities with the local high school, $320; Bismarck, N. Dak., Junior College, $400; Flint, Mich., Junior College, $520.90.

Junior-college economy claims are challenged by some officials of 4-year schools. They say that it costs more to educate upperclassmen, and claim that 4-year colleges can educate freshmen and sophomores just as cheaply as junior colleges.

BETTER EDUCATION?

Economy is not the only advantage claimed for junior colleges. In their survey replies, many educators argued that the education an underclassman gets in a 2-year school is as good as the one he would get in a 4-year school—and often better.

Records are cited to show that junior-college graduates do at least as well as other students when they transfer to a 4-year school. A recent comparison at the University of California showed that grades of junior-college graduates were slightly higher.

It also is argued that it is better for a teen-age student to start his college career in a home environment. President Marvin C. Knudson, of Pueblo, Colo., Junior College, explained it like this:

"The first benefit that accrues to most individuals is that the student has two more years to mature under the guidance and leadership of his parents and as a member of his church and other groups. He also frequently has more opportunities to exercise his leadership in social situations, athletics, drama, art, music, etc., because usually, the junior colleges are fairly small and also because he is not dominated by upperclassmen. Junior colleges can often promote closer relationships between student and faculty member and more help than is possible in larger institutions."

Robert Gordon Sproul, president of the University of California, said recently: "I would today urge high-school graduates to attend junior college unless there is a compelling reason for them to go to a 4-year college away from home."

JOB TRAINING, TOO

For the student who seeks vocational training instead of a college degree, a junior college is pictured as having a value unmatched by the ordinary 4-year college or university.

Nearly every junior college surveyed by U. S. News & World Report listed some kind of job training in addition to its academic studies.

Here are some of the courses junior colleges offer:

Secretarial and business training, nursing, agriculture, auto mechanics, drafting, machine shop, electricity, electronics, household mechanics, planning, decorating, plumbing, printing, sheet-metal working, woodworking, welding, cookery.

In some community colleges, as in Flint, Mich., Junior College, classroom teaching is combined with on-the-job experience, with students earning pay while learning their trade.

The idea is suggested by several educators that expansion of junior colleges would help fill the shortage of technicians in the United States labor force.

SCHOOLING FOR ADULTS

More than one-third of all junior-college students are adults. Some are getting a general education which they never had a chance to acquire in their youth. But many are taking courses to help them in their work—bring them up to date with technological advances, prepare them for better jobs, or teach them new trades.

In a junior college they can take these courses at night, after work. Junior college officials point out that most of these adults would never be able to go away from their homes and jobs to attend a university.

ASSET TO COMMUNITY

From a community standpoint, a junior college is pictured as an asset industrially, as well as educationally and culturally.

Benjamin K. Swarts, director of East Los Angeles Junior College, observes:

"The curricular offerings of the junior college can be adjusted to meet the educational needs of the area which that college serves. For example, as there is a very large electronics industry in our part of the city of Los Angeles, we have developed and offer a very successful electronics curriculum."

President Glen L. Bushey, of Asheville-Biltmore College, Asheville, N. C., cites this as an example of community service: "We cooperate with business, industry, community institutions, and Government agencies in providing special programs to benefit their personnel."

LESS "RAH RAH"

There are some things a youngster has grown to expect from college life that he might not find in a junior college. Some of the traditional trappings may be missing.

For instance, most junior colleges surveyed do not have social fraternities and sororities. Many do not have football teams. Some do not have campuses of their own.

Dean L. J. Elias, of Olympic College, Bremerton, Wash., suggests that many of the social traditions that are identified with American university life, such as football and social fraternities, will have to be modified in the philosophy of the community junior college. He says "adequate parking space for commuting students" should be more concern than "rolling acres of lawn."

Some junior colleges, however, are as big and fancy as universities, and have fullscale programs of intercollegiate athletics. The Junior College Directory, published by the American Association of Junior Colleges, shows 39 junior colleges with enrollments of more than 5,000, ranging up to 37,320 at Long Beach, Calif., City College.

WHERE MONEY COMES FROM

Junior colleges are financed in a variety of ways. Of the 637 in this country, 371 are public institutions, supported mainly by taxes, and 266 are private schools. Most public junior colleges depend entirely or primarily upon their local communities for support. In 26 States, they get no State aid.

Where State aid is given, communities still contribute heavily to the junior college cost.

California is perhaps the outstanding example of State-community cooperation in junior college financing. There, the State contributes $120 or more per pupil, and the junior college taxing district puts up the balance of the cost. This method has resulted in the largest statewide system of public junior colleges in the country. There are 63 such schools, with a total enrollment of more than 400,000.

In California, public junior colleges charge no tuition. They are part of the State's system of free education. In most States, however, students pay at least part of the cost of junior college education in the form of tuition.

OUTLOOK FOR FUTURE

The picture you get from this survey is one of tremendous growth in junior colleges with more rapid growth ahead.

Junior colleges are a comparatively new development in American education. The oldest public junior college in the country at Joliet, Ill., was founded in 1901. It was not until World War II that junior colleges became significant in the overall educational picture. Yet, today nearly one-fourth of all American college students attend junior colleges.

Now you find several States planning big expansion of their junior-college systems. Much of a 250-million-dollar bond issue recently voted by the State of New York will go for community colleges of the 2-year type. Illinois, Florida, and Maryland are considering proposals for statewide networks of such institutions. California and Texas are constantly adding to their already-big networks.

A special State commission on higher education in Illinois recently recommended that "Illinois should extend locally controlled public junior colleges eventually to cover the State so that all high-school graduates are within commuting distance of an institution of higher learning."

President Ralph Prator of Bakersfield, Calif., College predicts:

"In my opinion, there will be many communities and many States which will soon branch out into the community-college concept as we know it in California. The reason I believe this concept will grow is because the community college, generally speaking, is the most economical institution to operate."

The hope you find among many educators is that junior colleges may provide an answer to this country's problem of mounting college enrollments—and mounting college costs.

How junior colleges have grown

	In number	In enrollment
6 years ago (1951–52)	580	568, 559
Latest count	637	863, 513

Following, State by State, are the number of junior colleges, public and private, and their total enrollments for the school year 1956–57.

State	Public	Private	Total	Enrollment
Alabama	1	8	9	2, 169
Arizona	2	0	2	4, 243
Arkansas	2	2	4	2, 511
California	63	6	69	414, 428
Colorado	7	1	8	8, 928
Connecticut	0	8	8	11, 751
Delaware	0	1	1	225
District of Columbia	0	7	7	3, 162
Florida	7	5	12	9, 813
Georgia	9	9	18	11, 021
Idaho	3	2	5	5, 223
Illinois	16	12	28	35, 947
Indiana	15	4	19	25, 626
Iowa	16	8	24	13, 558
Kansas	14	6	20	7, 444
Kentucky	1	11	12	3, 640
Louisiana	0	1	1	45
Maine	0	4	4	646
Maryland	11	5	16	4, 567
Massachusetts	2	17	19	11, 297
Michigan	16	3	19	28, 570
Minnesota	9	2	11	9, 813
Mississippi	15	7	22	9, 888
Missouri	8	13	21	12, 326
Montana	3	0	3	693
Nebraska	4	1	5	2, 257
Nevada	1	0	1	419
New Hampshire	0	1	1	501
New Jersey	2	9	11	4, 096
New Mexico	2	0	2	331
New York	17	17	34	37, 310
North Carolina	5	18	23	9, 815
North Dakota	4	0	4	2, 151
Ohio	1	6	7	6, 614
Oklahoma	13	3	16	7, 430
Oregon	2	2	4	3, 314
Pennsylvania	13	15	28	21, 709
Rhode Island	0	1	1	377
South Carolina	0	10	10	1, 678
South Dakota	0	3	3	361
Tennessee	1	7	8	2, 580
Texas	35	11	46	67, 496
Utah	4	0	4	6, 095
Vermont	0	2	2	589
Virginia	2	11	13	9, 257
Washington	10	1	11	27, 155
West Virginia	1	2	3	1, 672
Wisconsin	30	4	34	9 380
Wyoming	4	0	4	3, 402
Total	371	266	637	863, 513

Source: American Association of Junior Colleges.

Deportation of William Heikkila

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on April 30, 1958, an editorial discussing the deportation of William Heikkila appeared in the Springfield (Mo.) Leader and Press. Because it is of general interest not only to Missourians, but to Americans everywhere, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HE'S NO EXCEPTION

It was only the rather inept handling of the case of William Heikkila, San Francisco draftsman who was deported and imported again as fast as a trans-Atlantic airplane could carry him, that made it stand out from thousands of other cases very similar to it.

Actually—though the hot verbal exchanges in Washington may have made it seem otherwise—the Government had and has every right to toss Mr. Heikkila out of the country, no matter how exemplary a citizen he may have been for lo, these many years. What's more, Mr. H. brought all his troubles on himself.

Behind his case lies one of the most complex, least understood laws on the Federal statute books—the Immigration and Nationality Act, current version of which was passed in 1952. It is commonly known as the McCarran-Walter Act.

Any alien who runs afoul of its numerous provisions can be deported, no matter how long he has lived in the United States, and no matter how upright a life he has led.

Draftsman Heikkila, for example, has lived in the United States for almost 52 years. He came here with his parents from Finland when he was 10 weeks old. If his parents had become naturalized citizens while he was a child, he would have automatically derived his citizenship. But neither of his parents ever became naturalized, contrary to some published reports.

Heikkila could have applied for citizenship in his own right at the age of 18, or any time after that. Immigration records show he did file a declaration of intent to become a citizen when he was 18. But he waited until he was 39 before he filed an actual petition for naturalization. Maybe he knew what would happen to it, maybe he didn't. At any rate, it was promptly rejected because he admitted at a hearing that he had been a member of the Communist Party from 1929 to 1939. And that is all that is needed, under the law, to get an alien deported—for him to admit he is, or ever has been a member of the Communist Party after his entry into the United States. The question of whether he is still a Communist just doesn't enter into it.

Even if an alien, having carried on a youthful flirtation with Communist doctrines, later recants and becomes a violent anti-Communist, he is still subject to deportation for his earlier folly. But the law provides him with the right to appeal to immigration authorities for suspension of deportation, which may be granted if he shows he is now a person of good moral character, free of subversive tendencies, and that deportation would be an exceptional hardship to him.

Six years after the Immigration Service started proceedings to deport him, Heikkila filed such an appeal. It has been kicking around in the courts ever since, and is the basis for his swift return to the United States for further court hearings after an apparently too-hasty boot by the immigration people.

Actually, as we said at the outset, Heikkila's case is only one of thousands. During the past fiscal year, 5,082 aliens were deported—and only 12 of them were charged with a history of subversive activity. They're the ones who get the headlines. The rest—and most of them are ousted because they never had any legal right to be in this country—are just statistics.

Probably Mr. Heikkila is and would continue to be a good American citizen. Like most other American citizens, he has made some mistakes. In his case, his mistakes may cost him much more than they could ever cost a native of the country—his right to live and work in the United States.

Minshall Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, early in April, it was my privilege to mail an opinion poll to the voters of Ohio's 23d District. This is the fourth year that I have polled this suburban area of Cleveland on the vital issues before the Congress and each time the response has been excellent. A tremendous voter interest was shown as over 16,000 returned the questionnaire which present some of the questions of current interest before the second session of the 85th Congress.

In addition to completing the questionnaire, over 5,000 people also sent in additional letters and comments amplifying their views on the various issues. I am pleased with this response for it shows the great interest which the residents of this congressional district have in their Government.

Following are the results of the poll with an accompanying newsletter which were mailed to all voters receiving the questionnaire:

CONGRESSIONAL BRIEFS

April traditionally marks the midway point of a congressional session. This time last year only two major pieces of legislation had been passed, the President's Mideast doctrine, and the annual extension of corporation and excise taxes. Acting at a faster, election year tempo, this session's accomplishments include passage of a $1.9 billion housing bill, a highway-construction measure, and a pay raise for military personnel. In conference between the House and Senate is the postal pay raise and postal rate increase bill. Action is yet to come on foreign aid, extension of Reciprocal Trade Act, statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, pay increase for classified employees, and numerous other measures. About half of this session's appropriation bills, which usually are about 20 in number, have already passed the House. Six of these have also passed the Senate, and four have been signed into law. The President's much discussed Defense Department reorganization bill is presently being heard by the Armed Services Committee and is in for some rough sledding, but will be passed with modifications. One thing is certain and that is: Politics will be the keynote during the remainder of the second session of the 85th Congress. With the Democrats in control of the Congress and the Republicans in the White House, no holds will be barred.

RECESSION

I reported in my January newsletter that we could meet today's challenges quickly and wisely without being foolhardy in our appropriations. The recent mail load also indicates that many share that opinion, and that there is no need for us to go hog-wild in our spending. Leading economists have just recently reported that our economic tailspin seems to have leveled off, and although the outlook is much rosier, you can be sure that if things are not what they should be by the end of June, Congress will take definite action, most likely in the form of tax relief.

HAVE PASSPORT, WILL TRAVEL

All indications are that 1958 will be one of the biggest travel years on record, and the rush will start in earnest in June, so if you are thinking of traveling abroad this summer, be sure to apply for your passport in plenty of time. The new look—if you wish, you can now have your passport picture made in color, and you can smile without violating the regulations.

DID YOU KNOW?

It's only peanuts. We spent only about $3½ million for research development and procurement in connection with our missile program from 1945 to 1952. During the same period $116 million was spent by the Government in supporting the price of peanuts. Weather note: Usually mild Washington had over 40 inches of snow during the past winter—nearly 10 inches more than fell in Cleveland.

MINSHALL OPINION POLL

Returns to my most recent questionnaire arrived back in this office by the mailsackful. This is the fourth such poll I have sent out, and again the results were most gratifying. Nearly 16,000 were returned, and an unusually high percentage of people also sent additional letters and comments. The percentage of return is much higher than in other congressional districts conducting similar polls. I am highly pleased with this response for it shows the great interest that residents of the 23d District have in their Government. It is regretted that staff limitations will not permit an individual reply, but you can be sure that all answers were read and much appreciated. Thank you for your many generous comments and your wonderful cooperation.

It is interesting to note that answers to questions we asked again this year showed very little change in thinking. For example, in comparison to the 1957 poll, a very slight difference is noted between Federal aid for school construction, the air raid shelter program, and foreign trade. There was, however, a 12 percent shift in favor of foreign aid.

I shall continue to thus sample the opinions of my constituents from time to time for I feel there is no better way to find out what the majority of people are thinking, and of course having the benefit of your views is invaluable to me in representing you in the Congress of the United States.

The results of the 1958 opinion poll follow:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you approve of the proposal to put pay TV on a trial basis?	23	67	10
2. Do you favor a protective tariff or quota on imports of foreign goods which compete with our own business?	62	31	7
3. Do you believe we should continue our foreign aid program which calls for the expenditure of $3,900,000,000 in military and economic aid to our allies in free countries during the next fiscal year?	80	15	5
4. Are you in favor of removing the Federal Government's present regulatory control over prices which producers can charge for natural gas?	26	65	9
5. Do you feel a need exists for some form of Federal assistance to encourage scientific education?	52	41	7
6. Would you favor a $20,000,000,000 national air-raid shelter construction program?	16	72	12
7. Do you favor increasing social security benefits with corresponding increases in individual and employer contributions?	52	39	9
8. Would you favor furnishing nuclear weapons to our NATO allies in Western Europe?	49	37	14
9. In an effort to meet the national economic situation, please indicate which of the following Federal actions you think should receive prior attention:			
1st choice: Accelerate our present public works program (highways, public buildings, etc.).			
2d choice: Income tax reductions.			
3d choice: Increase our housing program.			
4th choice: Reduce credit restrictions.			
5th choice: Initiate a massive public-works program.			
6th choice: No Federal Government action required.			
10. Do you favor Federal aid for local school construction?	45	51	4

Guesswork and Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday I put in the RECORD an article from the U. S. News & World Report which reported on a survey by the National Bureau of Economic Research which showed that the American consumer now plans to reduce, not increase, his purchases, and that by a 2 to 1 margin the American people believe that this is a bad time to buy. The survey was based on interviews with 25,000 families.

An editorial in the New York Times points out the fallacy of basing plans and expectations for the future on hunches instead of firsthand information. The administration believes that people are ready to start buying again. An objective inquiry proves that just the opposite is true. Why was not the best intelligence available relied upon instead of guesswork?

Mr. President, we must not make the same mistake in the other direction. The Times editorial is right when it says that Washington should find out what is going on before action is taken—or de-

layed. It is equally true that we ought to have the best information available as to what the effect of any governmental action will be on the economy.

Because I believe we should not rely on hunches when we take action to combat the recession, because I believe that we ought to know the probable effect of a tax cut or a public works program—or any other proposed action—I have introduced in the Senate a concurrent resolution directing the Joint Economic Committee to study the effect of various Government programs on the cost of living. I believe we should eliminate the guesswork in economic policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "The Consumer and Business," which appeared in the New York Times on May 6, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONSUMER AND BUSINESS

The National Bureau of Economic Research undertook a survey of consumer buying intentions in early April, under the supervision of Dr. F. Thomas Juster, and it has now made public its findings. It can hardly be said that these lend much comfort to Washington in its wait-and-see policy. The poll, which covered 25,000 families representing all parts of the United States, reveals that as of the time they were questioned this cross-section of the consuming public planned to buy even fewer new cars and major items of household goods now than a half year ago.

Plans to buy new cars were 20 percent lower in April than they had been last October, though the number planning to buy used cars was sufficiently large to reduce the deficiency as it applied to cars of all kinds to 10 percent. Similarly, intentions to buy major consumer durable goods, such as ranges, refrigerators, TV sets, freezers, etc., dropped, on the average, by more than 10 percent. Information was also sought by those in charge of this survey on buying intentions 12 months ahead. Here, plans to buy new cars were almost 30 percent lower than they had been in October 1956, when the last comparable survey was taken. In the case of no fewer than 15 items the drop in buying intentions ran to 40 percent.

The households included in this survey of the National Bureau were member subscribers of Consumers Union of the United States, a nonprofit organization that tests, rates and publishes the results of its findings on various products. This group was selected because the record of its buying intentions was available for 10 years back. Despite the fact that these 25,000 families are above the national average by such tests as size and stability of income and of the degree of formal education, their buying plans have forecast with considerable accuracy the actual changes realized by the Nation's consumers as a whole.

One wonders whether Washington wouldn't be in a better position to play a leading role in combating the recession if it went out itself and inquired into the general state of the national psychology, rather than trying to persuade itself that the curve of business activity was showing signs that it might be getting ready to approach an initial stage of deceleration that could conceivably lead ultimately to a condition favorable to the first phase of the process of flattening out.

Defense Unification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the April 28, 1958, edition of the Kansas City Star carried editorials on the subject of defense unification and medical care for the aged. I believe these editorials to be significant analyses and worthy of being brought to the attention of the Members of Congress, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE UNITY DOESN'T MEAN ONE SERVICE

The possibility of 1 armed service instead of 4 is a favorite bugaboo of those who fight defense unification. This 12-year-old scarecrow has been hauled out again by Congressmen who are leery of the administration plan for more central authority in the Pentagon.

President Eisenhower had his dander up when he replied to the allegation at his most recent news conference. He told a reporter that it is just as sensible to say Congress is going nuts and will abolish the Defense Department as it is to suggest that he wants a single military service.

Neil McElroy, Secretary of Defense, has found the going hot and heavy before the House Armed Services Committee. Under a barrage of questioning, McElroy has agreed to try to reword the White House proposal to meet a chief congressional objection. The change would make it impossible to merge the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps into a single service.

In the era of atomic warheads the once-separate jobs of the four forces tend to overlap. This is why the President wants the power to accomplish greater unity of command. But he has shown no desire to tamper with the military and naval traditions of the United States.

That isn't the purpose of the plan to reorganize the Defense Department. But some Members of Congress won't be satisfied until they see it in writing. This can be done in the interest of a clear understanding on purposes. In order to get action it should be possible to make some compromises without defeating the principle of more effective coordination in the Pentagon.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

If Missouri can find the money to increase old-age assistance the logical method is a State-Federal partnership to provide medical care for the indigent. A new Federal program is available and about 40 other States are taking advantage of it.

In the next fiscal year, old-age assistance in Missouri will cost about $82 million. Fifty-five million of this is from Federal taxes and 27 million is the State contribution. For each $60 check, the State pays $21 and the Federal Government $39. Any amount above $60 would be paid entirely by the State. If the maximum were increased to $70, as has been suggested, the cost to Missouri would be about $15 million a year.

The indigent who are ill, the ones who need help most, could receive aid to the extent of $14 million with Missouri paying half the cost. Under the program, a maximum State appropriation of $7 million would be matched by Federal funds. In most States the money is used to pay for drugs, hospitalization, and other medical needs. And it can be used for the extra expense incurred in nursing homes for the ambulatory patients who require much special care.

Only those who already are on the assistance rolls would receive the aid. So we do not see this as a wedge for socialized medicine. Apparently a majority of Missouri's doctors agree. A poll of the members of the Missouri State medical association brought a 3-to-1 vote in favor of a neutral stand if the bill is introduced in the 1959 legislature.

The Current Economic Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as a part of the statewide conference sponsored by the State Democratic-Farmer-Labor Central Committee at Minneapolis, Minn., on April 26, 1958, the former Chairman of President Truman's Council of Economic Advisers, the Honorable Leon Keyserling, made an important address.

His remarks dealt with the current economic situation and deserve to be widely read. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from his address on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS OF LEON H. KEYSERLING[1] AT THE ECONOMIC CONFERENCE OF THE DEMOCRATIC-FARMER-LABOR STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., APRIL 26, 1958

As the American economic situation continues to deteriorate, the administration in Washington continues to dawdle. Its actions, or lack of actions, are internally self-contradictory and externally confusing. While the country suffers, the administration stalls.

The administration which promised to stabilize the dollar has generated the greatest peacetime inflation in the United States in the 20th century. The administration which promised prosperity without war has sparked by far the biggest economic recession since World War II. The administration which promised to balance the Federal budget is now almost weekly revising upward by a billion dollars or so its own shaky estimates of the size of the deficit in the Federal budget during the approaching fiscal year.

Official Government sources, including the Secretary of the Treasury, now indicate that the Federal budget is likely to show an

[1] Former Chairman, President's Council of Economic Advisers. Consulting economist and attorney. President, Conference on Economic Progress.

$8 billion deficit for the fiscal year starting July 1. (The Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, that sturdy ally of the administration's dizzy economic policies, has just estimated this deficit as high as $10 billion.) This contrasts with the President's budget estimate, as recently as mid-January, that there would be a surplus of almost half a billion dollars for the same fiscal year starting July 1. What explains this $8½ billion changeover in so short a period of time?

The explanation is simple. First, a deteriorating nationwide economic situation is already forcing upon a reluctant administration some speedup, though inadequate, of expenditures for many programs including national defense which since the new Republican era have been carried forward at too low a level—recession or no recession. Second, the economic recession means that, in the fiscal year under consideration, the Treasury now expects to collect about $4 billion less in tax revenues, even assuming existing tax rates, than it had estimated as recently as mid-January.

This in turn can mean only 1 of 2 things, or both: (1) Either the administration in mid-January did not correctly appraise the adverse economic outlook when it made its overoptimistic revenue estimates; or (2) even now the administration's complacent economic outlook is refuted by its own revised budget estimates as of today.

This most recent development illustrates vividly the fallacy of Republican economic policies which have persistently tried to balance the Federal budget at the expense of the national economy. Rising unemployment, falling production, and a dwindling tax base do not and cannot balance the Federal budget, Messrs. Humphrey, Anderson, and Martin notwithstanding.

But even this most recent revelation of the obvious has not yet induced the administration to alter its course. Even now, high Government officials use the worsening budget picture, which reflects a worsening nationwide economic picture, not to revise their policies, but rather to justify their existing policies. These officials are now using this worsening budget picture, reflecting this worsening nationwide economic picture, to support their inflexible resistance to the spending programs and tax reductions which are now imperatively needed to restore the economy and thus restore the Federal budget.

Recent Government statistics also reveal that our total national economic activity in first quarter 1958 was down $8.6 billion below fourth quarter 1957, contrasted with a decline of about $7.4 billion from third to fourth quarter 1957. These figures refute assertions still being made to the effect that the recession is leveling off or has just about hit bottom. Unemployment in March, when properly adjusted for seasonal variation, was about 250,000 higher than in February. Our total national economy in first quarter 1958 was operating at an annual rate about $63 billion below full production, and about 4 million jobs below full employment. We now have a true level of unemployment of about 6 million, taking fair account of the full-time equivalent of part-time unemployment, contrasted with the 2 million or so unemployed that would be the frictional unemployment consistent with full employment.

We now need a drastic and immediate tax reduction of five to seven billion dollars, concentrating upon increasing the purchasing power of low and middle income groups. We now need also an increase of five to seven billion dollars in the annual rate of Federal spending. This spending should not be for made-work projects nor merely to combat the recession. Instead, such spending should have the broader and more permanent purpose of closing the huge and dangerous gaps in our national security, education and health services and social security, natural resuorce development and highways and housing, as well as the huge gaps in our economic strength and human well-being resulting from depressed farm income, inadequate minimum wage laws, and gross neglect of the whole problem of persistent poverty in a land of plenty. In addition, unemployment insurance should be vastly expanded with Federal aid.

Through this bedrock assumption of responsibility by the Federal Government, the climate can be created for the vast reactivation of private business investment, the vast reactivation of jobs in private industry, and the sound restoration of consumer confidence among 173 million Americans. Through this sound program, we can by mid-1959 reduce unemployment by several million, and increase the annual rate of national production by about $35 billion above the current level, thus making great strides toward the fair goal of full employment and full production. By the end of 1959 or early 1960, we can completely achieve the full prosperity for all which is the rightful heritage of our people. And in consequence of this economic restoration and consequently larger tax base, we could go through the approaching fiscal year 1959 with a smaller deficit in the Federal budget than the $8 billion deficit which the administration now foresees, not to speak of the $10 billion deficit which Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board— the architect of the devastating tight money policy—now foresees. Assuredly, it is better to have in the coming year a smaller Federal deficit in a revived economy, rather than a larger Federal deficit in a stricken economy. And surely, we can most rapidly get back to a balanced Federal budget, a consummation devoutly to be wished, in a fully expanding economy than in a further contracting economy. The time has come, therefore, to reverse the Republican national economic policies which have turned out to be so penny foolish and pound foolish.

Catholic Mother of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Mrs. Leo J. Stupfel of McMinnville, Oreg., was recently named Catholic Mother of the Year by the National Catholic Welfare Conference and will receive a gold medal signifying her selection from Archbishop Edward D. Howard of Portland, Oreg., at a ceremony on May 15, 1958.

Mrs. Stupfel is an Oregon farm mother, 4 of whose 8 children have entered religious life. Other children have succeeded impressively in professional careers. Mrs. Stupfel has been a devoted mother who richly deserves this honor, and I extend to her my congratulations and respect.

Both Mrs. Neuberger and I have made public addresses under the auspices of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, which is an organization dedicated to the advancement of social welfare and the family unit.

Mr. President, it is indeed an honor to my State of Oregon that Mrs. Leo Stupfel of McMinnville has been selected as the 1958 National Catholic Mother.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the news release by the National Catholic Welfare Conference announcing Mrs. Stupfel's selection as the National Catholic Mother for 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON FARM MOTHER, WITH 4 OF 8 CHILDREN IN RELIGIOUS LIFE, NAMED CATHOLIC OF THE YEAR

WASHINGTON, May 8.—An Oregon farm mother, 4 of whose 8 children have entered religious life, has been named 1958 National Catholic Mother.

She is Mrs. Leo J. Stupfel, of McMinnville, Oreg., in the archdiocese of Portland in Oregon. Mrs. Stupfel was selected by a committee of the National Catholic Family Life Conference, which has headquarters here.

For the first time in the 17-year history of the mother-of-the-year award, the selections committee also chose 3 other Catholic mothers to receive silver medals of honorable mention.

They are: Mrs. Raymond L. Morrow, of Kansas City, Mo.; Mrs. Magdalene Frey, of Vincennes, Ind.; and Mrs. Ernie J. Broussard, of San Antonio, Tex.

Selection of the four women was announced jointly by Bishop Peter W. Bartholome, of St. Cloud, Minn., episcopal moderator of the Family Life Bureau, National Catholic Welfare Conference, and Dr. Frances Rothert, of Little Rock, Ark., president of the family life conference.

The mother of 5 boys and 3 girls, Mrs. Stupfel (the former Mary Morrison) has been married for 39 years. All of her children have been educated in Catholic schools, and four have entered religious life.

Two are nuns—Sister Theresa Maurees, a teacher in an Oswego, Oreg., school, and Sister Mariella Rose, a nurse in a convent infirmary. One son, Father Leo Stupfel, is a priest of the Baker, Oreg., diocese, and another, James Stupfel, will be ordained a Holy Cross father in May 1959, and will then go to Pakistan as a missionary.

Mrs. Stupfel's married children are: Clifford Stupfel, an engineer in Seattle, Wash.; Dr. J. F. Stupfel, Portland physician and surgeon, and Rosaleen, a graduate nurse. A fifth son, Joseph Stupfel, is a dental student at the University of Oregon.

Asked to comment on the honor, Mrs. Stupfel said her family's approach to happiness has centered on prayer and frequent reception of the sacraments.

"You can get the blessed mother to help raise your family by praying the rosary," she said. She added that the sacred heart was enthroned in her house and that the family gathered for 1 hour of prayer each first Friday night.

Mrs. Stupfel disclosed that she and her husband, who is now retired, plan to leave the six bedroom house they now occupy and move nearer to town because "we'd like to get closer to mass."

Mrs. Stupfel will receive a gold medal signifying her selection as mother of the year from Archbishop Edward D. Howard of Portland, Oreg., after an evening mass on May 15. The archbishop will also preach at the ceremony.

When informed of Mrs. Stupfel's selection, Archbishop Howard issued a statement in which he declared himself "extremely pleased that so high an honor has come to a mother in our archdiocese."

"In the person of Mrs. Stupfel," he added, "every Catholic mother in the United States is being honored. My sincere congratulations to her and to her family."

The selections committee remarked that a combination of qualities brought Mrs. Stup-

fel her award as Catholic mother of the year. It observed that there are regular religious devotions in the Stupfel home, including daily recitation of the rosary.

The committee pointed out that Mrs. Stupfel's devotion to Catholic education prompted her to take her own children, as well as those of two other neighboring families, to Catholic schools for 20 years. It also called attention to the fact that she has found time to lead 4–H Clubs, work with farm groups and the Red Cross, represent her area on the Archdiocesan Council of Catholic Women, and be active in the work of the National Office for Decent Literature and Sunday observance programs.

At present, Mrs. Stupfel is grand regent of the Catholic Daughters of America in her area.

International High Fidelity Music Festival of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I note with interest that an International High Fidelity Music Festival has been planned to take place in Washington early in 1959. I understand that this event will be staged for the benefit of the National Symphony Orchestra, which will play a special concert in Constitution Hall on January 31, and that an exposition will follow at the Shoreham Hotel from February 5 through 8.

I am informed that the International High Fidelity Music Festival of 1959 will, for the first time, combine international cultural interchange with a trade-showing of high-fidelity equipment from all countries, including, of course, our own.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the Honorable Sherman Adams, the Assistant to the President of the United States, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 9, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Next weekend I hope it will be my good fortune to share with all of you the excitement of passing through electronic gates of Washington's High Fidelity Music Show of 1958. Here we shall see some of the specialized achievements of this electronic age. We are really only on the threshold of all it holds for us.

Already, as we know, giant computers perform calculations almost beyond human comprehension. Various electronic devices steer our airplanes through good weather and bad. Electronic controls assist in guiding manmade satellites into their orbits in space, and through electronics we keep in communication with these traveling bodies and learn scientific secrets that we can discover in no better way.

The list goes on and on, reaching into every branch of human endeavor, affecting our safety, comfort, health, and progress.

We fortunate people who will gather at the hi-fi show are especially interested in the application of electronic devices to our cultural life. Most of us are music lovers. We are not only intrigued by the engineering aspects of high fidelity, but we are profoundly impressed by the new appreciation it has given us and the new horizons opened for us in the world of music.

Some of us may put more emphasis on tweeters and woofers than we do on Bach and Beethoven. But it is a remarkable phenomenon that if you enter this field through your addiction to gadgets, you soon become a captive of the wonderful appeal of great music.

On the other hand, those, like myself, who derive their greatest satisfaction from the faithful reproduction of music and performances that they have revered for years, unwittingly find themselves engrossed in the intricacies of high-fidelity techniques. We even find a way of understanding the amazing jargon of the high-fidelity devotee.

Speaking of understanding, music has long played a part in promoting international understanding. In our time, through the readily available reproduction of music by radio and phonograph, the international message of music can be distributed easily and quickly to every human being.

The application of the science of electronics to the art of music has led to the greatest cultural revolution in modern times, and this has all taken place substantially in the last 30 years. Thus, a single network radio broadcast of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony can be listened to by more people than were able to hear this masterpiece during all of its performances throughout the 19th century.

Today, when it is our aim to have a better understanding with the people of nations separated from us by ideological barriers, music on records and on radio has served as the first ambassador of cultural interchange. Thus, when the Soviet violinist, Oistrakh, recently played in our concert halls, his art was already known to us through his recordings, which had been widely distributed and broadcast in the United States.

For our own part, the violinist, Isaac Stern, and the Boston Symphony Orchestra has performed for Russian audiences in recent years and the Philadelphia Orchestra will include a visit to the Soviet Union in its European tour this year. The people-to-people contacts made by musicians cannot help but pave the way for better understanding at other levels. Music and high fidelity thus frequently fill a functional role in international relations.

It is indeed a happy package that can hold so many desirable gifts. The inventors and manufacturers of high fidelity equipment live by our interest in the mysteries of these contrivances. The composers and musicians live by our love of their genius and their artistry.

I find that in 1957, the production of high fidelity instruments in the United States attained to some five million units, an increase of nearly 20 percent over 1956. It is noteworthy that the greatest increases were registered in the higher quality instruments and that the majority of the combination radio-phonographs included FM, the ideal medium for the broadcast of music.

What all this means to musicians and composers is not easily reduced to figures. What is really more important is that most artists and composers never get rich. On the contrary, they need us. They need to find us in their audiences at concerts and recitals, for live performances are necessarily the heart of the activity that inspires the imposing reproducing instruments to be seen and heard at hi-fi shows.

Here in Washington, that means that we should support our National Symphony Orchestra with our attendance at its concerts as well as by making the financial contribusions that are possible for us. And we should give equivalent attention if we can to all of the many fine musical organizations in the community. Who shall say that such support in their own communities by all our people throughout America does not add to our national strength and character?

Indeed, music has already greatly enriched our lives in America, and it is clear that it is constantly growing in scope and in influence. So, be it the living performance or the reproduction, listen with an open ear and you may be sure that you will always discover beauties and new spiritual qualities in this mysterious, yet pervading art that sooner or later affects all of us.

Michigan's Attractions Are Outstanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the editorial writer of the Bay City (Mich.) Times has struck at the very heart of the current Michigan Week observance when he says that in Michigan we seek to give our guests an indication of genuine hospitality that awaits them during their stay, be it brief or extended, among us.

The editorial follows:

MICHIGAN'S ATTRACTIONS ARE OUTSTANDING

Recreational, scenic, and historical attractions are uppermost in the minds of tourists when, with eager anticipation, they cross State lines into Michigan. And we have all three in the greatest abundance, to as great an extent, perhaps, as any other State in the Union.

The Wolverine State can offer thousands of beautiful lakes, silvery fishing streams, skyline drives, mountains, waterfalls, great sand dunes, and other natural wonders almost without limit. Its historical associations equal those of any eastern seaboard State. To the multitude of its other interests, including the cool greenery of a rolling countryside, it has added this year the magnificent Straits of Mackinac bridge, which all middle westerners will want to see and cross as soon as they can.

The breath-taking beauty of that lacework structure of steel and concrete is alone enough to mark it out as the year's top drawing card for vacationers. But even it is only a part of the wonderfully picturesque straits panorama with its incomparable setting, Mackinac Island.

These facts are well known to the hundreds of thousands or millions who will be thronging to the two peninsulas this year. They know they are more than welcome, but a considerate hostess does not rest satisfied with the mere assumption her visitors know how glad she is to see them. She makes sure of it by extending at the door all the little courtesies that set her friends at ease and make them feel at home.

In much the same spirit the State highway department has decided to give tourists at least a signboard welcome to Michigan when they arrive at the State lines. As a result of the new friendly policy of the department, "Welcome to Michigan" signs will be erected at the State borders along 20 major trunkline highways. The signs will carry a replica of the Mackinac Bridge to incite tourist in-

terest, and they will be reflectorized for nighttime visibility. They will be constructed in such a way as to make possible the publicizing of special events through the use of an interchangeable panel.

This is, of course, just good business, but it's also a great deal more than that. Our tourist and resort interests should be among the chief beneficiaries, but that was not the principal consideration in the minds of those who proposed and adopted the plan. They wanted to show, rather, that Michigan is a friendly State, one that seeks to give its guests at the borders an indication of the ginuine hospitality that awaits them during their stay, be it brief or extended, among us.

Near East Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, 1948, I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my views regarding a recovery plan for Palestine, stating that it was incumbent upon us as Americans to preserve peace in that area. Note, this was said before the new State of Israel was established.

Ten years later, almost to the day, Drew Pearson has written an article voicing the responsibility of the Christian and Moslem world to maintain peace in the Holy Land.

My article of May 10, 1948, and Drew Pearson's article which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 7, 1958, follow:

A RECOVERY PLAN FOR PALESTINE

(Remarks of Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, in the House of Representatives, Monday, May 10, 1948)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my happy privilege to participate in a conference in this city which started on May 7 and concluded last night, designated as an Emergency Conference To Propose a United States Policy for Palestine and the Middle East.

The conference was summoned by Senators Charles W. Tobey, Wayne Morse, and Dennis Chavez. Among its sponsors were many of our most outstanding citizens who came to Washington from all parts of the country for this purpose. Partisan politics had no part in its makeup or in its deliberations. The results of its activities will be released on Wednesday. At its concluding session I said to the conference:

"A REHABILITATION PROGRAM FOR THE MIDDLE EAST

"This conference has been called primarily to deal with an emergency which will be upon us with its full force in a matter of hours, if it is not actually upon us at this very moment.

"For many weeks I have been urging that the way to avert the grave consequences that can be seen by all except those who will not look, are some very simple expedients. They are:

"1. Announcement by our Government that as of May 16 it will recognize the Jewish state in Palestine and deal with it as a sovereign power; and

"2. Implement that recognition by treating with the new state as a sovereign, including lifting the embargo on arms as to it, and invoking economic sanctions against its aggressors.

"Without in any way lessening my position in that regard, permit me to take a few minutes to comment upon a rehabilitation program for the Middle East.

"In our efforts to propose specific actions to halt the bloodshed, warfare, and destruction in Palestine, we dare not ignore the underlying realities which caused this emergency and made possible this upheaval. We must go to the roots of the crisis if we are to achieve a stable and lasting peace in the whole troubled area of the Middle East.

"By underlying realities, I mean the economic conditions of the region—the level of economic development, the type of economy, the standard of living, the extent of industrialization, and related problems. A survey of the economic conditions of the Middle East brings sharply into focus a single basic fact: With the exception of the Jewish areas of Palestine, all the countries of the Middle East suffer from extremely low standards of living and operate on an extremely low economic level.

"Predominantly agricultural, these countries have for centuries made no advance toward more efficient use of such resources as they have. Their methods of cultivation are the same as in Biblical times. Outmoded systems of land tenure have long since destroyed initiative among the rural populations. Inadequate irrigation and inefficient marketing systems result in low yields and much waste. The usual physiological factor accompanying such conditions is an increase of the population of the area. In the Middle East it is at the rate of 600,000 persons a year. This increase only aggravates the problem of existence, because natural and man-made limitations render it impossible to provide for the minimum needs of the people.

"Accordingly we find that disease, ignorance, and poverty afflict the vast majority of the peoples.

"The impact of the industrial revolution has already caused the almost complete decay of handicraft skills. The modern skills have not begun to take their proper place in their economy.

"What are the dangers for us and for the world inherent in such conditions?

"Until adequate steps are taken to improve the substandard conditions of life in this area, there can be no hope of peaceful stability or social and political progress. What we have learned to be true of Europe in this respect is tenfold more true in the Middle East. If we hope to reduce the threat of communism in that strategic area, we will have to set about providing for its development toward a better balanced, more self-sufficient economy capable of offering the downtrodden populations a relatively decent standard of living. We can work no miracles in a short space of time; too many centuries of neglect and disintegration lie behind the present stagnation.

"We can make an important beginning. We can help the people of that region to help themselves—a principle to which our Government has committed itself and undertaken to implement in the case of Europe. How much more critical are the needs of the Middle East? Regardless of what brought the condition about, when we recognize it, we must agree to improve it.

"We must offer to support a program for the greater use of already existing resources and for the diversification of production, both agricultural and industrial. In return for our technical and financial assistance, we must expect the willing cooperation of the governments whose countries benefit.

"Palestine provides a striking example of how the economic potential of the area—meager, sparse, and difficult to exploit as it appears at first glance—can be effectively turned into economic abundance. In the past two decades the intensive application of western-type initiative, capital, and industry by the Jews has revitalized the Palestinian economy and pointed the way toward resurrection of the entire desert area between Egypt and India. The Jews have reclaimed the land and made gardens bloom where there were bleak wastelands. Between 1923 and 1942 the cultivable area of Palestine was almost doubled; capital investment has increased 21 fold and the number of industrial enterprises sevenfold.

"Any program for the economic development of the Middle East will have to take into account the experience of Palestine. Specific factors were at work there which made progress possible. The Jewish community has technical skills that are essential to expanding production. Its social institutions, educational system, and democratic political structure are unique in the Middle East. They need not remain so. They must not remain so. They must be made the universal pattern of progress there.

"The economic developments in Palestine will affect the development of its neighbors. Their economies can complement one another in the interest of material progress for the whole region.

"This conference will not have done a complete job unless it goes on record as recommending that the United States call upon the Middle Eastern countries to convene for the purpose of drafting a plan for the economic development of the Middle East—an ERP, or, in this case, an MERP, a Middle East rehabilitation plan.

"Certain conditions should be attached to any United States loans and grants provided to finance such a program.

"First. Peaceful relations must be established among all the countries, including, of course, Palestine. The only area where there are the technical skills and the industrial potential available to begin the regional development is Palestine.

"Second. An economic union providing for the coordination of material resources and waterpower (especially of the Jordan Valley) among the Middle East countries.

"Third. Political and social reforms to permit the elevation of depressed populations of the area so that they may participate as healthy, literate, and civilized human beings in the regeneration of their region.

"The reasons which led our country to adopt the European recovery program apply with far greater force to the establishment of a Middle East recovery program. Such a project must be an integral part of any long-term planning looking toward permanent elimination of the turbulence spreading through that region.

"I join with you in praying for peace in Jerusalem, peace in Palestine, peace in all the world."

NEAR EAST PEACE CHRISTIANS' DUTY

(By Drew Pearson)

The little State of Israel, now celebrating her 10th birthday, has accomplished miracles but faces grave problems ahead. These problems are not hers alone. They are the problems of the rest of the world from three points of view.

From a materialistic point of view, the problem of Arabian oil is vital to the West. Upon it depends the industry of France, England, and Western Europe.

From the point of view of peace, the Near East is the boiling pot most likely to erupt in war. It has erupted twice since VE-day.

From the humantarian point of view, we of the Christian world—even the Moslem world—have a moral obligation for the murder of 6 million Jews in Germany. Our minimum obligation is to ensure the Jews peace in the ancient land of their forefathers.

Most people have forgotten that it was during Hitler that anti-Jewish hatred was planted in the Arab world. Looking through the file of my old columns I find that on August 25, 1946, I published the secret testimony of Walter Schellenberg, chief of Hitler's SS foreign espionage, in which he told United States examiners how he had been ordered by Himmler in 1942 to pay the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem to stir up anti-Jewish prejudice. A flat $250,000 was paid by Hitler, $150,000 by Mussolini. Schellenberg further testified: "The mission carried along one-half hundredweight in gold coins, 20,000 in English pounds, and $10,000 in United States dollars."

OBLIGATION FOR PEACE

The public has also forgotten that Hitler's campaign of terror against the Jews started in 1933 and continued while we of the Christian world looked on, blasé and little concerned. We did nothing until other religions and other lands began to feel the imprint of his hate. And for at least a year after the war started, certain American diplomats tried to keep secret the gruesome reports which came into the State Department of Nazi concentration camps, the persecution, the starvation, the eventual transition to gas chambers and soap factories.

These are memories which we of the Christian world have forgotten. Jews can never forget. They constitute a reason why the rest of the world, including the Moslems (also descended from the Prophet Abraham), has a deep, unpaid obligation to the Jewish people.

The most complete way to make that restitution is to bring peace in the Near East. The Jews have already made great sacrifices to establish a homeland. What they need now is peace. Furthermore, we of the Christian world have an obligation to bring peace to that part of the world where He whose religious precepts we profess to follow first taught peace on earth, good will to men. We haven't followed it anywhere else in the world. We can begin at least where He taught.

From a monetary viewpoint, the Foreign Minister of Italy, Dr. Giuseppe Pella, suggested a constructive course toward peace when he conferred with John Foster Dulles in Washington last year. Pella recalled what most Americans have forgotten, that under the terms of the Marshall plan Western European nations soon must begin to pay off their Marshall plan loans. Pella proposed that this money be reinvested, jointly, to reconstruct and stabilize the Near East.

Mediterranean nations could join the United States in building irrigation projects and other public works to help both the Arab States and Israel to realize their interdependence, break down the barriers of prejudice, and bring peace.

THE TRUMAN PLAN

This is part of the idea Harry Truman was working on when he left the White House. Foreign Minister Pella would also extend cooperative French-Italian-American reconstruction aid to the Arabs of North Africa where French-Algerian bitterness has so disrupted the world.

Basically the two ideas are identical—the idea of outside nations cooperating with Near Eastern nations to get them in the habit of working together.

"Back in the days of the Greek and Roman Empires 60 million people lived in this area," Mr. Truman once told me. "Now there are about 25 million—all because of war, suspicion, and the destruction of the great irrigation works on the Tigris and the Euphrates."

NATO Trend at Copenhagen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an article entitled "NATO Trend at Copenhagen" by Constantine Brown which appeared in the May 6 edition of the Washington Evening Star.

NATO TREND AT COPENHAGEN

(By Constantine Brown)

Reports from Copenhagen where the NATO foreign ministers are meeting seem to indicate that the moral diplomatic victory obtained by the United States as a result of Russian's veto of our Arctic inspection proposal has been short-lived.

When the Russians cast their 83d veto, American and foreign diplomats in Washington were in an optimistic mood. This, they said, shows clearly to the rest of the world the ultimate aggressive objectives of the Soviet Union. It would prove henceforth clearly to our European allies that the Khrushchev proposals for a summit meeting are nothing more than a cheap propaganda gimmick.

The private talks held by Secretary of State Dulles with his British colleague, Selwyn Lloyd, and other foreign ministers have been disappointing, according to some reports. The desire to push us into a meeting with the Soviet dictator appears as strong as it was last winter in Paris when President Eisenhower was pressured into accepting the offer of "Stalin II."

At Paris we insisted on some safety clauses. These were preliminary talks at the ambassadors' level of the four powers directly concerned with the relaxation of tension, to be followed by a big four foreign ministers conference only after these meetings had shown concrete results and established a definite area of understanding were the heads of state to meet.

It appears the Russians want now to extend the big four meetings to include, at least at the foreign ministers conference, a number of satellites and so-called neutralists from Eastern Europe, the Middle East and, some believe, from the Far East. To our surprise, the British seem inclined to accept the Soviet thesis.

The British feel that since the present talks are intended to reduce tensions in so many parts of the globe there is no valid reason why other foreign ministers besides those of the big four should not participate at a powwow. As a matter of fact, the British Government—itself under Laborite pressure—would have favored the parity demanded by Foreign Minister Gromyko and agreed to participation of the Polish and Czechoslovak ambassadors at the meetings which are now going on in Moscow.

The NATO foreign ministers are reported to have assured Mr. Dulles of the full backing of their respective countries at the summit meeting. This encouraging declaration through former Belgian Prime Minister Paul-Henri Spaak (now secretary general of the organization) shows that the pressure for a meeting of the heads of state of the principal powers continues as in the past.

After the demonstration of bad faith and truculence by the Soviet Union, most observers, including Mr. Dulles, believed that a summit meeting would be indefinitely postponed—at least until Premier Krushchev provided some positive deeds in support of his demands for relaxation. Mr. Dulles expected to find that type of atmosphere in Copenhagen. But he is reported to have been surprised at the attitude of most of his colleagues who represent the political climate in their respective countries. They all assured him that the NATO ideological unity would be greater than in the past. But in the meantime, they said, their people still wanted a summit parley. This was not practicable this year, but maybe in 1959 it would offer a better chance.

Most of our West European allies are said to want their own foreign ministers to attend the second phase of the summit preliminaries. They want to be in a position to give an indirect mandate to American, British, and French heads of states when they meet Krushchev.

Few, if any, West European statesmen have any doubt that the Soviet proposal is anything but a phony diplomatic maneuver. But all of them are scared because of the alleged Soviet military power, particularly in nonconventional weapons. They see in the missile sites established in Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary a more direct threat to themselves than to the United States. Hence, their eagerness to accept even a phony relaxation by means of a summit meeting.

Public Reaction to Tax Cut Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of April 20, 1958, contained two articles on the public reaction to tax cut proposals. The first was a Minnesota poll and the second was a Gallup poll.

The Minnesota poll seemed to show a strong preference for public works projects over Federal tax cuts, although the framers of the question forced a choice between these suggestions while many people would combine them.

The Gallup poll showed national opinion almost equally divided between a tax cut and public works.

I believe the comparisons are interesting and instructive, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of these articles from the Minneapolis Tribune be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOES JOHN Q. PUBLIC WANT TAX CUT?—STATE VOTERS PREFER WORKS PLAN OVER OTHER BUSINESS BOOST AIDS

A Federal works program will do more to improve business in the United States during the next year than will a 10-percent Federal tax cut or an increase in military spending,

2 out of every 5 Minnesota men and women believe.

Public works also are rated ahead of high price supports for farm products and increased foreign trade, as a means of giving a lift to the national economy.

These are findings in a statewide survey by the Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota poll, based on personal interviews with a cross section sample of voting-age men and women.

The survey also indicates that:

Sixty-seven percent of the people are in favor of calling a special session of the State legislature if there is widespread unemployment in the State later this spring.

Thirty-two percent think the Eisenhower administration is doing a good job of dealing with the business recession, 36 percent term it fair, and 24 percent call it poor.

One of the questions interviewers asked was this:

"A number of suggestions have been made in recent weeks on ways to improve business in the United States. Of the five ideas on this card, which one do you think would do the most good in the next year?"

Each respondent was handed a card listing the five proposals:

	Percent
Start Federal works projects to create jobs for the unemployed	40
Increase our trade with other countries	18
Cut Federal taxes 10 percent for everyone	16
Maintain high support prices on farm products	16
Increase our defense and military spending	5
Other answers	2
No opinion	3
Total	100

A few persons think there should be combinations of the choices, like high farm price supports and a tax cut. Several think we should cut down on foreign aid, or quit spending.

City and town people throughout the State make public works their No. 1 choice. Farm people put high price supports in first place.

Another question was:

"If a large number of Minnesota people are out of work later this spring, do you think it would be a good idea or a poor idea to have the State legislature called into special session to deal with the problem?"

The replies:

[In percent]

	Total	Men	Women
Good idea	67	64	71
Poor idea	19	23	15
Other answers	1	1	1
No opinion	13	12	13
Total	100	100	100

The idea of a special session, if there is substantial unemployment in the State later this spring, has the backing of large majorities in all major segments of the population.

For the most part, they say either that the legislature could "set up State public works projects," or that "something would have to be done."

People who consider a special legislative session a poor idea believe that the legislature would be unable to act promptly enough, or say "it's a problem for the Federal Government," or that it would lead to increased taxes. A few say, "The situation isn't that bad."

Before inquiring about public views on a legislative session, interviewers asked:

"In general, would you say the Eisenhower administration is doing a good, fair, or poor job of dealing with the slowdown in business?"

The answers:

[In percent]

	Total	Men	Women
Good job	32	29	36
Fair job	36	35	37
Poor job	24	28	19
Other answers	(1)	1	(1)
No opinion	8	7	8
Total	100	100	100

[1] Less than 1 percent.

Sixty percent of the Republican voters in the sample, and 50 percent of the college educated men and women, say they think the administration is doing a good job. But 42 percent of the Democratic-Farmer-Laborites call the administration's performance "poor", a view shared by 29 percent of the farm residents.

Persons labeling the administration's work "fair" or "poor" in dealing with the recession were asked:

"What do you think the administration should be doing?"

The replies fall chiefly in these categories:

1. Start public works; create jobs.
2. Cut taxes.
3. Help the farmer.
4. Act more promptly; "they're too slow."
5. Establish price controls; cut prices.
6. Cut down on foreign trade.

But 3 percent said they believe nothing much can be done, and another 6 percent had no suggestions.

GALLUP FINDS NATION FAVORS PUBLIC WORKS AS "SHOT IN ARM"

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J.—As politicians and economists argue the relative merits of tax cuts and increased Government spending, one question remains which only the consumers can answer—what would they do with a tax rebate if they got it?

The first of two special reports on the recession's impact shows these highlights:

1. If the Government returned part of the money paid in income tax this year, about 3 out of 4 tax dollars returned would find their way back into circulation—the hoped-for reaction by economists. The remainder would be saved or invested.

2. The public, however, is basically cool toward the idea of a tax cut. Although people feel strongly that the Government will have to take some action on the current business slump, they prefer public works to tax refunds as a Government "shot in the arm."

Americans do not feel that conditions will get better naturally with time. Views on this, however, vary by the kind of work one does, the region of the country he lives in and the amount of education he has.

As the business downturn continued to dominate Washington conversation, 162 experienced reporters from the institute's field staff were out talking to the people of America—asking housewives and workers, farmers and executives what they would do if Uncle Sam were to return some of the tax bite he took this year.

Their assignment was to ring doorbells, to get at the grassroots sentiment in all sections of the country. They asked the question:

"If the Government gave you back one-fifth of the money you pay in income tax, what would you do with the money?"

From a Montana Creek, Ala., miner who said he would buy whisky with it, to a Pulaski, Wis., farmer who would purchase a new manure spreader, the answers Gallop poll reporters got from voters fall into these general categories:

	Percent
Would buy something which otherwise would not buy	36
Would pay debts	22
Would save it	18
Would use it for normal living costs	11
Would invest it	7
Don't know	6

To get voter reaction to the Government's position in the recession, Gallop poll next asked these two questions of voters from coast to coast:

"Do you think conditions will get better naturally with time, or do you think the Government will have to take action?"

The views of all voters:

	Percent
It will get better with time	35
Government will have to take action	54
No opinion	11

"If the Government does take action to improve the business situation of the country, which of these two plans would you prefer—an income-tax reduction for all taxpayers and businesses, or Government spending for public works?"

The vote:

	Percent
Tax cut	41
Public works	46
No opinion	13

Analysis of the question of Government action reveals that although all groups feel the Government will have to step in, the greatest sympathy for letting time take its course is found in the Midwest, among college-trained people, and among business and professional people.

Michigan Is Vacation Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, this is Michigan Week. For the fifth consecutive year we are engaged in this observance and Michigan is the only State in the Nation to celebrate such an event. During this week we endeavor to publicize to the Nation and to the world the human, natural, recreational, and economic resources of our State.

Today as one phase of this Michigan Week observance, I would like to call attention to our great recreational resources. The 10th Congressional District, which I represent, is in the very heart of the recreational area of our State. Within the 10th district are many miles of trout streams, hundreds of beautiful inland lakes thriving with fish, thousands of acres of hunting territory, and many miles of the crystal-clear waters of Lake Huron.

Michigan's tourist attractions are enumerated in the current issue of the magazine Inside Michigan in an article entitled "Michigan's Vacation Land."

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to our Michigan water won-

derland and invite you to join us for your vacation this year. The article follows:

MICHIGAN IS VACATION LAND

Approximately 9 million persons will vacation in Michigan this year. That is the estimate of the Michigan Tourist Council and it means that the tourist industry is a very important segment of Michigan's economy. In fact tourist expenditures in Michigan every year are about $600 million.

Michigan is the fourth most popular State in the United States among vacationers. With its burgeoning winter sports business it is becoming a 12-month vacation State and it can be expected that the number of vacationers will increase steadily. Another factor that foretells future growth is the opening of the Mackinac Bridge providing easier access to many potential vacation areas in the upper peninsula.

A recent survey by the Michigan State University Bureau of Business and Economic Research gives a good idea of how people enjoy themselves in Michigan when they are on vacation. The data was tabulated from 10,000 questionnaires sent to persons selected at random from the 75,370 responses to tourist council vacation advertising in 1957.

What do people do when they come to Michigan? Fifty-seven percent said they come for sightseeing, scenery, and to visit historic and other interesting places. One out of five come for swimming and other water sports. Fishing is the major attraction for another 23 percent. Camping draws 7 percent, hunting 3 percent, and hiking 1 percent. Twenty-two percent of those answering admitted they vacationed in Michigan just for quiet relaxation.

Mr. Average Vacationer was found to be a family man who is likely to travel in a party of four. The average stay is 11.7 days and the average vacation expenditure is $217. The odds are that he and his family have vacationed in Michigan before, since 70 percent reported that 1957 was not the first they had vacationed in Michigan and 28 percent said they were new customers. Almost a third said they made more than one trip in the Wolverine State in 1957.

About a third of the vactioners said their home was in Michigan and 40 percent came from the surrounding States of Indiana, Ohio, Illinois and Wisconsin. Other States which have many residents visiting Michigan include New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and the plains States of Minnesota, the Dakotas, Kansas, and Missouri. About half of the visitors remained on the move while in Michigan and the other half tended to stay in one place.

August is the most popular month for vacations with July, June, and September ranking behind in that order.

Let's take a closer look at what Michigan has to offer the vacationer. Water is, of course, the chief attraction because Michigan has so much of it. There are 40,000 square miles of lake surface and no point in Michigan is more than 85 miles from one of the Great Lakes. It has more than 3,000 miles of shoreline and 11,000 inland lakes. It has wide sandy beaches and even sand dunes. For those who just like to watch the boats pass by, the Detroit River and the locks at Sault Ste. Marie are the busiest waterways in the world.

Michigan has a romantic past and there are historic sites to visit in almost every county. An outstanding attraction, for example, is Dearborn's Greenfield Village which is one of the most popular tourist meccas in the country.

Tourists are welcome to visit the vast auto plants scattered throughout the State and the chemical centers are also interesting attractions.

There are 36,000 miles of fishable rivers, upland game country and resorts to suit every taste and purse. There are some 350 summer camps in the State. Fifty-seven State parks, thousands of roadside tables, and 90,000 miles of excellent highways bid welcome to all travelers.

Vacationers can visit the wonderful dunes country along Lake Michigan, the breathtaking beauty of the Grand Traverse and Leelanau Peninsula regions, the fruit-growing centers all along the west coast, the Thunder Bay country near Alpena, and the Lumbermen's Memorial along the Au Sable River.

Southwestern Michigan with its proximity to Chicago is among the most popular vacation areas. And well it might be with its miles of Lake Michigan beaches, interesting cities, and many historic landmarks. Southeastern Michigan, in addition to fabulous Detroit, has outstanding attractions in the academy at Cranbrook and the University of Michigan. The rich Saginaw Valley area, the many points of interest in Michigan's thumb, the center of the State with Michigan State University and the State Capitol and the Grand Rapids area with its industry and tourist attractions are all spots that might be on any tourist's itinerary with profit.

Hundreds of resorts, cottages, motels, and hotels are available for overnight or extended stays. Michigan has gone all out to make vacationing in Michigan an enjoyable experience. And few people can say they have seen it all after one visit. There is too much variety for that.

First Synagogue Has Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN H. MAY, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, it was a great privilege to attend the dedication ceremonies of Temple Beth Tefilah in East Hartford, Conn., Sunday, May 4, 1958.

It was a most impressive ceremony, symbolic of the great and continued growth of religion in our country. I felt that this occasion deserved recognition by recording the event in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The development of the first synagogue in East Hartford, Conn., is very appropriately described in the following write-up in the Hartford Times.

FIRST SYNAGOGUE HAS DEDICATION

There have been people of the Jewish faith in East Hartford for nearly all of its entire 75-year history, but there has never been a formal synagogue in town until today.

Religious dignitaries of all faiths and civic leaders are attending the dedication of Temple Beth Tefilah this afternoon. Located at Rector and Bigelow Streets, the temple is the fulfillment of 4 years renovation, 10 years of searching and planning, and more than a century of yearning by those of the Jewish faith for a permanent home of worship.

Temple Beth Tefilah is the former Center Methodist Church. It was acquired 4 years ago by the East Hartford Jewish Community Center, composed of 65 persons, who now make up the congregation of the new temple.

Much of the form of the 85-year-old church has been preserved in the renovated structure, including the oak-stained pews and the varnished paneling. The seating arrangement, common to many New England churches and found also in many synagogues, remains unchanged.

Behind the altar, however, is the traditional ark, which contains the Torahs, the scrolls read at the Sabbath and holiday services. Two graceful menorahes, six-pronged candelabra, flank the altar. The exterior of the temple has received a recent coat of white paint and a new slanting roof. An ornate Star of David at the entrance signifies it is a temple.

The rough work of clearing and preparing interior and exterior of the temple was done mostly by the congregation, on weekends or nights. Once funds began to accumulate, professional craftsmen took over.

Besides the sanctuary, there are offices for a rabbi, yet to be named, and an entire downstairs vestry. The vestry has been in use for some time now, for social functions and for Sunday and Hebrew schools. A completely equipped kitchen was recently installed.

Attending the dedication this afternoon is Town Council President John Torpey, Representative Edwin H. May, Jr., the Reverend Roger S. Nicholson, representing the East Hartford Council of Churches, and many other notables.

Benjamin Goldfarb is president of the Jewish Community Center, which has been in existence for nearly 10 years.

Dedication committee follows: Chairmen Jack Kaplan and Mrs. Milton Faiman; program, Mr. Faiman and Everett Kaplan; invitations, Mrs. Murray Gottfried; publicity, Sidney Maiofes; refreshments, Mrs. Morris Blicht; head usher, David Schwartz; flowers, Mrs. William Nemirow; and building and maintenance, Louis Boxer.

Liberty—Whither Goest Thou?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a well-prepared address, Liberty—Whither Goest Thou? delivered by Dwight B. MacCormack, of Boston, Mass., to the student body of Bethany College, in commemoration of Armistice Day, on November 14, 1957:

LIBERTY—WHITHER GOEST THOU?

(Address delivered to the student body of Bethany College, November 14, 1957, in commemoration of Armistice Day, by Dwight B. MacCormack, Esq., of Boston, Mass.)

Today Bethany College is extending to me a very great privilege—the privilege of imparting to you some thoughts pertaining to the meaning of liberty and freedom.

As the father of a son who was graduated recently from this fine, old institution of learning, I am very happy to be here. It has now been some years since I taught law, and, therefore, some time since I have been on the inside of an institution of higher learning looking out, instead of on the outside looking in.

Whatever I may say to you, and however I may say it, I hope you will understand that my thoughts as expressed today are not my final thoughts. There are few things in life that are final, and so little that is

infallible. I am reminded of some words once uttered by a Justice of the United States Supreme Court while referring to the work of the Court: "We are not final because we are infallible, but infallible because we are final." None of us is infallible. I know from history that the decisions of our Supreme Court are not always final and not always infallible.

I suppose—because of the habits I have amassed through the years as a lawyer—I may be pleading a cause as the true advocate, because I do believe very deeply in the freedom and liberty of each person as an individual human being. However, my purpose this morning, in speaking to you, is centered upon the hope that what I say may be of sufficient interest to awaken in your young and fertile minds an academic curiosity, so that you will search for the answers to these questions:

"What is freedom?" "Liberty—Whither goest thou?" If there are sufficient numbers of each generation who will seek the answers to these questions, the future of democracy in America wil be more secure than it at present appears to many that it will be.

On November 11, 1918, I marched through the streets of Amherst, Mass., in uniform, to celebrate the end of World War I and the first Armistice Day. It was a few weeks before that day that I had entered Amherst College as a freshman. In those days the war being fought "to make the world safe for democracy" was being waged with grotesque ferocity. The Government had taken over the colleges as training centers for the future officers of our citizen army. These training centers were called the Students Army Training Corps and popularly referred to as the SATC. Too young to be inducted into the military service, but because I had entered college in the ordinary course of events as a freshman, the military authorities regimented me, along with a number of others in my category, into a special company of our own. They had to do something with us. We were issued uniforms of a kind, armed with wooden guns, put under the pseudoauthority of army lieutenants and herded into barracks quite far removed from those who had been formally inducted into the service. Soon—by dint of youthful enterprise—our company earned the unique title of the "Yellow Belly Brigade of the Saturday Afternoon Tea Club."

I know that others like myself on that first Armistice Day, as we paraded through the town, really believed that the world had been made safe for democracy. The forces of democracy had prevailed, our liberty was preserved and we were free to continue our lives under a government established to secure our safety and happiness, to maintain our unalienable rights, and to secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity.

It was nearly 36 years later that I awakened one July morning, and, for the first time in my life, asked myself seriously: "What is the real meaning of our liberty and freedom?" I had received in the morning's mail an invitation from a legal periodical of one of our law schools to write an article. At the time I was enjoying the comfort and luxury of life on a lake in Maine and my thoughts naturally gravitated toward those things which had made my comfort possible. For almost 36 years since the first Armistice Day, I had been going about my daily work, accepting life as it came to me, experiencing my joys and suffering my sorrows. I knew—because World War II and the Korean conflict had come and gone—that the world had in fact been made safe for democracy in 1918 only for the time being. I knew that our political, our economic and our social life had been constantly changing down through the years that have led us into the atomic age, but I did not realize fully that there had been taking place a constant, a persistent, a positive changing content in the meaning of individual freedom and the rights of man—for the safety and security of which our Founding Fathers had created our democratic form of government.

The great English teacher of history, Lord Acton, so it has been said, wanted to write a history of liberty, but found the task too great for one man. That is easy to understand, because the subject matter is inexhaustible.

It is not very important what my thoughts may be on the meaning of our liberty and freedom, but it is very important how the undergraduates in our colleges think and what they believe upon the subject.

In a book entitled "Changing Values in College," scheduled for publication last month, Prof. Philip E. Jacobs of the University of Pennsylvania has analyzed 200 studies of student beliefs. I understand yours is a conservative generation and that your trend toward conservatism maintains that Government should have a very minimal role in running the economic life of America, because the welfare state tends to destroy the initiative of the individual person. I hope that this is a true estimate of your attitude of mind because the welfare state by the very nature of its patterns does in fact destroy the freedom and dignity of individual man. Only by implanting in your minds and in the minds of others of your generation the true concepts of human freedom and individual dignity can we hope to preserve the American tradition. Do not wait 36 years before you are awakened and seek an appraisal of the meaning of our freedoms. The price of liberty is eternal struggle and eternal vigilance and the price must be paid by each succeeding generation.

"Liberty" and "freedom" are equivalent and correlative terms. Without one there is not the other. Search the great works of history and philosophy and you will not find a satisfactory definition of either. Liberty and freedom have meant different things to different peoples, in different places, in different ages—or to the same people in different times.

In 1864 Lincoln said:

"The world has never had a good definition of the word 'liberty', and the American people, just now, are much in want of one. We all declare for liberty, but in using the same word we do not all mean the same thing. With some the word 'liberty' may mean for each man to do as he pleases with himself, and the product of his labor; while with others the same word may mean for some men to do as they please with other men, and the product of other men's labor. Here are two, not only different, but incompatible things, called by the same name, liberty. And it follows that each of the things is, by the respective parties, called by two different and incompatible names—liberty and tyranny."

Under each and every government which is not democratic in form, it is the government which possesses the rights and it is the subjects who owe the duties. Under a democracy such as ours—on the other hand, it is the people who posses the rights and it is the government which owes the people the duties.

It was the writings of Locke which so strongly influenced the thinking of the Founding Fathers. It was his philosophy which found its way into the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. According to Locke, before there was government, all men lived naturally and equally in a state of perfect freedom. Each man exercised his own separate and individual will and was in no manner dependent upon the will of any other man. He was subject only to the law of nature. The law of nature was reason, which teaches all men that they are born equal and independent. As Locke said: "No one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty or possessions."

However, by the nature of things the enjoyment of such liberty was uncertain and insecure. Therefore, to make the enjoyment of liberty certain and secure, man created government, but the powers given to government were held in trust for the benefit of the donors. The government had only fiduciary duties, according to the compact it entered into with the men who created it.

Perfect freedom means absolute liberty. In Locke's state of nature, man did not have perfect freedom. He was unable to enjoy absolute liberty because of the transgressions of those who defied the law of nature. All governments are engaged in the practice of restraints. The more restraints government imposes, therefore, the fewer the freedoms. So, neither in Locke's original state of nature, nor under government, is there perfect liberty or absolute freedom. The liberty of man can exist only in something less than the absolute, and freedom will be something less than perfect. To put it another way—the extent of liberty man will enjoy under government will be greater or less in proportion to the amount of freedom he surrenders to government, or the amount of liberty government will deprive him of by its restraints upon his freedoms. Each restraint by government is one more deprivation of freedom and consequently one more step toward tyranny.

The great difficulty man has always had in his fight for his rights is to understand the difference between liberty and tyranny. The meaning of liberty may be abstract, but the enjoyment of freedom is a very realistic experience. Lord Acton has said: "Liberty is not a means to a higher political end. It is itself the highest political end." Liberty, therefore, is the ideal to which man in all his dignity aspires. He will aspire to realize perfect freedom and absolute liberty, knowing that to obtain the same is impossible in this world. In his aspirations he must be able to distinguish between the ideal that is false and the ideal that is true. To aspire to ideals that are false, provided there are enough of them, will lead not to liberty, but to tyranny. History is replete with the experiences of man to prove this. I will give but one example. The ideals of Marx are the foundation upon which communism has been built.

It is necessary that each individual participate in the functions of government. If all of us share in the duties of government, the greater will be the chance that our true ideals will give strength to our traditions and customs and lend strength to the generations to come. The trouble is, however, that there are too many of us today who find it more comfortable to let others do the work for us, because too many of us are indolent. Others are content to submit to the stronger wills of others, because that is the easy thing to do. This characteristic of man has been called deference. Men may fail to share their burdens because of their inclination to do as others do and feel as their neighbors feel. This is called sympathy. Men may fail to act because of the fear of asserting themselves against the strong or against a government gone wrong. Lastly, men may fail to act by reason by which they conclude that it is more practical to swim along with the tide of things and to submit to the popular trend. These five motives, indolence, deference, sympathy, fear, and reason, are the motives ascribed to man by which Bryce says governments are obeyed. If carried by sufficient numbers to excess, these characteristics also represent the five weaknesses of man which enable those with stronger wills to gain the power necessary to destroy our liberties, and to make government tyrannical.

In his volume entitled Liberty in the Modern State, Harold J. Laski began his treatise in words such as these:

"Liberty is essentially an absence of restraint."

This is a negative way of defining liberty. This tells us what must not be done in order that liberty may exist. Since Medieval times much of the liberty man has gained has been achieved through the removal of restraints. It is by such a process that the English constitution has grown.

Paine was of the opinion that in England there was no such thing as a constitution, because, beginning with William the Conqueror in 1066, the government was a tyranny founded on conquest, and what happened thereafter was: "The exertion of the nation at different periods to abate that tyranny and render it less intolerable."

Paine adds that Magna Carta was one of those acts of exertion by the people to compel government "to renounce part of its assumptions." Let us in America hope that the people will never again find it necessary to exert themselves in a way necessary to compel Government to renounce its assumptions except by the democratic process.

This negative concept that freedom is the absence of restraint is the fundamental basis of our American constitutionalism. The late Prof. Franz Neuman called this "juristic freedom" or "juridical liberty." Do not be critical of this negative aspect, because if you throw away this negative aspect of freedom and liberty there is nothing left but totalitarianism. By keeping this negative aspect of freedom in our form of government, we are able to maintain a balance between the constant struggle that is always waged in politics—the individual citizen versus the state. This is so, because politics by nature is the struggle for power. It is better that we maintain such a two-sided conflict than have no conflict at all, because where the state alone is paramount there is only tyranny. As long as government performs the functions for which it was created by "we the people" this contest of man versus the state is a healthy conflict.

Our daily life is not confined to its political aspects. There are freedoms other than "juridical freedoms" and rights other than political rights. There are, for example: (1) Personal rights, and (2) societal rights.

What are personal rights? They are those rights which belong to man as an individual. They are those rights which the individual possesses separate and apart from all other individuals and which are not dependent upon the individual's associations with others. Such, for example, is the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus under article I of the Constitution which guaranties, except in times of invasion or rebellion, that no person can be cast into prison and kept there without formal charges against him and without the benefit of a speedy trial. This human right was called by Professor Choffee the most important one in the Constitution. Other personal rights are such liberties as are set forth in the Bill of Rights by which we are secure in our persons, our homes, our papers and effects, and by which we are not subject to unreasonable searches and seizures in accordance with the fourth amendment; those rights by which we are entitled to a speedy and public trial, to have counsel and to be confronted by the witnesses against us in accordance with the sixth amendment; those rights which hold that in any criminal case no man shall be subjected to double jeopardy, nor compelled to be a witness against himself under the fifth amendment; those rights to a trial by jury under the seventh amendment and those rights which protect us from excessive bail and excessive fines under the eighth amendment. Such rights do not change with the ever-changing conditions of our social and economic life.

What are societal rights? They are those rights which man possesses as a member of society in his relations with other individuals. Such rights are the freedom of religion, the freedom of speech, freedom of the press and of peaceful assembly as set forth in the first amendment, and rights in property under the fifth amendment. These rights exist as long as they do not unreasonably interfere with the like rights of others.

Lord Bryce in his work on Modern Democracies has another way of describing our different rights. He states that there are four kinds of liberty: (1) Religious liberty; (2) political liberty; (3) civil liberty; and (4) individual liberty.

(1) Religious liberty is the "exemption from control of the expression of religious opinion and the practice of worship." This includes the manner of worship and the freedom of conscience.

(2) Political liberty is the "participation of the citizen in the government of the community."

(3) Civil liberty is the "exemption from control of the citizen in respect of his person and property." Civil liberty which is older than political liberty may exist without political liberty. Civil liberties are those liberties which were extracted from the King drop by drop.

(4) Individual liberty is the "exemption from control in matters which do not so plainly affect the welfare of the whole community as to render control necessary." Individual liberties are the most vague and most incapable of understanding. Every kind of individual liberty may be called a civil liberty.

As individual liberty consists in the exemption from legal control, so political liberty consists in the participation of control.

Man is both a private person and a public citizen at the same time. His interests as a private person in fact conflict with his interests as a public citizen. As a private person, he is an individual interested in his personal freedoms. As a public citizen, he participates with others in government and government deals in restraints. So, we have a conflict of man versus men. It is much easier for the collective wills of a group of men to overpower the will of one individual, or a group of individuals acting separately, than it is for one man to overcome the individual will of another individual. Thus, a majority, or a minority group well organized and acting in concert, is able to obtain from government legislation which will be favorable to the group as a group and oppressive to the minority, or unorganized majority.

The ability of a democracy such as ours to survive depends upon the treatment accorded the minority by the majority. A democracy cannot survive alone on the process, as Nietsche would say "of counting noses." The inability of our democracy to survive may be determined by the constant repetition of acts and attitudes of mind which favor only the interests of the majority, or which lay too much stress on the collective rights and security of mass groups. We have made errors in this direction. Some public officeholders, fearing disfavor, subject themselves to the influence of those who control large blocks of votes and of those who seek their own security to the absolute exclusion of others. As Lincoln might say, some would call such action "liberty," others would call it "tyranny."

In the Preamble of the Constitution we have a clause that pertains to man in the collective sense as a public citizen, namely, that the Constitution is established to "promote the general welfare". We have also the provision that applies to man as an individual person, namely that the Government is established to secure the blessings of liberty. The word "secure" means to safeguard, not to obtain, because we the people already possessed those blessings of liberty before our Government was established. These two provisions in the preamble are in some respects complimentary of each other, but in other respects they are mutually antagonistic, as time has proved to us they are. It is because of this natural antagonism between these two purposes of our Government that we are caught between the conflicting philosophies of those who believe primarily in States rights and the freedom of the individual on the one hand and those who believe in the socialism of the Welfare State on the other hand. By the provisions of article I, section 8, Congress has the power to lay and collect taxes to provide for the general welfare. That is a very great and specific power, which when exercised in the form of positive action has more appeal for law makers than engaging in the pursuit of the negative aspects of liberty. Congress has been exercising powers under this provision on a scale that defies the imagination, perception and understanding of any human being. As one wit has remarked: "It is a bit surprising that our ancestors worried so much about taxation without representation when we see the size of the taxation we get with representation."

We have said that the words "liberty" and "freedom" are equivalent and correlative terms. So, they are, but the Bill of Rights does not use them interchangeably. The first eight amendments say to the Central Government, "Thou shall not do these things", "You shall make no law for example, to deprive the people of the freedom of religion, the freedom of speech, the freedom of the press, the freedom of peaceable assembly, and the freedom of petition." But there are laws which regulate certain of these freedoms. The fifth amendment is the first provision of the Constitution in which the word "liberty" appears, except as that word is used in the preamble.

The Declaration of Independence declared:

"We hold these truths self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."

But the fifth amendment is a positive contradiction that such rights are in fact "unalienable", for it states that no person shall "be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law." By those words, and similar words in the 14th amendment, liberty is made the subject of restraint by government provided that the restraint is in accordance with due process of law. Anything that can be taken from us in any manner, whether it be by due process of law or by any other method cannot be unalienable.

Those who would call themselves realists would say that the words I have read from the Declaration of Independence only declare that such abstract rights of man exist and the mere declaration is not a guarantee of anything. Professor Beard in his provocative work The Republic has written:

"Rights are not established or imposed by proclamation. Proclamations and institutions merely help to define, enlarge and sustain them. Yet, if these rights are not deeply rooted in the theories, customs, sentiments and practices of the people, paper assertions are like chaff in the wind."

Let us add to this the words of Lord Acton that all freedom has been won on:

"The doctrine of national tradition and the doctrine of the higher law; * * * the principle that all political authorities must be tested and reformed according to a code which was not made by man."

Cicero believed there was a higher law and maintained that any manmade law which violated the higher law was not law, and therefore, void. Our Founding Fathers

believed in this higher law, but such a doctrine is no longer part of the public concern. Even the doctrine of national tradition has lost much of its former fortitude.

Possibly you have noticed that in speaking of liberty I have said nothing about equality. Never before in history has there been a land in which there has been so much equality, but it is from our misunderstandings of what equality means that we have made most of our errors under our democratic process. As we can never possess perfect liberty, so we can never enjoy perfect equality. As there are different kinds of liberty, so there are different kinds of equality, such as political equality, civil equality, social equality, and natural equality. But equality and liberty are not equivalent and correlative terms. When Hamilton was arguing on the floor of the Philadelphia Convention, he remarked:

"An inequality would exist as long as liberty existed, and that it would unavoidably result from that very liberty itself."

Political equality of our citizens is necessary. Civil equality is not the same thing as political equality. The matter of natural equality belongs to the Creator and He has made no two of us alike in mind, in character, in conscience, in ability, or in fortune. As Perry Como has been crooning of late:

"Some people are born to be doctors
Others are born to be lumberjacks
Some people are born just to take life easy
Others are born to break their backs."

As to the matter of social equality, it seems to me that that must come out of the consciences of the people, from the moral and ethical customs and practices of our Nation. We are reminded by the failure of the 18th amendment that one cannot legislate the morals or ethics of a people. The 18th amendment certainly was one proclamation that was life chaff in the wind. We called that the great experiment. We should not forget the lessons it taught us.

The ninth amendment has been called the forgotten amendment. It provides:

"The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

It seems clear enough, but what does it mean? No decision of the United States Supreme Court has told us. Such rights referred to as having been retained by the people refer to the personal rights of man—not to man's public rights, or his interests as a political person. This must be so, because, if it were not so, the ninth amendment would not have been put into the Bill of Rights. Being there, it should not be construed in any manner other than as a restraint upon the Federal Government against the attempted exercise of promoting the general welfare when such exercise of its powers will deny or disparage those rights retained by the people.

Let us hope that the ninth amendment will never be used in such a manner that it will give aid and comfort to those who would have us march towards absolue socialism, for beyond absolute socialism there is only totalitarianism and communism.

The fear of absolute socialism is not hysterical. Communism describes itself as democracy. Rousseau as an exponent of democracy advanced the theory of the general will. The English Utilitarians advocated the principle of "the greatest good for the greatest number." Communism is the exponent of the general will in which the minority has no rights. He who in his actions and even in his thoughts is not loyal to the government is not to be tolerated. The Communist theory of government—brazenly but erroneously referred to by Communists as a democracy is that of one party mass rule, mass civilization and a so-called mass democracy. The Communist theory of government is contrary to our traditions, to our beliefs in the purposes of government and the end of law, as well as being contrary to our Christian religion. The term "mass democracy" is a self-contradictory term. The words "mass" and "democracy" do not belong together in America.

Today in America we have moved toward the interests of the masses. It is ironical to think that the very masses for whose safety and happiness our Government was created may be the cause of the destruction of our individual liberties. Mass production has changed not only the quality of our products and our economy, but the quality of our thinking as well. Everything today is bigger and getting bigger. We have giant corporations, giant unions, giant Government, and giant taxes. It has become difficult for many to think in such small terms as "the rights of the individual person." We have been going through a metamorphosis from rugged individualism toward a state of existence which some have called by that hideous appellation, mass democracy.

The dangers to our blessings of liberty lie in the determination of how far we are destined to move away from the free individualism of our forefathers and how far we will move toward a mass democracy which concerns itself only with the general will—and nothing else.

I believe it is high time for us to determine anew the things that belong to Caesar and the things that belong to God.

This morning I have exercised what your Dr. Robinson [1] has described as a primordial natural right, namely, the right to be wise. Mind you, I am not saying that I am wise. I say only that I have exercised my right to be wise. Let me read something Dr. Robinson has set forth in his Crucial Issues in Philosophy, chapter 15:

"The right to be wise implies the right to do independent and critical thinking on any problem or question that may arise during one's conscious life span. Wisdom, then, may be said to begin with the exercise of one's capacity to do reflective or critical thinking."

I commend these words of wisdom to you. Exercise your right to be wise. Do not wait 36 years before you seek the answers to 1 of the great problems of our day.

"Liberty: Whither goest thou?"

[1] Daniel S. Robinson, Ph. D., Litt. D., LL. D., director, Emeritus, School of Philosophy of the University of California, distinguished service professor at Bethany College, Bethany, W. Va., on the John Hay Whitney Foundation.

Alcoholic Beverage Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of some fine people, who are constituents of mine, I am extending in the RECORD a resolution which the Lewis County WCTU has passed. Believing that the RECORD in a way is a forum for opinions in this country, I am sure the Members will be glad to read it:

DEAR LAWMAKER: In view of the increasing difficulty experienced by parents in educating their children on the problems of alcohol because of the competition from the glamorous alcoholic beverage advertising appealing to young people and even to children, especially over the radio and television.

Resolved, That we call upon our representatives in both Houses of Congress to seriously consider whether it is for the good of the Nation to permit this competition which ignores the basic fact that alcohol is potentially dangerous both physically and socially, and ask them to aid the efforts of the home, the school, and the church by passing the Langer (S. 582) and Siler (H. R. 4835) bills now before them for consideration.

The Lewis County WCTU representing many citizens, respectfully ask your support of the above bills.

MRS. DULCIE HILL, *President.*
MRS. GLADYS DOBSON, *Secretary.*

Common Pleas Courts of Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Stroudsburg Daily Record, Stroudsburg, Pa., of May 3, 1958:

COMMON PLEAS COURTS OF RECORD
(By Hon. Chester H. Rhodes, President judge, Pennsylvania Superior Court)
(Last of four articles)

In Philadelphia County there are 7 courts of common pleas, each composed of 3 judges, while in Allegheny County there is 1 court of common pleas of 16 judges. In other counties the number of judges varies according to local requirements.

In Philadelphia there is also the municipal court, and in Allegheny County there is the county court. The purpose of these courts is to alleviate the burden of the courts of common pleas.

The courts of common pleas are designated courts of record as they maintain permanent records of their proceedings. In civil matters they exercise equity jurisdiction to provide a remedy where there is no other adequate remedy available. The judges hear criminal cases in the courts of oyer and terminer for serious crimes, and in the courts of quarter sessions for less serious crimes.

In counties where the population exceeds 150,000 there are separate courts called the orphans' courts, which have jurisdiction over matters involving decedent's estates, adoptions, trusts, guardianships, and related matters. In counties which do not qualify for a separate orphans' court, the common pleas judge performs those functions.

Monroe and Pike Counties constitute, at the present time, the 43d judicial district. They were originally a part of the 11th judicial district which was created in 1811 to include Luzerne, Wayne, Susquehanna, and Bradford Counties. Pike was added in 1814, and Monroe in 1836.

In 1844, Monroe County was transferred to the 21st judicial district, together with Schuylkill and Carbon Counties. In 1849 the 23d judicial district was created and Monroe and Pike Counties were transferred to that district which also included Wayne and Carbon Counties. In 1874 Monroe and Carbon Counties were taken from the 23d

district and made into the new 43d district. In 1901 Carbon County was made a separate district, the 56th and Pike County was transferred from the 22d district and added to Monroe in the 43d district.

Pike and Monroe Counties have remained as the 43d judicial district to the present time.

In the 83 years of its existence, the 43d judicial district has had only 7 president judges, 2 of whom served 1 year each.

The first president judge was Samuel S. Dreher, a native of Stroudsburg, who had previously been president judge of the 22d judicial district from 1870 to 1875. He became president judge of the 43d district on its creation and served until his death in 1893. The judge was born at Stroudsburg on April 10, 1824, the oldest of nine children. He was admitted to the bar in May of 1846. Dreher Township, Wayne County, has been named for him. In 1878 he presided at the trial of two men, in Carbon County, who were accused of participating in gang murders which were prevalent throughout the anthracite coal region. They were found guilty and sentenced to death to be hanged at 10:30 a. m. on January 14, 1879. A reprieve was granted by the Governor, but the executions took place before the reprieve was delivered.

John B. Storm was appointed to succeed Judge Dreher, and served until 1894 when Allen Craig was elected. Judge Craig served until his death in December 1902. Wilton A. Erdman was then appointed and served until January 1904. Charles B. Staples, who was elected president judge in 1903 and reelected in 1913, served until his death in 1917. He was recognized as one of the leading trial judges of his time.

Judge Staples was succeeded by Samuel E. Shull who served as president judge of the 43d judicial district until his death on June 4, 1945. Judge Shull was assigned by the supreme court to try many important cases throughout the Commonwealth.

The present president judge, Fred W. Davis, was appointed on June 12, 1945. He was elected in 1947 for a 10-year term and reelected in 1957. He is a worthy successor of those who have preceded him in that capacity.

In conclusion, I think a universal understanding of our system, if that were possible, would insure peace and progress and tend to preclude the collapse of civilization.

With the rule of law we have individual liberty and legal protection; without it life would be empty and often short. Whether it prevails depends to a great extent upon judges and lawyers—that is, on the proper functioning of our judicial system, the keystone of our constitutional structure. The preservation of the rule of law is not without effort and vigilance on the part of all of us.

The nationwide observance held on May 1, 1958, "was an important and significant demonstration to the world that the American people are united in their determination to preserve the way of life which our institutions of law and justice have made possible."

Hon. Emanuel Celler

SPEECH
OF
HON. LUDWIG TELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues in extending my felicitations to Congressman MANNIE CELLER upon the occasion of his 70th birthday.

My colleagues have adverted to his distinction as a lawyer and as a devoted servant of the community. I have been made aware of these qualities, in a deeply impressive way, during my friendship with MANNIE CELLER. His sharpness of mind, his uncanny wit, and his unfailing sense of humor have been made well known to the Members of the House during the many years he has been a Member of Congress since he was first elected in 1922. He has had ample opportunity to influence the minds of the Congress and of the American people upon many significant public issues. The values to which MANNIE CELLER subscribes are those identified with the welfare of the people, and he has never walked away from a fight in the interest of the people.

All of this is well and nationally known, but I desire to speak of MANNIE CELLER as a personal friend and to acknowledge the deep influence which he has had upon me, as a friend and as a teacher. I well recall the sharp debate which took place in the last session over the civil-rights bill. As chairman of our Judiciary Committee, Congressman CELLER was in charge of the bill. Who will ever forget the unfailing graciousness, the patience, and the abiding sense of fairness which he demonstrated in that debate?

His statesmanlike and friendly participation in that debate knitted the membership of the House together, and when it was over, all of the Members of the House, both those who favored and those who opposed the bill, reaffirmed their friendship, admiration, and respect for this great man.

Long may he know peace and happiness, and continued membership in our House of Representatives.

A Tribute to Mr. Arvid Lundell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, it is a great pleasure for me to say a word concerning a constituent of my district and my friend, Mr. Arvid Lundell. The purpose of my remarks is to make known his service to the Government. As president of the Colonial Broach and Machine Co., he brought his vast knowledge and business experience to his position as adviser to the Director of the Metalworking Equipment Division, Business and Defense Services Administration, United States Department of Commerce. His great knowledge of machine tooling from the smallest to elephant-size production was a valuable asset to the Government.

Mr. Arvid Lundell of 799 Lochmoor Road, Grosse Pointe Woods, Mich., president of the Colonial Broach and Machine Co., New Methods Steel Stamps, Detroit Tap and Tool, and director of the Peoples State Bank, of Hamtramck, Mich., has completed 6 months of Government service in the capacity as Adviser to the Director, Metalworking Equipment Division, Business and Defense Services Administration, United States Department of Commerce.

Mr. Lundell's vast and varied business experience made it possible for him to participate in the development of many vital mobilization programs of BDSA. Mr. Lundell spearheaded the M–Day Machine Tool Trigger Program—the first phase of which was completed during his tenure with the Metalworking Equipment Division. This program is considered by most mobilization officials as one of the foremost and progressive of the Nation's mobilization programs.

The primary objective of the M–Day Trigger Program is to buy essential time in producing the machine tools required for critical military end products. This is accomplished by placing with individual machine tool builders, a firm and definite contract that would permit the carrying out of the required production schedules on a practical and economic basis. This permits detailed planning of bills of materials, facilities, and production equipment requirements, subcontracting, and related production problems.

Approximately 91 machine tool builders have contracted to participate in the first phase of this program, covering approximately 15,298 general purpose machine tools having a value of about $233,882,000.

In the opinion of most mobilization officials, this program not only vastly enlarges the mobilization production potential of the Nation, but it also saves the Government millions of dollars through the comprehensive planning and programming that has been undertaken during a cold war period as contrasted to the problems and difficulties that would be encountered during similar programming under mobilization conditions.

Mr. Lundell also participated and was able to offer his industry experience in the development of the Critical Machine Tool and Elephant Machine Tool Programs. These programs will enable the Metalworking Equipment Division, Office of Defense Mobilization, Department of Defense, and other appropriate Government agencies program intelligently to meet critical machine tool production areas under mobilization conditions. Recently, Mr. Lundell activated a Government program that had for its objective the channelling of surplus machine tools into the junior high schools, high schools, technical schools, colleges, and universities, to better train the youth of the Nation, and to provide dispersal of machine tools which would be of vital importance in the event of an attack upon the country. This program has been widely acclaimed by congressional and educational leaders, and it is anticipated that it will strengthen the overall mobilization preparedness of the Nation through its aspects of expanding the opportunities of providing technical

and practical training of the Nation's youth.

Mr. Lundell has taken an active interest in the executive reserve program of the Metalworking Equipment and Business and Defense Services Administration, and during the past 6 months, has enlarged the Metalworking Equipment Division participation in this program so that as of the present, it covers 51 reservists from approximately 16 States and the District of Columbia. Mr. Lundell, on his return to Detroit, will continue his participation in this program, and he has been assigned to direct and supervise the metalworking equipment program in the area.

On May 6, Mr. H. B. McCoy, Administrator, Business and Defense Services Administration, presented to Mr. Lundell on behalf of the Secretary of Commerce, a certificate of merit in recognition of his outstanding Government services during the past 6 months. In addition, the Secretary of Commerce gave Mr. Lundell a personal letter of congratulations. Mr. H. B. McCoy presented to Mr. Lundell, a flag that was flown over the Capitol as a token in recognition of his services to the Nation, Business and Defense Services Administration, and the Department of Commerce. Mr. McCoy, in his own behalf presented a personal letter of congratulations.

Approximately 75 friends, business associates, and Government representatives attended Mr. Lundell's certificate of merit and flag presentation.

Again, Mr. Speaker, Michigan's leadership and know-how served the National Government.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am happy to include an excellent editorial commemorating the Polish Constitution Day on May 3, which appeared in the Lynn (Mass.) Item on May 3, 1958.

The editorial follows:

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Few people realize that the first democratic constitution to be adopted by a European country was that promulgated as law by the Great Parliament of Poland on May 3, 1791, just 167 years ago today.

Greater Lynn residents of Polish birth or descent—one of the fine, solid segments of our population—are joining today in formal recognition of the anniversary, as suggested in a proclamation issued by Governor Furcolo.

The observance takes place in an atmosphere of hope that Poland soon will again take its rightful place among the free nations of the world, no longer under the atheistic domination of Communist Russia. It is noteworthy that when restrictions were eased slightly in Poland recently, its people immediately turned to the West to renew bonds of friendship and to appease their enforced intellectual hunger.

The original Polish Constitution was adopted only a few years after our own.

This document, incorporating many of the liberal social reforms initiated by the writings of Stanislas Staszic and educator Hugo Kollataj, guaranteed rights and priviliges unheard of in Europe. It proclaimed the rights of man. It declared that the state existed to serve the people. It enabled all Polish citizens to hold public office, and it abolished serfdom.

It was not coincidental that this work reflected the highest ideals of the Western World. From its early beginnings, about 965, the Polish state was linked closely with Western Europe. Its highly developed culture, in the early 16th century, was representative of the best of the European renaissance. This was the heritage which gave the world such notable figures as General Kosciusko, Count Pulaski, Henryk Sienkiewicz, Joseph Conrad, Chopin, Paderewski, and Mme. Marya Sklodovska Curie.

Unfairly Weighted Publicity Results From Exploitation of Wrongdoings of Few in Labor Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I am offering in the RECORD three articles by Stanley L. Johnson, the secretary-treasurer of the Illinois State Federation of Labor, that some of us would do well to ponder.

There is not a word of apology in these articles for any labor figure who has done wrong. But there is good strong common sense about the hypocrisy and the unfairly weighted publicity by which the sins of a few union leaders are condemned while the evils of individuals in other groups are treated lightly.

We in this House know that we are having to legislate to impose penalties on business firms that have collected tens of millions in social security and withholding taxes from workers and have failed to account for them to the Treasury. Does anyone rush to condemn business in general? Of course not; the vast majority of businessmen are honest and responsible, and no one would dream of laws to impose ethical codes on their associations or to break up and regulate their associations in a manner that would hamper legitimate activities.

But there is grave danger that the exposure of wrongdoing by a few labor figures will be exploited to impose hampering laws on unions. There is danger that we waste energy in writing unwise labor laws while we fail to work at the really urgent task of using the power and leadership of Government to check the recession and put our people back into jobs; that we do too little, rather than too much, to meet the problem of the man whose jobless compensation is exhausted, or was never eligible.

I hope that in the remaining months of this session we shall keep our sense of proportion, that we shall understand clearly what the needs of the hour are and where the dangers to our country lie.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I offer Mr. Johnson's articles for the RECORD:

CONDEMNATION AND HONEST REPORTING

(By Stanley L. Johnson, secretary-treasurer, from the Illinois State Federation of Labor Weekly News Letter)

Cheats, crooks, traitors, are all strong words. The most distasteful probably is traitor. We usually think of it as describing a person who betrays his country, which is about the most degraded, low act a person can commit. Trust can be betrayed by cheats, crooks, as well as traitors. Therefore, a good case can be made for lumping cheats and crooks with traitors.

We in labor use strong words, perhaps too much. We have said bluntly, both vocally and in print, that any labor official who has stolen funds of the union, misused them, or used his position of leadership for his own personal gain, is a traitor to labor. We have not joined the pack in constantly decrying the alleged and real misdeeds of a very few traitors who have been exposed in labor. We had publicized our views before the McClellan committee arrived on the scene. Even if only a portion of the revelations thus far exposed are true, it still is a mess than smells and needs cleansing.

Here is where we part from the characters who are damning the whole labor movement, vicious in their condemnation of labor officials, and in their hypocritical love for the rank and file member, but secretly want him reduced to a spineless beggar. What pains us is that some labor officials fall into this trap and are more mouthy than the characters who won't be happy until the labor movement is reduced to impotence. It is no wonder then that the average member can get confused. It is no wonder then that some rank and file members will unwittingly betray their union because of this confusion. Coupled with confusion is the deluge of antiunion, slanted news articles, antiunion editorials, and antiunion statements by self-seeking politicians of both parties battering all of us.

This weaseling, sniveling tirade of damnation, belching forth from editors and politicians alike against labor, is truly disgusting, because they do know the whole truth about all segments of our society. Why then this singling out only one part of our industrial, business, agricultural, and political economy as the only group bereft of virtue.

The truth is very brutal. Industrial, business, agricultural, and political segments have many more cheats, crooks, and traitors only because there are more of them, not because they happen to fall in the above categories. Human weaknesses are prevalent in every strata of our economy and society. The weakness and perfidy of man is recorded from centuries ago down to this date. So is the great strength and decency of man, which has always prevailed in the end against those greedy exploiters and betrayers of their fellowmen.

Have you seen headlines in the daily press such as these: "Employers Cheat Uncle Sam," "Millions in Withholding Taxes Stolen," "Retailers Cheat State," "Retailers Steal Taxes," "Millions Lost in Taxes." No, I haven't either. But you should see them, if the press wanted to sensationalize business malpractices. Why this timidity with employer groups? There is no qualm about headlining labor rascality. Either headline all alleged cheats, crooks, and traitors equally, or place them in the right perspective in a factual reporting job. Then editorialize with honesty. Let us get some of the honest objectivity which the press is always prattling about, but fails dismally and

we think purposely when the press discusses labor questions.

What are we talking about? We mean the misuse or improper accounting of money not belonging to the individual, to the company or business, which amounts to millions of dollars. Employer groups now stand accused of this cheating by both Federal and State Governments: Money which rightfully should be a sacred trust fund—money which was collected for our Federal and State Governments from workers and retail buyers by employers.

Our Federal Government is so disturbed over the delinquent employer that special legislation, providing penalties against these employer cheaters, is now necessary. H. R. 8865 passed the U. S. House of Representatives on August 16, 1957, and on January 23, 1958, was referred to the U. S. Senate Committee on Finance. The House Ways and Means Committee issued a report to accompany H. R. 8865, which points out the necessity of such legislation. Even with the penalties for the future, our interpretation is that H. R. 8865 deals gently with the tax cheaters or crooks to date.

According to the House Ways and Means Report for the years 1951 through 1956 inclusive, social-security taxes, and withholding taxes taken from employees, and not accounted for to the Federal Treasury, amounted to $279 million. Count it, $279 million collected from workers, and not credited to the workman's account. What does the press, the pious employer, the rabid political figure have to say about the employer and business morality and ethics? Those condemning organized labor so freely seem to be strangely silent. Yet, we are to assume that employers will safeguard health, welfare, and pension funds of their own, when so little respect is paid to Uncle Sam's money taken from the worker's pay check.

What about Illinois business? According to the Illinois State Department of Revenue, approximately 80,000 Illinois retail taxpayers owe the State of Illinois $24½ million in collected sales taxes. Twenty-four and one-half millions of dollars were collected from purchasers of goods at retail, and yet these retail groups and their spokesmen have the gall to point the finger of scorn against labor. According to the State Department of Revenue, $20 million cannot be collected from the retail employer. The $4½ million might be collectible. This is so, because business is treated gently by our State statutes when said businesses violate a law by cheating the State out of money taken from consumers, who in the main are wage earners. Many of them are union members.

Our union members ought to know that as rotten as a union official, who betrays them, may be, that a greater aggregate of betrayal comes from some employers. These employers have employer associations front for them. These associations overlook the peculations and unethical business practices of their own people and bravely take up the cudgel for the individual union member. These are the vociferous spokesmen who infer that all that a workingman need do is trust his future well-being to these spotless paragons of virtue. They wish to save our membership from those terrible, corrupt unions and the labor bosses. The record is there for all wage earners to check on the sincerity of employers in correcting injustices and inequities. Our members know better and if any doubt, please check the records and not our statements.

This is what bothers us: Using the labor movement, and particularly its entire leadership as a whipping boy, because of the speculations of a very few. According to the broadest allegations so far made, $10 million has been perverted in union dues money over a span of years, similar to the Illinois sales tax fraud span of years since 1933. We repeat—even if the $10 million of union funds should be proven to be stolen from union treasuries, the comparison is odious for the employer groups. We use the word "stolen" as a strong description purposely, even if the Senate committee making the allegations did not so infer. We gently remind our employer friends to suggest to their rabid spokesmen to read their Bibles. The greatest Teacher spoke thus on a certain occasion: "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone."

Where does all this leave labor and employer alike? Obviously, it ill behooves employer associations and employer spokesmen to berate unions and their leadership, when their own house is in such disorder. Political figures could very well reexamine their consciences.

Apropos of this whole smelly mess is an article by a well-known psychologist wherein he points out that an honor system is only for crooks. This dealt with a group of students at Northwestern University in the department of education no less. Here was a group of students who presumably in the future might be teachers, and over 30 percent cheated in grading their papers. Proof again, that honesty or dishonesty cuts across all segments of our society. Therefore, this pointing the finger of scorn at labor only is sheer viciousness. It is perpetrated by those who feel that by weakening, and if possible castrating the labor movement, the workingman will come to heel, and be a patsy for exploitation.

We could go on for pages, but suffice to say that there is developing a hard core of good American trade unionists who will fight this un-American attack. By hard core we mean the men and women who pay the dues to keep their organizations going. We would much rather channel this spirit into sounder labor-management relations. But, if a small group of employer spokesmen are going to lead the great majority of fine employers up the alley which can only lead to jungle warfare, we wonder at the intelligence and vaunted know-how of management.

Labor has shown its responsibility through actions of the past few months. Let responsible management now demonstrate that demagogues and hate mongers do not control the destiny of management. Genuine differences we will continue to have, but let us both work in an atmosphere of cooperation. We believe in private enterprise. We want prosperous employers. We want to help create and continue such prosperity so we can share in it through better wages and conditions. Thus farmers and city dwellers alike will have well-being. All of us as Americans—we, the people—will then make our great governmental system operate equitably for the least of us.

Honest Reporting

(By Stanley L. Johnson, secretary-treasurer, from the Illinois State Federation of Labor Weekly News Letter)

Last week we had an article in the Weekly News Letter relating to Condemnation Versus Honest Reporting. We indicated that the record would substantiate our charge. Since then an outstanding editor, Ralph McGill of the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, made some comments which are to the point. The remarks were made at De Pauw University, Greencastle, Ind.

Mr. McGill stated that the citizen gets only a great hash of opinions, facts, claims, distortion, analyses, and interpretations, and half truths are made into truths. He was concerned about the job the American newspapers are doing in informing and forming national opinion. He further stated that while the press must move to meet, expose, and defeat all threats to a free press, the press must even more forthrightly see to it that the press deserves such freedom.

The sense of our statements, articles, and reports over the years has been for a free, responsible press. Print the news. Expose wrongdoing in any field. Be objective in reporting. Above all, be honest in editorializing.

As we have stated so many times, it is the dishonesty in editorializing which is the most disgusting. Besides the inference that all labor unions and their officials are corrupt, now we see still another attack on labor unions. For several months prior to the economic recession of the past 6 months, labor was blamed for all the inflation ills. Now, strangely enough, labor is being blamed by some of these editorial spokesmen as the cause of the deflation or recession.

Robert McLean of the Philadelphia Bulletin has served the Associated Press as president for 20 years. He was lauded this week at the AP's annual convention, attended by the top newspapermen of the country. In responding to the plaudits, he stated the compliments were to be regarded as pride in AP itself. He said, "I hold that pride to be justified, because the publication of news, the stark news, if you will, news without bias or prejudice, without intent to influence, without regard to whether the news be good or bad, favorable or unfavorable, is essential to the successful operation of a democracy."

If these editors will now go forth and live up to this philosophy, we say—amen. But we know that high principles are not always lived up to, even in the self-righteous atmosphere of the editorial room. Because we are practical men, knowing of the pressures put upon these quite human and likable individuals, we forgive them their weaknesses. However, we do not forgive these editors for using the labor movement as a whipping boy because of their frustrations—frustrations caused by their sense of guilt through failure to do an honest reporting job.

We ask our members to check the record. A delegation of Illinois businessmen, representing the chamber of commerce, is going to Congress again this week to oppose all measures which are of direct help to the unemployed. We think the Illinois Congressmen and the two Senators should have the gumption to ask these pseudoguardians of the lowly wage earner what positive measure of help they might suggest for a change. If the effrontery were not so tragic in attempting to act for the welfare of workers in their opposition to every measure which has sought to elevate the material welfare of wage earners over the years, we should consider it ludicrous.

These same employer spokesmen want picketing eliminated. They want State right-to-work laws. They should be happy about the present interpretations of the National Labor Relations Board on the Taft-Hartley Act. Every 1 of the 5 members of the National Board has been appointed by President Eisenhower and approved by the Senate. By administrative action, the Taft-Hartley Act is being even more used as an antiunion device. We have pointed out for years this ever-present danger of one-sided, biased rulings which would come as a result of the Taft-Hartley Act when the Board is dominated by employer thinking.

In conclusion, we ask: Where is the right to work for 5½ million Americans looking for a job? The sidestepping on this issue by the chamber of commerce and manufacturers' spokesmen would do credit to a Russian ballet dancer.

Questions on Policy

(By Stanley L. Johnson, secretary-treasurer, from the Illinois State Federation of Labor Weekly News Letter)

As an interested observer and as an official trying to gage the effects of national legislation on the wage earners of Illinois,

there is one phase of the AFL-CIO legislative policy that should be discussed.

We joined with AFL-CIO representatives from our State when we saw our Senators and Congressmen on March 11–12, urging them to institute a tax cut and increase public spending. This was done in good conscience to try and remedy an acute attack of unemployment. When several million Americans are out of work now, and the danger that the contagion may spread rapidly, it is time for drastic action.

Therefore, my usual caution in fiscal affairs is a victim of an emergency. It is difficult to be concerned with deficits and inflation when people need jobs. Likewise, this is true when billions for foreign aid and reciprocal trade agreements with other nations are stressed by political figures of both parties as essential to our Nation's welbeing. We are aware that approximately 85 percent of foreign-aid funds are spent in this country. We are aware that reciprocal trade agreements put some people out of jobs, too.

What is bothersome is that we still have inflation in the midst of declining jobs. The cost of living continues to go up and still labor is blamed for inflation. The hue and cry of a few months ago on the dangers of inflation seem to be forgotten. There should not be a casual dismissal either by our labor people, or others, of potential serious deflation of the dollar. It is one thing to take a calculated risk and another to ignore what might result.

I am for the calculated risk. The risk is a huge Federal deficit piled on top of the already overwhelming Federal debt. Couple this with a reduction in taxes and that deficit mushrooms again. The interest payments will so increase that either we will need a tremendous increase in taxes at a later date, or repudiation of the public debt could occur through various devices. This latter should never happen.

My personal feeling would be not to reduce taxes. Big business could be satisfied with a little less profit, through judicious price cutting. Increase unemployment-compensation benefits now with the same broad coverage as Social Security. This coupled with a comprehensive public-works program, schools, housing, hospitals, roads, dams, post offices, etc., now, would spread the money into every economic activity of the country. The increased tempo of business and people working, paying taxes, would help hold the deficit to reasonable bounds.

To ignore future possibilities of a day of reckoning, due to uncontrollable debt with wild inflation, could only lead to disaster for the very people we seek to represent and help—the wage earners of America. The least that we can do is to point out that in advocating needed emergency action by the Congress of huge spending, there are some future risks that must be taken.

General Practitioner of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of April 25, 1958, which comments on the designation by the Luzerne County Medical Society of Dr. A. W. Grover, Kingston surgeon and educator, as general practitioner of the year:

PRACTITIONER OF THE YEAR

Honors from his profession and community are not new to Dr. A. W. Grover, Kingston surgeon and educator, but the action of the Luzerne County Medical Society this week in designating him as general practitioner of the year is a tribute that should have special appeal since it not only constitutes recognition from colleagues, but it is an acknowledgment of his devotion to duty for more than a half century.

A native of Hobbie and a resident of Kingston for 60 years, Dr. Grover has been accorded such distinctions as a fellowship in the American College of Surgeons, the presidency of the Luzerne County Medical Society, a portrait in the staff room of Nesbitt Memorial Hospital in appreciation of his service as a trustee for 30 years and the presidency of the board of education in the West Side school district.

The respect Dr. Grover commands testifies to his professional skill and to his service beyond the call of duty. It is easy to concur in the decision of the profession to add to his laurels.

Hello, Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in my hometown paper, the Cambridge Chronicle-Sun, having to do with the question of excise taxes, a subject pending before the Congress at this time.

I am in full accord with the thoughts expressed in the editorial, and I hope that my colleagues will join with me in endeavoring to secure early and favorable action.

The editorial follows:

[From the Cambridge Chronicle-Sun of May 1, 1958]

HELLO, CONGRESSMEN

At our house, a telephone is a necessity, not a luxury. Most Cambridge people feel the same way; over 80 percent of our city's families have phones. They find the telephone is a must for modern living.

That's why we wonder how long the Federal Government is going to continue its presumably temporary policy of taxing us 10 percent of the charges for both local and long-distance service.

The telephone company pays a lot of other taxes out of its own income, but this excise tax is different. The entire 10 percent is paid by telephone users. The company has the headache of collecting the tax from the public, but doesn't keep a penny of it. Every cent is turned over to Uncle Sam.

ADDS TO LIVING COST

This 10 percent tax adds to the high cost of living in every home that has a telephone. And people who gripe—as people will—about the size of their phone bills often fail to recognize that it is Congress and not the telephone company which has added 10 percent to the total tab.

There seem to be two main reasons why Congress imposed this kind of tax in the first place: To raise money for Government operation in periods of war or economic emergency, and to discourage use of telephone service during wartime.

During World War II, these taxes went up to 15 percent on local service and 25 percent on long distance, and these levels continued until 1954, when they were reduced to the present 10 percent rate.

This reduction was a boon to telephone users, but recently something new has been added to the picture. Recommendations have been made to turn certain Federal responsibilities over to the State governments, and to give the State access to 40 percent of the revenues from the 10 percent tax on local telephone service.

HERE FOREVER?

If this plan goes through, it's a safe bet that these so-called temporary taxes on telephone service will become permanent. In short, taxes which were established for emergency purposes will be here to stay, forever and a day.

That's why we think Congress should take a long, hard look at this whole telephone excise tax business. Congressmen should ask whether it is fair to tax one necessity in a way in which other necessities are not taxed. And above all they should ask themselves whether temporary really means temporary, or is just a polite way of saying permanent.

Latin America and the Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the extension of the trade-agreements program has been advocated by many sincere people as a means of aiding other countries to strengthen their economies in this critical period of world tension. It is not generally recognized that if the Congress refuses to extend the Trade Agreements Act no existing tariff rate will be increased. It is also apparent that many well-meaning citizens do not appreciate that so many of our imports are items on the free list. No duty whatsoever is paid on these imports and certainly no Member of the Congress would suggest that we impose a duty on them.

A booklet prepared by the State Department has contributed to this confusion. It included this statement:

In our (hypothetical) tradeless world there is (would be) no coffee on your breakfast table, nor cocoa, nor tea. You can't (could not) buy chocolate or tapioca, or brazil or cashew nuts. Spices like pepper, cloves, and mustard have (would have) just about vanished from your pantry shelves. Olives, olive oil, lobsters, tunafish, sugar, figs, bananas, and dates are (would be) more expensive now, and sometimes your grocer doesn't (would not) have them at all.

On January 15 our colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], showed that almost all of the items described in this booklet are on the free list. He said:

Nearly all the important products of commerce found in the compilation are on our free list. The question then arises what

moved the State Department to list these products unless it could have made no impression and no case without doing so. The fact is that no further tariff reduction or liberalizing of trade in these items could possibly increase our imports since there is no duty to be taken off. Among them are coffee, newsprint, tin, copper ore, bauxite—aluminum ore, cocoa beans, tunafish—frozen, bananas, tapioca, lobsters, and pepper.

On March 25 I included as an extension of my remarks an address by Dr. Leland I. Doan, the president of the Dow Chemical Co., before the Economic Club of Detroit. Dr. Doan also touched on this problem with particular reference to our imports from Brazil. He said:

Our imports from Brazil are second only to those from Canada, principally coffee and cocoa, which are on our free list. Yet since 1948 our share of the Brazilian market has receded from a little over 50 percent to less than 25 percent. Our exports to Brazil have in the meantime been falling for she has used the dollars earned for purchasing in Europe.

Brazil has multiple exchange rates ranging from 18.36 cruzeiros to more than 308 cruzeiros to the dollar. Further, the Government levies a tax of 10 percent on all foreign exchange and an additional surcharge of 25 cruzeiros per dollar on exchange used for importing wheat, coal, and publications.

If a high level of United States imports from a friendly country should insure its prosperity, then the economic conditions in Brazil should be excellent. Unfortunately the Brazilian economy has been afflicted with many ills, which American imports have not cured.

In 1954 the Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economic Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs made an exhaustive review of many of these problems. The subcommittee's report includes this comment with respect to Brazil on page 304:

Imports from Brazil to the United States are under no restrictions, and their volume has been high, providing the Brazilian economy with an ample flow of dollars. Formerly these dollars were spent in Europe, which enabled Europe to settle its adverse dollar balance with the United States. Today Brazil, in spite of our purchases, has had great difficulty in settling its own commercial dollar transactions with the United States and it has been unable to furnish the market it formerly provided to Great Britain and the Continent of Europe.

It employs import controls and many restrictive devices at the present time. Foreign investment is discouraged as Brazil has reaffirmed its position that no foreign capital would be welcome in developing her potential petroleum resources.

Brazil's insistence on virtually nationalizing the development of her natural resources has resulted in the ridiculous situation where the rationing of oil supplies is receiving serious consideration, as railroads are being converted to diesel power and automobile imports are increasing.

More recently, Finance Minister Aranha has issued new regulations to subsidize agricultural exports and to allocate all foreign exchange for imports.

Receipts from exports are channeled directly to the Bank of Brazil. Exporters of coffee and other agricultural products are to receive bonus payments in dollars or other currencies. The bank retains enough of the balance, about one-third, to cover Brazil's foreign-debt service.

The remaining foreign exchange is auctioned to the importers who bid for exchange under five categories ranging from most essential (i. e., aviation gasoline) to least essential (perfume). The auction system for exchange certificates has aroused bitter complaints among Brazilian importers. Aranha has insisted that this procedure must be followed and exports must be stimulated so that Brazil can secure the funds for industrial expansion.

This diversion of dollars to industrial projects has also given rise to inflationary pressures at home, and to discontented workers who are unable to purchase consumer goods. Such policies by underdeveloped countries are not conducive to the development of world trade, and there is little that the United States can hope to accomplish by a unilateral reduction of its own tariffs in curing these conditions, except to jeopardize its security position through becoming dependent upon foreign countries for critical materials without which we could not conduct a war.

Mr. Speaker, these conditions reported during the 83d Congress still persist, as indicated by two recent articles on the Brazilian economy by Leslie Gould, the financial editor for the New York Journal-American. Under unanimous consent, I include them at this point:

[From the New York Journal-American of April 7, 1958]

BRAZIL GROWTH IMPEDED BY GOVERNMENT POLICIES

(By Leslie Gould)

(This is one of a series on South America by Financial Editor Leslie Gould who just completed a 4-week trip around that continent.)

The biggest country in South America is Brazil. In land area. In population. In potential wealth.

The possibilities there are limited only by Government policies.

These policies, most of them hangovers from past administrations, have brought on an inflation, which today is getting, if not already, out of hand. These policies also have encouraged nationalism and socialism and hampered or prevented, as in petroleum, private development of the rich natural resources.

Brazil, even with its rapid industrialization, is still a one commodity economy—coffee. Coffee accounts for more than 60 percent of the foreign exchange producing exports. Cotton and cocoa account for another 25 percent.

TWO-CLASS NATIONS

Brazil also is a two-class nation—the poor and the rich. There is no middle class to speak of. This situation is true in most South American countries. The Argentine is the exception.

The present population is around 60 million and the next 10 years is expected to see it pass the 80 million count.

With its tremendous potential for supplying industrial raw materials, Brazil's increasing population can be developed into an equally tremendous consumer market.

Brazil is short in food, electric power and transportation, and the terrific inflation has hampered the correction of these deficiencies as well as retarded the development of the country's vast natural resources.

CRUZEIRO PLUMMETS

The cruzeiro, which was 64 to the dollar last July, recently dropped to a rate of 111 to the United States dollar. In 2 weeks this year it weakened from 94 to the dollar to the 111 rate. This latest weakness follows a period last year that had given some promise of stability.

The Brazilian financial situation is critical. Dollar reserves in the United States dropped in a year from $153 million to $32 million and the loss continues. All holdings of gold and foreign are down 30 percent.

Brazil's two major economic headaches are an oversupply of coffee and a drop in coffee exports, and failure of the nationalized petroleum industry to develop enough oil to meet the country's needs.

About $300 million a year of foreign exchange must go for oil imports. The sad part about this is that Brazil has the oil in the ground, but Petrobras—the Government monopoly—hasn't been able to get it out. The need is for a change in policy that will permit outside interests to come in and develop the oil, the same as neighboring Venezuela, which has one of the world's strongest and most stable currencies.

TOO MUCH COFFEE

Coffee is proving to be another drain. It does account for better than 60 percent of Brazil's foreign-exchange income, but because of overproduction the Government this year may be forced to buy in 8 million bags on top of 7 to 8 million bags now in Government warehouses.

Last year Brazil exported 14.3 million bags of coffee, off 2½ million bags from 1956. So far this year shipments have totaled 2,330,627 bags, off 1,699,990 bags from a year ago. In March, shipments were off 170,000 bags. This means a considerable drop in needed foreign exchange—mostly dollars.

While exports are down, Brazil's imports are up. Last year exports were down $60 million but imports rose 60 percent. The country still had a favorable trade balance, but the gap is narrowing.

BRAZILIAN CRUZEIRO

Cruzeiros per United States dollar (free rate): 1946, 20.90; 1947, 22; 1948, 27; 1949, 30.50; 1950, 33.35; 1951, 31.05; 1952, 33.75; 1953, 44; 1954, 58.50; 1955, 79.25; 1956, 86.50; 1957, 72.50; 1958, 107.

[From the New York Journal-American of April 9, 1958]

UNITED STATES GOLD POLICY HELPS REDS COMPETE IN SOUTH AMERICA

(By Leslie Gould)

(This is one of a series on South America by Financial Editor Leslie Gould, based on a just completed 4-week air trip around that continent.)

Brazil is where the Russians, under their new look, will contest the United States in the economic phase of the East-West cold war. The Argentine is the other big battleground, with Chile and Uruguay smaller targets.

Russia is dangling long-term credits, including needed dollars, and barter deals of oil equipment and other machinery.

The irony of these proposals is that these credits are made possible by the United States Treasury's $35-an-ounce fixed price for gold. This puts a firm floor under the world gold markets, no matter how heavy the offerings of metal.

OFFERING EASY CREDIT

Russia is a heavy seller of gold. These sales are the source of much of the money being used to carry on the economic phase of the Communists' cold war, as well as to finance subversive activities of its other agents.

The United States is at a disadvantage in meeting this kind of competition, for the Soviets are playing up to the Brazilian factions devoted to nationalism, as in oil development, and socialism. They also aren't missing the point that the United States will drop billions in aid to Europe and elsewhere around the globe, but will channel only a trickle of such funds to the countries south of our border.

The Russians also are offering credit on terms that cannot be matched on any business basis.

The real future for Brazil and the rest of the South American countries lies in development of their almost unlimited natu-

ral resources—certainly in Brazil—through private enterprise.

A great many top drawer American companies are in South America. The American private stake in all Latin America is around $9 billion. This gives the United States a big advantage over the Russians.

FAVORS TRADE WITH UNITED STATES

While the Communist, socialistic and nationalistic forces are strong in Brazil, the country basically favors doing business with the United States and putting greater emphasis on private enterprise.

Brazil, though, is facing a serious financial crisis, as evidenced by the flight from the cruzeiro and its fall in value. The inflation of the currency in the last 9 months has been almost 100 percent.

The country in the next couple of years has very heavy dollar financial obligations to meet, about $1 billion. Total dollar obligations are close to $2¼ billion.

INFLATION NO. 1 PROBLEM

This picture is complicated by the drop in coffee shipments and the price for the country's No. 1 export commodity, the recession in the United States as well as at home and the Government's red ink.

The biggest headache is the inflation, which up to last year was about 20 percent a year. In the latter half of 1957, this was temporarily arrested, but it is out of hand again.

Once this is solved, nothing can stop Brazil.

Mr. Speaker, we are fortunate in this case that imports from Brazil are complimentary to our economy and that they have not caused any harm to our producers. Certainly the Brazilians should have no concern with what Congress does with the Trade Agreements Program, as we will not impose a tariff on coffee. Yet, it is quite clear that the solution to the inflationary pressures which prevail in Brazil lies with the Brazilians themselves who must make it possible for private capital to develop their vast mineral resources.

The Senate report in 1954 and Mr. Gould's articles in 1958 both stress that foreign exchange presently used for oil imports could be saved by encouraging American oil companies with the technical know-how to come in and develop the oil which Brazil is fortunate to have but which its government monopoly has been unable to produce.

The solution to many of these problems requires a more hospitable climate for private enterprise and investment. The American taxpayer cannot solve all the world's problems by massive contributions of American aid nor can we sacrifice our own industries by a continuation of the present trade agreements program which has reduced American tariffs without securing any real compensating advantage for American producers selling abroad.

A Dulles Triumph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal Star of May 5, 1958.

A DULLES TRIUMPH

Secretary Dulles has pulled off a real diplomatic triumph. It is a rare pleasure when our State Department puts the Soviet Union on the defensive. Give John Foster Dulles credit for a skillful job.

His offer of an Arctic open skies inspection plan was so logical that the Russians had no reasonable way of refusing it. They were forced to use their veto privilege in the U. N. Security Council, which is the equivalent of shooting a peace dove with a double-barreled shotgun.

People of Europe who have been swallowing the Soviet peace propaganda were suddenly disillusioned by the Soviet veto. It took the mask off the Communist peace talk. It made Soviet demands for a summit conference look ridiculous. It undid the work of months of clever Russian propaganda.

Much of the pressure for a summit conference is now off our allies. That relieves our Government of pressure to take part in a Soviet-planned meeting which probably would have been a propaganda disaster for us.

Domestic pressure, too, has been taken off President Eisenhower by the Dulles triumph. Democrats who were shouting for a summit conference now see what Eisenhower and Dulles saw all the time; namely, that the summit talk was only Soviet deceit.

We have been taking a series of propaganda beatings from the Kremlin since last November. Mr. Dulles' present triumph wipes much of that off the record.

It will help restore world respect for the United States. And it should greatly increase confidence in Mr. Dulles among us Americans.

High School Principal Runs a Strict School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, something is wrong with education in America today. Men like Cyrus L. Oyer, principal of Babylon, N. Y., High School, have the answer. Mr. Oyer is practical. He is a realist. He gets the job done.

I am happy to recommend to you, Mr. Speaker, and the Congress, this splendid article:

[From Parade magazine of May 4, 1958]

I RUN A STRICT SCHOOL

(By Cyrus L. Oyer)

BABYLON, N. Y.—In New York City not long ago, a high-school student stood before Judge Samuel S. Leibowitz. The judge was staggered to learn that the boy was unable to spell some of the simple words on his junior-high diploma.

And in a midwestern college, the director of admissions shook his head in perplexity. A number of freshmen, he had discovered, thought Theodore Roosevelt was president before the Civil War.

You probably have heard similar stories about poorly educated youngsters. But you won't find any of this among the students at my school. That's because this institution is run with a firm belief in the old-fashioned virtues, including hard work and discipline.

When my boys and girls receive their diplomas, they have a hard core of knowledge in the arts, the sciences, and the humanities. They have learned how to study. They have learned how to think. And they can spell the words on their diplomas.

Otherwise, I can tell you, they don't graduate.

Now why am I sounding off like this? You are hearing much talk these postsputnik days about "soft" American high schools, about the teaching of so-called trivia, about the lack of emphasis on science and mathematics.

Some of this unquestionably is true. I've heard that a few schools actually offer credit for corridor duty and library assistance. At one school, time is devoted to discussing clothes—how to pick them and how to wear them. Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell said recently that half our high schools offer no modern foreign language, 33 percent no intermediate algebra, 43 percent no physics, and 20 percent no plane geometry.

Clearly, many schools can stand tightening and overhauling.

MY SCHOOL IS TYPICAL

But the impression has gotten around that all high schools are shameful wastes of time. The feeling is growing that secondary education is just one wow of a social experience and precious little else.

This is not only false but dangerous.

I ought to know. I have been a school principal 22 years and I know many schools which believe in high, rigid, exacting standards. My school, Babylon High, is just one. It's typical of a good many others.

Our school is in a village 35 miles east of New York City—not wealthy, not poor, just average. You'll find no imported marble or expensive paneling in our corridors. We believe in spending money on libraries and laboratories. We want the best. And we want the best from our students. We believe the way to get it is to be strict in 4 main areas:

1. Homework: We believe in it. We don't accept the notion that a youngster should do all his studying at school and be left free the rest of the day to follow his own inclinations. I've heard claims that this produces a more rounded individual. If it does, it also is certain to create a pretty thinly educated one.

For every 40 minutes of class work, a student at Babylon High is assigned 40 minutes of homework. On the average, a youngster must do between 3 and 4 hours of preparation a night.

An unprepared student stays late to make up. If his unpreparedness occurs often, he goes to our guidance department. If it persists, we have a conference with his parents. The student continually is checked to keep him on the ball.

2. Tests: We believe in tests, lots of them and stiff ones. Frequently teachers spring tests without warning. Unfair? We don't think so. What's unfair about expecting a pupil to keep abreast of his work?

We require each boy and girl to pass a 3-hour examination in each course every year. This is in addition to Regents tests given by the State.

I've heard of schools which do not tell pupils how they made out on tests for fear of giving them a sense of inferiority. Our students are told promptly. We take the attitude that a youngster's psyche doesn't bruise quite so easily.

3. Discipline: We don't tolerate misbehavior of any sort. Our standards of conduct are strictly old-school, namely: Rules are rules and must be obeyed. We don't take the stand that "Oh, well, kids are kids and have to let off steam." That's for the football stadium.

If misbehavior occurs, we handle things quietly and efficiently. If the offense is serious, the offender is taken home by an attendance officer after the principal has telephoned his parents to expect him. That day, a letter going out explaining that the

youngster will not be re-entered until a parent comes to school. Almost invariably, parents come in next day.

BETTER GROOMING, BETTER WORK

Three years ago we banned sloppy clothes at our school. We did this because we felt that attitudes toward dress can affect conduct and lead to slovenly schoolwork and careless thinking. The students have cooperated beautifully. They look well and, more important, they act well.

4. Courses of study: We don't believe in letting a student choose from a supermarket-type display of a large variety of courses, among which he hopes to find a good sprinkling of snaps. Babylon has no snaps. We don't feel that students go to high school for a social experience. We take the view that they come to feed their minds.

Thus for graduation we require passage of stiff courses in English, science, mathematics, history and health. A student must take a major sequence, consisting of 3 years in a chosen field—but this field is restricted to the major areas of study.

And if a youngster does not complete all his credits, neither pleas nor tears can squeeze him through. Last year nearly 5 percent of our seniors failed to graduate by a half point. They had to go to summer school to win their diplomas.

I'll tell you something which may astonish you. It's not unusual for a student who has scored 85 on a test to receive a stern lecture for doing poorly, while one who gets 75 is not called on the carpet. Why? Because if a student who has consistently scored 95 suddenly dives 10 points, we want to know the reason. We consider a 95 student who gets a few 85's more deficient than a 75 student who keeps getting 75.

And a student who can complete a 40-minute assignment in 15 minutes is not just considered lucky. He is given longer and harder jobs to do. If you think this makes youngsters resentful, you're wrong. They're grateful because they want to do more, learn more.

Basically we believe that every youngster should study up to the limits of his mental capacity. If an A science student has room in his schedule for an elective, he has to have a pretty good reason for choosing a course other than more science.

WHAT IS A FRILL?

While I am on the subject of courses of study, I would like to inject a word about frills. United States schools are being compared to Russian schools and all instruction which doesn't seem to be strictly business is labeled with that derisive term.

Yet a physics course actually can be a frill—and a cooking class important. Suppose a physics teacher tells his students, "Those who wish can bring radios next month and we'll try to fix them up." If the students who do not bring radios are permitted to loaf, that course is the frilliest of frills. On the other hand, a cooking course that requires tests, homework, and reports can be valuable.

With all this, do we believe school should be pleasant, even fun? We do. We do not believe that relaxation should be reserved for afterschool hours or off-school areas.

Thus, when our students finish lunch, they can stroll into the gym and dance to records. If some jazz enthusiasts want to bring their instruments, that's all right, too. Others can go to our audio-visual room and watch movies.

STAYING IN STEP

There are shady walks and athletic facilities. Sometimes teachers even act as lonely hearts advisers to youngsters with romantic problems. I've functioned in that capacity myself.

Finally, no school is worth much without a dedicated faculty. This we have, plus a school superintendent with vision—Gerald W. Anderson.

That's our school. We're proud of it, and we're backing the American system of education. There is some softness in it, some need to step up programs. But it always has adapted to change.

Not long ago Charles F. Kettering, former General Motors research director, said: "There's nothing wrong with the science program in the United States. People should quit talking about it as though there was. I think the science program should be stepped up but that's not because of the launching of the sputniks. Normal advancements bring certain changes. School curriculums should be brought up to date with this in mind."

They are being brought up to date. It's time Americans realized that.

Yes, I run a strict school—but so do principals in many communities. We know the challenge of our enormous responsibilities toward your children. Toward our children—my own daughter is a senior at Babylon High.

We accept the challenge. We are meeting it headon.

Five Churches in Wyoming Valley and Wyoming Seminary Preparatory School Hold Major Events

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilkes-Barre Record of April 28, 1958, which describes the recent major events held by five churches in Wyoming Valley, Luzerne County, Pa., as well as that held by Wyoming Seminary, leading preparatory school:

FIVE CHURCHES AND SEMINARY HOLD MAJOR EVENTS—BISHOP FRED CORSON OFFICIATES AT SIX FUNCTIONS IN AREA

Five local and area Methodist churches and Wyoming Seminary, yesterday held major events which included two cornerstone layings, two ground breakings, one consecration service and a sesquicentennial celebration.

In the first event of the day, Bishop Fred Pierce Corson, resident bishop of Philadelphia area of Methodist Church, spoke at services of First Methodist Church of Kingston in Wyoming Seminary chapel. Following services, the clergy and congregation moved to Market Street and South Sprague Avenue, site of the proposed new church, for the laying of the cornerstone.

More than 300 persons were present for the cornerstone laying. Among them were Isaac S. VanScoy and Frank M. Garney, both of whom were members of the church when the first cornerstone was laid in 1872. In addition to Bishop Corson, VanScoy and Garney, others who were present on the speakers' platform were: Rev. Harold C. Buckingham, district superintendent; Dr. Ralph W. Decker, president of Wyoming Seminary; Rev. Alfred L. Crayton, pastor; Rev. Milton F. McKenney, associate pastor; Arthur L. Strayer, chairman of the building committee; Dr. Wilbur H. Fleck, chairman of trustees; W. Charles Maxwell, Jr., chairman of official board; Charles M. Talley, architect, and George R. Taylor, contractor.

Cornerstone for Wyoming Seminary gymnasium was laid at 12:30 p. m. yesterday. The ceremony followed church services at Nelson Memorial Chapel on the school's campus. Bishop Corson delivered the sermon.

More than 250 persons attended the cornerstone laying for the $800,000 gymnasium. The cornerstone was a piece of native bluestone taken from in front of Forty Fort Meeting House, where it had served as a doorstep since the erection of the building 150 years ago. The stone is inscribed: "This cornerstone was a doorstep in the Old Meeting House in Forty Fort, erected in 1807, where in October, 1839, Dr. George Peck started the movement that resulted in the establishment of the Wyoming Seminary."

Construction of the gymnasium was authorized by trustees last October and the contract was awarded to Tabone and Barbera, Pittston. Designed by Thomas H. Atherton, the building will house the main winter sports program of the school. Faced in red brick with white trim to harmonize with the other school buildings, the structure also will house a swimming pool in a separate wing. Gifts to cover the cost of construction were pledged by a small group of alumni and friends of the school.

CONTENTS OF BOX

Among the items placed in a lead box sealed within the cornerstone are a copy of the Bible, a history of Wyoming Seminary, a photograph of Rev. George Peck, interior and exterior photographs of Forty Fort Meeting House, a letter from Walter S. Carpenter, Jr., concerning the gift which made erection of the building possible, clippings from Wilkes-Barre Record and Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader Evening News, and a set of the most recent issue of United States coins.

Participating in the ceremony yesterday were Dr. Ralph W. Decker, president of Wyoming Seminary; Z. Platt Bennett, president of trustees; Walter S. Carpenter, Jr., trustee; Dr. Wilbur H. Fleck, president emeritus and trustee; Bishop Corson, trustee; Dr. Alfred L. Crayton, secretary of trustees and pastor of First Methodist Church, Kingston; Col. Thomas H. Atherton, trustee, representing the architects; Dean James A. Adams, John Charlton, president of the senior class; Dr. Harold C. Buckingham, trustee and district superintendent, and Santo Tabone, representing the contractor.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY AT RUGGLES

More than 150 persons, a capacity attendance, filled Ruggles Methodist Church yesterday afternoon at 3:30 for a consecration service. Taking part in the consecration of the remodeled church were Bishop Corson, District Superintendent Reverend Buckingham, Rev. John Gordon, pastor; Rev. Ruth Underwood, Rev. David R. Morgan, and a combined choir from Noxen, Alderson, and Ruggles churches under the direction of Mrs. Fred Swanson.

In the service it was pointed out Rev. James Hilbert was pastor during the first years of the church and later Reverend Miss Underwood and Reverend Mr. Gordon. A total of $20,000 has been invested in the remodeling to date, it was explained, with future plans calling for finishing and furnishing a basement, landscaping the lawn, and a new exterior finish for the building.

A tea followed the consecration service in the basement with Mrs. John Gordon and Mrs. Clarence Oberst pouring.

GROUND-BREAKING AT DALLAS

Next event on yesterday's Methodist calendar was ground-breaking ceremonies for a Sunday school building held at 4:30 p. m. at Dallas Methodist Church. Rev. Russell Lawry was in charge. Brief remarks were made by Bishop Corson. Reverend Buck-

ingham led the prayer. Despite the rain, about 125 persons attended the ceremonies.

Others who participated in the Dallas program were church lay leader Lawrence Updyke, church lay member Clark Hildebrandt, and Niles White, president of trustees.

It was announced yesterday final plans for the building have been approved and bids for construction will be placed within a few days.

SHAVERTOWN CEREMONIES

Later in the afternoon, at 5:15, Shavertown Methodist Church was the scene of ground-breaking ceremonies for a new educational building expected to cost about $101,000. Rev. Robert Yost was in charge of ceremonies and approximately 100 persons attended.

Reverend Mr. Yost was assisted by Bishop Corson, who encouraged those attending to carry on with the project. Others who took part in the program were Thomas Graham, building committee chairman; church lay leader John Henninger, Donald F. Davis, Sunday school superintendent; and Mrs. Carl Hontz, WSCS president.

Other members of the building committee are Stephen Johnson, Wesley Davies, Ross Williams, Stephen Davis, Harry Carson, George Jacobs, Norman Patton, William Powell, John Coon, Donald Tretheway, J. Houston Day, Thomas H. Morgan, Clarence Laidler, John S. Wilson, Herbert Tippett, Walter Cook, and James Edwards.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIFTH YEAR AT ORANGE

Climaxing the Methodist events yesterday was the final meeting in connection with the 125th anniversary celebration of Orange Methodist Church at 7:30 p. m. Rev. William W. Reid, Jr., pastor of Carverton Charge, which includes Mt. Zion and Carverton Churches in addition to Orange Methodist, officiated. Bishop Corson preached the sermon. Music was furnished by the combined choirs of the three churches in Carverton Charge.

A social hour followed the service with Methodist youth fellowship members as hosts. Earlier Sunday, a morning service featured a sermon entitled "Rear View Mirrors and Windshields," delivered by the pastor. Other speakers were Herman DeWolfe, Caverton, and Nelson Lewis, Mt. Zion. Homecoming Day was observed Saturday with a special dinner at 6 p. m. Other events which highlighted a 4-day celebration included a pageant, an open house, and a past pastors' night.

Union Methodist Society of Orange was organized in 1833.

Resolution of the Detroit Metropolitan Conference of Mayors and Village Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert in the RECORD a resolution which was adopted on May 2, 1958, by the Detroit Metropolitan Conference of Mayors and Village Presidents:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the President's 1959 budget recommended to Congress that the sum of $18 million be allocated for fiscal 1959 for work on the Great Lakes connecting channel project; and

Whereas at this rate of appropriation the completion of this project would not be possible until 1965 or later; and

Whereas through the efforts of the Michigan Members of Congress the President requested an additional $5,500,000 for this project in a supplemental public works budget, making a total of $23,500,000 available for fiscal 1959; and

Whereas the Army engineers in charge of this project state that $30 million can be used in the prosecution of this project for fiscal 1959; and

Whereas the original schedule called for completion of this project in 1962; and

Whereas the completion of this project is so vital to the economy and progress of the State of Michigan and particularly the metropolitan area of Detroit: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Detroit Metropolitan Conference of Mayors and Village Presidents, representing 91 units of government, go on record requesting the United States Congress to appropriate for fiscal 1959 an amount of money sufficient to assure the completion of the Great Lakes connecting channel project by 1962; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Michigan delegation in Congress.

Unanimously adopted, May 2, 1958.

How a Trade Agreement Is Made

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very timely commentary by O. R. Strackbein, chairman, the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, which corresponds with the consideration by the Congress of the trade agreements extension bill of 1958.

HOW A TRADE AGREEMENT IS MADE

(Commentary by O. R. Strackbein, chairman, the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, April 30, 1958)

The Department of State has issued a brochure under the title "How a Trade Agreement Is Made." It bears the date of February 1958 and has recently been distributed far and wide. This dissemination corresponds with the consideration by the Congress of the trade agreements extension bill of 1958.

The publication presents in detail the interdepartmental organization that initiates trade agreements, sets forth the several steps involved in preparing lists of items on which it is proposed to reduce the tariff on the one hand, and on which concessions are to be asked from other countries, on the other; traces the public hearings process, the setting up of negotiating teams to deal with foreign representatives, the actual process and considerations that guide the bargaining operations and the final promulgation of the results by the President.

The Department is to be congratulated on the thoroughness of its job.

However, in making this exposition the Department was probably unaware of the thorough manner in which it also confirmed the many bitter complaints lodged against this very system by numerous domestic producers who have experienced the results of the organizational features described in the brochure and the airtight procedures pursued in making a trade agreement.

Intentional or not, the system almost completely shuts out all influences other than those of the executive power, which is enthroned atop of numerous interlocking and same-thinking subsidiary committees, which in their turn are also drawn, with minor exceptions, from the swollen and teeming executive departments: State, Treasury, Defense, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor.

As well try to penetrate the inner precincts of a medieval palace through the concentric rings of guards as to undertake to produce the least effect upon the deliberations of these executive representatives. Their precautions against influence from outside the executive branch would all be appropriate with respect to subjects that fall exclusively under the functions of the executive; but are out of place with respect to a subject on which no settled policy can be forespoken.

It becomes obvious that such devices as hearings before the Committee for Reciprocity Information (which is made up almost completely of executive departmental personnel) in preparation for trade agreements are nothing more than hollow concessions made to outward appearances. The executive personnel of the Committee for Reciprocity Information (a hearings agency) is the same as that of the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements (an operating group). Not only is this odd but reflects once more the prevalent attitude that domestic producers whose vital interests are involved should be told and not asked. Theirs is not to reason on the hows and whys.

If the document on How a Trade Agreement Is Made is read against the constitutional enumeration of the powers of Congress, where the responsibility for the regulation of foreign commerce and tariff making is placed unequivocally upon Congress, it becomes obvious that once the portals to the executive maze that leads to a trade agreement are entered Congress is soon lost to sight; and no one has yet been able to find or fight his way back. The dungeonkeepers of the Middle Ages would find the atmosphere familiar; and the marauders of the Arabian Nights would recognize a kindred world.

To men of the open day and sunlight the system is and should be abhorrent.

The men who sit on these inner committees are as bound in thought and conclusion as the members of a Russian soviet; and this is alien to the American system.

How can this be?

The fact arises from a basic error of administrative concept:

What has happened is that the administration of a law governing an ever-controversial issue (tariffs and trade) has been treated since 1934 as if it had been moved into a settled arena, to be guided henceforth by an inflexible and undebatable formula: in this case, progressive and relentless tariff reduction under executive rule with but a shadow of recourse by those who are injured.

The procedure established could only be based on the assumption that the electorate, once having spoken, had relinquished its interest in the tariff and trade subject and left it to the President (meaning in effect the State Department) to do with as he saw fit. Judging by the executive procedures established to govern the trade-agreements program, the 73d Congress sitting in 1934 was apparently regarded as having spoken for all future Congresses as well. This is, of course, wholly out of keeping with the Constitution which contemplates changes in sentiment among the

people and the expression of such changes through their elected representatives.

Procedures for making trade agreements under the legislation were characteristically set forth in Executive Order 9832. This was in effect an act of waving goodbye to representative government in this particular field.

Why?

It is because executive personnel of the departments who became almost the exclusive administrators are appointed by the Executive, owe their tenure, the future of their careers, their advancement, and all else that makes for loyalty, to the Executive. Their function is to carry out settled policy. Theirs is not a legislative or parliamentary field nor one in which the voice of the voters is registered.

Therefore, it is unrealistic to look to public hearings conducted by executive personnel and expect results significantly at odds with the ruling executive policy. Such personnel is not responsive to Congress; and the voice of Congress is lost in the intervening chasm.

It would be different if the administering bodies were creatures of Congress and responsible to Congress, as are some of the independent agencies. That is the distinction between the Tariff Commission, which is an agency set up by Congress to do the detailed and technical work of Congress, and the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements and its alter ego the Committee for Reciprocity Information, which are not creatures of the Congress but arms of the Executive. The Tariff Commission under the present setup, is but an edentate body constantly frustrated by the President.

The nonresponsive effect produced by this system could still be overcome but for two practices that effectively lock the door to the reentry of congressional influence.

1. Tariff Commission recommendations under the escape clause are sent exclusively to the President to do with as he likes. The escape clause represents the principal recourse against injury from trade agreements available to domestic producers. In rejecting such recommendations the President has but to sign a letter directed to the chairmen respectively of the Senate Finance Committee and the House Committee on Ways and Means. From this there is no appeal, and the President has since 1951, when the escape clause was first enacted, rejected about two recommendations for every one he has signed.

(These rejections appear to be completely at odds with the successive presidential assurances that no domestic industry would be hurt by the trade-agreements program. This reassuring face is the one the Executive has turned to the public while in the meantime the trade agreements machinery has continued to grind out its results quite oblivious of these assurances.)

2. In negotiating the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade the State Department agreed to far-reaching trade rules that go beyond mere tariff reductions. These trade rules, one example of which is renunciation of the use of import quotas (with some transitory exceptions), have the effect of interposing between Congress and its freedom to legislate certain international taboos that cannot be violated without breaking solemn international commitments.

The practical effect of the operation of the trade agreements system, including the organizational and procedural aspects of making agreements, has thus been to make a house of futility out of Congress so far as the regulation of foreign commerce is concerned.

At the same time and by the same process the electorate has perforce been effectively disfranchised in this field so far as its control over the Government is concerned as contemplated under the concept of popular sovereignty. The Constitution has been amended de facto in complete disregard of the prescribed procedures.

"How a Trade Agreement Is Made" might just as appropriately be titled "How the State Department Through the Trade Agreements Legislation Drove Congress From the Hill."

The obvious remedy lies in legislation that would restore congressional control, at the very minimum to the point of controlling the escape clause remedy. This could be accomplished by requiring that the Tariff Commission recommendations be sent to Congress for possible disapproval by joint resolution. In other words, the veto power over such recommendations should be shifted from the executive to the Congress.

The need for an escape clause action arises from errors committed in tariff negotiations by the executive under the system set up by the executive for making trade agreements.

Since the original power in the regulation of foreign commerce resides in Congress and the President exercises only delegated power, the Congress rather than the President should be the judge of whether the delegated power has been properly carried out. This would be accomplished in substantial part by giving to Congress the final word on escape clause recommendations.

If the President has reasons beyond the question of injury to a domestic industry for wishing to block a Tariff Commission recommendation he could present his reasons to Congress; and if these were compelling Congress would no doubt give heed to his plea.

Not Anti-American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the letters to the editor column of the Wilkes-Barre Record of April 25, 1958, on the situation in Lebanon:

NOT ANTI-AMERICAN

EDITOR OF THE RECORD:

I read with interest your article Maronite Patriarch Asks Neutral Lebanon. May I be permitted to state the following: In your article it states that his beatitude, the maronite patriarch, Msgr. Paul Meouchi, called on the Lebanese to oust the pro-American Government of Lebanon. It would sound as if the patriarch is anti-American which he is definitely not as he is an American citizen and holds very dear to his ties with America, with much honor and pride.

What has happened in Lebanon today, politically, is that the constitution of the Lebanese Republic limits the president to one term in office of 6 years, and he cannot succeed himself. The government, being pro-Western and concerned about the fate of Lebanon, feels that the present Presiednt, Camille Chamoun, is strong politically to guide Lebanon through the present crisis in the Middle East without being absorbed by other ambitious nations. The patriarch insisted that President Camille Chamount is having the constitution changed to permit him to be reelected for another term of 6 years. It is required to have two-thirds majority in Parliament to make amendments to the constitution, and the President does not have the required majority, and the patriarch insists that it is not the will of the majority of the Lebanese people who feel there are other able and capable men who can qualify to succeed to the presidency and continue to serve ably the needs and aim of Lebanon, which is very pro-Western and pro-Arab.

The ironic twist to this whole matter is the way it is being skillfully used by the anti-Western forces in Lebanon who are in a complete minority and are able to foment trouble for the Government of Lebanon by quoting that the maronite patriarch, who is a powerful figure in Lebanon, is against the Government of President Chamoun, who is pro-Western; therefore the patriarch is anti-Western, especially anti-American which is completely untrue.

I hope this will erase the misjudgment of the few who interpreted this article incorrectly.

A. G. ALBERT.

WILKES-BARRE, PA.

Why the Independent Business Schools Should Be Included in Federal Aid to Education Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include a very interesting statement on the role of the independent business school in American education, which was prepared by the National Association and Council of Business Schools and submitted to me by Miss Agnes B. McClellon, executive vice president of the Malden Business School in Malden, Mass.:

MALDEN BUSINESS SCHOOL,
Malden, Mass., May 5, 1958.

The Honorable THOMAS J. LANE,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: This is a report, prepared by our National Association and Council of Business Schools, which gives the salient points which we feel justify our inclusion in the Federal aid to education bills.

We repeat that we are not interested in any financial aid that might come to us from students attending our schools. However, we maintain their right to choose us, if they wish. Our interest is that we not be excluded from the definition of "an institution of higher education" for which we qualify except for the nonprofit and tax-supported or tax-exempt requirement.

Anything you can do to help us will be greatly appreciated by us and by the thousands of successful graduates and future graduates of independent business schools throughout our country.

Sincerely,

AGNES B. MCCLELLON,
Member of Legislative Committee,
Massachusetts Association of Business Schools.

WHY THE INDEPENDENT BUSINESS SCHOOLS SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION PROGRAMS

THE ROLE OF THE INDEPENDENT BUSINESS SCHOOL IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

1. There are approximately 1,500 independent business schools throughout the

country training over 500,000 students annually.

2. Many firsts in education were developed through private school initiative and enterprise. Among these firsts in education are many important contributions made by independent business schools to improve educational methods, text materials, start of frequent enrollment opportunities, individual progress according to ability, adult education. Many other neglected gaps in our educational program have been filled to meet the changes brought about in the last 50 years by the independent business schools.

3. The independent business school makes a distinct contribution to serving the youth of America, and providing trained personnel for private industry, government, and national defense.

4. The independent business school is prepared to join with other educational institutions to meet the growing crisis in education. The independent business school, by its continuing expansion plan, can double its present student enrollments, without any additional cost to the taxpayers.

5. It is possible that many people have lost sight of the fact that the first business schools were private business schools. They came into being because there was a definite need for the kind of training they were able to give best. There will always be a definite place in our educational system for the independent business school, giving truly functional training to the many thousands who do not have the time or money to spend on a college education, and who should receive the same benefits as those in more favorable circumstances.

6. Our schools are community colleges which cater to the needs of people in their areas. Specifically the courses and curriculums offered meet the needs of employers in each area, and students are able to secure positions at the highest salaries. Because of the history of the independent business school and the role it plays in the community, it is our firm opinion that care should be exercised that the bona fide interests of independent business schools should be considered and supported. Business-school training has a definite goal. It provides specialized training for business that is a definite aspect of our culture. Business education is an economical education—economical both in time and money. Business education develops the specialized skills in which we train students so that they can earn their own way and render useful service to society.

7. The quality of instruction and the methods of teaching are of the highest caliber in the independent business schools.

8. Because of the proprietary nature of most business schools, they are more flexible and can rapidly change their curriculums to meet the ever-changing needs of our dynamic society.

9. The independent business schools have an accrediting commission called the Accrediting Commission for Business Schools, which is a nationally recognized accrediting agency, so recognized by the Office of Education of the United States.

WHAT DO THE INDEPENDENT BUSINESS SCHOOLS WANT IN FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION BILLS?

1. The independent business schools are not interested in any grants to business schools, nor are they interested in any particular parts of the bills which would, in effect, give any sums of money directly to institutions of higher learning.

2. The independent business schools do not want or desire any type of grant or subsidy from either Federal Government or any of the State governments.

3. The independent business schools do not want any other aid such as laboratory equipment, library facilities, or research funds.

4. The independent business schools do want inclusion only in specific parts of the bills dealing with scholarship assistant which goes to the student and not to the school. In other words, the only interest independent business schools have in Federal aid to education is the right of a student under the scholarship provisions to select the type of educational institution which he desires, including the independent business school.

5. In allowing scholarships, a student should have a freedom of choice to pick any type of educational institution, including an independent business school. This means that if a student wants to attend Harvard, MIT, or a State university, or a junior college, he should certainly be allowed to do so. But if he prefers to go to an approved business school or technical institute, he also should be entitled to do so.

WHY SHOULD THE INDEPENDENT BUSINESS SCHOOLS BE INCLUDED UNDER THE SCHOLARSHIP PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION BILLS?

1. The independent business schools have formulated new courses to meet the current crisis in education. Such courses as technical, engineering, scientific training for secretaries, and engineering aide courses are now being offered by independent business schools. A constant complaint of many engineers is the fact that they are tied down by office tedium to a point where they spend too much of their time on matters which can be handled by a competently trained secretary or aid. Our schools have developed and are offering a 2-year course of intensive training, consisting of the specialized terminology of the technical, scientific and engineering professions; laboratory work in general science (especially physics and chemistry), engineering mathematics, drafting, all in addition to a full curriculum of standard secretarial instruction.

The purposes of these courses is to cut months off a new secretary's usually lengthy adjustment to complex engineering terminology and to free engineers from some of those only marginally professional duties such as routine calculations and graph plotting.

In a recent report published by Professor Hamlin, chairman of agricultural education at the University of Illinois, in the Nation's Schools for March 1958, he states: "We don't want to waste those who are professionally trained in jobs others could do. We hear of a shortage of engineers, but we hear also that a high percentage of engineers are doing work of less-than-engineering grade. Vocational schools provide the helpers they need. Similar situations prevail with respect to all of the other professions."

2. Since many private business schools are junior colleges and 4-year institutions of higher learning, a failure to include these schools will result in discriminations, since a student could take the same courses, taught in the same manner, using the same textbooks in another institution down the street. One would be approved under the law as it now stands, but an independent business school would not be so approved.

3. It is not the intent of the Congress of the United States to arbitrarily discriminate against any type of educational institution. Failure to include the independent business schools under the scholarship provisions would go against numerous precedents such as the World War II GI bill and Korean GI bill, Public Law 550.

4. Our whole economy is based on the free enterprise system and schools which are organized without tax support should be honored and respected for what they are doing in serving the young people.

5. It is the stated purpose of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department that all educational institutions be utilized to their fullest extent. This is also the recommendation of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School. It must be recognized that the colleges and universities will not be able to handle the tremendous influx of students which are expected in the very near future. The independent business schools will be able to take care of the overflow and provide the necessary education for a large segment of the public.

6. It must be remembered that many students do not want a college education and prefer practical training in the independent business schools. In addition, there are other students who cannot afford to go to colleges and universities, even with a scholarship, but need to provide for a family as soon as possible. They would prefer a 2-year course in an independent business school. There are many others who are not of college caliber. Their needs and wishes cannot be ignored by the Congress of the United States.

7. The independent business schools can play a substantial part in absorbing many college freshmen in the years ahead. After completing their 2 years of training in an independent business school, they could then be absorbed into the colleges and universities to replace the students who drop out after the freshman year. This would result in saving the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

SUMMARY

Suppose there had never been a business college in the United States? There would be no shorthand writers because the shorthand systems in use today were developed by business college educators. Typists would be scarce because only within the last years have high schools and public colleges seen fit to teach typing skills. There would be very few bookkeepers because prior to the beginning of the business college, people learned to keep books through the apprentice system.

If all business college-trained people vanished from the earth, government and business would be in a turmoil today.

It is important to the broad educational future of our country that independent business colleges be included in the benefits of any education bill which is passed. Business schools do not need and do not want subsidies for the payment of teachers, dormitories, buildings, etc., but independent business schools do feel that people who are unable to attend a 4-year college should receive assistance and consideration in some measure comparable to that of the student who is able to go to a 4-year college. We hope that any bill which is passed by Congress this year will have a provision whereby aid can be given to students who attend business schools as well as those who attend other types of colleges.

Business schools have certain advantages for a large group of people that the 4-year college does not have. We are all aware that there are some people who are not capable of assimilating a 4-year college training program. Newspaper articles on this subject have stated that more than 40 percent of those people who enter 4-year college training fail in their subjects and are dropped by the wayside. Surely this is a great waste of the taxpayer's money and the time of the student.

Many of these finally find their way to the independent business school and make good as bookkeepers, clerical workers, stenographers and business machine operators.

In addition to the fact that certain people cannot profit from a four-year college course but could benefit from a business course, there are other advantages. They are: (1)

the relative cost of business education is approximately one-fourth that of other type colleges; (2) business schools train people for a specialized job and do not require the student to take unrelated subjects thereby saving a great deal of time for the student; (3) business-school graduates have been able and will continue to be able to compete on the same grounds for secretarial and accounting jobs as four-year college graduates in commercial studies; (4) business schools are taxpayers—both Federal and State. Business schools do not consume taxes, they pay them.

The independent business school should be included in the proposed legislation because of the work it is now doing in the field of science and technology. The private business school is instituting new crash programs and courses such as engineering secretarial courses and engineering aide courses, which have been designed with the aid of industry as an answer to its problems.

To show the urgent need for such training, read the following statement from prominent men in the engineering field: Mr. William Cavanaugh of the Engineers Joint Council states: "Development of Supporting personnel such as secretaries and technicians is one of the most productive avenues to increase engineers' output."

Mr. E. Paul Lange, secretary of the Joint Council, explains the shortage of engineering-wise office aides this way, "before World War II, few companies went in heavily for research and development projects." "Now that's all changed and about 150,000, or approximately 25 percent of the country's engineers, are working on some kind of civilian or military research and development project." "These are the engineers that baffle secretaries with complicated technical jargon; they lose idea time when they have to go back over letters and reports to iron out errors."

U. S. News & World Report, January 10, 1958, states: "Lack of Technical help is found to load down engineers with all kinds of chores. One electronics firm found that engineers in one of its divisions spent 19 percent of their time on jobs that could be done by technicians and clerical, or administrative employees."

Mr. Miles McConkey, supervisor of the Westinghouse Electric Research Center, states: "Proofreading of research reports bothers us a lot. Most secretaries don't know enough about engineering terminology to avoid mistakes when they're typing reports, so our engineers have to take time out to go over the finished paper."

Naturally these courses require the careful selection of proper students. It is clear, however, that the private business schools will be advancing science by its work in these fields.

We Have Nothing To Gain at Summit Conferences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, gangsters, crooks, and dope peddlers have everything to gain and nothing to lose by open conferences with decent people. Many of our people out over this great country feel the same way about summit conferences with Russia. We have everything to lose and nothing to gain by lending standing and dignity to the Communist leaders at international conferences. The following letter is a good example of how some of our thinking people feel:

GREENVILLE, S. C., *April 16, 1958.*
The Honorable W. J. B. DORN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DORN: It is urgent that you do do all in your power to prevent another summit conference. The record shows:

1. Agreements with any advantage for the United States have almost never been reached in these conferences.

2. Russia has never yet kept one such agreement.

3. We occasionally get a slight propaganda benefit from such a meeting, but Russia almost always gets the short-range propaganda gain and always gets the long-range propaganda gain.

4. The honest man has nothing to gain by conferring with gangsters, the gangsters everything. Why continue to build respectability for the Russian gangsters in the eyes of the world?

The time to stop this destructive process permanently is now.

Sincerely yours,

STERLING L. SMITH.

Space Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial on the policies to be considered in the research, development, and exploration of outer space as a national policy is contained in the New York Times for Sunday, May 4, 1958. I submit this editorial for the RECORD:

SPACE PROGRAM

Dr. R. E. Robertson, a chief scientist of North American Aviation, is the latest person to speak out for a reasoned space program. He joins Dr. L. A. DuBridge, president of the California Institute of Technology, and Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Director of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, in urging careful concentration of the Nation's resources on first things first. Other respected authorities have joined them in condemning space-cadet stunts and ill-advised projects which could at best have marginal military utility and might disperse the country's resources.

The tug-of-war between the military and the scientists—though muted—is obvious. But the best of both military and scientific worlds appear to agree that the President's concept of a National Aeronautics and Space Agency—to absorb the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and to be independent of the military—is sound.

But several major amendments to the projected legislation are certainly desirable. The status and authority of the Agency should be clearly defined. Its 17-man board, to meet only 4 times annually, appears to be cumbersome, and might well be replaced by a commission form of authority, similar to that of the Atomic Energy Commission. Its director, in any case, should have authority to make quick decisions. There should be a military applications division; military personnel should participate in the Agency's work, and liaison with the military should be close and intimate.

Responsiveness to military needs—and vice versa—is essential to space progress, as well as to this Nation's future security.

The Outlook in the Field of Immigration and Nationality Legislation in the 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following speech I delivered before the Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers in Brooklyn, N. Y., Friday, May 2, 1958:

THE OUTLOOK IN THE FIELD OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY LEGISLATION IN THE 85TH CONGRESS

There are many who believe that any change at all in the Immigration Act of 1952 is so much pie in the sky. I do not count myself among those. Within the last year, through the enactment of Public Law 85–316 (act of September 11, 1957), together with favorable committee action on H. R. 11033, a bill to provide for creation of record of admission for permanent residence of certain Hungarian refugees, and H. R. 11874, a bill to record the lawful admission of certain aliens, who entered the United States prior to June 28, 1940, we see that change, little by little, a step at a time, is taking place.

I would like to discuss with this knowing audience these 3 pieces of legislation, 1 already existing law, the other 2 certain to become law, as I see it now, before the end of the session.

In discussing Public Law 85–316, I would like to list briefly both its advantages and its shortcomings:

1. The status of the stepchild is clarified by including him in the definition of "child born out of wedlock."

2. Illegitimate and legitimate children are now in the same status. However, it is to be noted that it does not help the illegitimate child in the event the father, in recognition of his responsibility, wishes to bring the child to the United States. It is the mother-child relationship that is paramount here.

3. A child adopted under the age of 14 years by intending immigrants or by United States citizens is considered to be a natural-born child for immigration purposes. However, such child must have been in the legal custody of the adoptive parents for at least 2 years.

4. Nonquota status is granted to first-preference skilled specialists for whom petitions were filed before July 1, 1957. However, because of this cutoff date, the first preference portion for immigration quotas has again become oversubscribed early this year, namely, quotas for Japan, the Philippines, Iran, and the subquota for Jamaica. I make the point that all skilled specialists whose services are urgently needed in the United States should be placed on nonquota visas. It is illogical for the law to state on one hand that a foreign skilled specialist can enter if his services are urgently needed, and then make him wait until a quota number is available. He is either urgently needed, or he is not.

5. The nonquota status granted to adopted children under the age of 14 is valid only through June 30, 1959. There should be, I believe, no time limitation since by adoption the child becomes a legitimate member of the family unit and there should be no restrictions on keeping the child with his adopted parents.

6. Waivers were granted to immigrants excludable on the ground of commission of crime or immoral conduct or affliction with tuberculosis, provided they come to the United States to join their nearest relatives. Similar waivers were granted to immigrants who in the past misrepresented certain facts while endeavoring to enter the United States.

7. Fingerprinting was waived in the case of nonimmigrant aliens, which has had a very salutary effect, as you know, on foreign relations.

8. The mortgages imposed on 16 immigration quotas under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 and 1950, as well as under two special sheepherders acts, were removed, resulting in the full use of all immigration quotas.

9. The naturalization of minor adopted children of United States citizens stationed abroad was expedited.

10. The pending petitions for second and third preference quota visas were transferred to nonquota status. This provision alone, it is estimated, will bring to the United States by the close of this year over 27,000 people who are parents of United States citizens, spouses, or children who were previously admitted for permanent residence. However, the fourth preference (brothers and sisters of United States citizens, children of United States citizens over 21 years of age or married) remains heavily oversubscribed, notably in such countries as Italy, Greece, Poland, Turkey, and others. The action taken for the first three preferences should be applied to the fourth preference as well.

11. The provision permitting the issuance of 18,656 nonimmigrant visas not used under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, represents a welcome recognition by the Congress that the refugee problem still exists, but the number allocated is, of course, pitifully small to meet the need. There is no provision made for sudden emergencies which inevitably will arise in this conflict-torn world.

There are other provisions not as dramatic as these upon which I do not touch, but taken altogether, there is in this act an unarticulated acknowledgment of some of the inadequacies that existed in the 1952 legislation. But it is a good step forward and establishes a healthy precedent for further amendment.

In addition thereto, the Committee on the Judiciary has acted favorably on H. R. 11033, which provides for the retroactive adjustment of the immigration status of Hungarian refugees who were paroled into the United States subsequent to October 1956. This bill is on the Consent Calendar of the House, and I believe it will be acted upon favorably by the House at the next call of the Calendar.

The third bill to which I made reference, H. R. 11874, permits persons illegally in this country prior to 1940, either through illegal entry or through overstay of legal entry, to adjust their status to that of permanent residence. Existing law, as you know, permitted adjustments of these categories up to the year 1924. A 16-year period of grace will be added. How many will be favorably affected when this bill is enacted, no one knows, since we cannot know who is illegally here until he is caught; but we do know that in the year 1938, some 21,000 persons' status was adjusted. This rate has declined steadily until we find that in the year 1957, some 4,200 were thus recorded for permanent residence. It is estimated that perhaps with the enactment of this bill, some additional 10,000 to 15,000 will be recorded as permanent residents in the next fiscal year.

Perhaps I have been unduly long in dwelling on Public Law 85-316. But I view its enactment as a prelude to what can—not necessarily shall—but can follow. Hearings on my bill, H. R. 3364, are tentatively scheduled for the month of June. It is admittedly not the most propitious time for the holding of hearings. I shall come back to this point in a few moments. But I would like to make clear that the subject of an immigration policy for the United States is one that has been drowned by a deluge of words. There is none of us who has been intimately concerned with the liberalization of our immigration policy who has not, at one time or another, felt that whatever observations we can make have long since become trite and platitudinous. Emma Lazarus' inscription on the Statue of Liberty has been quoted so often that even the most ardent supporters of good immigration legislation must cringe at its sound.

Let us make no mistake; this is a danger. Too many of us get weary of the old subjects, tired of the old tune, not realizing, of course, that we must go on talking, must go on agitating, must go on sponsoring, because the remedy—the just and right remedy—has not as yet been supplied. This is precisely what has happened in the whole area of refugee relief. People grew weary of the refrain. Then we enter into a new phase of the battle: to battle the apathy that follows the weariness.

This is always the danger point: the flagging of enthusiasm that ends inevitably in retreat. And yet the fact of the refugee is an inescapable fact of contemporary history. Geographical partition produces refugees. Political divisions produce refugees. Supernationalist movements produce refugees. And, tired as we may be of the story, the refugee exists, and to turn aside in weariness will not erase the fact of his existence.

We ask ourselves the question now, how much further will the Congress go?

I am not clairvoyant and do not presume to know. But I do know what is unfavorable and what is favorable in the climate which could or could not produce changes in the immigration law. I know that approximately two-thirds of the Congress are against change; particularly, they are opposed to any change in the national origins system.

I know, too, that there will be a different argument used this time to uphold the national origins system. Spokesmen against change will move away from its heaviest emphasis on possible subversives, and even away from the argument of inability of southern Europeans to assimilate easily into our culture. The argument will shift to the facts of the economic decline. Emphasis will be placed upon problems of population. It will be pointed out that we already have a population of some 170 million; that in about 20 years the population of the United States will increase by some 60 million; that the pattern of large families will continue; that our schools are overcrowded, to put it mildly; that our hospitals are already inadequate for our growing population; that automation is and will continue at accelerating pace to displace American workers; that increased population—either through natural increase or through immigration—will increase demands which, in turn, will increase inflation because productivity will not catch up with such demands.

It will be argued that immigrants almost invariably settle in cities already populated beyond the point of comfort, adding to congestion and, hence, contributing to delinquency. It will be argued that immigrants do not settle on farms where population is decreasing.

These, I believe, will be the main burden of the refrain. These arguments will have to be answered and I maintain that all these assertions can be rationally met.

I would like to make one modification. I have seen growing evidence of the adoption of these arguments by former proponents of liberal immigration. I have been told that some groups would be willing to settle for the change from a 1920 census base to a 1950 census base, a redistribution of unused quotas, and a modification of some of the deportation provisions. They have based their conclusions on the arguments I have just given you. I have been advised that they will stop pressing for the departure from the national origins system.

What I cannot understand is the perfectly obvious flaw in this kind of reasoning. Assuming for a moment—and I, for one, do not make such assumption—that increased immigration is at this time against the best national interests, what in the name of sanity has that to do with discrimination in public law? If the United States admits, 2, 5, 25, or 250,000, must they not be admitted on an equality of selection? Must they not be admitted on criteria that apply to all peoples, regardless of race, color, or creed? We must be prepared to meet these arguments not with heat, but with light.

Much will depend upon the nature of the testimony given at the hearings. If the testimony in favor of change is of the same pattern of exhortation and generalization, as well as denunciation, then we will not succeed in effecting any change whatsoever, especially in light of the economic picture. The opponents of change will seize upon this opportunity to emphasize and reemphasize the dangers of added numbers to our census. The argument must be based on America's imperative need to be, above all, just to all people. The argument must be based on America's absorptive capacity. The argument must be lodged in facts and figures on America's new industry, on our decreasing pool of skilled and unskilled workers. The American image has been badly damaged upon our insistence on the retention of the national origins system.

I believe that what we have to seek to establish at this point is not so much an unrealistic increase in numbers permitted to enter the United States, but the reassertion in our immigration law of the American principle of equality of opportunity for all, regardless of race, color, or creed. I believe it can be shown that the rigid quota system applied to Europe, Asia, and Africa, yet not applied from the Western Hemisphere, has resulted in weaking the argument that some persons assimilate easily and others not at all.

Some 49,000 Mexicans enter the United States each year, as against approximately 210,000 from Europe, Asia, and Africa all together. I have seen no injury to America from the Mexican influx, nor has it been a subject for comment by any of our immigration restrictionists. I merely point this out to show the fallacy in the restrictionists' thinking when it is based on a pretended homogeneity of the American people.

You will agree that limits must be set; not all will agree as to what those limits should be. For my part, I seek to have established a total annual quota of 250,000. I have based this on the average number of immigrants actually admitted into the United States within the last decade. My new bill, in most aspects, is similar to the legislation introduced in the 84th Congress and known as the Celler-Lehman bill, but I have extensively revised the earlier bill in its two most significant areas.

In retaining the basic features of the Celler-Lehman bill, I am, of course, proposing the elimination of the discriminatory features of the present law. Under my proposal, there will be no discrimination based on national origin or race, and there will be no classification of United States citizens into two categories, native-born and naturalized. There will be no additional grounds for loss of United States citizenship by naturalized citizens except those that apply to native-born citizens.

All provisions of the present law which permit its retroactive application in deportation proceedings have been eliminated in my bill. Similarly, all of the unduly harsh pro-

visions applicable now in exclusion proceedings have been humanized in my proposal. I have provided for a full and unlimited judicial review of administrative decisions made in all immigration and naturalization processes, including deportation and entry, and I have retained all the humanitarian provisions of the Celler-Lehman bill designed to prevent the separation of families. I have made the provisions applicable to suspension of deportation more human by eliminating the stiff restrictions of the present law in removing the requirement that suspension of deportation could be granted only if it would cause what the present law refers to as "exceptionally and extremely unusual hardship."

The revised features of my new bill pertain to what I believe is the heart of our immigration policy, namely (1) our quota system, and (2) jurisdiction over immigration.

The bill I am offering contains a new formula for the distribution of quota immigrant visas. This is a new formula devised for the first time since 1921, not based on national origins and not depending on any nose count of the United States population.

Wives, husbands, and minor children of United States citizens will continue to be admitted as nonquota immigrants, but I have added to the nonquota class parents of United States citizens and professors of academic schools.

In an attempt to make the new quota flexible in order to permit the United States to adjust its intake of immigrants in enlightened self-interest to the fast changing political, economic, and social situation of the world, under my new proposal our annual quota will be distributed among 5 classes of immigrants without regard to national origin, race, or any results of the United States census, as follows: (1) family unification class, (2) occupational class, (3) refugee asylum class, (4) national interest class, and (5) resettlement class.

Within each of the 5 classes, no more than 15 percent of the annual allocation could be issued to inhabitants of any single country. Here is how the annual distribution of the overall immigration quota will be established: Each year the President of the United States, after consulting with the Secretaries of State, Commerce, and Labor, and with the Attorney General, would submit to the Congress, prior to March 1, the proposed allocation for each of the 5 classes, and Congress will have 60 days following the submission of the President's proposal to disapprove it by passing a concurrent resolution. If the proposal is not disapproved by the Congress, it would take effect on the first day of the fiscal year immediately following. If the Congress disagrees with the President, the allocation effective in the preceding fiscal year would automatically become effective.

In order to get the joint executive-legislative responsibility for the annual distribution of the total immigration quota started, I propose that the first presidential allocation plan shall reach the Congress within 6 months immediately following the enactment of my bill, and if agreement is not reached on this first presidential proposal, the total annual quota of 250,000 would be simply cut across the board so as to give each of the 5 classes 20 percent of the total. This interim allocation would, of course, be valid for the first fiscal year of operations, pending the submission of the next presidential proposal which, again, will be subject to congressional disapproval.

My main purpose in proposing this flexible distribution of a permanently fixed annual quota is to permit the President to decide—on a year-to-year basis—with congressional concurrence, whether it is desirable in any particular year to grant more immigrant visas to relatives of United States citizens or to, say, refugees, or to, perhaps, immigrants possessing special skills needed in the United States at that particular time, or to any of the other classes.

The 15-percent permanent limitation affecting the participation of any single country in the distribution of the fivefold allocation is, in my opinion, a sufficient guarantee that no unfair distribution of visas for the benefit of inhabitants of one particular country would be practicable.

The second revised feature of my bill affects the administration of the law. Under the present law, we have a two-headed system where officials of the Department of State issue visas to both immigrants and nonimmigrants abroad, while officers of the Department of Justice determine at ports of entry whether the holders of visas are admissible to the United States. This is an antiquated, cumbersome, and expensive system. It creataes anxiety and uncertainty in the minds of the immigrants and nonimmigrants alike, and it causes friction between two governmental agencies operating independently in the same field and stepping on each other's toes.

Under my proposal, the entire administration of our immigration and nationality laws will be placed in the hands of a Director of Bureau of Immigration and Citizenship, who will be an Assistant Attorney General, subject to confirmation by the Senate. His officers, acting as immigration attachés, will be stationed at our consulates abroad and will issue immigrant and nonimmigrant visas after a finding is made that the recipient of a visa is found to be eligible actually to enter the United States.

In addition to simplification of procedures and elimination of dual standards, as well as uncertainty in the minds of immigrants or foreign visitors, my proposal will automatically open visa issuance to administrative review in the Department of Justice by the well-qualified and trusted Board of Immigration Appeals. The issuance of diplomatic visas will, of course, remain a function of diplomatic officers in the Department of State.

I believe that the administrative system which I propose will not only provide for a more efficient and more equitable issuance of visas abroad, but that it will also bring a great saving to the American taxpayer.

I have every reason to believe that the hearings on immigration will be both intensive and extensive. Twenty-eight Members of Congress have followed me in the introduction of this bill, which is in itself a most heartening fact. However, be it noted that the greatest majority of those who introduced identical legislation come from the heavily populated States. While it is reasonable to expect that these States, having benefited from immigration, would be most liberal in immigration matters, it is an indication of the educational work that must be done in the Midwest, Western, and Southern States.

If the proponents of liberalized immigration law do their homework, defer to reason and not passion, drop the name-calling which only serves to antagonize and strengthen the opposition, we can, through the forthcoming hearings, if nothing more, at least start the ball rolling toward an immigration law that will do honor to us and proclaim an effective and working democracy to those abroad.

Editor's Report by William Randolph Hearst, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting report by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., following his interview with Walter Ulbricht, top Communist stooge of the satellite state, East Germany.

The report follows:

RED LIKENS SELF TO LINCOLN

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

The old wheeze about a newspaperman "meeting so many interesting people" was pretty well justified, at least as far as I was concerned, the past 10 days.

Last week in Germany we lunched and talked with a half dozen German industrialists, including Alfred Krupp, the chief of that famous industrial firm. Then, on the political side, we spent an hour with Franz Joseph Strauss, young West German Defense Minister, and topped it all off with an interview with Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, which hit quite a few front pages all around the world.

Friday evening Bob Considine, Frank Conniff, and I flew up to Berlin and Saturday, too late for inclusion in last week's piece, we interviewed, by appointment, Walter Ulbricht, the top Communist stooge of the satellite state—East Germany. He had with him three members of his cabinet, including Gerhart Eisler, who, you might recall, jumped bail after being convicted of an immigration offense here in 1949, on the Polish ship *Batory*.

They had insisted that we submit our questions to them a week ahead and, when we met them at the central Communist Party headquarters, presented us with a 24-page propaganda-laden set of replies.

I must say it was an interesting session because, despite the fact that they knew that we knew we were getting a lot of double-talk, we were at least able to break it up on a light note.

That occurred when, speaking in German, the humorless, goateed Ulbricht tried to compare himself with Abraham Lincoln, and I made the remark, addressed to nobody in particular, "I thought Abraham Lincoln was on our side." With that the three cabinet members, all understanding English, burst into laughter. Realizing he was making no progress with his illogical line of reasoning the meeting broke up in some disorder.

I am informed that the reaction—unanimous, naturally—of the East German press to the interview is to accuse me of being adamantly pro-West. It is a censure that has not caused me one sleepless night.

The next morning, Sunday, we flew into New York, and Monday lunched with Dag Hammarskjold, Secretary General of the United Nations.

We have been on a mutual admiration "Dag and Bill" basis since our first Russian trip.

He is outspoken in his belief that these trips and interviews with the leaders of the countries that we have visited in our travels the past few years have been all for the good in helping promote better understanding

between peoples, and I have become a convert to the value of the work the United Nations does (or tries to do) under his able and dedicated leadership. As you know he is a Swede, and Sweden, at least in this century and despite two World Wars, has played a peaceful, neutral role.

His country's history and his own intellectual background eminently qualify him for his position, further attested to by the fact that both the East and the West voted for his continuing in his high office for a second term of 5 years.

Dag did not surprise me, therefore, when the other day he just could not restrain himself from speaking out in the Security Council on behalf of President Eisenhower's obviously sincere suggestion to set up an international Arctic inspection area, which Russian or American bombers would presumably traverse if launching an attack.

The President's plan proposed that nations whose interests include the Arctic—such as the United States, Russia, Canada, Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Finland—undertake technical studies for an effective inspection system against surprise attack. As Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge carefully and reasonably spelled it out, such a system should include prior notification of flights and other significant military movement in the Arctic, and radar and ground inspection posts.

Of all 11 nations in the Security Council only Russia sarcastically and scornfully rejected it, and it was at this point that Dag, though not supposed to take sides in a partisan argument, felt obliged, as a man of peace, to speak up.

Occasionally we read of someone appearing in a legal dispute in this country as a friend of the court. Dag played somewhat the same role. He appeared before the Security Council as a friend of humanity.

He explained afterwards that he felt compelled to speak because the President's plan offered the hope of making a dent in the disarmament deadlock. This same attitude was expressed by Secretary Dulles Thursday when he said: "I can hardly overstate my view that if something of this sort got started, it might mark a real turning point in this whole cold-war situation."

Mr. Dulles, I thought, was superb. His earnestness and his flexibility made the Russian charges that this was just a gimmick and a diversionary maneuver look shabby and ill-tempered. And this, coupled with President Eisenhower's equally earnest request to Soviet leaders the day before to reconsider their rejection, gave the United States proposal a tremendous moral and humanitarian impact. Proof of this were reports in the U. N. that even the Soviet satellites, Poland and Czechoslovakia, were pressing the Russians to give ground.

So along came Friday—the showdown day in the Security Council—and Soviet delegate Sobolev led off the proceedings with another snarling "No." He took a cut at Mr. Hammarskjold, saying his intervention in behalf of the plan "did not strengthen his authority * * * rather to the contrary," which I would say is rather to the contrary of the truth. He belligerently warned Cabot Lodge that in another war the territory of this country would be involved.

Cabot's reply was calmly irrefutable. If the Russians were as concerned as they professed to be about the accidental outbreak of war, he remarked, why did they object to a plan that would obviously reduce that danger?

The only answer the Soviet delegate had was to cast the sole vote against the President's plan.

In so doing, as Cabot Lodge observed, the Soviet Union may have deliberately knocked a summit meeting on its head.

By refusing to consider one single, specific proposal to relieve world tension—put forward in good faith and supported by men and nations of good faith—the Russians have made a mockery of expectations of any real accomplishment at the summit.

As you know, I have been in favor of a summit meeting since the return of the Hearst Task Force from Russia some 5 months ago.

Now, after this affront to the hopes of humanity for peace, I am inclined to agree with Cabot that in vetoing the President's plan, the Russians also have vetoed the summit.

What Can Foreign Investment Do for the Philippine Economy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH L. CARRIGG
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. CARRIGG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement by Mr. Gerald Wilkinson, president of Theo. H. Davies & Co., Far East, Ltd., may I say that the President of the Philippines, the Honorable Carlos P. Garcia, is soon to embark upon a visit to the United States where he will be greeted by our President and engage in discussions with our Secretary of State and others of our distinguished representatives. President Garcia's administration is most friendly to the United States and seeks to encourage foreign investments in the Philippines.

Mr. Gerald Wilkinson, president of Theo. H. Davies & Co., Far East Ltd., the author of the attached address entitled "What Can Foreign Investment Do for the Philippine Economy?" made to the Management Association of the Philippines, Manila, March 24, 1958, is a distinguished soldier, author, economist, and businessman. Mr. Wilkinson, as a representative of both domestic and foreign capital, has been engaged in various businesses in the Philippines for the past 30 years and during the last war had a distinguished war service record as liaison officer between the British and American armies, having departed from the Philippines with General MacArthur.

WHAT CAN FOREIGN INVESTMENT DO FOR THE PHILIPPINE ECONOMY?

Mr. President, members of the Management Association of the Philippines: In view of the important announcements made during recent weeks by His Excellency, the President, and by the speaker of the lower house, encouraging foreign investment in the Philippines, I am honored by your invitation to speak to you today, as a representative of both domestic and foreign capital, on the subject, "What Can Foreign Investment Do for the Philippine Economy?"

What foreign investment could do for the Philippine economy is clear. It could fill the gap which is more serious now than ever in Philippine history. I refer, of course, to the foreign exchange gap, the lack of foreign exchange; in other words, the gap between Philippine need of foreign exchange and the Philippine reserves of foreign exchange.

Why is that need more serious than before? Because, as we all know, the growth of Philippine population is outstripping the cost of imports and industrialization.

The disparity between the official rate of exchange and the black market rate of exchange has put a premium on barter which in turn reduces the foreign exchange available from exports, thereby further impairing the national reserves of foreign exchange. At the same time, in the Philippines, as elsewhere in Asia (except Japan), the terms of world trade have, particularly in recent years, worked against the Philippines. A significant statement on this point was made at the recent ECAFE meeting in Malaya, from which I will quote: "There is a disturbing trend where nonindustrial countries seem to be getting a decreasing share of world trade while industrial countries continue to advance." The reason for this, of course, is that the cost of agricultural products, and gold and recently base metals, from all of which the Philippines derives much of her export income, have not enjoyed the increases in price which capital goods and imported raw materials have enjoyed, so that the value per unit of our imports has become more costly than the value per unit of our exports.

Those who criticize the Philippine monetary authorities and regard them as alone responsible for the serious decline in Philippine foreign exchange reserves, would do well to remember that for years the Philippines has been swimming against an adverse economic tide in the terms of trade. The critics would also do well to remember that Philippine reserves of foreign exchange have not been wholly squandered on nonessentials. I know of no other country in southeast Asia that has achieved the same percentage of growth in industrialization, using 1949 as the base, that the Philippines has achieved, and most of this has required a heavy outgo of foreign exchange for capital expenditures and materials, although the percentage of local raw materials used in Philippine factories will undoubtedly grow in years to come.

There is another factor which presses on the balance of payments, and that is the growth of Philippine population, and the growth of the desire per capita to have more things. These forces exercise a mounting pressure for more imports and for more production by local industry. They do not necessarily act as a force for larger exports unless the incentives to develop exports are built in.

So, in measuring what investment, domestic or foreign, can do for the Philippine economy, we have this rising tide, the tide of more people needing more things, needing more production, needing more goods competing for the market, needing an economy of abundance and not an economy of scarcity, needing in fact more things to be made available so that prices may be controlled by the only thing that ultimately ever controls prices: abundance of supply. In many of the countries outside of North America, it seems to me that we have lived so long in atmospheres of State-controlled scarcities, that many of us businessmen are getting hardening of the arteries; not the arteries of the body but the arteries of the mind and the imagination.

Now, how is all of this going to be improved not only for the Philippines but for those other countries of southeast Asia whose populations are also increasing, whose standards of living deserve to rise, and who are also suffering from adverse terms of trade, that is, adverse values of exports compared with the cost of machinery and imported materials? How is abundance of supply and production to be achieved for this great section of the world's population?

The voice of Russia has been clearly heard; her advice in occasions of this sort is to encourage economic nationalism within small countries and to urge them to solve it your-

self. It reminds me of the wolf, disguised as grandma, beguiling little Red Riding Hood. However, let us look at this advice. Can we solve the economic needs of the Philippines by going it alone without foreign investment? If we could, what a relief, how simple.

I remember a time in the Philippines when it was commonly thought by many Filipinos and foreigners that Philippine capital would never venture beyond real estate and precious stones, into industrialization on any major scale. How wrong those judgments have proved. In companies associated with us alone, I have seen Filipino capital come out of real estate and savings into new industry on a scale that any patriot would be proud of, and I know that our experience is a minor one compared with what is happening elsewhere in Philippine finance. Colonel Soriano's companies alone have done wonders in domestic capital development. We need a few dozen more like him; but they don't grow on every bush. What is remarkable, I think, is that domestic capital has moved into industrial development, trade and commerce, to the extent that it has in recent years, when any movement of Philippine capital, for example out of inherited real estate into new ventures or out of any old business into a new one, is punished by a capital gains tax which highly industrialized countries, such as Britain and Candada, do not impose upon their economies, and which even the United States, in all its wealth and power, regards as undesirable above a 25 percent rate. I believe that the deterrent effect of the capital-gains tax upon the movement of Phillippine domestic capital into greater productivity, is a very serious matter, and that its silently restrictive effect upon Filipino capital movement is far greater than the small sums earned by the tax.

However, even if the capital gains tax were abolished, would Philippine domestic capital be able to provide the increased national production required to fill not only the empty shelves of today but the shelves of 5 and 10 years' time? If the population was static and if its standard of living was already high, I think that with the aid of some very large long-term foreign loans (if obtainable) to fill foreign exchange gaps, domestic capital might be able to do the job. But is the population going to be static and is the standard of human consumption already high enough? We know that it isn't, and we know that in 5 and 10 years' time the situation is going to be far more serious than now.

Did you notice the statistics quoted by Leo Virata the other day that in the 1956 census 71 percent of the Philippine population was under 29 years of age, and 44 percent of it under 20 years old? How old will those large percentages of the population be in 5 and 10 years from now? Will their per capita desires be less or more than now? Will they and their growing families be content with an economy of controlled scarcity, or will they demand more things more cheaply for more people? The answer is all too clear. They will want more things more cheaply for more people. What is going to solve than want? Communists of course would like to do it their way; the sharing of everything by everybody, which can be quite popular when nobody has much to share. The best antidate to that, I would think, is to have an economy in which more things are available for more people more cheaply. Communism must lose much of its charm when it requires a lot of people to give up a lot of things, and I have not noticed it achieve much success in a country where most people have a lot of things. Have you?

Then how are we going to provide a lot of things during these next 5 or 10 years? Only, I would think, by a major increase of domestic and foreign investment and by a concentrated drive not on development alone but on the acceleration of development. This is going to require heavy expenditures in foreign exchange. Why not encourage foreign investers to bring it in voluntary, not shotgun, partnerships with domestic capital? (I mention the shotgun because if foreign investors are told that their participation is to be regimented and that their partnership plans are to be compulsory, not voluntary, they may not turn up for the wedding.)

In this connection, I notice that the wording of our subject today is "What Can Foreign Investment Do" and not "What Will Foreign Investment Do." This distinction seems to me a wise one. What foreign investment can do and what it will do can be very different things. For the ability of foreign investment to do anything is subject to the actions of the Philippine Government, the legislature, and the monetary authorities. If the attitude and actions of the Philippine authorities toward foreign capital are welcoming, nondiscriminatory, considerate and consistent, I am sure that the Philippines could attract the entry of helpful foreign capital on a scale that has not been seen before and surpassing the probable entry of foreign capital into any areas between Suez and Japan inclusive. Why? Because the people of the Philippines are known to be progressive, friendly, Christian, and anti-Communist. And because this country is known to possess a combination of agricultural, mineral and power resources that could provide great prosperity for all her people.

If, on the other hand, the actions of the Philippine authorities toward foreign capital are divided in the nature of their welcome; if, for example, the administration is welcoming and the legislature passes helpful bills to encourage foreign investment, but at the same time, other bills aim at discouraging foreign investment and their staffs and technicians, then new capital, which is in demand all over the world, will obviously go elsewhere, as it has been doing to a large extent. This matter of consistency is of the greatest importance if we are to attract foreign capital here. A foreign investor, like a domestic investor, wants to be sure of consistency in the regulations. He wants to know if the dividend and profit remittance formulas are going to be changed. Most changes of regulations make investors nervous, and give investors the feeling that they are swimming in a sea of unpredictable waves, which may upset the worthiest calculations and the most efficient operation. Any uncertainty as to adequate raw materials supply is of course fatal, and it would be better for Philippine prestige and fairer to all investors, domestic and foreign, I think, if permission to establish a new industry were denied rather than to grant the industry permission to start and then deny it the raw materials upon which the industry, its employees, and its investors, depend.

His Excellency, Tunku Abdul Rahman, Prime Minister of the Malayan Federation made, I thought, a most constructive suggestion the other day, when he suggested that Asian countries might attract private capital from abroad if they drew up an international charter, a charter that would regulate the treatment of foreign private capital, that would assure investors that their rights would be protected, and would remove fears that such investment would interfere with the sovereigney of receiving countries. He expressed the hope that Malaya's neighbors might take a lead in this.

I would have thought that the Philippines is admirably qualified by her political sophistication, her recognition that the world is moving towards internationalism, her strategic position, and her need to develop her natural resources, to take a lead in this suggestion from Malaya.

From the Philippine point of view, I can well understand the former fear that overinvestment by foreign capital might prejudice national freedom. A hundred years ago such a fear might have been well founded. But today, the diversity of Philippine agriculture, mining and industry, and the large proportions of ownership that are firmly in Filipino hands, can give little grounds for fears. This is no desert in which an oil strike might prove politically indigestible. If the capital gains tax is abolished and so liberates Philippine capital to enter into new ventures in voluntary partnerships with foreign investment, the growth prospects for Philippine investors would, in my view, be far greater than today, and far greater than in any country trying to go it alone.

Well, gentlemen, time marches on. I have spoken enough and if anything I have said is mistaken or misinformed, I hope you will correct me. There is so much to learn. But it is not only in this room that time marches on. The growth of population, the rise of human needs, and the scarcity of foreign exchange, are urgent matters.

As a long established resident of the Philippines, I recommend that a Philippine charter to welcome foreign capital be earnestly considered, and I believe that such a charter will benefit the Philippine public and domestic investors immensely, now and much more so in years to come.

A Moral and Legal Obligation for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 31, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, Congress has a moral and legal obligation to reverse the recent Supreme Court decision of Commissioner against Sullivan. In this case the Court held that operators of gambling enterprises may deduct as ordinary and necessary business expenses amounts expended to lease premises and hire employees, even though their business is illegal.

As it now stands, this decision opens the door for gamblers to deduct just about any item they consider ordinary to their particular business. This could well include the cost of buying police and local protection, of hiring thugs to scare off competitors, and other illegal payoff deals which are essential to the operations of the bigtime gambler.

To put an end to this nonsense, I introduced on March 27, H. R. 11691, which would prohibit the deduction of any expense incurred in furtherance of a gambling enterprise which is illegal under State law. We should enact this bill immediately, so that no law-abiding citizen will be forced to pay more taxes to the Federal Government because illegal organizations are allowed to reduce their tax burdens by the amount of illegal expenditures he has made. When it comes to paying taxes, the bigtime gambler should be treated for what he is—not a law-abiding businessman, but an out and out crook.

Chairman MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee has assured me the bill will receive early consideration by the committee as soon as the depart-

mental reports are received. Public interest is high in this measure, and I am hopeful Congress will act on it before adjournment.

Three editorials from different parts of the country have endorsed the principle of H. R. 11691. They are from the Christian Science Monitor, the Nashville Banner, and the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle. Under leave previously granted, I insert them at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of March 22, 1958]

THE TANGLED WEB

"Oh, what a tangled web we weave,
When first we practice to deceive!"

To which lines of wisdom by Sir Walter Scott, Congress in 1951 and a decision of the Supreme Court this past week have supplied a word of special emphasis: "ourselves."

The Court has just ruled that professional gamblers—although their operations likely violate State law—when reporting income for Federal tax purposes may deduct "ordinary and necessary expenses," such as wages, and rents, incurred conducting their illegal businesses.

United States Solicitor General J. Lee Rankin, in presenting the Government's argument for a contrary decision, made a succinct commentary on this extraordinary ruling:

"We do not believe it is 'necessary' to break the law or, in particular, that it is 'necessary' to hire persons to commit crimes."

Fantastic? The Court's majority opinion gives the clue to why this is simple fantasy compounded:

"This [referring to the tax code] seems to us to be recognition of a gambling enterprise as a business for Federal tax purposes."

Back in 1951, searching for sources of revenue and hopeful of exposing professional gamblers, Congress enacted a law requiring such gamblers to register and buy $50 tax stamps. If the gamblers avoid this they break Federal law; if they comply they furnish about all the information needed for prosecution under State law. And gambling is illegal in almost every State.

Congress has never given the Internal Revenue Service a fraction of the men necessary to enforce such a law. The tax has brought in but 2 percent of the annual $400 million predicted. And it has so tangled the legal and moral factors that a Court decision such as this one might be termed logical in the context.

But it is basically wrong. And the law is basically wrong. When the people or their representatives permit their Government to be led into any sort of partnership with elements against which it is expected to protect society, then they indeed deceive themselves.

[From the Nashville Banner of April 10, 1958]

TO RECTIFY "LAW OF THE LAND"

As to what is legal and what is illegal—what is the "law of the land"? That Congress has the right to say, and in some very definitive language by written statute, is the theme of a bill introduced last week by Representative KENNETH KEATING, of New York, moving to reverse (by law) a March 17 decision of the United States Supreme Court.

In that decision, the high tribunal held that it is right and legal for the Federal Internal Revenue Service to grant an income-tax deduction on expenses incurred by persons who are engaged in operating businesses that violate State laws.

The case originated in Illinois, which forbids by law the operation of gambling enterprises. The Supreme Court ruled that persons engaged in illegal gambling there had a right to deduct rent and wages of their employees before paying Federal taxes on their profits. Supposedly that became the "law of the land."

Truly the Court moves in mysterious ways its wonders to perform.

Among the laws that Congress writes are the revenue laws. It leaves to the States (and properly) the writing of laws determinative of what is legal or illegal within their respective boundaries.

Representative KEATING is right in his proposal to put some sense and principle into the defense of law as written. This is not the first time, nor the only field, in which the Supreme Court has sought to preempt authority and dispossess a State law.

[From the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle]

CRACK AT CROOKS

Representative KENNETH B. KEATING's bill to prohibit the deduction of business expenses incurred in an illegal gambling operation is a response to virtually a challenge from the Supreme Court.

In ruling that such expenses could be deducted, the tribunal in effect said that Congress had never disapproved of such deductions. Therefore it becomes a corrective legislative function; the Court only interprets—it does not make the law.

In the case appealed to the Court, a gambling operator's request to deduct money spent to lease premises and hire help in an illegal operation was confirmed. Furthermore, it is understood that gamblers, in reporting income, may reduce their winnings by the amount of their losses—"business losses," you know.

The High Court's interpretation leaves the door open to some interesting "business expenses." They might include the cost of police protection, of hiring thugs to frighten competitors, or of paying strong-arm boys for collecting from welshers.

Under provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, not only is a breed of lawbreakers officially recognized; but the Government compounds an evil (an illegal mess) by feeding upon it.

No law-abiding citizen ought to pay more taxes because an admitted lawbreaker is allowed to pay less. If the Government cannot stamp out illegal gambling, at least the operators should pay heavily for it.

Hon. Emanuel Celler

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in extending to the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, heartiest congratulations on his 70th birthday.

I have been associated with him in the House of Representatives for many years and I know of the great contributions he has made to our Nation. I value his friendship. We have always found him cooperative, willing to aid all those who call upon him for assistance.

His talents and capabilities are outstanding. He is an able and astute legislator; as chairman of the important Committee on the Judiciary, his vast knowledge of the law and his fair and impartial treatment of all who appear before him, make him one of the great committee chairmen in the history of the House of Representatives. His active participation in philanthropic programs, community affairs, his interest in the welfare of mankind, all contribute to his great stature as a leader among men.

I wish for my dear friend EMANUEL CELLER many more happy birthday anniversaries.

Let's Not Overadjust Our Readjustment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, we cannot pick up a newspaper today, or listen to a news report without hearing about the recession. Of course, we should at all times be alert to the changes in our economy, but we should not go headlong into a spending spree which could take us into a financial or economic depression.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very sensible article from the May 1958 issue of Nation's Business. The article follows:

LET'S NOT OVERADJUST OUR READJUSTMENT

However much the present business adjustment may differ in severity from its immediate predecessors, it surpasses them in at least one respect:

It claims far wider attention.

The recessions of 1949 and 1954 came and went largely unremarked except by those immediately affected and by economists.

The casual acceptance of mild adversity in those years contrasts sharply with the alarums and tocsins that are sounding today. Press wires out of Washington are frantic with rumors of impending actions, legislative proposals, spending schemes, boasts, excuses, and assurances that the unemployed have not been forgotten.

One who can think in all this din is likely to ask himself: Why this effort to pump life into a business adjustment which, though sharp in places, is far from universal?

He arrives at a pretty shabby answer:

Nineteen-fifty-eight is an election year.

If this harsh judgment seems to imply a belief that expediency colors the politician's view of the national economy, one needs only to turn to the proposed emergency spending schemes for proof.

Few of these schemes are new.

Some have actually failed on their own merits only to be offered again—after sputnik—to help us catch up with the Russians; now, once more, to get us out of recession.

Some were tried in the decade 1930 to 1940 when, in spite of an orgy of Government spending, we had the longest depression in our history.

Most would put Government money initially into construction which is already projected at a record level and where inflation cost has been running five percent a year compounded for more than a decade. Such spending would not only run the Government deeper into debt; it would take effect slowly and would be unstoppable once

begun—even Government cannot leave a dam half-built.

Carrying over into months or years after the present adjustment ends, it would bid against private builders for material and labor, thus increasing the pressure for inflation—which only a few months ago was a major concern of Government.

It will be again unless statesmanship replaces the chase for selfish political advantage. If it will return to realities, Government can help lay a firm foundation for a sound and enduring recovery.

Some automatic governmental stabilizers are already at work.

Some actions already taken can be helpful.

Latest figures show that, of the present 5.2 million unemployed, some 3 million are unemployable, changing jobs, or seasonably out of work—a normal condition. Some 700,000 are new additions to the working force seeking their first job. This leaves some 1.5 million who have lost their jobs because of the business readjustment.

Since it costs about $16,000 today to employ a man in industry, a government effort to provide a job for these people would cost $23 billion.

Even the most lavish government spenders would pause at this.

Private industry can meet this cost with advantage to everybody if Federal tax reform provides the incentive to develop new things, and put people to work making them.

Editors Strike Hard at Secrecy in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to inclde an editorial which appeared in the Illinois State Register on May 5, 1958. The editorial follows:

EDITORS STRIKE HARD AT SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT

The editor of the State Register had occasion, when in Washington at sessions of the American Society of Newspaper Editors in mid-April, to personally congratulate Congressman JOHN E. MOSS, Democrat, of California, on his review of his gallant fight against Government secrecy. We are pleased to add that legislation which Moss is sponsoring to let the people know about the people's business, has been, and is, stanchly supported by Congressman PETER F. MACK, Jr., of this district, a close friend of MOSS.

The current issue of Editor and Publisher presents the problem succinctly when commending House passage of an antisecrecy amendment to the Federal housekeeping statute. The Editor and Publisher sums up the situation as to the future. It says, and we are in complete agreement:

"The victory in the House would not have been possible without the stalwart efforts of Representative JOHN MOSS and his committee members. But at the same time, their success would not have been possible without the support and backing of newspaper editors. If it had not been for Dr. Harold Cross, ASNE counsel, who first uncovered the statute (5 U. S. C. 22) as the source of much governmental secrecy, the move to amend might never have occurred.

"The fight to reduce secrecy in government must not end here. Dr. Cross cites as the target for tomorrow, title 5, United States Code, section 1002, enacted in 1946 as a part of the Administrative Procedure Act. It has five built-in provisions susceptible of use to justify secrecy, according to Dr. Cross. Among them are provisions permitting secrecy for 'any function of the United States requiring secrecy in the public interest,' or for 'any matter relating solely to the internal management of an agency.'

"Bills to amend this section have been introduced in the Senate and House. They deserve the same support that editors have given and must continue to give to the Moss-Hennings bills."

In an interview with Congressman MACK in Washington, the Springfield district representative said: "JOHN MOSS is a close personal friend, and I support his views on freedom of information. I am a vigorous supporter of his bill (H. R. 2767) as Government agencies admittedly overclassify information and use this classification as an excuse for withholding information from the public. The people have a right to know that this legislation is in their interest."

The editor of the State Register is pleased to report that all newspaper conferences he has attended this year—the Copley Press, American Society of Newspaper Editors, the Associated Press, and the American Newspaper Publishers Association—have gone on record as insisting, to the point of demand, that the people must be kept informed of the people's business in government, local, State, and national. Secrecy in government is un-American.

Virginia's I. T. Quinn Points to Legislative Conflicts in Resources Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the searching editorial, The Prodigality of Man, written by I. T. Quinn, executive director of the Commonwealth of Virginia's Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries in a recent issue of Virginia Wildlife:

THE PRODIGALITY OF MAN

(By I. T. Quinn)

Contrary to common belief, nature was not prodigal at the time of creation. After heaven and earth were brought into existence, the waters were separated from the earth, and lights for both day and night were established. Then came into being the beasts of the field, fowls of the air and fishes of the waters. Last, but by no means the least, the human race was brought into existence and was given dominion and made the overseer of every living thing.

How well man has discharged the responsibilities assigned him, you may judge, dear reader. If I were to be the judge, I am afraid the sentence passed on him would be a rather harsh one. During the nearly 35 years that I have been an administrator of man-made laws and regulations governing the conservation, protection and development of the wildlife of fields, woods and waters, I have observed the selfish rapaciousness of man exemplified throughout the length and breadth of the United States and some of the foreign countries.

Drive along the modern highways of today and you will see grim monuments to man's stupidity. The red devil of fire has taken its toll of some of the best that has been left by the saw and ax. Too many of our once beautiful streams remain burdened with human and industrial wastes. Eroded soils fill their beds and produce costly floods. Go to our fields and woodlands, and in too many instances will you find little or no game where once there was an abundance.

True, man has begun in a feeble way to restore the forests, the virgin waters and the soil he so ruthlessly mined; but he's just scratching the surface. Human population is far outstripping man's effort and his ability to reproduce natural renewable resources.

Manmade laws too often destroy the natural laws which, if given opportunity, through the process of reproduction and growth would guarantee to the teeming millions of earth a reasonable supply of all those natural renewable resources placed here for man's pleasure and economic benefit.

Many of our natural resources are dissipated upon the altar of political expediency. Witness the conflicting legislation which has been enacted in recent years. Some of the outstanding examples of man's innate desire to do something spectacular without regard to consequences may be cited as follows:

(a) Laws enacted and large sums of money appropriated to authoriez and pay for ditching and draining millions of acres of potholes and wetlands, where ducks and other migratory waterfowl are struggling to perpetuate their kinds, for the purpose of increasing the number of acres which may be devoted to raising agricultural crops.

(b) Revenues appropriated and other revenues required from the sale of duck stamps to construct potholes and to take lands out of agriculture and convert them into wetlands for the purpose of raising ducks and other migratory wildfowl.

(c) Millions upon top of millions appropriated to pay farmers to take cropland out of cultivation.

(d) Millions appropriated to reestablish agricultural lands by methods of irrigation.

(e) Millions appropriated to pay farmers for taking land out of cultivation under the Soil Bank plan, so they will not produce so large a surplus.

(f) Millions appropriated to teach farmers how to produce more agricultural crops per acre.

(g) Millions appropriated on top of millions to feed and thereby obtain the good will of the peoples of other nations.

(h) Large sums appropriated from which a million-dollars-a-day storage rent is paid for caves, warehouses, and ships to store grain and other surplus food products. Why could not this food be sent to the hungry peoples of the world instead of sending them money with which to buy food from other countries?

How does all this conflicting legislation come about? Well, one set of legislators has constituents who own large acreages of wet land and pot-hole country; another set has a large number of semi-arid country landowners. Still another group has a constituency that wants to get in on the soil-bank plan, and so on. Each fraction trades back and forth on the taxpayers' money. One says to the other: "I'll vote for an appropriation to ditch and drain your pot holes and wetlands if you'll vote for an appropriation to construct pot holes and build dikes for the purpose of creating wetlands for my constituency." A third group says to the first two: "I'll vote for both of your bills if you will help me get the millions it's going to take to get all of this crop land out of production." The irrigation group votes for all of the other three groups if they vote for his irrigation projects. By the time all the trades are in, a multiplicity of conflicting laws have been written into the statutes. At least, that's the way it looks from where I sit.

It may be that the lawmakers do not trade with each other, but, whatever they do, they come up with the aforesaid legislation.

Slovaks in Russia Before 1917 Bolshevik Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on May 4, 1958, the Slovaks of the world in general and the United States of America in particular, paid tribute to Gen. Milan R. Stefanik, scientist, soldier, patriot, and cofounder of the first Czechoslovak Republic in observance of the 39th anniversary of his tragic death.

I am proud to point out that General Stefanik visited the Newark area of my disrtict on two occasions. Once in 1907 while on his way to Tahiti as a member of the French Academy of Scientists, and then again during World War I. General Stefanik's late brother as well as another well-known fighter for Slovak freedom, Gustave Kosik, at one time claimed Newark as their residence.

The following article by John C. Sciranka, editor of the American Friends of Slovak Freedom, of Passaic, N. J., is timely in recalling the role General Stefanik and the Slovaks played in fighting communism.

SLOVAKS IN RUSSIA BEFORE 1917 BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION

(By John C. Sciranka)

On November 7, 1957, the 40th anniversary of Bolshevik revolution was celebrated in Soviet Russia and in all the countries where she has her diplomatic representatives including the United States.

This brings the subject of Slovaks in Russia before this revolution in 1917. They have lived there for several centuries. Especially the Slovak wireworkers, drotari, established their shops in principal cities of Russia. Many apprentices after finishing their 4 years of craftsmanship in Slovakia, moved to Russia. One of the larger Slovak wire manufacturers was Bellis, whose namesake operates a wire factory in Bronx, N. Y. Bellis employed several hundred workers in various cities, including the province of Georgia, where Stalin was born. He transported his wires by freight, horses, wagons, and on camels.

But not all Slovaks in Russia before the revolution of 1917 were wireworkers. Many were diplomats, army officers, and professors. For instance, Michael Baludjansky was born in Zemplin County in 1769 and died in St. Petersburg in 1847, after completing his studies in Kosice, eastern metropolis of Slovakia, went to St. Petersburg as professor. Later he became a senator and chairman of the czar's cabinet chancery. Baludjansky also was first president of the University of St. Petersburg. Later Dr. Dusan Makovicky became personal physician of the famous Count Leo Tolstoy, author of War and Peace, Anna Karenina, and many other popular works. Makovicky lived with Tolstoy in the Yasnaja Polyana. Another Slovak, Albert Skarvan, was the first non-Russian writer to translate and publicize Tolstoy's famous works.

When in 1916 American Slovaks sent two delegates to Russia to seek czar's aid in establishing a free Bohemia and Slovkia, the late Dr. Gustave Kosik of Passaic, N. J., and Dr. Stefan Osusky of Cudahy, Wis., later Czechoslovakian ambassador in Paris for 20 years, were chosen as representatives of the Slovak League of America. Osusky is presently in Washington, D. C., heading the Czechoslovakian liberation movement. Osusky never reached Russia but stayed in Paris, assisting Dr. Eduard Benes. Kosik arrived in London, where he was briefed for his trip for several months by Dr. T. G. Masaryk, later first president of Czechoslovakia. Before Kosik's arrival in Russia in 1916 with Gen. Milan R. Stefanik, 1 of the 3 principal cofounders of Czechoslovakia, the Czechs and Slovaks there were talking seriously about kingdom of Czechoslovakia. At that time it was apparent that Russia will win the war and one of the Russian dukes would occupy the historical throne of Bohemia. Kings and emperors were still popular. Of course, Masaryk, Benes, Stefanik, Col. Hurban, later Ambassador in Washington, Kosik, as well their associates in United States of America, England, France, and other countries outside of Russia were preaching democratic form of government on the pattern of our United States. Kosik was well known in Newark, N. J., as president of the Slovak Catholic Sokol.

Although the Czechs and Slovaks lived in Russia for several centuries it was only after the outbreak of World War I, that they called the First Czechoslovak Congress in Russia, which was held on August 28, 1914, in St. Petersburg. Poland, especially the city of Warsaw was then under the czar's rule. There the Slovaks had a very large colony. Jozef Orsagh was their leader. They had their society called the Warsawska Beseda (Warsaw Forum). When the Czech and Slovak leaders met in St. Petersburg, they proclaimed the unity of two nations. However, at that time, the mentioned Jozef Orsagh insisted on the Slovakian homerule, which was adopted unanimously. On September 17, 1914 Czar Nicholas the last, received the first delegation of Czechs and Slovaks at the Carske Selo. Delegate Klecanda represented the St. Petersburg group; Konicek the Moscow group; Cerveny the group from Kiev and Orsagh was the Slovak representative.

This delegation asked the czar for the freedom of Czechs and Slovaks of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the establishment of the independent Kingdom of Czechoslovakia. The czar was impressed and since Orsagh was the only Slovak representative, czar directed a question at him, whether the Slovaks demand a unity with the Czechs, to which Orsagh responded in the affirmative.

The czar gave his sanction for the establishment of the Czechoslovak freedom movement. What followed was the step to unite the existing Czech and Slovak societies in all czarist Russia. Such unity meeting of both nations was held at a conference in Moscow from February 22 to 26 in 1915. It was a mere coincidence that President George Washington's birthday was selected for the first day of this historical conference. Later Washington, D. C., and the United States played a very important role in the establishment of Czechoslovakia, which was considered its child and President Woodrow Wilson its uncle or godfather. Bohumil Cermak, namesake of famous Chicago mayor, Anton Cermak, was elected chairman of the conference.

The only known Slovak intellectual who opposed this unity was Dr. Kvacala, professor at Jurjevska University. Kvacala's relative was a Lutheran minister in Braddock, Pa., who again worked for the creation of Czechoslovakia.

Dr. Massaryk soon learned about the misunderstanding in Russia, so he sent there Mr. Durich; former Czech member of Vienna Parliament. But Durich proved to be too weak to master the Czech and Slovak group. On May 31, 1915 B. Cermak, as chairman; J. Moravec as vice chairman; Jiri Klecanda as secretary, and Frantisek Reif and A. Wols, as members of the committee issued a proclamation, recalling the glorious past of Great Moravian Kingdom and the unity of Czech and Slovak nations. Professor Kvacala continued to oppose this unity. However, the presence of General Stefanik and Gustave Kosik as spokesmen for the American Slovaks helped to cement that unity, which Kosik later opposed. At that time there were many Czech and Slovak war prisoners in Russia. They were either captured or gave themselves up, refusing to fight as soldiers of Austro-Hungary against their Slavic brothers—the Russians. Many were shot for treason. Later many of these prisoners were terrorized. Some 20,000 of them, mostly Slovaks, died building the Murmansk road, others died of hunger and typhoid fever.

Russia at that time was already in the German hands. Czar was but a figurehead. And German diplomats and officers plotted to overthrow the czar whom Kosik visited and presented the memorandum of American Slovaks. Czar's minister Sturmer, a German, promised to take care of Czech and Slovak war prisoners and help them to join the Czecho-Slovak legion. But it was just an empty promise. Sturmer worked against the Czecho-Slovak liberation movement and was in the hands of German agents, who helped Lenin to enter into Russia in a sealed train. Minister Sturmer had for his adviser a certain official named Priklonsky, who although was czar's consul general in Budapest for 15 years yet he did not know anything about the Slovak problem and their desires. Kosik later informed Priklonsky but it was too late. Hunger and disunity were already forcing czar's abdication. Later murder of mad monk Rasputin and the assassination of czar and his family followed. Kosik was still in Russia when Kerensky came into power. He was on the streets of Moscow when many fightings took place. However, very few Russians took the Bolshevik leaders seriously. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt is right that the world in general did not know true Russia and this applies even now.

I heard very often my old friend Valentine Nemec, well-known Slovak printer in New York City, now retired, who knew Leon Trotsky personally. Nemec often remarks that who would have ever thought that a weakling like Trotsky with a few whiskers on his beard, would become such a giant during the "10 days that shook the world," as described by John Reed, an American, who became arch-Bolshevist and is buried in Kremlin.

General Stefanik after his return from Russia warned the Allies that bolshevism is a menace to the free world unless it is stopped. General Stefanik's Czecho-Slovak legion and its historical march of the 70,000 under the leadership of Gen. Rudolph Gajda checked its spread as described by the late Col. Stephen Bonsal, interpreter of President Wilson in his Suitors and Suppliants and The Unfinished Business, a Pulitzer prize winner. Bonsal knew General Stefanik and quotes his prophetic warning but many then, just like now in the era of sputnik, minimized the Soviet power, ambition, and expansion. Let the past be a lesson and a warning for the present and the future.

Victory Without War—Is It Possible?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, an excellent new book published a few days ago has come to my attention. The title is

Victory Without War. This is a challenging subject in which all of us are deeply interested.

This perceptive volume is written by a distinguished soldier-analyst, George Fielding Eliot. Mr. Eliot tells a sharply challenging story of the amazing build-up in the missile and space exploration field now credited to Soviet Russia. He recommends certain "must" courses to make war impossible. These are courses to be taken by the United States and the free world if they are to equal the Soviet Union's remarkable advance.

To know current, vital problems in this most interesting area, I recommend this volume as an efficient and telling work which will make every intelligent American, regardless of party, stop, look, and listen.

I am particularly struck with the keen analysis embodied in these forward-looking views and want them to be considered by the careful and thinking Members of the Congress and the American people in broadening the basis for their judgment.

Poland's Contribution to America

SPEECH
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 167th anniversary of the enactment of a document which has profound significance for all of us who appreciate the priceless heritage of freedom under a government of law.

One hundred and sixty-seven years ago, the Polish Diet met at Warsaw and enacted, by unanimous vote, a constitution for the Polish people which became at once a charter of their liberties and a document of vital importance for all peoples.

Drawn at a time when Poland was being threatened by imperialistic countries, this constitution carried principles which survived while Poland was struggling for independence and which were embodied in the constitutional laws of the Polish State which emerged after World War I.

Today it can be said that while Poland's government is Communist its people are not. The tenets of the original constitution are cherished in the hearts of Polish citizens within the borders of this unfortunate nation, and are remembered by everyone who is deeply concerned with the freedom and rights of man.

Reports from Poland indicate that communism has made no gains over deep-rooted Polish love of liberty and patriotism, due, in large measure, to the clear memory of the precepts carried in the original constitution of Poland.

Now is the time, I believe, to take notice of the enactment of this great document and to reaffirm our friendship for the people of Poland.

Surely, people who produced such an inspiring document as this can never be subjected in spirit by a force as detrimental as communism.

Try as they might to eradicate the tenets of constitutional government, the Communists cannot rub out the bright light of liberty which was kindled in Poland in 1791.

That light will burn long after the torch of communism has been extinguished.

This is a fitting opportunity to note the tremendous contribution our Polish Americans have made to our country.

There is scarcely an area of our national life where Polish Americans are not prominent. They have brought to these areas qualities of self-reliance, indomitable courage, patriotism, and a love of work—indispensable attributes for our ever-growing, ever-expanding population.

These qualities, long regarded as synonomous with the Polish spirit, are now a very real part of our American fiber.

These qualities were at work in our earliest settlement at Jamestown. Poles were very much in evidence there. Poles helped to clear the forests, to build up the industries in their adopted country, exhibiting their great willingness to dedicate their minds and muscles to building up the mightiest country on earth.

Poles not only worked to further our liberty. They fought and, in many cases, died to preserve it. The story of the American Revolution is not complete without chapters devoted to the bravery and vision of Pulaski and Kosciuszko who fought at the side of General Washington. There are many hundreds of other Polish names on the muster rolls, too, names of men who fought for American liberty at Saratoga, Brandywine, and Charleston, to mention just a few of the engagements.

After the Revolution, Poles discarded their weapons for other tools. They participated in all levels of activity in peacetime, from the grueling hard work of early factories to the splendid contributions to our spiritual and cultural heritage from pulpits and teachers' rostrums.

These dedicated, dependable Americans participated in every struggle for liberty in which our country engaged. It has been pointed out—and should be cited again—that more than 40,000 Polish Americans volunteered in World War I and that a total of 300,000 served in all the armed forces during that conflict.

More than 550,000 served in World War II—and thousands more participated in the Korean conflict.

No reference to Polish American contributions can be complete without telling how they bettered our American culture. A list of Polish-American musicians, authors, painters, sculptors, and architects could fill these pages. We might well consider the artistry of Artur Rubinstein and the eminence of Leopold Stokowski, to mention only two leaders. America would be far poorer without these men and the men Polish citizens whose contributions have enriched our lives.

It is well for us to remember the names of leading Polish-Americans. But it also is essential that we pay tribute to the many thousands of people of Polish extraction who are not famous in the sense of the world—but who are serving their communities, States, and Nation. These people are part of the real flesh and bone that is America.

If there is one word that typifies their contribution to America, it is "dependability." It is a great word. Polish-Americans can be depended on to render great service to America. They can be depended on to produce the many hours of work that is needed by modern America. They can be depended on to furnish the leadership for our cultural and scientific advances. They can be depended on to work and fight for continuance of our American Republic.

I cite Polish-Americans today for their enviable record of dependable service to the Republic.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate them on this anniversary of the enactment of the constitution of their native land—and I join with them in the prayer that soon Poland will again be a free neighbor in the association of nations.

Syria Souring on Egypt's Curbs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following news story written from Beirut, Lebanon, by Foster Hailey as it appeared in the New York Times of May 1, 1958:

SYRIANS SOURING ON EGYPT'S CURBS—BUSINESSMEN, FARMERS, AND OTHERS PROTEST AGAINST LOSS OF FREEDOM

(By Foster Hailey)

BEIRUT, Lebanon, April 28.—The fruits of economic union with Egypt are developing a bitter taste in Syria.

Damascus newspapers reaching Beirut record a growing protest by industrialists, business men, farmers and labor union leaders against the attempted imposition on the former free economy in Syria of the strict controls imposed by the revolutionary council in Egypt since 1954.

The latest was against the imposition of stricter controls on imports of so-called luxury goods. These make the importation of any thing worth more than $300 impossible except for a favored few large operators, Syrian importers say.

That is only the latest of a series of measures taken by the new United Arab Republic to integrate the economies of Egypt and Syria, the two regions of the new union. Syrians say privately it is an attempt by Cairo to drag Syria down to the same low standards as Egypt.

There is now in Cairo a delegation of Syrian farmers to protest the announced intention of extending to Syria the benefits of the protection of the farmer law. Its most controversial clause limits landholding by any one family to 250 acres. That may be needed in land-hungry Egypt, the Syrian

farmers say, but not in Syria, which is much less densely populated.

When leaders of the 1,800-strong Workers Union of the Iraq Petroleum Co. refused recently to bow to the Government takeover of their bargaining and union control, they were sumarily dismissed.

PAPER LISTS COMPLAINTS

Little or none of this discontent appears in the Egyptian newspapers, or at least not in the issues that reach Beirut.

The Damascus press has not been completely indoctrinated, it would seem, although six newspapers have had to go out of business because of the withdrawal of subsidies. Syrian papers dutifully denounce the protesters as enemies of the state. But they print the protests so that all literate Syrians can read—and literacy is much higher in Syria than in Egypt—the complaints made by these enemies against restrictive state controls they had not known before.

Al Sham, for instance, had a long editorial listing the complaints of various special groups and concluded:

"If we suffer a drought, they say it is the fault of union with Egypt. If development figures in the budget rise, they start moaning about the possibility of an increase in the tax rate.

"Should a baker be lax in performing his duties [all flour recently was put under government allocation and bread prices pegged], they start beating their breasts."

Before the union, Syria had one of the soundest international trade positions in the Middle East. She exported tobacco to the United States, hard wheat to Italy, and cotton to all the world. With those exports she earned hard currency. The Syrian pound was stable and on a strict parity with the Lebanese pound, at 3.15 to $1.

Now more outspoken Syrians say the Egyptians are buying Syrian wheat and cotton and paying for it in Egyptian pounds, which then have to be sold at a 35-percent discount in Beirut.

Egyptians are reported to have moved in on Damascus to take over banking and other commercial activities. Every Syrian Army unit from the company level up has an Egyptian cadre attached to it.

Progress Report: Merrimack River Flood Control 22 Years Later

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my statement on May 6, 1958, before the Subcommittee on Public Works of the House Committee on Appropriations, recommending an appropriation of $2,300,000 in the fiscal year 1959, for the Hopkinton-Everett flood-control project in the State of New Hampshire:

PROGRESS REPORT: MERRIMACK RIVER FLOOD CONTROL 22 YEARS LATER

(Statement of Hon. THOMAS J. LANE, of Massachusetts before Subcommittee on Public Works of the House Committee on Appropriations recommending an appropriation of $2,300,000 in the fiscal year 1959 for the Hopkinton-Everett flood-control project, May 6, 1958)

Mr. Chairman, the Merrimack River, originating in mountain brooks, gathers volume and strength as it runs through southern New Hampshire and northeastern Massachusetts.

From mountain to ocean, it is 116 miles long, and drains an area of 5,015 square miles.

The population of the basin is more than 1 million concentrated in the industrial cities and towns that spread from the banks of the river.

Major floods in the Merrimack River Basin are caused by heavy rainfall covering large areas, in combination with rapidly melting snow cover.

The most destructive flood in the history of this river took place in March 1936, when the daily discharge at Lawrence, Mass., was 160,000 cubic feet per second, or 80 percent larger than the record flood of 1852.

The bill for damages came to $36 million.

Subsequent hurricanes, drenching the area with heavy rains that the river could not handle, brought additional floods. The industries and the people of this area suffered further losses, running into millions of dollars. The cost so far has been heavy.

Each spring we anxiously watch the swollen waters of the Merrimack, wondering if they will spill over their banks to flood homes and stories and factories, and asking ourselves: "When are we going to get protection and relief from this annual threat?"

Let's look at the progress report to see what has been accomplished in the 22 years since the disastrous flood of 1936, not to mention the lesser but still damaging floods that occurred during the intervening years.

The United States Army Engineer Division, New England, has had no illusions about the problem.

It was after a 1938 survey that: "The district engineer finds that a serious flood situation exists in the Merrimack Basin. The district engineer concludes that the only feasible method of obtaining comprehensive flood protection in this basin is by means of reservoir control. There are several combinations of reservoirs within the limits of economic justification which will eliminate nearly three-fourths of the annual flood damages."

And the Congress, theoretically, through the Flood Control Act which was approved on June 22, 1936, authorized the construction of a system of flood-control reservoirs in the Merrimack River Basin for the reduction of flood heights in the Merrimack Valley.

Efforts to build this intent into fulfillment were frustrated by the priority needs of World War II, general apathy, and technical delays.

Finally, in 1946, one dam was completed.

Nothing else in the way of actual construction has been accomplished during those 22 years, even though in the October 1956 issue of Industry, which is published monthly by the Associated Industries of Massachusetts, the Merrimack was described as potentially the most dangerous flood site in Massachusetts today.

As far as preliminary technicalities are concerned, they have been resolved.

New Hampshire, where the reservoirs will be built, had to be compensated for the tax money it would lose from the farms and homes that would be taken for the reservoir area, and for the highways that would have to be relocated.

Last year the Merrimack River flood-control compact was passed by the legislatures of the two States, providing for compensation by Massachusetts to New Hampshire, of 70 percent of the loss that will result through this construction.

The compact was approved by Congress and signed by the President.

The 1959 budget originally called for an appropriation of $1,200,000 to continue land acquisition, to initiate work on relocation, and to continue the engineering and design on this project.

The United States Army Engineer Division, New England, has made arrangements with the Governor of New Hampshire for his department of public works to handle the relocation of the four State highways affected by the construction of the dam and the reservoir. The State agency will also assist in the disposition of local roads. These highway studies and preliminary designs are well underway. Governor Dwinell has also appointed an advisory committee to coordinate and advise the Army engineers in several problems affecting 2 or more State agencies and the 4 towns in the area.

The first property in the area has been purchased with funds made available for the acquisition of hardship cases.

The budget originally recommended for the year beginning July 1 the sum of $1,200,000. On March 13 the White House, with the endorsement of the Budget Bureau and the Corps of Engineers, recommended an increase of $200,000, bringing the revised estimate up to $1,400,000.

Under date of April 23, 1958, I was advised that the Merrimack River Flood Control Commission, "after conferring with the New England Division, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and the New Hampshire Department of Public Works and Highways, and also taking into consideration the hardship cases in the Hopkinton-Everett area, recommend that the Congress appropriate the sum of $2,300,000 for fiscal year 1959, for the Hopkinton-Everett flood control project."

The New Hampshire Department of Public Works and Highways needs an additional $500,000 for highway relocations. An additional $400,000 is required to take care of land acquisition and to compensate for the hardship cases that result from these "ejectments." These needs justify a total appropriation of $2,300,000.

After 22 years, we are at last committed to definite and substantial action leading to construction of the Merrimack River flood-control project.

When the President and the Bureau of the Budget revise their estimates upward, this is evidence in itself that an accelerated rate of progress toward construction of this vital project is considered urgent.

The appeal of the Merrimack River Valley Flood Control Commission, whose members are in direct contact with the problem, reinforces that conclusion.

From my own knowledge and experience over the years in the long struggle to win Federal recognition and assistance for our flood-control needs, I believe that this project, now cleared for action, should go forward with all possible speed.

After 22 years of waiting, the people and the industries of this valley reasonably expect that the Congress will vote an appropriation of $2,300,000 to make certain that the Merrimack River flood-control project is at last on its way toward actual construction.

Representative May Hears From the Grassroots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post which commends my Connecticut colleague, the Honorable EDWIN H. MAY, JR., for polling

some 200,000 of his constituents for their opinions of important questions facing the Congress.

Representative MAY has, in a short period of time in his first term, earned the respect of both his colleagues and his constituents for his conscientious devotion to duty, his vigorous defense of principle, and his untiring efforts on behalf of his constituency.

Congressman MAY demonstrated that he considers himself the elected Representative of all of his constituents, not just the members of the party under whose banner he was elected, by including Democrats and independents as well as Republicans in his poll.

The people of Hartford County have in ED MAY a devoted servant and an able legislator who is dedicated to carrying out the will of his constituency to the best of his ability.

WHAT THE "GRASSROOTS" THINK

When Members of Congress visit their home districts during recesses and vacations they are generally described as keeping their ears to the ground, listening to what is being said in the "grassroots" areas. This is how they are reputed to be getting advice on what their people want and how they should vote in Congress.

We have no idea how many actually do this. Representative EDWIN H. MAY, JR., Republican, of Wethersfield, used another method which proved to be highly successful in finding out what the voters in the Hartford area are thinking about on several important subjects.

Early this year the Congressman sent out a questionnaire to 200,000 voters in the First District. He received 12,000 replies, which he considered well above the average return of questionnaires of this type. It required 4 months, he said, to prepare and mail the forms and to tabulate the answers. Mr. MAY called it an extremely worthwhile experiment and is now making public the replies he received from Republicans, Democrats and independents. Six of the 12 questions have been tabulated. The others will follow.

The first question asked for an opinion on the appropriation of more money for missiles and rockets, even if this eliminated the possibility of a tax cut or a reduction in the Federal debt. The percentage voting yes, was 84.9 percent; voting no, 11.6 and undecided 3.5 percent.

To the question of approval of the Eisenhower foreign policy, 68.9 percent voted yes; 24.9 percent no, and 7.1 percent were undecided.

On the continuation of foreign aid he received 65.9 percent yes votes; 26.1 no, and 8 percent undecided.

On the revision of the McCarran-Walter immigration law to allow more immigrants to enter the United States through revision of the quota system, 31.1 percent voted yes; 61.9, no, and 7 percent undecided.

Regarding approval of Federal aid for school construction, 67.2 percent voted yes; 29.1 no, with 3.7 percent undecided.

In regard to approval of legislation providing safeguards against misuse of labor union and corporate welfare funds, 95.1 percent said, yes; 3.3 percent voted no, with 1.6 percent undecided.

That is a pretty clear indication of what the voters in Hartford County want, and expect their Representative to act accordingly. This may not be a hundred-percent-accurate report, but it probably comes as close to "grassroots" opinion as can be obtained.

Congressman MAY's method of polling his district could well be emulated by all Members, who are interested in learning what people back home are thinking about.

The Maladministration of the Reciprocal Trade Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest industrialists of our times is Mr. Leon Lowenstein. Mr. Lowenstein has always promoted the very best working conditions for his employees. He is now very much alarmed over this tendency to sacrifice American labor and American industry. This House will be interested in the following comments by Mr. Lowenstein concerning the present maladministration of the reciprocal trade program:

Tariffs may have originally been for purposes of revenue; later to protect infant industries; but now they are control points for determining whether products made with cheap foreign labor should be allowed to displace United States merchandise. I think it is as simple as that. Looking at the problem from the point of view of equity, I say it is unfair practice to require American labor and industry to compete with products made in many countries abroad. Is it fair to have a person who earns $1.50 an hour compete with one making 15 cents per hour? That is so in textiles except it is 13 cents in Japan, not 15 cents.

We must face certain facts. If the equal product of country X can sell for less than the American product, it will displace the American product. We all know that one of the most important ingredients of any product is labor. Style, skill, and tools play important parts. But granted a standard product and thus eliminate the style—recognize that country X has the tools and the skill but a much lower labor cost, and the inevitable consequence of a free trade policy is the elimination of the American producer from the market.

That is so with respect to textiles. Japan buys the raw cotton from the United States at 15 percent lower than American manufacturers can buy it here. They have machinery as modern as ours (built since the war with our dollars), they have skills, the product is a standard one involving no style element which might otherwise be a factor, and their labor rate is less than one-tenth of ours.

But it isn't of textiles alone that I write. You have mentioned stainless steel, cutlery and watches. The automobile industry has felt itself immune to foreign competition—now they are beginning to ask themselves some questions as more and more foreign cars find themselves in this market. Do we for one moment believe that our cattle industry would not suffer if we lowered the bars on foreign cattle and beef? We recognize the farmers' needs in our quotas on foreign cotton and sugar. We have over the years recognized the need to equalize other domestic costs in our various tariff rates.

Now there are certain areas where we have yielded the entire market to foreign manufacturers. I refer to embroidery and cheap toys as illustrations. Embroidery requires a skill which is present in many countries with low living standards. There is now no domestic embroidery industry as such.

In toys American ingenuity may devise novel items which have a certain market, but in terms of dollars and items foreign competition has left only the unique or the crumbs to the American toy industry. In both instances cheap labor, lack of a specific style element, no machinery problem, all are present—result, the United States market is preempted by foreign countries.

The illustrations could be multiplied countless times. It would be a wonderful world if each nation could produce in the world market and the one that was the most efficient or ingenious would make the product for which it was thus preeminent. We would then have the situation of each one concentrating on that activity in which he excelled. But that can only be successful if all have equal standards of living.

Now, some may say, Why not let the most efficient have the market? Are we prepared to say that if foreign nations can deliver a product here to undersell the American market, they should be free to do so? At first blush the consumer might think this is a good idea. Joe Doakes, who drives a truck, might like the idea of this saving on his purchases. But soon Joe would have nothing to carry in his truck and he would have no wages with which to shop for these bargains.

Are we prepared to say that American industries, of which the textile industry is one, should fold up and turn over its markets to foreign companies? The theory of free trade is an attractive one—in theory—but in the light of reality it spells suicide. In one sense I am selfish. I don't wish to preside over the liquidation of an industry with a capital investment of billions and employing millions of persons. And from the view of our Nation's security, I wonder if sufficient thought has been given to the place of textiles in our country's defense.

I need not comment on those individuals who have suggested that industries and individuals who are displaced by this foreign competition be given assistance. We want no dole.

There has been much mention of the great numbers of persons who are engaged in this country in export-import trade. In fact, the number so engaged falls largely in the export area, not the import. Relatively, few owe their employment directly to imports as such. These are shippers and distributors.

With respect to the importance of imports in order for us to maintain our exports it should be recognized that we are an exporting Nation. Our foreign customers do not buy from the United States just because they like us (which we hope they do) but because they need our product and cannot buy it cheaper elsewhere in the world market.

In this connection, is there any other country which allows the importation of products when the same product is available from domestic manufacturers? I think not. If, perchance, it does, I believe its tariff rates will be such as to put the foreign product at a disadvantage in competing with the domestic variety.

Yet we in the United States allow Japanese textiles to undersell American goods of the identical type in our own market.

I may be accused of selfishness, and I admit I have a bias—a bias to preserve our industry and my company. I think proponents of free trade too have a bias. Examine each voice and see where the personal interest lies. Thus it becomes a task for men like yourself to determine the matter on the basis of fairness and principle. What is in the best interests of the people of the United States—the elimination of certain basic industries or the building up of certain countries which presently are our allies?

The most important requisite of the day is, I think, to keep all of us out of world war III. However, sometimes one can be too liberal. Instead of keeping us out of war we can get right into it, and we can get into it without the partners that we might think we have. If we get into war we wouldn't even have unity in our own country.

Without proper tariffs we are bound to get more and more unemployment, and I am concerned about this unemployment. We

will get it. We have a recession right now, and if we have real unemployment people are going to have empty bellies. Please don't think for one minute that with empty bellies you are not going to get a lot of Communist sentiment. That would come. Take unemployment today. I imagine that if it was figured properly we would have upward of 6 million unemployed.

I am not so much worried about the number of unemployed as a lot of other things. I am worried about the percentage of unemployed to employed. Now, the employed support the unemployed. As an example, something occurred in our own company this very week—we had one mill in South Carolina that was running full on a certain style. We were getting 27½ cents per yard for this particular number. Japan came out with this very same piece of goods, just as good as ours, which is as good as can be made in this country or any other country, at 2½ cents a yard under our price and they sold the goods. Do you know what this means to this mill? First, the mill immediately threw off its Saturday operation which pays them time and a half to the employee, and then it went off 1 day out of the 5 remaining days. The result is the mill is running only 4 days and before you know it, we have that many more unemployed because instead of running 3 shifts they will only be running 2 shifts, and perhaps only 1 shift. Now, this is an example of how we are going to cause unemployment in this country and it is going to occur more and more.

Now, if Japan is doing this to our company and other companies like ours in the textile industry, they are going to affect other industries because we cannot cope with their labor rates. We cannot with the standards of living that we now have.

I certainly want to keep out of war and I want us to continue to have the partners that we now have and, if posible, we should have more partners; in other words, take them away from Russia. Sometimes when one gives away too much, one gives badly; instead of making a friend or partner one makes an enemy. I am asking you a question—did you ever lend a friend any money? How long was he your friend after that?

Let's look at the textile industry. Why should any one industry stand the brunt of imports made with slave labor rates? We are a country where everyone should bear his share of the cost of the national problem. Now, how are we going to do this? You talk about lower taxes, building roads, etc. Do you know how long it will take us to catch up with ourselves? How can we stop the recession we are now in? And there is no question about it—we are in a recession.

In the Roosevelt administration we had our problems—and, by the way, I voted for Mr. Roosevelt, if my memory serves me right, twice, and I voted for Mr. Eisenhower two times because I believed in him. I believed in what he stood for and some of his doctrines, but I am going to make a confession—I question right now whether I believe in today's administration as much as I believed in it a year ago. When I vote, I vote for whom I consider the best man for the country.

Now, in the Roosevelt administration they had a WPA. The Government sought bids on yard goods and then they had other bids for garments made out of yard goods. Then they gave the garments away in areas that really needed it. How can you get employment back faster all the way from the base right to the end product? More and more people would be employed in this way, and giving it away will not be too expensive to the Government.

Now, let's go further. There are a lot of foreign countries whose people do not have enough clothing. It might be a good idea to give garments to these foreign countries. Our Government can do all its buying through sealed bids so that nobody gets an advantage.

If my memory serves me right, during the Second World War, how did we go into Africa? I was in on this situation. Our Government sent a boat loaded with textiles that the north African people needed and wanted badly. We made friends out of them. It helped us to win the war.

I am not for reducing the standard of living in America. America was made by proper standards of living. People are happy here and we want to keep them happy, but you can only do this if you have employment. Unemployment will make very unhappy people, and who is going to get blamed for it? This administration, of course—there is no question about that.

It might be a smart thing to give away money but with this money they buy merchandise or machinery or whatever they want from America. I understand that Japan, which is the best copyist in the world, has not only copied our machinery but has improved it and is now shipping it elsewhere so they can further compete with the United States. How long will it be before we have the kind of competition we cannot take also from India?

You and I both know that every country today is doing everything possible to nationalize itself. In this country we talk about higher education—more scientists, more engineers—and maybe it would be quite an idea if we aided the education of people in other countries. There is no question about it—our way of thinking is the right way of thinking, and it would only be a question of time before the people of the other countries became our friends as they would become educated and thus reason for themselves.

Free Enterprise and Commonsense—The Answer to the Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the United States of America was not created, developed, and expanded by timid men and women. It was created by people with fortitude and courage, a people unafraid to fight for the ideals of freedom and independence in which they believed.

It was developed by people who could face apparent insurmountable obstacles with steadfast courage and faith that a problem recognized and appraised was a problem which could be solved.

It was expanded by men and women who could face the future with optimism and act boldly and confidently in times of emergency and economic crisis.

Today we face an economic problem in business, and we hear talk of depression and recession on every side. And the cry for a quick remedy, any remedy, sometimes borders on panic at a time when what is needed is a calm and resolute appraisal of the economic facts contributing to the present business slump.

And as Americans we must remember that our Nation is dedicated to the principle of free enterprise, and Government of the people, by the people and for the people—rather than Government control of the people.

If we evaluate the present economic problem correctly, we shall find a sensible solution, and in solving the problem business, labor, and Government must cooperate.

The following "Letter from Eddie," a letter written by Edward Schwarz of Los Gatos, Calif., gives a citizen's straightforward views on the present economic situation with one man's suggestions for solution. I believe this letter should receive the consideration of all Members of Congress:

LETTER FROM EDDIE

So far as we're concerned a depression is to business slumps what the Grand Canyon is to valleys.

And we don't think our mental picture of a depression differs much from that of anyone else old enough to have had his tail feathers singed in the depression of the thirties.

In a depression prices plunge, credit crashes, banks bust, businessmen bankrupt, stock prices collapse, faith flees, the bottom falls out of the country's personal income, almost 25 percent of the labor force is out of a job, and businesses stop making commitments for new plants and equipment.

Now prices are up, credit's healthy, banks are solid, the business failure rate is about normal, stocks are holding up with many going up, general business activity is good, people have enough faith to take on long-term credit obligations, and the country's personal income figure is only a whisker away from where it was at this time last year despite fewer jobs, and unemployment is running at 8.4 percent of the labor force. Employment is right at 62 million, only 4 percent lower than this time a year ago. The Securities and Exchange Commission and the United States Department of Commerce say first quarter expenditures for new plants and equipment will be a mere 3.6 percent below a year ago.

If this is a depression then a mouse is a fire-snorting, man-eating monster.

What's going on is this: Sales of manufacturers have been wavering around twenty-seven or twenty-eight billion dollars per month ever since July 1955. Inventories increased from $44.1 billion in July 1955 to $54.2 billion by September 1957. Then the order book closed just the way it must when one of your departments is overbought.

When you have a $10 billion excessive inventory to work off in a $27 billion a month business, production has to be curtailed. The fact that you are comparing production with figures that were adding to inventory last year makes the picture look worse.

Since $7.4 billion of the excessive inventory is in durable goods, that's where the cutback hurts most—and it will keep on hurting until sales catch up to inventories or vice versa.

The Government isn't spending less—it's spending more.

Up to now everybody who's been able to get the floor has O. K.'d every possible kind of handout to save us from this depression that doesn't exist. Willing saviors of our supposed quaking nation are popping up in all the places you'd expect.

But up to now we haven't heard a peep out of anybody about the proven American method of letting business solve in its own problems by taking the beating it has coming to it for overextending inventories and then getting back to work selling goods.

The automotive industry is the worst off. Here free gratis for nothing are four distasteful but effective ideas that will help solve their problems.

First. Hold a heavily promoted industry-wide, nationwide one price for all week based on Blue Book trade-ins, nonfinagled extra costs and the lowest price each dealer has sold a similar car for so far this year.

This will bring out those buyers who've discovered they've been rooked by some smart guy auto dealer with the business morals of a Syrian rug peddler. These millions are afraid to buy the car they need for fear of being even bigger patsies on a fast shuffle.

It's going to be pretty tough to get the bamboozled public to believe this one-price-for-all deal is on the level, but a propaganda machine that can sell an inventory adjustment as a catastrophe calling for even bigger big Government should be able to handle it.

Second. Face it. Nineteen hundred and fifty-eight car styling is not what enough customers want. Sales are poor because enough people don't want the gaudy, gimmicked monsters with their grotesque, exaggerated fannies and pinball lighting. Look around—most of the people of this country have as good taste in cars as they do in women. You've noticed they seldom take those bizarre jobs with size 42 bazooms hung on a size 10 frame home to mother.

Even with power steering these monsters are too tough for the little lady to park.

Start over—make cars smaller, sleeker, more functional, easier to handle. Take the markdown the way we do in store business—decisively, painfully, and quickly.

Third. Get prices down; $4,000 is too much to spend for a car that stands in a factory parking lot all day or that is being used to haul kids and groceries.

If you don't know how to make a car for $2,000—with radio, heater, and white sidewalls—find out how.

But don't expect your entrenched, thought-conditioned, design and engineering groups to come through with ideas out of the groove. Just get a couple of old tin benders, engine and transmission men together with a smart young engineer who can work a slipstick and keep them locked up 'til they find the answer.

Your industry is full of over-organization, unchallenged concepts, red tape, yessing, playing follow the mob, and too little 'round-the-clock brain squeezing for bold new concepts.

Two thousand dollars, delivered complete—that's the goal.

Fouth. Get aggressively competitive. Cut competitors' throats—no quarter. Fight to win. But fight with ideas, not price claims.

Who'll be first wtih disc brakes and fuel injection on a $2,000 car?

Who'll be first with a 40-mile-per-gallon standard car?

Who'll first go to 100 percent leasing?

And who'll have the guts to first make dealers go one price to all.

The auto industry can tnd must sell its way out—and that goes for any other industry in trouble.

We don't need tax cuts. We don't need monster public works programs. And we don't need any other kind of economic sugar-tit.

What we need is less election year grandstanding to the gallery with promises of a worry-less, low tax, beef and bourbon Utopia and to get back to letting men fight it out for themselves, with no help from enslaving big brother government.

Personally I'm fed up with Government-by-crisis and the trend toward wholly un-American socialism and inflation policies.

An if you are you had better let your boys in Washington know it via a petition with enough names on it to scare the hell out of them and get them back in line.

Urban Renewal in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, what is going on in urban renewal in the district in Chicago that I have the honor to represent is attracting national interest. As a pilot project, closely watched by the Nation, it naturally is attended with many problems and is still a subject of spirited controversy.

My colleagues will remember one phase that Senator DOUGLAS in the other body and I in this body brought to the attention of the 84th Congress. That was in connection with the plight of the small-business tenants who were dislocated from the sites of long-established businesses. We were successful in getting an allowance for moving expenses up to $2,000, which in the 1st session of the 85th Congress was increased to $2,500. This will prove of benefit to other communities when urban renewal plans place tenant small businesses in position comparable to that of the dislocated Hyde Park merchants. It illustrates how important it is that the experiences we are going through in this pilot urban renewal project should be reflected in permanent legislation governing nationwide.

There is another phase graphically presented to the senior Senator from Illinois and the Congressman of the Second District at a meeting of Hyde Park business and professional men during the Easer-vacation period. The consensus of opinion at that meeting was that priority should be given by the redeveloper to the dislocated businesses in the rental of properties in the new business district. This was advanced on the equitable principle that businesses that had earned the good will of the community by years of serving it should be given first opportunity, under equal conditions, to relocate themselves in the new business district where they could continue thir old relationship with their customers. Proposed legislation along this line is now being drafted.

Walter Allman, 1360 Madison Park Avenue, Chicago, in a recent letter to me, said:

I am a businessman in Hyde Park, being located on the east side of Lake Park Avenue. Needless to say, the redevelopment plans are of great concern to me, as well as numerous other small-business men. I am in complete accord with the idea that neighborhoods must be rehabilitated. Naturally, there are many reasons for this deterioration. At this time that is not important, but what is important is the fact that seemingly land-clearance plans, as noble as they seem, are basically inhuman because they take away from business people their entire business with a pittance as remuneration. As I understand the land-clearance laws, property owners are paid the fair market values, but the owners of businesses who make the property valuable get nothing. Not only do they get nothing, but their income is completely stopped. In most cases it is impossible for a small-business man to move into a new project because the rents that the private redevelopers charge are far beyond his reach, and as I understand it, the land is sold to these redevelopers at a very low price.

There are, in my opinion, two important things that should be incorporated in the laws before the Hyde Park plan is finally accepted and approved: (1) Businessmen should be given fair market value for their businesses. (2) Businessmen who are being disenfranchised should be allowed to purchase parcels of land in redevelopment areas if they so desire. They should not be at the mercy of the private redevelopers who have no interest in them or their plight.

Because this is the major urban renewal plan in the country, and as a pilot its progress is being followed so widely in other cities, I am extending my remarks to include the full text of a page article appearing in the Chicago Daily News of May 3, 1958. The article follows:

MUST COMPETE WITH SUBURBS

(By Paul Gapp)

Sometime in the next few months a giant bulldozer will roar into life near the corner of 55th Street and Lake Park Avenue.

The driver will plunge its big steel brow into the earth and thereby begin a new cycle in the life of our city.

It will be the first new construction on the gigantic Hyde Park-Kenwood renewal plan, a project that will prove whether we have at last found the secret for saving our city's future.

Private enterprise and public planning are teamed up in this effort to stop the deterioration of 900 acres of housing and industry bounded by 47th Street, 59th Street, Cottage Grove Avenue, and Lake Michigan.

The goal: A new kind of city that will be such a good place to live in that people will move back in from the suburbs.

Whole blocks of aging buildings will be ripped away—some already have been—to make way for modern homes, schools, parks, playgrounds, churches, and shopping centers.

Uncle Sam is pumping $26 million into the area. Local governments will swell this by another $13 million.

And behind this will come a much bigger pile of private capital, the total of which cannot even be estimated accurately.

NEW YORK FIRM PUTS UP $15 MILLION

The first chunk of private money—$15 million—will come from the New York firm of Webb & Knapp for Hyde Park Projects A and B. This is where construction will start this summer.

Projects A and B cover 47 acres of blighted land bought by the Chicago Land Clearance Commission, razed, and resold at "fair used value" to Webb & Knapp.

More than 1,200 families moved out of this area.

Work will soon begin on the first of two 8-story buildings to house 528 families.

Soon thereafter will be built a shopping center and single homes, another 267 families.

Thus the new projects will house some 900 families, one-third less than now occupy its steaming, crowded apartments.

This is the shape of tomorrow's city, where city dwellers will have more elbow room. But it is only the nucleus of the great conservation program now before the city.

The overall plan, a subject of heated controversy in the area today, calls for modernizing an additional 1.3 square miles.

It would raze 638 buildings scattered through the area. These buildings now contain 6,239 living units, or 19,000 persons.

In their place would be built 2,350 modern living units. The exact number of persons these will accommodate has not yet been determined.

PLAN TO REDUCE UNITS BY 10 PERCENT

But the new plan will reduce the total number of living units in the 1.3 square-mile area by about 10 percent—from 29,321 to 25,432.

The modernized community, in addition to giving residents more living room, is to add more than $1 million a year to local tax revenues.

Six private institutions such as churches and private schools will buy 504,252 square feet of the cleared property.

Fifteen acres have been earmarked for parks and 9.4 acres for schools. New police and fire facilities, offstreet parking and modernized street lighting are also planned.

Cottage Grove, Lake Park, and 47th Street will become the three big traffic carriers under a plan to route through traffic around the community.

Buildings in need of rehabilitation will be brought up to minimum code standards under a continuous enforcement program.

Property owners who need loans to make improvements will be eligible for mortgage insurance under the liberal section 220 of the National Housing Act.

Backers of the renewal plan hope private interests will sink up to $100 million in the neighborhood once the basic rejuvenation is completed.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO TO CONTINUE AS STRENGTH FACTOR

Hyde Park's two big anchors—its location and the University of Chicago—will continue to be major factors of strength in the future.

It is expected that the lure of comfortable housing only 15 minutes from the Loop will draw many new professional and middle class workers into the area.

Jeremiah P. Holland, head of the community conservation board, hopes to submit the plan to the council in June.

What happens in Hyde Park will help form the pattern of action in six other Chicago neighborhoods designated as conservation areas by the CCB.

Municipal officials all other the Nation will be watching Chicago's South Side, too.

EXPERTS ANSWER CRITICISM—WHY SOME OBJECT TO PLAN

Whenever the city has undertaken a major improvement project involving the relocation of a considerable number of people, violent objection to the plan has been raised.

This is no exception in Hyde Park-Kenwood, where opponents of the program have cited a number of criticisms to the plan now before city officials.

Most articulate of these opponents are the Hyde Park-Kenwood Tenants and Home Owners, the United Woodlawn Conference, the North Kenwood-Oakland Community Conference, the 5400 Dorchester Block, the 5400 Blackstone Block, and District 1, United Packinghouse Workers Union.

Here is a list of the major objections raised by these groups and the sense of official replies presented by Jeremiah P. Holand, head of the community conservation board, Julian Levi, executive director, South East Chicago Commission, and James V. Cunningham, Jr., executive director of Hyde Park-Kenwood Community Conference.

Objection: It will displace most of the Negroes now in the area. It will discriminate against them. They will not be able to afford the rentals charged in new or improved buildings.

Reply: Only about one-quarter of the Negroes will be displaced by land clearance. The plan contains a tough antidiscrimination covenant.

Negro rents are increasing now, without benefit of rehabilitation. Many Negro families in the area enjoy incomes higher than those of neighboring whites.

"One of the most important goals of this whole plan is to establish a stable, interracial neighborhood," said Cunningham.

Objection: The plan calls for razing too many apartment buildings that could be rehabilitated.

Reply: Every effort is made to avoid this. "But you can't carry out a program like this without taking down some sound structures," said Levi.

Allowing one solid but shoddy building to stand on a site cleared for a new school, for example, would defeat the basic purpose of the program.

Objection: The new housing is going to be too expensive for the little man.

Reply: At current prices, it's impossible to build anything that will rent at less than $37 a room. The plan makes provisions for co-op and Chicago Dwellings Association housing, too. This will help.

Objection: Why isn't any public housing included in the plan?

Reply: The Chicago Housing Authority will build an 8-story apartment building at 50th Street and Cottage Grove this summer.

Objection: The people displaced by clearance in Hyde Park are going to invade already crowded areas like Woodlawn.

Reply: When earlier clearance was carried out in Hyde Park, 81 percent of the 651 families moved were relocated in neighborhoods generally considered to be uncrowded. We hope to do better this time.

Objection: If a property owner rehabilitates his building, what assurance will he have that the city won't come along and tear it down?

Reply: "The plan requires no more than compliance with the city code," said Levi. "If you comply, your building is safe."

If a property owner can't get an improvement loan, or if he refuses to meet the code, his building may be marked for clearance.

Objection: The University of Chicago has dominated Hyde Park planning and arranged rehabilitation and clearance policies for its own benefit.

Reply: While the university planning unit devised the plan, policy matters were handled by the CCB and the Conservation Community Council.

THE CASE FOR CITY RENEWAL

(By Lawrence A. Kimpton, chancellor, University of Chicago)

There is much more at stake in the Hyde Park-Kenwood urban renewal plan than the elimination of that area's blight, the preservation of its productive tax base, or even the continuation of its many important institutions.

The real question is whether the city of Chicago will act to save itself as a place to live, or, by refusing to face up to the increasing deterioration, will encourage the flight to the suburbs of the citizens who are essential to it.

If the city is to be saved, a start must be made somewhere. Because of its vigorous efforts over the past 6 years, and the support of the city administration, Hyde Park-Kenwood is ready to start.

By developing a plan that saves 80 percent of its present area, Hyde Park-Kenwood offers the most hopeful pattern yet devised for saving all the middle-aged neighborhoods of Chicago.

Double Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Norman Cousins which appeared in the Saturday Review for April 19, 1958:

DOUBLE DISASTER

(By Norman Cousins)

The Soviet decision to halt its nuclear tests has resulted in two serious defeats for the United States.

The first defeat is the result of the fact that we allowed the Soviet Union to be the first to respond to the fast-mounting demand of the world's peoples for an end to the growing contamination of air and food produced by radioactive fallout.

The second defeat—and possibly a larger one—is the result of the initial negative response of the United States to one of the gravest challenges in our history. It seemed puny, petulant, unimaginative.

For what is involved here is not just a routine maneuver in the cold war that can be handled with the usual diplomatic counterthrust.

What is involved here is the need of the United States to demonstrate before the world its ability to come up with a dramatic forward thrust of its own on one of the major questions in human history.

For next to peace itself, the runaway nuclear arms race and the threat of radioactive fallout are the most serious problems confronting man on earth.

The approach to this problem involves a supreme sensitivity to human values. It requires the fullest possible exercise of the moral imagination. For our security depends less on bomb stockpiles than it does on our ability to reach people everywhere and earn and keep their good will and support.

The world's people today are worried—as they have every right to be.

They are worried about the obscene competition in creating weapons that can incinerate millions at a time.

And they are worried about the fact that just in the act of testing these weapons there is a real threat of contamination to air and food.

Radioactive fallout, it is now admitted by the United States Atomic Energy Commission, can no longer be dismissed as a negligible danger.

Inevitably, the world's peoples have been increasingly insistent that their basic rights be respected. The principle here is a simple one: No nation has the right to contaminate or jeopardize the air or water or food that belong to other people.

This is the central issue whose implications have yet to be fully understood.

There is nothing unnatural about this indignant demand by other peoples. If we as a Nation were not involved in nuclear testing, we would split the sky with our fury over the crass violation of our sovereignty by the testing powers. American parents would demand immediate action by our Government to protect their children from being exposed to the danger of the diseases of blood and bone that can be produced by radioactive strontium.

Are we so morally calloused that we cannot understand that this is exactly how others feel—as they have every right to feel?

That is why it is not enough for us as a nation to regard the issue of testing only in the context of propaganda advantage or disadvantage.

It is not enough for us to point out, which is perfectly true, that the Soviet Union conveniently waited until it completed its most intensive series of nuclear tests before announcing its decision to stop the tests.

It is not enough to say this, because there was no reason why the United States should not have announced it was calling a halt to nuclear testing after the completion of its own recent tests. A halt must be made somewhere.

We were the first to start testing and stockpiling nuclear weapons. There was no reason why we shouldn't have been the first to stop and then do everything in our power to mobilize world opinion behind a universal ban.

It is not enough to protest that the Soviet is making a cheap bid for world support.

It is not enough, because the world's people are not stupid. They are aware of the spurious aspects of the Soviet bid. They have not forgotten the monstrous outrage of the Soviet violence in Hungary. But they are also aware that the United States has not come to life on this issue. They are not blind to the fact that we have shown neither imagination nor sensitivity in our own approach to this question.

There is no point in fooling ourselves. The State Department has been willing to talk about arms control for propaganda purposes. But its basic position, well known to close observers in Washington, is that it does not believe that arms control is desirable—even if a foolproof system of enforcement could be achieved.

In part, this is the result of the insistence by the British and French that they be allowed to develop their own family of nuclear weapons before any ban is put into effect.

If, therefore, we insist on proceeding with our tests, the result may be a moral disaster for the United States in the world.

Yet it may be claimed that the tests are essential to the Nation's security.

But there is no security in polluting our air and fouling our food.

There is no security in cutting ourselves off from the good will of the overwhelming majority of peoples in the world.

There is no security in an insane race for weapons of obliteration that no longer have any military justification, for when these weapons are used the result will not be victory but mutual suicide.

There is no security in distributing nuclear weapons around the world to various nations when the careless use of such weapons could easily start a chain reaction leading to world nuclear war.

That is why our response to the Soviet requires something more substantial and meaningful than a routine reply in the context of the cold war.

If we are to hold our own in the world, if we are to move towards a meaningful peace, then we must come up with a daring program of our own. We must put into action specific points of that program at once.

We can accept the challenge of the Soviet on the matter of nuclear testing but say that we do not propose to stop there. We want to set up machinery to insure such a ban.

We can say we are prepared immediately to act on the question of control over existing stockpiles.

We can say we are prepared immediately to act on the question of reducing those stockpiles under United Nations auspices, with a plan for inspection and control, and challenge the Soviet to do the same.

We can put an end to the nightmare of the proposed distribution of nuclear weapons and materials to our allies in the world. A French colonel in an American plane bombed an Algerian village. The bombing was said to be unauthorized. It will be no consolation to the survivor of a nuclear war to be told that the explosion that started that war was unauthorized.

We can say that control over arms is but a start on the larger problem of the peace and that we are prepared to act immediately to give the United Nations the kind of responsible powers that can deal with basic causes of war.

We can challenge the Soviet Union to a competition in the mobilization of our respective energies and resources in an attack on the basic problems of mankind.

This is where sanity begins—if we are interested in sanity.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed and cleared for President bill authorizing prototype for nuclear destroyer and took up urgent deficiency appropriations.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 7324–7349

Bills Introduced: 10 bills and 1 resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 3763–3772; and S. Res. 301.

Pages 7328–7329

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows: H. R. 1342, 2763, 4445, 6176, 6528, 6731, 7203, 7718, 8039, 8433, 8448, 9012, 9109, 9395, 9490, 9514, 9991, 9992, 5424, and 7733, private bills (S. Repts. 1525–1544, respectively).

Page 7328

Bills Referred: 27 House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees. Pages 7323–7324

Louisiana Bayous: Report dated March 25, 1958, from Chief of Engineers, Department of Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on review of reports on Bayous Petit Anse, Tigre, and Carlin, La., was referred to Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed as S. Doc. 70. Page 7332

Miami Harbor, Fla.: Report dated April 16, 1958, from Chief of Engineers, Department of Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on review of report on Miami Harbor, Fla., was referred to Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed as S. Doc. 71. Pages 7332–7333

Nuclear Destroyer: Senate passed without amendment and cleared for President H. R. 12009, increasing by $35 million authorization for appropriations for AEC for a land-based prototype powerplant for a nuclear destroyer or frigate.

S. 3632, an identical bill, was indefinitely postponed.

Pages 7349–7350

Klamath Indians: Senate passed with committee amendments S. 3051, to amend the Klamath Termination Act by providing in the alternative for Federal or private acquisition of the part of the tribal forest that must be sold. Pages 7352–7363

D. C. Heliport: Senate passed, without amendment, S. J. Res. 167, directing the D. C. Commissioners to make a study of factors involved in the construction of a heliport in the D. C. Pages 7364–7365

D. C.—Liquor: Senate passed with amendments H. R. 7300, providing certain changes in zoning provisions under the D. C. Alcoholic Beverage Control Act.

Page 7365

D. C. Firemen: Senate passed without amendment and cleared for President H. R. 7568, providing that service in the grades of inspector and private in the D. C. Fire Department shall be deemed to be service in such grades for longevity purposes. Pages 7365–7366

Minnesota: S. Res. 301, providing for printing as a Senate document a manuscript entitled "A Sketch of Minnesota," prepared by Russell W. Fridley, director of the Minnesota State Historical Society, was adopted.

Pages 7328–7329

Canal Zone Sabotage: Senate passed without amendment and cleared for President H. R. 3604, providing penalties for interference with communications facilities in the Panama Canal Zone. Pages 7366, 7382

Urgent Deficiency Appropriations: Senate made its unfinished business H. R. 12326, urgent deficiency appropriations for fiscal year 1958. Page 7382

Nominations: Nomination of Arthur S. Fleming, of Ohio, to be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, was received, along with 1,072 Air Force nominations. Pages 7384–7388

Program for Thursday: Senate adjourned at 3:50 p. m. until noon Thursday, May 8, when it will continue on H. R. 12326, urgent deficiency appropriations.

Pages 7382, 7384

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

APPROPRIATIONS—PUBLIC WORKS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee continued its hearings on fiscal 1959 budget estimates for public works, with testimony from the following witnesses: Senator Dirksen and local witnesses, on funds for navigation and flood control in Illinois; Senator Bible, on flood-control survey funds for Nevada; and Senator Yarborough, on funds for river and harbor and flood-control work in Texas.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

Appendix

No Time for Timid Souls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "No Time for Timid Souls," which I delivered before the State Federation of Republican Women's Convention, in Prescott, Ariz., last Saturday night, May 3.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO TIME FOR TIMID SOULS

One hundred and seventy-one years ago this month, at Independence Hall in Philadelphia, the City of Brotherly Love, there assembled 55 delegates representing the American colonies.

You know the purpose of that meeting. You and I honor, love, and respect the documents they forged. We believe they created a framework of freedom in which has flowered the magnificent productivity of America.

The Constitution they wrote has endured to meet the challenge of the industrial revolution, the conquering of time and space, the magnificent technological advances and change.

The Constitution of the United States of America has burned like a flaming torch of freedom before all the world.

But now we are being told that that beacon light upon which the eyes of the less fortunate have so long been focused is losing its brilliance, is somehow tarnished, has lost its power to enlist and retain the allegiance of men.

You and I do not share this belief. We find the promise of political and spiritual and economic freedom more challenging and desirable today than in all the 6,000 years of man's recorded history. And yet we are told that America is losing prestige abroad, our social progress is deprecated, and our failure to solve all man's problems is magnified into total failure.

We have been subjected for more than 25 years to a philosophy of fear. The great horrible depression of the late twenties has been exploited by those who seek personal power to undermine our confidence in ourselves and our country. Men have become mesmerized with an unrealistic, utopian situation described as security. And we are told that physical and economic security must become the goal of all men everywhere.

Such is our world in the middle 1950's. We see reflections of these beliefs in our national magazines, our great newspapers, on the television, and hear it on the radio. It is no longer a thing of wonder that earnest men, sincere men, find themselves questioning the validity of freedom, wavering between the challenge of individual responsibility and the promise of collective security.

We are immersed in an absorption with material things and material objectives. We are and we must be constantly preoccupied with the necessity of earning a living, of securing everyday comforts for our families. And in these rightful, proper, everyday tasks we perform, there lurks the dreadful possibility that we may become totally absorbed and completely indifferent to problems of such great magnitude they appear to be insoluble.

May I confess that I am not an authority on all the ills of the world. I have no ready or pat answer to the problems I have so briefly outlined. Yet I know the uncertainty and the agony and the injustice in our world must be solved and I am confident that men of good will with courage and determination can and must find those answers.

And may I suggest the answer will not spring fully perfected and documented in detail from the national House or the national Senate or the national administration. The solutions to all problems must come from you, from the small towns of America, from the men and women who look up from the toil of their day to day labors toward a better world, toward a nearer approach to that spiritual society of loving men and women God intended his creation to become.

When you and I approach the Grand Canyon of the Colorado, the vast immensity of that magnificent natural wonder is completely overpowering. We cannot even contemplate more than a small section of that gorge at one time. And even though we know how it was created we cannot comprehend the expanse of time required for its accomplishment.

May I suggest that if we are to find an answer to the front page headlines which give us such great concern, it is first necessary to accomplish an understanding of the various factors at work in our world which have created situations which now appear to be overpowering and insoluble.

When the delegates to the Constitutional Convention assembled in Independence Hall those 171 years ago, they too were burdened with what appeared to be an insoluble problem.

There was great jealousy between the States. There was conflict of economic interest and geographical concern. Each State was jealous of its own power, its own authority. Yet these men were able to conquer their selfish self-interests, determined to create a government which would protect the rights of the individual. They pushed aside vanity and conceit and hammered out the Constitution.

In our world today, you and I are caught like a shuttlecock in a badminton game between the power plays of ambitious men.

This is easily recognizable on an international level. We are familiar with the long history of the balance of power between England and the continental powers. We recognize the emergence of the United States of America as a world leader produced perhaps more jealousy than respect, certainly more envy than love.

The conflict between the basic governmental philosophy of a free people and the dictatorial slavery of world communism is quite apparent. And these aspects being beyond our immediate control and influence cause us to feel remote and unimportant and helpless.

The exercise of greed for power must first be recognized and challenged in our own lives and our own experiences.

In America, we still cherish the idea that man is free, free to worship God in his own fashion, free to seek a job at labor of his own choosing, free to start a business if he so desires, free to move when the wanderlust attracts him, free to be thrifty and prudent, or wasteful, free to keep himself healthy or free to allow his body to deteriorate.

You and I must recognize in the constant struggle for the concentration of power in this Nation these very freedoms I have enumerated are being challenged and limited.

If this were only a contest between two antagonists we might someday accommodate ourselves to the dizzy pressures from, first, this side, and then the other. But today we are threatened by the concentration of power in three antagonists on a national level and hundreds of other opposing forces in our own communities and our own lives.

The rapid development of industrial America has produced a growing concentration of power in the business community. Mergers have increased productive capacity and lowered unit costs. And when size no longer contributed to a better product or a lower price, size became desirable solely for the establishment of power alone.

The tax structure of the last 25 years has contributed tremendously to the number of mergers and the concentration of power in the business communities. We have witnessed the ridiculous situation of poorly managed companies with tremendous tax losses being desirable as a merger partner because of the advantage of those tax losses which were representative of poor business management.

In some areas of our economy merger has been the only solution when an enterprise was faced with either a giant competitor or a giant labor union.

The union movement in this country, by and large, hase been a helpful one. The idea of old trade unions, the theory that wage earners should unite in order to bargain on equal terms with the owner of an individual plant or business operation strengthens the concept of the freedom and the dignity of the individual.

But when labor unions adopt compulsion, when then enlarge and expand and merge until they can virtually dictate prices in our economy, the basic benefits of unionism are lost. And they become a threat to freedom rather than a prop for freedom.

Beginning in the 1930's with then needed assistance and support of the Federal Government, the size of labor unions has doubled and dedoubled until today there is virtually a monopoly and the destiny of millions of wage earners is controlled by a handful of union leaders many of whom were not democratically elected, who submit themselves to little democratic control or suggestion and who operate with all the ruthless selfishness of political dictatorship.

The third giant concentration of power is in the activities of the Federal governmental establishment.

Under the impetus of the depression in the early 1930's, the Government perhaps with good intentions moved into many fields which had heretofore been reserved for private endeavor. Somehow, men, lacking confidence in their own ability to solve the Nation's economic ills, subscribed to that ancient fallacy that a powerful central government could do more for man than man could do for himself. And to create this power, the gradual assignment of individual

freedom, the collective control of big government, appeared to be desirable.

Power is an intoxicant. It gives its possessor a feeling of omnipotence, it shouts down criticism, it dismisses failure contemptuously, it refuses to admit mistakes, it denies the dignity and importance of the individual.

The heartland and strength and growth of America has always been on the main streets of our small towns. We've been a Nation of small shopkeepers, of small manufacturers, of independent operators. The freedom of opportunity has been available to any man who would work for the accomplishment of his own goals.

Today, after 25 years of meddling and tinkering with the basic concepts of the Constitution with our ancient understanding of the position of a free man in a free society, and with our constant increasing dependence upon a central authority, in business and in labor and in government, the face of America's main street has been changed.

And this struggle for power continues and intensifies as the degree of power obtainable increases and intensifies.

If we are to reestablish a free America as the beacon light for all the world, if we are to triumph in this material struggle with the disciples of Marxian communism, if we are to provide for our children the land of opportunity our fathers gave to us, we must recognize, define and limit the continued concentration of power in our economic, political, and social society.

This is not time for timid souls, this is not the hour when men can back away from their responsibility, this is not the moment when we can concentrate on our own personal ventures and personal fortunes. This is a time for bravery, determination and understanding.

The strength of America is in the character of its individual people. And character strengthens in the face of adversity and problems. Character does not shrink back from the difficult, unpleasant duty.

If the Walker Party had preferred the sheltered safety of the established eastern cities, there would have been no gold dug from Lynx Creek and Prescott would probably not be where it is today.

If Charles Poston had preferred the luxuries of London or New York, Arizona never would have become a territory. If those brave men who followed Teddy Roosevelt up San Juan Hill had preferred the security of life at home to the responsibilities of free men, the lamp of freedom would have long ago been extinguished.

If the doughboy of World War I had made security the total goal of his life, the course of history would have been altered.

And if our own sons and fathers and brothers had preferred the safety of this protected continent to facing the evil challenge of the Nazi dictatorship, our world today would be a different world.

Are you and I less dedicated to the cause of freedom than those men and women who lived and loved, labored and died, that it might be preserved and perpetuated?

At this moment of peril the contest is not on a foreign battlefield. It is no further removed than our own neighborhoods * * * our home States. And the day of decision is marked for November 4, 1958.

The delegates to the Constitutional Convention ratified their labors and submitted it to their respective States on the 17th of September, 171 years ago.

The elections of 1958 will either ratify or reject their dedicated devotion to the dignity of the individual.

And while the struggle for power goes on all around us, in arenas which appear to be remote and untouchable by the individual citizen, the struggle and contest is not removed. For this is a contest for the allegiance of the minds of men.

Shall the exercise of the Federal Government be further corrupted and expanded into a completely paternalistic and collective administrative dictatorship?

Shall the power of the labor unions be expanded to where they will hold within their grasp the ability to dispense or deny the right to a livelihood to the wage earners of America?

Shall we encourage by apathy and indifference and the continuation of ridiculous tax laws a further concentration of power in big business?

If we follow the trend of the past 25 years, the independent businessman will disappear to be replaced by a managerial class operating the properties of gigantic corporate structures.

The independent craftsman will disappear to become a number in a union organization.

The gigantic Federal Government will expand its activities to administer paternalistic benefits with tax funds extracted from the impersonal corporations and the individual wage earners increasing its own power and importance by matching these two antagonists with each other.

The power for which these giants struggle does not belong to them and is not in their possession, for the power in this Republic reposes in the individual citizen and in his expression at the ballot box.

Let us unite, and let us enlist the active, concerned, informed ability of every man and woman who believes in freedom.

Let us express our decision in November. Let us deny the wisdom of those who offer us the pie-in-the-sky of collectivist paternalism in return for a surrender of our individual freedoms and responsibilities.

Let us reassert the dignity of the wage earner and his right to voice his opinions and express his wisdom through a democratically elected union leadership.

Let us remove every aspect of big government which inspires further consolidation of our economic system. And then let us reestablish that principle of limited central authority under which the States and the people of America created the greatest land of opportunity and freedom and spiritual independence ever known in the history of civilization.

Let us once more proclaim that ancient truth, that man as a child of God is not to have his labors or his wisdom or his substance tampered with, or controlled by any combination of governmental, economic, or social powers or authority.

Let us be hardheaded in our wisdom and our judgment. Let us become participants in the exercise of political government and thereby protectors of political freedom.

How can we do all these things? We can do them as individual citizens, both Republicans and Democrats. We can demand that candidates seeking public office be men of integrity and devotion rather than men of ambition.

We can demand that every aspirant for public office be a first-rate candidate worthy of our trust and confidence rather than the political hack who has curried favor with a few men who control in some cases the destiny of segments of the political parties.

We can denounce and refuse to accept that ancient enticing philosophy of something for nothing.

In our business world, we can examine and study and then carefully adopt a set of principles which satisfy the nature and condition of the independent individual. Certainly this is true: if the people of America who by their purchases support the American commercial establishment, express their disapproval of the concentration of power in big business, the businessman, sensitive to the necessity for the good will and favor of his patrons, will terminate that concentration of power.

The wage earners, in their union activities, with the help and understanding of their fellow citizens, certainly possesses the power to limit the expansion and concentration of arbitrary authority in the hands of a few central labor leaders.

All these things can be done. You and I can do them—do them as individuals. For nothing will be started and nothing will be accomplished until we as individuals commit ourselves, our labors and our support to that concept of the dignity of the individual man and the perpetuation of freedom so beautifully pronounced and so ably outlined in that document those gentlemen of Philadelphia presented to us 171 years ago in the City of Brotherly Love.

Address by Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding address delivered by the distinguished Postmaster General, Arthur E. Summerfield, before the Brown County Republican organization at Aberdeen, S. Dak. I commend the address to all my colleagues. It is one of the most outstanding I have heard.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD BEFORE THE BROWN COUNTY REPUBLICAN ORGANIZATION, ABERDEEN, S. DAK.

My fellow Republicans, I am both grateful and happy to be here tonight in South Dakota, in the midst of this great agriculture belt—this heartland of America—and to bring you greetings of the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

I have the wonderful coming home feeling here in this land so rich in opportunity, so steeped in the true-blue kind of Americanism that has made our country the most favored Nation on earth.

My political outlook, indeed, most of my life, has been formed in a middle-western setting much like this.

I was born not far from here, over in Michigan.

My father and his father were just as devoted as I have been to our Grand Old Party which, for more than a hundred years, has served America so faithfully and so well.

It is a very real pleasure to be here in the home State of two of the ablest of our United States Senators, your own KARL E. MUNDT, of Madison, and FRANCIS CASE, of Custer.

Both these outstanding Americans are rendering invaluable service not only to the people of South Dakota, but to all of our citizens.

I am pleased and honored to be on the same platform here tonight with the great patriot, your very able Governor, Joe FOSS.

You will, I know, send him to Congress where his sound judgment, aggressive leadership and great courage will make him an

extremely useful Congressman, particularly in these trying times when character and experienced military counsel are so urgently needed in the solving of our defense problems.

I feel certain, too, that you will reelect your able Congressman, E. Y. BERRY, of McLaughlin, to represent your Second District for the fifth time.

Congress BERRY is urgently needed back in Washington where his intimate knowledge of Indian affairs and mineral conservation is so essential to the economic well-being not only of South Dakota, but the Nation as well.

South Dakota is unique among these United States because you folks have kept faith with the traditional Republican virtues of thrift and fiscal integrity.

The people of your great State are not burdened with a State income tax—not burdened with one red cent of bonded indebtedness.

The fine leadership in good government in South Dakota will be continued whether you elect that experienced administrator, Lt. Gov. Roy Houck, or your able Attorney General Phil Saunders in the gubernatorial elections this fall.

My fellow Republicans of South Dakota, I sincerely salute you for your great accomplishments.

I can well understand also why you have been called the opportunity State and why your strong economic position makes South Dakota an inviting area for industry and investment capital to flourish and prosper.

The State and the Nation owe all of you a vote of thanks.

It is especially pleasing to come into this agricultural area during an era of peace when agriculture is successfully working its way out the maze of problems which confronted it after American participation in two wars in one generation.

There are still troublesome problems besetting agriculture today, but the picture is encouraging.

It is especially encouraging to you who are working with our great President Eisenhower and the Republican administration in trying to formulate policies and bring about programs which will help farm operators obtain the full parity of income to which they are entitled and which the President and all of us want for the farmers of America.

My friends, I have, like most of you, made my own way.

I have fought my way up through political and economic affairs in the community, in the locality, in the State, and in the Nation.

Over these years, I have been inspired not so much by the plentiful opportunities I have found along the way as by the tough and sturdy qualities of our people—the strength that flows from the grit, the eager competitive spirit, the proud self-reliance, the instinctive confidence of the great majority of Americans.

And this, too, I have noted, as you doubtless have: these strengths of our people are founded in a deep religious faith, a faith which is accountable for our political system and for the concepts immortalized by our Founding Fathers.

These truths—that faith, this strength of character—these always have been especially notable in this part of our country.

Perhaps that is because of the nearness, relatively speaking, of this region to the frontier.

Perhaps it is also because of the proximity of people here to the soil, to the eternal verities of nature, to the evidences of divine purpose so plainly revealed in your great plains, your glorious sunsets, the bounty of your land, and the eagerness of everyone in these parts to achieve for himself and to build a better future for his family and his fellow man.

At all events, such thoughts and feelings always recur when I come into this area.

And today, of course, I am deeply aware in addition that this is a political meeting of politically informed people—gathered for a political purpose.

And aware, too, that I speak to you as the former chairman of the Republican Party, and at the moment your Postmaster General.

Having such thoughts, my urge is to talk here of the truly basic considerations affecting our country—of the principles and concepts which in my recollection are the most meaningful to you folks who are the kind I have grown up with and over the years have known the best.

I enter upon this kind of discussion in this meeting for this reason alone:

With, I am sure, many of you, I look to our country's future with a confidence that simply will not be downed.

Yet I harbor a deep apprehension.

I am gravely concerned lest collectivistic socializing influences for years at large in our country may, in due course, recapture the reins of our Government, give them another mighty pull to the left, and thus divert for all future time our Nation and our people from the time-honored ways, convictions, and attitudes which have ever been the pillars of American liberty and opportunity.

You dedicated Republicans surely see, as I do, the clear portents of the times in which we live.

In many ways this is, in our history, our supreme test—a period every bit as grave and as fraught with significance as our revolutionary crisis two centuries ago.

We clearly see the gravity of the events of which I speak.

Across the seas a mighty nation has arisen.

Its foundation is repudiation of divine purpose.

It is materialistic, treacherous, wholly devoted to worldly goals.

Of human life and human worth it is utterly contemptuous.

Its leadership is tyrannical and cruel.

Its ambitions are insatiable.

Daily it feeds and grows like a vampire, subsisting on the misery of its own people.

It has objectives which to us are vastly evil—the extinction of western civilization—the destruction of every humanitarian ideal and impulse—the enslavement of mankind—the obliteration of man's acknowledgment of even the existence of God.

This menacing mass of humanity, numbering over 800 millions of enslaved people, has become in these times armed with weapons and a technology indescribably destructive.

Not only does it threaten western nations with death and ruin on a scale unmatched in history; today it also threatens the annihilation of humanity itself.

By force of arms, by threats of force, by economic bondage, cajolery and pressure, by open subversion and covert penetration, by cynical blandishment and deliberate distortion, by a Niagara of falsehoods cascading from radio and press and in newspapers, books and pamphlets—by whatever means, fair or foul, this evil force relentlessly pursues its goal of global domination.

With that conquest, it hopes finally to blot out for all time the human values so hard won by thousands of millions of men and women of all nations and all the ages.

Ballistic missiles, nuclear explosives, supersonic aircraft, massive ground forces, the largest submarine fleet in history, a rapidly growing industrial machine, an outpouring of skilled scientists and engineers, all this is the devilish tool of a godless tyranny that values as nothing human life and liberty and strives only for world mastery.

That, my friends, is the shape of things across the seas.

That menace, we must never forget for an instant, pervades the times in which we live.

To each of us, whether we live here in America's heartland or on the shores to the east or the west, this towering threat of Soviet imperialism has a meaning that is immediate and personal and long-lasting in its impact.

Wherever we live, we cannot escape the heavy burdens imposed by this greatest of all threats to human dignity and freedom.

You feel those burdens here, as your fellow South Dakotans feel them in Maine, Florida, and California, in the whiplash of taxes, in the continuing induction of young men into the Armed Forces, in the growth of huge military, naval, and Air Force installations, in the maintenance of large Reserve and National Guard units in our towns and cities and on the campuses of our colleges and universities.

We see them in the white streamers far above us in the skies as huge jet bombers conduct their awesome aerial patrols so fateful to any would-be aggressor.

We sense them as we know, perhaps not realizing the figure, that each minute we spent $50,000 for our defenses—while I have been speaking, spending a half-million dollars—almost every cent of which is wrung from the ingenuity and effort of private citizens who must make their own way in America's system of free enterprise.

As we ponder these things, we think too of the great accomplishments left undone due to the looming menace beyond our shores.

We think of the $200 billion spent only for military purposes in just these past 5 years, a sum so huge as to defy understanding.

We know from our great President the vast good it could have done in a more peaceful world.

We know it could have built all the Nation-spanning highways America needs, all the hospitals needed for 10 years to come, all the schools needed for another decade, all the hydroelectric dams America could usefully build, and yet could have left us some $50 billion more to cut taxes or reduce the national debt.

Knowing these things, we know that somehow, in such a time, there must surely be basic concepts of Government that must be applied consistently and firmly if we are to save our system and pass it on unimpaired to our children and those to follow them.

And then, as we look to our Nation's domestic affairs, what do we see?

We see the bounty for which America is justly famed, a richness unmatched anywhere at any time, an individual well-being, a comfort, a satisfaction of basic needs that have never been approached in all human history.

Yet, in the shifting winds of American life we see puffs of dark clouds which we recognize as harbingers of rough weather sure to come unless we act in time.

We see an enormous concentration of economic power in the hands of organized labor, power used not only to bludgeon management, but also to dominate and intimidate elected officials of Government, the leadership of a great political party, and even the selection of candidates for the highest offices in the land.

Additionally, we see millions of dollars being taken from laboring men and women, put into political pressure groups employing full-time political organizers, creating political organisms of crushing power in behalf of candidates selected not by the workers who paid the dues, but by labor's privileged few.

And, in the process, we see our elective system becoming more and more the catspaw of the lowest common denominators of human character, catering more and more to the greed and self-centeredness of classes and segments and sections of the populace in order to serve equally selfish, equally self-centered ambitions of demogogic leaders

who, by cynical raids on the Federal Treasury, seek to advance their power at the expense of the public.

Again, then, as we look upon these characteristics of the times in which we live, we ponder the future.

And again we wonder, is there, in these times, something truly fundamental, something firm and stable, something to which we can confidently cling as we make our way through such troublous events to a brighter, more promising future?

What, in short, can we do, each of us, all of us together?

What can we do to ensure that, as we confront this terrible Soviet menace seeking to master the world, as we take measure of the growing danger of high-pressure political power seeking to dominate our country, as we struggle to carry the heavy and growing burdens of our own defense, just what can we do to make certain that tomorrow, next year, and on into the future there will surely be liberty preserved for ourselves and our children?

What can we do to see that our free institutions survive, that our free enterprise is not overwhelmed, that America will continue to symbolize human achievement and happiness and freedom to all the world?

Is there—can there be—anything that you can do and I can do?

In answer to these questions, which so long have perplexed many of our people, I say that there are, indeed, solid anchors to which we can hold with assurance amid the swirling events of the middle 20th century.

I say that, most certainly, there are specific and identifiable things you and I and our neighbors can do to help preserve liberty and opportunity in America.

Further I say, that we must—imperatively we must—hold to these anchors not alone for our present well-being, not only for our children, but also for free men everywhere and, in truth, for the very salvation of humanity.

These thoughts bring me unavoidably to the roots of our political processes—and back once again to the great significance of the Republican Party to each of us and to our country.

Clear it is that the greatest trouble of our times is a willingness of too many among us to drift with changing political seasons, to be willing to stand politically for little or nothing, to accept compromise with principle as if expediency were itself a precept of government.

Clear it is that far too many among us fail to discern the enoromously significant differences between the two great political parties which daily contest with each other for the control of our governmental policies and programs.

Clear it is that many, too many, Americans have become prone in the past quarter century to look to Uncle Sam, as if he were some distant rich relative whose wealth can be bestowed upon you and me and our cities and States without any expense to ourselves.

Clear it is that unless we Americans come to understand far better than we do today that it matters tremendously to America's future which party holds the reins of the Government—we are certain to float aimlessly with the tide of events and to witness the gradual destruction of the basic principles which over the years have preserved our freedom and our system of private enterprise.

It may seem farfeteched when I say that your degree of Republicanism bears directly on the success of our efforts for world peace.

Maybe you would consider it at first as sheer exaggeration for me to say that your willingness to work and sacrifice in behalf of Republicanism has much to do with whether or not America will be adequately defended in this time of intercontinental missiles and hydrogen bombs.

And maybe you think it nonsense when I say that your freedom of decision here in South Dakota, your ability to make a living, the protection of your property values, the security of your jobs, the growth of your communities, and the standard of values of your children are all intimately related to whether or not Republicanism is successful in America's political life.

Yet, every one of these things is true.

Let me explain.

I have said that our two great political parties are entirely different.

I say this despite the current tendency of far too many of us to say that the present administration and some of the New Deal and Fair Deal varieties of government are much the same.

The truth is that this administration is totally different from any Democrat administration you can conceive of in charge of national affairs.

There are two basic reasons for this.

They go to the very heart of Republican political philosophy.

The first reason is simply this:

Republicans, as a party, believe in liberty not as an abstract thing, but as a very personal matter for the individual citizen.

Republicans, as a group, believe that each individual in America must be left as free as he possibly can to work out his own destiny in his own way toward goals of his own choosing.

And secondly, we Republicans believe, as a group, that each individual citizen is a singularly uncommon sort of person.

We believe that the individual in America is able and responsible, that he is entirely capable of making his own decisions, that he is quite able to get along without being nursed and fondled and fed political pabulum by a benevolent bureaucracy back in Washington, D. C.

We believe, as a party, that wisdom resides more in individual citizens back home than in some elected or appointed governmental employee.

We believe that America will be stronger and her liberties better protected as Central Government is restrained, as local government is strengthened, and as all government is kept to the very minimum consistent with public need.

Believing, then, as we do, that the key to our system is the liberty and capability of the individual citizen to act and do for himself, we begin to understand why our party stands as it does for various public policies and programs.

Let me give an example or two.

Consistent with our faith in the individual, we fight against legislation designed to favor classes in America and we support legislation to encourage individuals to venture and risk and do for themselves.

Consistent with that faith, we work constantly to get the Federal Government out of competition with private enterprise.

Holding to our basic philosophy, we struggle persistently to return to States and local governments responsibilities and revenues preempted by Uncle Sam and taken to Washington, D. C., during the past quarter century of New Dealism and Fair Dealism.

Reflecting our faith in the good sense of the individual citizen, we Republicans, as a group, have consistently worked over the years to keep the cost of government to the minimum—to keep its size as small as possible—to make the tax burdens as low as possible.

And indeed, to cut taxes whenever and wherever this could be done consistent with national obligations.

Our basic philosophy demands this of us, for we believe, as a party, that the individual citizen can more wisely invest and use his money than can some bureaucrat far away in Washington, D. C.

We completely reject the idea that career government employees know better what is good for you here in South Dakota than you do for yourselves.

Having faith in the commonsense soundness of these fundamental political beliefs, I am certain, my friends, that you see what I meant when I said that your ardency in the cause of Republicanism relates directly to our efforts for world peace—to the soundness of our defenses—to the preservation of American liberty.

If we are weak internally, American efforts to keep world peace are weak.

If we are financially on the skids, our confidence gone, private enterprise discouraged, our will-to-do weakened, our defenses will surely go to pot.

If our liberties are progressively restricted, our self-reliance eroded away and our decisions made for us by some bureaucrat far away in Washington, D. C., we can hardly belligerently wage the battle for freedom elsewhere in the world.

This means, I believe, very specific things to you and to me.

Earlier I mentioned anchors.

I said we must hold fiercely to them in the interest of America's future.

Those anchors are the principles of our Republican Party.

It is not enough to sit there and shake your head up and down in agreement.

Yes, we believe in individual freedom.

Yes, we believe in the good sense of the individual.

Yes, we therefore stand for small government, for free enterprise, for letting the little fellow work out his own destiny with minimum interference from Washington.

But, my friends, shaking your head up and down won't get us anywhere.

Merely agreeing won't keep your freedom and your livelihood.

You and I and folks like us all over America have got to get the petty irritations out of our system.

We have got to stop picking and hacking at each other.

We have got to start looking at the big picture instead of nitpicking.

We have got to make certain that leftwing, collectivist, bureaucratic planners don't take over our Government all over again 2 years from now.

And in the meantime, we have got to make sure that President Eisenhower is given once again a Republican Congress to work with—so this Republican program of ours can be as effective as it should be in the interests of all Americans.

Most solemnly I say this to you:

If in President Eisenhower's last 2 years of his term he is confronted by a Democrat Congress, then if America doesn't face a crisis abroad during that period, it will hardly matter—for the crisis, I assure you, will be genuine here at home.

And so, we are talking about your welfare.

We are talking about your children's future.

We are talking about the cause of peace and freedom in the world.

We are talking about America's safety in the nuclear and missile age.

All that is in your hands.

Is it worth your effort?

Is it worth doing more than shaking your heads up and down?

Certainly it is.

My friends, it is up to you, and no one else, to decide America's future.

I call on you to join me in making sure it is a bright one.

Meeting of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it seems clear that this 85th Congress will be recorded in history as a science Congress.

Probably few, if any, Congresses in American history will have devoted so much attention and, I believe, so fruitfully, to the various sciences than this, the 85th Congress.

I particularly commend the important work which has been done, and is being done, by my colleagues on the Senate Committee on Government Operations in their review of the Science and Technology Act of 1958, and related issues.

Our associate, the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has devoted a great deal of time and energy to this important subject of advancing American science and technology.

In our technical race with the Soviet Union, we cannot afford to be second-best; either in our pure research, the so-called basic research, or in our applied research.

I particularly commend the very excellent background material which was prepared by the staff of the Government Operations Committee in the form of Senate Document No. 90.

In addition to all of the many other phases of that document I found of particular interest its section devoted to scientific programs abroad. This section was prepared by no less a personage than Dr. Wallace R. Brode, the distinguished president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, who, with Dr. James Killian, is now working so industriously to advance American science.

It is my hope that the United States will get the maximum benefit from scientific research abroad. And, pursuant to President Eisenhower's science for peace program, as stated in his sixth State of the Union Message, it is my further hope that we will contribute generously and abundantly to scientific advances of other nations for peaceful purposes.

Naturally, the legislation which this, the 85th Congress, writes can be no better than the application of that legislation at the grassroots of America.

I am certain, for example, that the University of Wisconsin will continue to be in the forefront of scientific advances, as I have previously pointed out.

Coincidentally enough, at the very time the Senate Committee on Government Operations was hearing testimony from scientific leaders of our land, there was meeting at Whitewater, in my State, the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters.

At this session there were announced the scholarship winners in the 10th annual talent search conducted by the academy in conjunction with the science clubs of America.

It has been my pleasure, previously, to commend the work of the science clubs of America and, in particular, the work of Mr. Watson Davis in that connection. I can think of few better illustrations of stimulating the constructive energies of American youth in wholesome, fruitful ways than what has been accomplished by the science clubs throughout this land.

The Wisconsin Junior Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters will, I know, continue to play a most active role in this regard.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an article from the May 5 issue of the Janesville, Wis., Daily Gazette describing the comprehensive program of the senior and junior academies, including a list of the fiine folks—adults and teen-agers—engaged in this work, specifically. It is upon their shoulders, and similar shoulders throughout the land, that America's future scientific position depends.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AWARDS MADE, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN MAN ELECTED NEW PRESIDENT AT ACADEMY OF SCIENCE CONVENTION HELD IN WHITEWATER

(By Bonnie Moody)

WHITEWATER.—A highly successful 2-day session of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters, the first ever held in Whitewater, was concluded Sunday afternoon with a 6-hour trip to parts of the Kettle Moraine. Prof. Henry Meyer, Whitewater, who served as chairman of local arrangements, estimated that more than 300 persons attended this year's meeting, coming from all parts of the State.

New officers were elected Saturday afternoon at a short business meeting. Robert J. Dicke, of the University of Wisconsin, Madison, was named president. A member of this year's program committee, he will succeed Rev. Raymond H. Reis, S. J., Marquette University, Milwaukee.

Other new officers chosen were Professor Meyer, president-elect to understudy the president; Roy J. Christoph, Carroll College, vice president (sciences); Cyril C. O'Brien, Marquette University, vice president (arts); Haskell M. Block, University of Wisconsin, Madison, vice president (letters); Walter E. Scott, Madison, Wisconsin conservation department, reelected librarian; Roger E. Schwenn, Madison, of the University of Wisconsin Library, secretary-treasurer; and John W. Thomson, University of Wisconsin, Madison, chairman of Junior Academy of Science.

Stephen F. Darling, Lawrence College, Appleton, was chosen to serve as representative on the AAAS Council.

Elected to serve on the membership committee were Harold A. Goder, Wisconsin State College, Platteville, chairman; Bernice Cooper, Wisconsin State College, Superior; Otto L. Kowalke, University of Wisconsin, Madison; Fred Kaufmann, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee; John F. Vozza, University of Wisconsin Extension Center, Racine; and Frederick W. Hainer, Clever-Brooks Co., Milwaukee.

JUNIOR CONTESTS HELD

Special praise was heaped upon the high-school seniors who participated in sessions of the Junior Academy of Science, also held here Saturday, by the adults who attended their meetings.

For the students attending, the high spot was announcement of this year's winners in the 10th annual Wisconsin science talent search conducted by the academy in conjunction with the science clubs of America. There were 89 entrants this year and 12 winners, 8 boys and 4 girls.

Jane Karau, of Columbus High School, Marshfield, was top winner and nominated by the committee of judges for a 4-year tuition scholarship to Marquette University, Milwaukee. Her subject was "Natural Dyes for Home Use." In preparing it, she did research on how past generations, as far back as the Indians, used to extract the colors from walnuts, birch, and clover to dye fabrics.

Miss Karau and Daniel Gollnick, of La Cross Central High School, were named recipients of $100 cash scholarship awards made available through the Junior Academy committee of the State Academy. Since Miss Karau could not accept both the Marquette scholarship and the cash award, Priscilla Pestka, of the Mary D. Bradford High School, Kenosha, was named alternate winner to replace her.

Gollnick's paper was entitled "Effect of Natural Phenomena on Cosmic Ray Intensity," which he demonstrated with the most delicate of instruments.

Called Plant Rooting Media, Miss Pestka's subject dealt with a study of the marvels of nature's rooting plants.

The other winners and their subjects were:

Elliot R. Dreger, Kenosha, "Halogen Anion Analysis"; David E. Kullman, Kenosha, "Corrosion Inhibitors"; Caryl Ann Milkowski, Kenosha, "Prejudice Determination by the Use of Jokes"; Clarence R. Netwal, La Cross, "Unusual Uses of Light"; Peter C. Owzarski, Jr., Rothschild, "Experience with Rocket Fuels"; Samuel F. Pellicori, Kenosha, "Growth of Crystalline Solids in a Magnetic Field"; Ronald S. Saunders, Madison, "Anti-bubbles and Thickness of Air Films"; Henry E. Thompson, Racine, "Dial the Answer"; and Jacqueline J. Werner, Sheboygan, "Fractional Derivatives."

Judges for the Science Talent Search were Jesse M. Caskey, Northland College; Ralph C. Huffer, Beloit College; J. B. Greene, Marquette University; Daniel Q. Thompson, Ripon College; Robert M. Rosenberg, Lawrence College; Frances W. Jones, Milwaukee-Downer; L. A. Fraser, University of Wisconsin; and Roy J. Christoph, Carroll College.

Memberships in the American Association for the Advancement of Science were won by Edward Carberry, Nicolet High School, Glendale, and June Horock, Lincoln High School, Wisconsin Rapids.

Margaret W. Hicks, Nicolet High School, Glendale, and Tim Hulich, Aquinas High School, La Crosse, were elected co-chairmen of next year's meeting.

ONE HUNDRED TWENTY-THREE AT BANQUET

An outstanding part of the 2 days was the Academy banquet Saturday night at the Country Club. One hundred and twenty-three members heard Father Reis, Academy president and main speaker, give an excellent talk entitled, "A Study in Human Genetics."

Three busloads and several privately owned cars carrying about 115 members of the 2 academies departed at 9 a. m. Sunday for what proved to be the most popular portion of the 2 days for many, the tour of the Kettle Moraine. Prof. Warren C. Fischer, chairman of the department of geography at the local college, was tour leader and gave a running commentary from the starting point at Eagle until its end at Holy Hill.

Emil P. Kruschke, associate curator of botany, Milwaukee Public Museum, was botany leader. It was his opinion that the oaks and hawthorns are the most significant vegetation of the Kettle Moraine area and

that within the next 2 weeks, its beauty should be tops.

Clyde Smith, superintendent of the Kettle Moraine Park, also made the tour, explaining its future development and pointing out the locations for the various improvements planned.

Speaking at a symposium Saturday, Raymond T. Zillmer, a Milwaukee attorney, strongly recommended that the academy exert efforts to have the Federal Government acquire the entire Kettle Moraine for a national park.

In other business, the academy voted an honorary life membership to Dr. Hugo W. Rhode, Oconomowoc, a member for 60 years who has distinguished himself in the field of chemistry.

Next year's meetings, of both the academy and junior academy, will be held in Platteville.

Talmadge Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article which I wrote for the May 7, 1958, issue of the Georgia Farmers Market Bulletin explaining my suggested new farm plan, and the column written by Georgia Commissioner of Agriculture Phil Campbell endorsing it, published in the same issue.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALMADGE TWO-PRICE PLAN

(By Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE)

Many farmers have urged me to offer a bold new national farm program to rescue this Nation's agricultural economy and, after much study, I have formulated what I consider to be such a program.

It is my conclusion that our farm problems cannot be solved until the Federal Government is removed from the business of buying, storing, and selling agricultural commodities and the responsibility for marketing farm produce is returned to the farmer and private enterprise where it belongs. It is in that light that I propose to let the farmer plant what he wants to plant and sell his crops for the best prices he can get with the Federal Government paying him the difference between the prices he receives for commodities sold for domestic consumption and 100 percent of parity.

My proposed farm program has five points which are as follows:

1. Eliminate all acreage controls and Government loans.

2. Assign each farmer growing basic commodities a domestic production quota to be expressed in terms of unit measurements (pounds, bushels, bales, etc.) which would be the same percentage of the national consumption of basic commodities that the farmer's historic acreage base bears to the total national acreage base.

3. Guarantee and pay to each farmer a sales price support of the difference between the price he receives for his domestic production quota and 100 percent of parity.

4. Require each farmer to submit a bill of sale with his application for sale price support payments.

5. Impose a maximum of $25,000 on the amount of sales price support payments which any individual farmer could receive.

Such a program would eliminate redtape, end the accumulation of surpluses, cost the taxpayers less and once more let the farmer be the master of his own destiny. It would give consumers a price break and would serve to put both raw and manufactured farm products back on the world market at competitive prices. Because it is geared to domestic production, it would amount to no more than giving the farmer the same protection which labor gets with the minimum wage and industry with the tariff.

Although it is generally agreed that any new farm plan to be successful must be one which lets the farmer farm and guarantees him his proportionate share of the national income, there is no such consensus as to how those objectives should be achieved. Therefore, in announcing my ideas about what a new farm program ought to embrace, I am asking Georgia farmers to write me what they think about them.

I want to hear from every farmer in Georgia and hope each will drop me a line at the Senate Office Building in Washington. A tabulation of the replies I receive will determine whether I offer legislation to write the Talmadge farm plan into law.

TWO-PRICE SYSTEM IS ILLUSTRATED

(By Phil Campbell)

In the accompanying article, Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE has presented his proposal for a new national farm program based on the two-price support system.

I am in wholehearted agreement with this program advocated by Senator TALMADGE, which last year was introduced by Senator RICHARD RUSSELL and Congressman JAMIE WHITTEN of Mississippi as strictly a cotton support measure.

I will use cotton as an example to describe the workings of this two-price program. A farmer who presently has 25 acres for his cotton allotment would receive approximately 16 bales for his share of the domestic allotment to be consumed in the United States. He would receive 90 percent or 100 percent parity for these 16 bales on today's market.

One hundred percent parity would be well over 40 cents. In addition to this 16 bales supported by the Federal Government a farmer would be allowed to produce as much additional cotton as he desired at a world market price which on today's market would be 20 to 25 cents per pound.

I strongly support this two-price system as I feel it is the only plan basic and sound enough to be permanent without revision from session to session of Congress, with the consequent uncertainty on the part of the farmer in making his farm plans.

Senator Bridges Honored by Jewish League Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, earlier this week, my colleague, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], was honored by the American Jewish League Against Communism for his leadership and public service. The plaque presented to my colleague at the award luncheon in New York is engraved with these words:

Presented to Senator BRIDGES for courageous leadership and outstanding public service to his country by the American Jewish League Against Communism, 1958.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Herald Tribune for May 6, 1958, which comments on the award luncheon, and contains the thoughtful remarks which the senior Senator from New Hampshire made.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR BRIDGES WARNS OF REDS' LULL; CALLS PRESENT INACTIVITY IN UNITED STATES ONLY TEMPORARY

(By Paul Tobenkin)

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, New Hampshire, said yesterday that the apparent lull in Communist activity in the United States is merely temporary and that the Communists will resume fullscale operations as soon as conditions make it possible for them to do so.

Senator BRIDGES spoke to 450 persons at the the annual award luncheon of the American Jewish League Against Communism at the Waldorf-Astoria. He and Fulton Lewis, Jr., radio commentator and columnist, received the league's 1958 public service awards for their fight against communism.

Asserting that the Communists fish best in troubled waters, Senator BRIDGES said:

"Let us make no mistake about the need to continue this fight. The awakening of our people to the dangers of communism within our borders has caused some to believe there is a lull in subversive designs upon us. But this is temporary. The Communists have merely transferred their efforts to other parts of the world until conditions give them another chance in the United States."

Discussing the unchanging character of Russia's determination to control the world, Senator BRIDGES said:

"The Soviet Union has not changed in either its aims or conduct. Its goal is still world conquest. Its methods are just as brutal and despicable to all that is upright and decent in the history of mankind. And because the Soviet Union has at its disposal the awesome power of modern science and technology, it is today more dangerous than ever."

Senator BRIDGES said that the fate of western civilization depends in considerable measure on the leadership and strength of the United States and that the first step necessary for the preservation of freedom is to keep the United States militarily strong.

"It was the weakness of the nations of Eastern Europe at the close of the war that permitted the Soviet Union to overrun and subjugate them," he said, adding:

"And so it has been all over the world. Wherever force to resist was lacking, either the Soviet Union, or its puppets, moved in for the kill.

"From this we learned our second important lesson; that wherever we oppose force to conquest, the aggressor will generally desist.

"We saw this happen in Iran, Greece, Turkey, the Berlin airlift, Formosa, Korea and the Middle East.

"Out of necessity and much against our will, we of the free world have had to learn the language of force in order to travel safely through the dark alleys of Communist world politics.

"We must be prepared to meet aggression in any form—economic, political, military. We must meet it with determination."

President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles are correct in their opposition to another summit meeting without prior preparations.

The United States must stop permitting Russia to assume that we will never act until she strikes the first blow.

The bronze plaque given to Senator BRIDGES was for courageous leadership and outstanding public service to his country.

Other speakers included Mr. Lewis, George E. Sokolsky, writer and president of the league, and Roy M. Cohn, vice president and treasurer of the league and former chief counsel to the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy's Permanent Investigations Subcommittee.

Mr. Cohn recounted the 10-year history of the league in exposing Communists and urged a program of positive Americanism.

Mr. Lewis said that since the death of Senator McCarthy there has not been a single open investigation of communism by a committee of Congress.

The Retirement of Senator Flanders of Vermont

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Boston Sunday Globe of May 4 concerning the impending retirement of our distinguished and beloved colleague from Vermont, RALPH FLANDERS. Mr. Bob Healy of the Globe has done such a fine job of reviewing some of the qualities of RALPH FLANDERS that have so endeared him to his colleagues that I felt such an article would be of interest to the entire Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLANDERS LEAVING SENATE TO ENJOY VERMONT LIFE

(By Robert Healy)

WASHINGTON.—Just before 9 on these balmy spring mornings a green Ford Thunderbird, with the top down, rolls up to the side door of the Senate Office Building.

From out of the bucket-like seats steps RALPH E. FLANDERS, the 77-year-old Senator from Vermont.

Several pieces of yellow note paper labeled "Things to Remember," bulge the handkerchief pocket of his suitcoat. So they won't be forgotten, they are snatched by a secretary as he steps into his third floor office.

It's not that age has made him absent minded. He has been that way since he was 30 years old and these little coat pocket notes are his liaison between home and office.

At night, he leaves with more notes for his wife.

IN SENATE SINCE 1946

This methodical, deep-thinking Yankee, at times a very controversial figure, was sent to the United States Senate in 1946. Now after 12 years, he wants to hang up his campaign spikes and become a full-time Vermonter.

Senate life has become confining for him and there are many things that he and his wife, the former Helen E. Harkness, of Springfield, Vt., want to see and do in the years to come.

He hopes to keep his connections with public life to promote international disarmament and to study secondary education in Vermont and elsewhere in the Nation.

HIGH SCHOOLS CALLED CLUBS

On high schools he has this to say: "They have lost their interest in scholarship. Under the extreme modern educationists (not educators) they have become nothing more than teen-age clubs."

He makes his declaration on disarmament today before the University of New Hampshire.

When he announced this week that he would retire from the Senate at the end of the term, press association stories noted that it was he who initiated the fight in 1954 to censure the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin.

On this subject he will add nothing that is not in the record, except that he felt it was a job that had to be done.

WROTE SPEECHES IN VERMONT

Three speeches that he made on the Senate floor—each tougher than the preceding one—he wrote in his study at his white colonial home in Springfield, Vt. He received hundreds of letters both pro and con on the subject and even today there are persons who want to discuss the matter with him.

He once suggested that it might be a good idea, when he dies, if all the letters that he received on the McCarthy issue be turned over to either a university or foundation for academic study.

DRESSES IN TRADITION

The junior Senator for the Green Mountain State is a real individualist about dress and tradition.

He wears those felt hats turned up in the front and wild tartan vests. "Those preposterous vests he wears even to the best affairs," said one of his close Senate colleagues.

When he first came to the Senate Chamber he scoffed at senatorial courtesy and burlesqued it mildly.

"This excess of courtesy used by the Senators is an amusing thing, after all, if you listen to it and are not accustomed to it," he said.

"Alben Barkley, then floor leader, sat down next to me one day and told me although I found senatorial courtesy amusing I would find uses for it. He suggested that I study it before I made any more fun of it."

BARKLEY WAS RIGHT

FLANDERS did just that and found he could get across a keen political dig under the guise of senatorial courtesy. "It is really much more sophisticated than the fist shaking that goes on at the House side about once a year," he said, "and much more ingenious."

"Barkley was right."

He hasn't exactly lived by the senatorial courtesy book since then however.

In one of his weekly radio broadcasts to the folks back in Vermont, the Senator, describing the powerful Democratic Senate floor leader, LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, in action said:

"He looked like an orchestra leader except that he didn't stand in one place. He was up and down the aisles, in and out of the seats, shushing up one Democrat, encouraging another, fixing the necktie and brushing off the shoulders of a third while he whispered in his ear and he even went through the motions of winding up a mechanical toy as he endeavored to get the President pro tempore into high gear.

"So far as we could judge, he got away with it all. No one else could."

FRANKNESS WON FRIENDS

Frankness has won him friends, however, on both sides of the aisle.

Senator JOHN SPARKMAN (Democrat, Alabama), told the story of how he had arranged for a paired vote on a farm issue with FLANDERS when he, SPARKMAN, was on a trip to Europe.

"A single vote would have changed the outcome. Every pressure was used to make him change events from the White House. But he stuck with it," SPARKMAN said.

SPARKMAN also confirmed a story that for years he and FLANDERS conversed at sessions of the Joint Economic Committee in Latin.

"We did jabber some," said the Alabama Senator.

FLANDERS has a working knowledge of Greek, French, and some German and is an avid reader of the definitive books.

Throughout his life he has been an inventor and an engineer. Friends say that even on trips, which he has made with his wife all over the world, he carries his slide rule.

He holds patents on a number of machine tools and has written books and many papers on the subject. His latest venture is the book entitled, "Letter to a Generation," which is dedicated to his even dozen grandchildren, "their future wives and husbands, whoever and wherever they may be; and the goodly generation of which they are a part."

It is a philosophical work with the avoidance of World War II without surrender as the subject. The book is a discussion of morals and ethics, economics and politics, disarmament and peace. It is the fruit of his 77 years for the young generation and is an excellent mirror of the Senator's mind.

ORIGINALLY MACHINIST

RALPH FLANDERS became machinist, draftsman, designer, editor, engineer, industrial executive, president of the Federal Reserve Bank in Boston and Senator.

He was born in Barnet, Vt., where his father was a woodworker and farmer. The family moved to Lincoln, R. I., where Ralph entered ungraded school at 8 and finished high school when he was 15. "A high school graduate in those days knew as much as a college graduate today," he said.

"There was French, Greek, and Latin, and we learned reading, writing and arithmetic. Above all we learned how to spell," a subject on which the Senator has strong feelings.

STARTED AS APPRENTICE AT 15

He entered a machine shop as an apprentice at 15 and 3 years later won his journeyman papers. His interest in obtaining theoretical knowledge of machine design and mechanical engineers' work won him promotion.

He wrote several papers which attracted attention and was offered in New York the editor's job on Machinery, a technical journal.

As an editor he had leisure time and spent it acquiring a foundation for mathematics and theoretical mechanics and in later years became an authority in the theory of gearing.

SUCCEEDED WARREN AUSTIN

He returned to Springfield after the editor's post and eventually became president and chairman of Jones & Lamson Machinery Co.

He succeeded Warren Austin, who was named ambassador to the United Nations, in the Senate. He had made one unsuccessful run against the present Senator GEORGE O. AIKEN, in 1940.

America Still Needs Pioneers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address entitled "America Still Needs Pioneers," delivered by Cecil B. DeMille at the Broadcast Pioneers dinner in Los Angeles, Calif., on April 29, 1958.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA STILL NEEDS PIONEERS

(An address by Cecil B. DeMille, at Broadcast Pioneers dinner, Los Angeles, Calif., April 29, 1958)

Thank you, Mr. Patt, for that most generous introduction and for this citation from the Broadcast Pioneers.

You have made me feel a little less like Banquo's ghost at a broadcaster's banquet—but Plutarch says there is a skeleton at every feast, so I hope you will forgive me if I rattle it a bit.

I am not sure that I would qualify as a pioneer in broadcasting.

True, it is 22 years since I first said, "Greetings from Hollywood, ladies and gentlemen" on the Lux Radio Theater of the Air—but that association with broadcasting came to an end 13 years ago.

I am deeply moved by your remembering it here tonight.

That radio program meant a very great deal to me.

It is an honor when anyone asks you into his home as a frequent and familiar guest.

Week after week, for those 9 years, many millions of Americans opened their homes—and I think I may say their hearts—to those fine players who took part in those fine plays, and perhaps some opened their hearts to me.

Before going on that program, I had known something of what it means to reach millions of people through the theater and the motion picture screen—but the radio, as you gentlemen well know, gives an intimacy, a closeness, almost a membership in family circles all over this country.

It meant very much on those Monday nights to think that throughout the country, mothers and fathers were gathering their children around the radio in city dwellings and farm homes, that shut-ins and hospital patients, the blind, the crippled, and the very old and the very young looked forward every week to that hour when the magic of the theater came to them wherever they were, and that I had a hand in bringing it to them—and in return received their welcome and their confidence and their loyalty week after week for all those years.

But all that came to an end.

It was one of the most satisfying experiences of my life—and then it stopped.

Perhaps some of you may remember why.

I refused to pay a $1 political assessment levied by my union.

I was suspended by the union.

Under the union shop that meant that I could not work in radio any more.

There was no commercial television then, but since then the ban upon my right to work has been extended to television also, though there was no television union when I was denied the use of the air.

But I am not here to rehearse what is to some of you an old story.

I mention it only to help you understand how profoundly moved I am by your recognition of the work which was so very dear to me.

It is good to be remembered by you broadcast pioneers—just as it is gratifying when, even after 13 years, people still write to me or come up to me on trains or at airports or in stores or in the lobbies of hotels or on city streets and say, "I remember you on the Lux program."

And then those people usually add something which is very much more important than the personal compliment they are kind enough to pay me.

They usually say, "You were right not to pay that dollar."

They see that, as the Omaha World-Herald said at the time, "The issue cuts far deeper than the immediate controversy—it is far more important than Mr. DeMille or his union or his radio program or all of them together. To a considerable extent its symbolizes and dramatizes the most significant conflict of our age—the conflict between the individual and the organization."

In that editorial, the Omaha World-Herald puts its finger on the basic issue, which many leaders in the broadcasting industry and other industries apparently did not see in 1945—but millions of the American people saw it, and their awareness of it has been growing stronger through the years.

Does a man have the right to work—to earn bread for his wife and children?

Does that right belong to him—or to some organization which he is forced to join and which he is not free to leave if he is to go on working?

Should any organization have the power to cut off a man's livelihood and banish him for life from his chosen trade or profession?

Should a union have the right to assess its members for a political purpose?

This issue is not an old, dead issue.

If you think times have changed, ask the sign painters here in Los Angeles whose union has assessed them each $2 to fight the right to work—the same issue that I fought 13 years ago, the same tactics, the only difference is that the assessment is doubled now, or in some cases trebled.

Samuel Gompers, the father of our modern labor movement, said that loss of union membership in an organized trade was equivalent to capital punishment.

The Taft-Hartley Act was passed to free workers from that awful threat—but some unions have found a way to stay within that law and still keep the power of economic life or death.

They do not expel the union member who incurs the displeasure of his union bosses.

They merely suspend him and that is equivalent to his economic death.

He cannot resign and he cannot work.

That is something like telling a man he has been sentenced to death.

He is not going to hang—he is merely going to be suspended by the neck at the end of the hangman's rope.

Some people say, "DeMille can afford to talk. The loss of his job in radio did not mean the loss of food from his table or a coat from his back or a roof over his head."

And because that is true I have been able to speak for those who cannot speak—for the men and women who sent dollars and dimes to the DeMille Foundation, saying, "Use this money for our freedom, but don't mention my name because I have a family to support."

These are the same union members and their wives who, in State after State, in the sacred privacy of the voting booth, have cast their ballots as free Americans for laws protecting their right to work.

Thirteen years ago when the DeMille Foundation and other groups began their campaign for the right to work only 2 or 3 States had right-to-work laws, mostly inadequate.

Now 18 States, North and South, industrial and agricultural, have these laws—and the Supreme Court of the United States has upheld them on three separate occasions.

On the Federal level, the recommendations we made to the Senate and House Labor Committees in 1947 have been incorporated in the Taft-Hartley Act and applied in several cases by the National Labor Relations Board.

But this is not a historical question.

It is a very live issue.

In this State and some others it is the most prominent issue before the public—and it is not a partisan issue anywhere.

Workmen who are Democrats and workmen who are Republicans both need protection from bosses who follow neither Jefferson nor Lincoln but only their own greed for power.

At the very bottom of this issue is the struggle between the people of this Nation and the union bosses for the control of the country.

Public-opinion polls indicate that a majority of the people favor the right to work—the more people learn about this issue, the stronger public opinion for the right to work becomes.

Most people know now that the right-to-work movement is not antilabor.

The people are seeing through the propaganda gimmick of calling the right to work the right to wreck unions.

In the States having right-to-work laws, union membership has increased at a greater rate than in the States that do not have this protection.

The right to work does not hurt unions or union members.

It helps unions to serve their members.

It hurts only the power of union bosses to rule their members.

Some of the conclusions of the McClellan committee will interest those who are interested in union integrity.

I quote from the committee's report of March 24, 1958:

"There has been a significant lack of democratic procedures in the unions studied. Constitutions have been perverted or ignored. One-man dictatorships have thrived. Through fear, intimidation, and violence, the rank-and-file member has been shorn of a voice in his own union affairs, notably in financial matters. Use of the secret ballot has been denied in many cases."

And to all this abuse the individual member must submit in silence for he is required to maintain union membership as the price of keeping his job.

But if his right to work, regardless of union membership, is protected by law, he can demand fair play from his union officers, he can thwart their dictatorship, or he can leave a corrupt union and join a clean union or none at all, as he chooses.

The McClellan committee condemns certain managements for their illegal and immoral collusion with certain union leaders.

Where the worker does not have the right to work, he is a helpless pawn tossed on the bargaining table between corrupt union leadership and cynical management.

The McClellan committee refers to the "widespread misuse of union funds in the unions studied"—a total of "$10 million in union-dues money" lost, strayed, or stolen.

And note that the unions studied by the McClellan committee have only 2 million members out of the total union membership of 17 million.

I wonder how many times that $10 million would be multiplied if all the facts were known about all the unions in which these loose and corrupt financial practices prevail.

Whose money is this?

It is the hard-earned money of the individual workingman, who pays it to the union to represent him and look out for his rights.

And what can he do when he sees his money mishandled and stolen by those to whom he has entrusted it?

There is not one thing he can do, as long as his job and his family's food depend upon his keeping in the good graces of those who betray his trust.

But give back to that workingman his right to work—and he can stand on his own two feet as a free American and drive the money-changers from the temple of labor.

I do not say that a right-to-work law is the single answer to every problem in labor relations—but I do say that you can go through last month's report of the McClellan committee and find not 1 of the 11 glaring abuses listed in that report that could not be modified, if not wholly cured, if union membership were put on a completely voluntary basis.

Samuel Gompers also said, "No lasting gain has ever come from compulsion."

If he were alive today, he would see that the bitter fruit of compulsion is enslavement.

It is not unionism we oppose—but compulsory unionism.

The American people have accepted unionism as a necessary and important part of our national life, but they want it to be voluntary unionism.

They want every American to be free to join a union of his own choice—but free also to refrain from joining a union or to leave it if it fails to serve him.

This is the fundamental right which the citizens of 18 of our States now enjoy—and on which the citizens of several other States will soon be called upon to vote.

I have no doubt how they will vote if the case for the right-to-work is put before them with half the energy the union bosses are expending to deny the right to work to their members.

They are saying, or getting others to say for them, that right-to-work laws really don't accomplish anything—that working for the right to work is a waste of time—and that these laws are unenforced and unenforceable.

If right-to-work legislation is so unimportant and insignificant—if it is not a real threat to the corrupt power of the misleaders of labor—why are they fighting it so hard—why are they spending vast sums of money to oppose it?

How do those who say that right-to-work laws are unenforced and unenforceable explain the cases—in various State courts as well as the United States Supreme Court—in which right-to-work laws have been upheld and enforced?

They do not explain them.

They want to forget them.

The McClellan committee says that "the weapon of organizational picketing has been abused by some of the unions studied."

In Arizona and Arkansas, the supreme courts have curbed illegal picketing by applying the right-to-work laws of those States.

In Nevada and Tennessee, the supreme courts have protected the right of nonunion labor to work.

I cite these cases almost at random—I have not studied every case in which right-to-work laws have been tested in the courts—but these are sufficient to answer those who tell us that these laws are unenforced and unforceable.

I do not doubt that the right-to-work laws are violated in some places.

So are many other laws.

So are the Ten Commandments—all of them every day.

But that is no reason for repealing them.

The strength of the right to work is perhaps best demonstrated by the weakness of the arguments put up against it.

Sweep aside the deceptive fog of those weak arguments and the basic issue stands out crystal-clear: should a man be forced to join a union in order to get or hold a job?

That is the simple question which Americans are called upon to answer—it's a simple question, yes—but one which has its roots deep in the soil of the American philosophy of life.

Americans believe deeply that man is endowed by his Creator with certain unalienable rights, and the right to work is one of them.

Americans believe deeply that governments are instituted among men to secure these rights and that no government, and certainly no private group, may usurp these rights, and the right to work is one of them.

Americans believe deeply in individual responsibility—that every man should be free to exercise his God-given rights—and the right to work is one of them.

At the beginning of this campaign for the right to work, 13 years ago, when I was a younger man than I am now, I used to feel it necessary to say that there was no benefit in this campaign for me personally.

At the age of 76, one need not labor that point.

But I will go on speaking for the right to work—not my right, but the right of every American to work when he pleases, where he pleases, for himself or for whoever wants to hire him—as long as I have breath.

I am grateful to you for asking me to speak of it here, in this gathering of men whose eminence in your profession puts you in the front rank of leaders and molders of American thought.

I cannot close these remarks without referring to one whom you all knew, one who was in so many ways entitled to be called a broadcast pioneer, G. A. Richards—"Dick" Richards—one of the very few in the broadcasting industry who rallied to the cause of the right to work 13 years ago—one of those true pioneers of the kind that seemingly must be crucified in order to gain for others the rights denied to themselves.

Dick Richards' voice is silent now—but you have now the editorial freedom for which he was pilloried.

Use it for the freedom he cherished—the rights he defended—and the right to work was one of them.

You have given me more than a citation and a wonderful reception tonight.

You have given me a hope—not for myself, but for America—a hope that makes up, if anything could, for all that I loved and lost the last time I was permitted to say, "This is Cecil B. DeMille saying good night to you from Hollywood."

Resistance to the Recession in the Upper Midwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD more good news from the upper Midwest. It is a pleasure to be able to report that business continues to be good, and that industry and economic enterprises are continuing to expand. The flag is flying in the breeze, and people in the Midwest are moving forward.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Area Tops United States in Resistance to Recession," written by Randall Hobart, Minneapolis Star Business Editor, and published in a recent edition of that newspaper.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AREA TOPS UNITED STATES IN RESISTANCE TO RECESSION

(By Randall Hobart)

Economic indicators for the first quarter of 1958 show the upper Midwest is continuing to put up more resistance to the recession than the Nation as a whole, the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis reported today.

The bank's economists said business activity in some sections of the ninth Federal Reserve district are not as buoyant as might be desired, but they pointed to these plus factors:

March bank debits, a measure of checkbook spending, were above a year ago.

Cumulative department store sales were running ahead of 1957.

Agricultural prices are higher and the new crop season is off to an early start in most farming areas.

On the other hand the seasonal pickup in nonagricultural employment is less than in recent years.

"This reflects, principally, reductions in iron-ore mining and processing operations as well as the slowdown in overall construction," the economists noted in the bank's monthly review.

Nevertheless, employment in district nonagricultural establishments in March totaled 1,313,700, only 22,000 below that of March of 1957.

To support its assertion that the recession has not been so pronounced in the ninth district as in the rest of the country, the bank pointed to these percentage comparisons with a year ago for the first quarter:

Nonagricultural employment. Down 0.9 percent in the district; down 2.6 percent in the Nation.

Manufacturing employment. Down 5.7 percent in the district; down 7.8 percent in the Nation.

Average weekly earnings of manufacturing workers. Up 0.6 percent in the district; down 1.8 percent in the Nation.

Department store sales. Up 0.7 percent in the district; down 3 percent in the Nation.

Loans and discounts at banks. Up 4.4 percent in the district; up 2.7 percent in the Nation.

Demand deposits. Up 1.7 percent in the district; down 0.4 percent in the Nation.

Time deposits. Up 13 percent in the district; up 11.6 percent in the Nation.

Bank debits. Up 2.6 percent in the district; down 0.4 percent in the Nation.

The ninth district includes Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, upper Michigan, and northwestern Wisconsin.

Bank analysts described crop prospects for most of the region as excellent. Top moisture reserves are adequate to abundant; and in most areas the subsoil moisture is also plentiful.

"The winter wheat crop wintered well and is in good condition," they pointed out.

"The expectations are for a record crop; Montana producers currently expect a harvest of over 58 million bushels, 25 percent more than a year ago."

That the recession has deepened at the national level, is evidenced by a decline in gross national product from an annual rate of $433 billion in the fourth quarter of 1957 to $424 billion in the first quarter of 1958, the bank said.

Personal spending, which makes up about two-thirds of the gross national product, dipped about $1½ billion and business spending was down near $8 billion in the first quarter. Industrial production was down 12 percent from the peak reached last summer.

In recognition of these general trends, the Minneapolis Federal Reserve Bank reduced the discount rate again in mid-April by one-half of 1 percent, the fourth downward adjustment since last November.

The new rate of 1¾ percent is the lowest since August 1955. Reserve requirements at central Reserve city banks were also cut a full percentage point and by a half point at Reserve city banks, it was pointed out.

United States-Canadian Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 28, 1958

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the May 6 New Orleans States in the RECORD:

UNITED STATES-CANADIAN TRADE

There have been warnings posted from time to time about the shortsightedness of the United States trade policies as they affect neighbor Canada. The gist of these counselings is that the United States better be more considerate or it will lose a market it has had sewed up.

Figures coming from Ottawa now prove that those who issued the warnings were prophets. Canada has historically run a trade deficit with the United States, importing far more than she exported.

In the January-March period, Canada's deficit with the United States was down to $208,500,000—a 43 percent drop from the same quarter a year ago. This was primarily attributable to the sag in United States exports to Canada.

Yet, British exports to our northern neighbor managed to show a small gain—almost 3 percent.

Few have rushed into print to say so, but there must be a direct relationship between this growth of trade with Britain and last year's statement of Prime Minister John Diefenbaker of Canada that Canadian-British trade was to be cultivated.

A few days ago a Canadian trade commission made a report that generated much cheer in London newspapers. Trade-conscious Britain relishes the outlook for increased Anglo-Canadian commerce, noting that the average Canadian has twice the buying power of the average Briton.

The United States didn't have to irritate Canada and disrupt the trade pattern in which it sold the next-door nation 60 percent of her imports. But subsidized, surplus-laden United States agriculture dumped much produce abroad, undercutting markets on which Canada depends. And United States protectionists have made menacing gestures about some of the Canadian exports sold in the United States.

One doesn't have to strain his eyes to find in this situation good arguments against high tariffs and a farm policy which alienates some of our best allies.

Muskegon Fights the Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point to Muskegon in my Ninth Congressional District of Michigan as an outstanding example of a city, hard hit by the recession, that is rolling up its sleeves and fighting back.

Greater Muskegon, population 108,018, is an area of serious labor surplus, with about 12.5 percent of the working force unemployed. Military contracts, public-works projects and other activities show promise of lessening the pressure later in the year, but in the meantime merchants and civic leaders are locking horns with the psychology of recession by staging a huge buy-now-sales-mean-more-jobs campaign.

Since the campaign will continue until May 10, its success cannot yet be measured, but reports to date have been good. Other cities throughout the United States have succeeded with similar promotions.

Muskegon's campaign, marked by raised banners and lowered price tags, is extended to the entire range of buying, and is not limited to autos as in some other cities. The spirit behind the Muskegon promotion is well expressed in this excerpt from an editorial which appeared in the April 30 edition of the Muskegon Chronicle:

Anybody knows that a buy-now campaign isn't the whole solution. There also has to be Government action to remedy the unemployment situation. Certainly our buy-now idea is not intended to cover up unemployment or in anyway ignore it.

But it makes no sense for business firms or any of the rest of us to sit back waiting for the Government to do something. There is much we can do for ourselves through vigorous, courteous salesmanship and by an understanding of how buying creates jobs here and everywhere else.

The Western Michigan News, a weekly newspaper published in Muskegon by the AFL–CIO, in addition to supporting the buy-now campaign, is carrying on a continuing promotion to induce its readers to buy now in Muskegon.

Radio stations, too, are carrying their full share of the citywide campaign to boost Muskegon by its own bootstraps.

A nationwide effort, following the outstanding example set by Muskegon, through its energetic chamber of commerce, would be a great shot in the arm for our entire economy.

A move already is underway to spark this effort. The United States Advertising Council, a nonprofit public service organization, supported by contributions from American business, will sponsor, during this month, a nationwide campaign to promote confidence in a growing America. I am told by council officials that public spirited owners of newspapers, radio and television stations are expected to contribute between $10 million and $15 million in free space and time for a promotional campaign appealing to the consumer to help cure the recession by buying now. Other cities, following Muskegon's lead, will be able to take advantage of this national advertising.

Michigan, for many reasons, is one of the States hardest hit by the recession. One of the chief reasons, of course, is that the auto industry, for which Michigan is famous, is hard hit. Most of the decline nationally has taken place in the automobile, steel and other industries that make hard goods. Yet in Michigan, as elsewhere, personal savings are at an all-time high. Too many people, feeling that this is not the time to buy, are sitting tight.

Increased sales promotions, accompanied by lower prices, can encourage these people who are sitting tight to buy now the things they want and need. These sales will mean more jobs.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY G. HASKELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to say a few words today about the celebration of a great event in the history of Poland. On Saturday, May 3, the Polish people throughout the world celebrated the 167th birthday of the Polish Constitution. To the people of this great country the significance of the constitution in 1791 lies in the fact that it was an end and a beginning in the historic progress of their country.

For the people of Poland, the significance of May 3 is a significance of the spirit, for on this day they draw renewed inspiration of the promise of freedom and justice which was inscribed in the constitution more than 160 years ago.

Most Americans have been deeply troubled by what has taken place in Poland since the war. We in this country had hoped that out fo the smoldering ruins of the conflict, a new Poland would arise—strong, prosperous, and independent. Instead, we have seen an unscrupulous Soviet imperialism make a mockery of this hope. We have seen the rights of human beings trampled upon with utter cynicism. We have seen solemn international agreements treated as scraps of paper. The Communists have cut off the Polish nation and its traditional ties with the West. They have held up to ridicule and scorn pa-

triots who were fighting the Nazi hordes, and in many instances, have gone so far as to deprive these patriots of their liberty and even their lives. They have sought to undermine the work of the church, which has long fought for the rights of the people.

We in America are proud of the millions of Americans of Polish background who have put their strength, skills, and independence into American industrial expansion. That we, as a Nation, have reached such great heights of material power is due in no small measure to their unstinting efforts.

Americans of Polish descent helped to explore, to settle, and to build this Nation, and in the same manner, have also helped to defend it. From Kosciusko and Pulaski of Revolutionary War fame, through the Korean conflict, thousands of citizens of Polish extraction have written pages of an unbroken record of devoted services in the defense of this Nation.

I cannot believe that Poland, who shares the religious, social, and political heritage of the West, is now forever lost to the West. I can only hope, as I am sure you do, that Poland will surely emerge from the shadows of totalitarianism and resume her rightful place among the leading states of the Western World, that she will move forward with us and other peaceful nations toward common goals of national independence, international security, and continuing human progress.

Air Traffic Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement by the National Aviation Trades Association be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Public and Government concern is properly focused on the vital issue of air traffic control. I am pleased to see the Aviation Trades Association taking a civic-minded position as indicated in this statement. It is important for all of us to give careful thought to this complex problem which is of vital concern—the safety of our air traffic.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Grave concern over public interpretation of airspace use, which has been highlighted by the tragic collision of April 21, as well as fear that Government planners will lose sight of basic measures whereby collision hazards can be reduced, has caused the National Aviation Trades Association to issue a request and warning on these matters to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

This stemmed from CAB's announced intention, immediately following the accident, of giving a complete report of all actions and proposals now in process regarding airspace matters to the Congress.

The following is the NATA position as stated to CAB:

"DEAR MR. DURFEE: We commend your action with respect to providing pertinent data to the Congress following the tragic air accident of April 21, as stated in your telegram submitted to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees of both House and Senate. However, we would like to make the following observations.

"Irrespective of all the highly complicated proposals for control of the airspace, the very simple and basic fact remains: Had the aircraft involved been equipped with some type of warning device or proximity indicator, here again is another accident, in an already long line, that doubtless would have been avoided. It is imperative that you bring out this basic point in any statement in order that the nature of the air-space problem will not be further distorted in the mind of the Congress or the general public.

"We are requesting of the Airway Modernization Board that they give the development of a practicable anticollision device a top priority in their technical developments program. Such a device will greatly assist in the safe utilization of the airspace by all concerned.

"We recognize the technical difficulties involved, but with the vast resources available to the AMB, we believe that such a device can and must be developed which, in size, weight and cost, will eventually, if not initially, be usable by thousands of smaller aircraft as well. Initial application of such equipment abroad larger aircraft should not be delayed because of ultimate refinements desired, since warning in itself should be of immense value.

"The entire near-miss problem, which CAB has publicized considerably and which action we have earlier severely criticized, would in great measure be reduced to a relatively minor problem with the utilization of the equipment outlined.

"It is our position that utilization of a suitable electronic warning device, improved aircraft markings with particular reference to new florescent paints and continued efforts toward improved cockpit visibility, combined with the still utterly basic function of looking out the window, that the airspace can accommodate a vastly increased flow of air traffic of all types with a high degree of safety.

"We urge that our position, as herein stated, be given every consideration by you in your forthcoming special report to the Congress.

"Respectively yours,
"CHARLES A. PARKER,
"Executive Director".

A Lesson in Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, all those of us who have taught, and all those of us who have observed young Americans who have been taught by others, recognize the importance of impressing upon young Americans the advantage of living in this great United States of ours, founded on the concept of free American enterprise and free American labor.

Because of the unique way in which Thomas J. Shelly, for 35 years a teacher of economics and history in the Yonkers High School, has been impressing upon the students in his classes the perils, evils, and futilities of socialism, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a little item entitled "A Lesson in Socialism," written by Mr. Shelly.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LESSON IN SOCIALISM

Thomas J. Shelly, 35 years a teacher of economics and history, attempted to explain the meaning of socialism to his Yonkers High School class as follows:

"John, you made a grade of 95, and yours, Dick, was 55. I shall now take 20 points from you, John, and give them to Dick. Thus, each of you has 75, adequate for passing.

"Here I have applied the Socialist-Communist principle as set forth by Karl Marx: 'From each according to his ability, to each according to his need.'

"Now, let us examine this in practice. You, John, won't work because you have had your incentive removed. And, you, Dick, won't work because you are getting something for nothing.

"We can't exist unless we work and produce. Thus, in order to get the work done, we'll need someone with a whip or a gun. Socialism must lead to authoritarian control."

Our Real Trade Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 28, 1958

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the May 12 issue of Life magazine:

OUR REAL TRADE CRISIS

The House Ways and Means Committee is about to report a bill extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. It will whittle down the President's proposals, probably making this renewal more niggardly than the last, as happens almost every time. If the United States is to keep any seat at all in the world's trade councils, some kind of reciprocal trade agreements extension must be passed. Yet even the President's undiluted version would be a mere holding action. This is one of those situations "where little will be gained by success and a great deal will be lost by failure."

The phrase is that of Raymond Vernon in a forceful pamphlet called "Trade Policy in Crisis," which every Congressman ought to read (International Finance Section, Economics Department, Princeton University; single-copies free). The crisis Vernon means is not the quarrel over the reciprocal trade agreements extension, which is conducted with largely obsolete arguments. Let us hope the old-fashioned liberals (Cordell Hull type) wrest one more victory from the "Strackpots" (followers of O. R. Strackbein, the high-tariff lobbyist). But let us also be aware of our real trade crisis, and what we must soon do to meet it.

Two great changes have taken place in world trade. One of these was analyzed by Central Intelligence Director Allen Dulles before the United States Chamber of Commerce last week. The U. S. S. R., which Herbert Hoover in the 1920's could rightly

call "a gigantic economic vacuum," is now a major industrial power and a rapidly growing exporter and importer. What with its growth and our recession, the Sino-Soviet bloc for the first time produced more steel in the first quarter of 1958 than did the United States. And as Soviet production increases, so does its power to use trade as a weapon of Communist imperialism. The Soviet policy of investment in disorder is currently illustrated in Yemen, where $80 million in ruble credits, plus 65 Communist military advisers, are already creating new trouble in the Middle East. This Soviet weapon has also probed South America, as Vice President Nixon is learning on his current trip. It has penetrated parts of Europe, southeast Asia and Japan, not to mention Egypt and Syria. Mikoyan, the master of this new weapon, may be a major shaper of world history's next 10 years.

The second great change in world trade has also taken place beyond the grasp and without the participation of the United States. This is the economic resurgence of Europe. After a virtual stagnation of some 35 years, Europe has recently been shaping its own economic destiny toward unity, prosperity, and commonsense. The common-market treaties signed last winter required far more statesmanship and willingness to take risks than anything Americans have shown in that line since the early days of the Marshall plan. Led by Germany, the nations of Europe have rediscovered hard money, hard salesmanship, and free trade. Some of them have even discovered that old open secret of American capitalism's health: antitrust laws. The antitrust idea has made headway in the laws of Germany, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Norway, and the Coal and Steel Community—ironically at a time when the United States, as Vernon points out, was "withdrawing its support for an international agreement on the subject" of restrictive business practices.

In short, United States economic supremacy in the world, which we have so long taken for granted, is now being contested by Soviet might and guile on the one hand, and by bolder practitioners of free enterprise and economic horsesense on the other.

What do these vast changes mean for United States trade policy? They do not immediately threaten our position as the richest nation. Even if we withdraw into deeper protectionism, we might on on somehow thriving for a generation, though with increasing costs and dwindling alliances. But this would mean abdicating any claim to economic leadership against Soviet imperialism, as well as a short sale of our own greater destiny.

Americans have repeatedly proved to themselves that free enterprise, sound money and the profit motive are the most nearly magical key to prosperity ever devised, as well as the most favorable environment for other kinds of freedom. Now that Europe has rediscovered the same facts, Americans should rejoice at their fresh opportunity to make the system worldwide. But to seize it requires a much larger vision of economic policy than Washington has so far shown.

Life has already proposed (October 31) one means toward this great end: A United States policy of complete free trade with all like-minded nations. Vernon's proposal is similar: "The economic fusion of the free world's nations." A preliminary step, as urged in the current Fortune, would call for unilateral United States tariff reduction, liquidation of the Tariff Commission, and elimination of the escape clause (which at present makes the reciprocal-trade agreement's freer trade pretensions so hypocritical).

If the United States moves boldly in this direction, Europe's common market and capitalist revival would merge naturally into an expanding free-trade area of the whole non-Communist world. Result: Faster real economic progress everywhere, and a greater resistance everywhere to Soviet blandishments. If the United States does not so move, or merely stays put, the European community is likely to become autarkic and belligerent, the free world economically Balkanized, and the Soviet trade offensive provided with soft spots and round-heeled barter victims on every side.

Such is the real crisis of United States trade policy. Let's first pass this obsolete but indispensable reciprocal-trade agreements bill, and then get on with the creation of a real world trading system.

Surrogate Joseph A. Cox Makes Significant Contribution to Law Day, U. S. A.: The Supremacy of Justice According to Law

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUDWIG TELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the Nation's attention a significant contribution to a better understanding of our common law as a guardian of civil liberties, concisely set forth in an address by Surrogate Joseph A. Cox of New York County, given at New York Law School on "Law Day, U. S. A.," May 1, 1958.

Surrogate Cox, who is now a judge in one of our country's most important courts, was formerly a justice of the New York Supreme Court, and also served as a member of its appellate division. A profound student of the law, Judge Cox served for many years as a professor of law at New York Law School, and was recently elected president of its distinguished board of trustees.

In recognition of his scholarship and public service, he was awarded an honorary doctorate of law by Manhattan College.

Law Day, U. S. A. was observed on May 1, 1958, throughout the country by Presidential proclamation, as a tribute to the rule of law, as a day for reaffirming our belief in the system of human freedom under law which has helped to make our Nation great.

The common law, as Judge Cox shows, has played a large part in the development of our faith in a free society adaptable to the welfare of the people.

The address by Surrogate Cox follows:

LAW DAY, U. S. A.: THE SUPREMACY OF JUSTICE ACCORDING TO LAW

(By Surrogate Joseph A. Cox, president, New York Law School)

In this swiftly moving age, with its revolutionary advances in so many diverse fields of scientific and cultural activities, it is well to pause and reflect upon the role of law in American life. Unfortunately, in our preoccupation with daily chores, we miss the trees for the forest, for to a large extent the lawyers' time is taken up with private interests which, while important to the individual, too often ignore the vital issues affecting the community. Yet no lawyer can have any real pride in his profession unless he has the capacity for interpreting to himself and to his fellow Americans the full majesty and meaning of the law.

I can think of no better way of participating in the national observance of Law Day, U. S. A., than by discussing with you the origin, development, and growth of our legal system and its adaptability to modern living.

Without becoming unduly involved in philosophic concepts of law and justice which have been the subject of comment and debate for many centuries, it is enough here to note that without law man would be plunged back into the chaos from which we emerged at the dawn of civilization. It is the law that brings an orderly society, where men may follow their pursuits, secure in the knowledge that their rights will be protected and their obligations enforced. It is the law which protects the individual against the tyranny of his sovereign.

For a proper understanding of our present legal institutions we must look back over the past centuries to the origin and growth of the common law of England, for it was that system of law which shaped the thinking of our Founding Fathers. The origin of the common law may be traced to the customs of the Germanic tribes who stood before the Roman legions when Britain was still a Roman province. It was influenced by the teachings of the Christian church, after the conversion of the Roman Empire. Among the Germanic traditions which took deep root were those of freedom and individual self-respect, concepts which have characterized the common law ever since, and which largely account for our present-day liberties.

Primitive modes of proof and trial: As a result of the Germanic influence, early justice in England was formal and rigid, a characteristic of most primitive societies and essential, in critical periods of society, to prevent a relapse into anarchy and barbarism. Only by making hard and fast rules, evidenced by concrete expression, could it be demonstrated to the primitive mind that the law was the same for all men. In order, therefore, for a man to bring himself within the protection of the law, a suitor was required to follow the exact words prescribed by the legal ritual, which controlled the primitive modes of proof and trial which then prevailed. Thus, it is not surprising to find that up until the 12th century, there was no human method for resolving issues of credibility, this being left to the supernatural. Formalism was, therefore, at its peak in these archaic methods of proof and trial, the most prominent of which were, trial by ordeal, by oath or wager of law, and trial by battle.

The primitive trial involved two stages: In the first stage, the court rendered a medial or preliminary judgment, which merely involved the selection of the method of proof, to which the defendant was to be put and the time and place of trial; at the second stage, the judges acted somewhat as umpires to see that the method of proof prescribed by the preliminary judgment was strictly adhered to in the specific form of trial selected.

Perhaps the earliest form of the older modes of trial was the ordeal, dating from before the introduction of Christianity. As its practice was so widespread among primitive people, and as it was based on the belief that God intervened by some sign or miracle to determine an issue pending between two adversaries, the church felt obligated to soften its harsh features by surrounding it with formal ceremonies, which added to its moral and psychological effectiveness as a

test in the ascertainment of truth. According to Forsyth, an accused was subjected to trial by ordeal:

1. Where he was unable to secure a sufficient number of compurgators.

2. Where he had been previously found guilty of perjury.

3. Where he was not a freeman, unless his lord swore to his innocence, or purchased his freedom by paying the required weregild or fine.

Once a person was required to submit to ordeal, he might be subjected to either 1 of 3 forms of trial—the ordeal of the hot iron, the ordeal of hot water, or the accursed morsel. Without going into details, this primitive method of proof was open to corruption and perjury, produced few convictions and hence fell into decay, and in 1215 was condemned by the lateran council, after which it was prohibited by a writ which Henry III (1216–72) sent to his itinerant justices in 1219.

Trial by oath was unknown to Roman procedure; it was, however, known among the barbaric tribes which overran England. Consequently, this system of trial was found in operation early in the Anglo-Saxon period of English history. In trial by oath, the plaintiff made a formal affirmation or charge, which was met by an equally formal denial, controverting every point of plaintiff's assertion, word for word. The adversary could stop the oath and challenge the swearer as incredible. But this could only be done at the proper time, for an oath once begun could not be interrupted. To stop the oath the hand must be seized before it is lifted up to swear or before it touched the relic upon which the oath was to be made. Another method of stopping the oath was for the aggrieved party to bar the way into the church by stretching his arm or his sword across the door. In either event, the oathtaker, in the same fashion, must play his part exactly as the ritual required.

Where a crime was charged one could not always escape with an oath. Most likely he would be sent to the ordeal, which, as we have seen, was conceived as the judgment of God. The truth was revealed by immersion in water or fire. The water in the pit was adjured to receive the innocent and reject the guilty. He who sunk was safe. He who floated was lost. The red-hot iron, 1 pound in weight, must be lifted and carried 3 paces. The hand that held it was then sealed up in a cloth. Three days afterwards the seal was broken, and if there was a blister as large as half a walnut, it was fatal.

And now we come to trial by battle, which prevailed among the barbaric tribes of Europe, but was unknown among the Anglo-Saxons until introduced by the Norman conquest, after which it was extensively applied in the settlement of a wide variety of disputes, including both civil and criminal cases. Thayer observes that this mode of trial was viewed with suspicion, that the ordeal was preferred over it, hence when trial by ordeal was prohibited by Henry III (1216–72) in 1219, a wide gap was opened up to be filled by the now rapidly developing jury.

In this form of trial, the accuser undertook, during the course of the day, to prove, by his body, the truth of the charge; if he failed to do this before twilight fell, he failed in his proof and in effect became a perjurer. The object was not to kill or maim his adversary, but to make him pronounce the loathsome word "craven." Although the use of champions to fight the battles of the litigants was authorized by the Statute of Westminster I (1275), this form of trial was distrusted. In 1215 Pope Innocent III condemned it at the lateran council for the same reasons which proved fatal to trial by wager of law. Although obsolete, it persisted until the early part of the 19th century. In the year 1819 this mode of trial was finally abolished by statute.

Trial by jury: After the Norman Conquest and during the 12th and 13th centuries, William the Conqueror and his successors took the decentralized Anglo-Saxon system of courts, and superimposed thereon the 3 royal courts of King's bench, common pleas, and exchequer, with appellate jurisdiction vested in the court of exchequer chamber and the House of Lords. The development of these courts gave England a centralized court system.

As an incident of this development the archaic methods of proof, as represented by the ordeal, wager of law, and battle, gradually fell into decay, while trial by jury, initially conceived as a method of eliciting the facts in controversy from 12 neighbors, developed into the modern jury of today, the function of which is no longer to act as witnesses, but as triers of facts.

Shortly after William the Conqueror took over, he issued what was known as the ordinance of 1077, separating the common-law and ecclesiastical courts, with the common-law courts retaining jurisdiction over land, and hence of devises of land, while the ecclesiastical courts retained jurisdiction over testaments of personalty—a division which was destined to have a profound effect upon the law of real and personal property, as well as the administration of estates and the probate of wills.

The evolutionary development of the three superior common-law courts did not exhaust the judicial powers of the King's council. A residuary power remained in the council under which the King could have administered justice if all the other established courts had ceased operation. This great residiary power was now invoked by the King for the alleged purpose of relieving the rigidity of the common law, which, for various reasons—social, economic, political, and religious—refused to take jurisdiction of certain causes. In consequence, suitors were left with no alternative but a direct petition to the King. In such cases the King by his chancellor investigated and decided the controversy. Out of this practice there gradually developed a new tribunal known as the court of equity, which could afford remedies not available in the common-law courts. In this fashion the chancellor, as the keeper of the King's conscience, brought much needed liberalization to the administration of justice and provided the flexibility needed to deal with the great changes that were taking place. The common law courts and the courts of equity, after a period of conflict, as we shall see, worded side by side, one influencing and complementing the other.

As a result of this development of the common-law, ecclesiastical, and equity systems of courts, it was inevitable that the early history of English law should be marked by a continuing struggle for jurisdiction. And it was during this critical period that the common-law judges and lawyers stood firm, resisting the trend in favor of adopting the Roman law, which at that time, the 16th century, was sweeping over Europe.

Coke and the Magna Carta: In the 17th century the common-law became involved in a battle against the Stuart kings. When James I (1603–25) first came over from Scotland he found Coke in the midst of a battle with the ecclesiastical courts, which were resisting his use of the writ of prohibition to limit their jurisdiction. The King was aggravated by reason of the fact that in this struggle Coke insisted that the King was not above the law. At that time, however, James I was not yet sufficiently entrenched politically to challenge Coke. In consequence, the common-law courts took over a large portion of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

In the same century, battle was again joined, this time between the common law and equity courts, the latter supported by the crown, with Coke reviving his earlier view that the law, as opposed to the King, was supreme.

The issue arose when the court of common pleas granted a writ of prohibition against temporal action taken by an administrative tribunal established for the regulation of the church. The Archbishop of Canterbury complained to King James I (1603–25), before whom all of the judges of England were summoned, with Sir Edward Coke as their spokesman. The archbishop talked of the royal prerogative, that is, the right of the King to do himself what he had delegated to his judges. Coke replied that under the laws of England the King could not adjudge any cause, that all cases were to be determined in a court of justice according to the law and custom of the realm. The King took offense and regarded as treasonable the suggestion that he should be under the law. Coke's famous answer was that the King ought not to be under any man, but under God and the law.

In this contest, Coke was resting his case on Magna Carta, which had been wrung from King John 400 years earlier at Runnymede and Marston Moor, in order to compel his recognition and respect for certain basic rights, which are cherished by all men.

Coke's influence upon American constitutional doctrine: The role of the Magna Carta in the history of American constitutional theory is due in large measure to the revival and restatement of its principles by Lord Coke. The significance of the charter lay in the fact that it was drawn in terms that did not confine its application to the immediate issues at hand or to the interests therein involved. Its language was couched in terms of universal application. For the history of American constitutional law and theory, the most important part of the Magna Carta, was chapter 29, which has been translated as follows:

"No freeman shall be taken or imprisoned or deprived of his freehold or of his liberties or free customs, or outlawed, or exiled, or in any manner destroyed, nor shall we go upon him, nor shall we send upon him, except by a legal judgment of his peers or by the law of the land."

It is said that our concept of due process of law, upon which so many of our liberties have turned, stems directly from this provision.

Because of the generality and scope of the language, Magna Carta, from its inception, contained elements of growth. In 1297 Edward I (1272–1307) ordered all "justices, sheriffs, mayors, and other ministers, which under us and by us have the laws of our land to guide," to treat the great charter as common law in all pleas before them. Furthermore, any judgment contrary to the great charter was "to be holden for naught"; and all archbishops and bishops were to pronounce "the sentence of great excommunication against all those that by deed, aid or counsel," proceeded contrary to the charter or in any way transgressed it. By the 17th century Coke could cite 32 royal confirmations of the charter. With the passage of time, the principles enunciated by Magna Carta, became absorbed in the general stream of the common law and Englishmen transferred to the common law the worship they had so long reserved especially for the charter. Of this period it has been written:

"The common law is pictured invested with a halo of dignity peculiar to the embodiment of the deepest principles and to the highest expression of human reason and of the law of nature implanted by God

in the heart of man. As yet, men are not clear that an act of Parliament can do no more than declare the common law. It is the common law which men set up as an object of worship. They regard it as the symbol of ordered life and disciplined activities, which are to replace the license and violence of the evil times now passed away. * * * Common law is the perfect ideal of law; for it is natural reason developed and expounded by a collective wisdom of many generations. * * * Based on long usage and almost supernatural wisdom, its authority is above rather than below the act of Parliament or royal ordinances which owe their fleeting existence to the caprice of the king or to the pleasure of councilors, which have a merely material sanction and may be repealed at any moment."

This attitude is reflected in the writings of Sir John Fortescue, Henry VI's chief justice, who followed his king into exile, and also in the later writings of Coke and Blackstone.

It was, however, in the name of the supremacy of the common law that Parliament challenged the doctrine of the divine right of kings. Coke's dictum in the Bonham Case, decided by the court of common pleas in 1610, has had a tremendous impact upon Anglo-American constitutional law. It reads as follows:

"And it appears in our books, that in many cases, the common law will control acts of Parliament, and sometimes adjudge them to be utterly void; for when an act of Parliament is against common right and reason, or repugnant, or impossible to be performed, the common law will control it and adjudge such act to be void."

This dictum pointed the way to judicial review of legislative acts and postulated the test of reasonableness. In consequence it found its way into the legal literature of the time, and was used as a weapon against Parliament's claim to sovereignty. Coke was not expounding a rule of statutory construction, but was expressing a rule of higher law, binding on Parliament and the ordinary courts alike. In other words, Coke regarded common right and reason as something fundamental and permanent, a higher law. This concept is also to be found in the maxims with which his writings abound: "A statute should have prospective, not retrospective operation." "No one should twice be punished for the same offense." "Every man's house is his own castle." These and many other declarations by Lord Coke are now familiar parts of our jurisprudence.

In restoring the great charter to its proper place Coke wrote that it was called Magna Carta, not for the length or largeness of it but in respect of the great weightiness and the weighty greatness of the matter contained in it; in a few words being the foundation of all of the fundamental laws of the realm. He pointed out that the benefits of Magna Carta extend to all. He meant the benefits of the historical procedures of the common law, the known processes of the ordinary courts, such as indictment by grand jury, trial by the "law of the land," habeas corpus, security against monopoly, taxation only by the consent of Parliament.

From Coke's version of the Magna Carta, through the English declaration and bill of rights of 1688 and 1689, to the Bill of Rights of our Constitution, the line is direct. Coke's great contribution to our legal system was later supplemented by John Locke, whose Second Treatise on Civil Government first appeared in 1690. Locke emphasized the natural rights of the individual resting upon a social compact. The primary sources of his studies were the wirtings of Fortescue and Coke and his own conceptions of natural law. He shifted the emphasis from the individual to the people in mass. He noted the limitation on legislative power and its supremacy within the law and not a power above the law or a license for arbitrary acts. He also noted that the law must be general in application, the same for rich and poor, and that it must dispense justice and decide the rights of the subject by promulgated standing laws, and known authorized judges. In saying these things, Locke was anticipating some of the fundamental propositions of American constitutional law: Law must afford equal protection to all; it must not operate retroactively; it must be enforced through the courts; legislative power does not include judicial power.

The higher law doctrine: The influence of the higher law doctrine, associated with the names of Coke and Locke, was at its height in England when the American colonies were being settled. Their greatest contribution to the American colonists was that legislative power emanates from a sovereign people. Our Constitution gained acceptance because it was based on the concept of a higher law, superior to the will of the sovereign. This outstanding characteristic of the English higher law was described by John Adams, while still a young man, as follows:

"It has been my amusement for many years past, as far as I have had leisure, to examine the systems of all the legislators, ancient and modern, fantastical and real * * * and the result * * * is a settled opinion that the liberty, the unalienable, indefeasible rights of men, the honor and dignity of human nature, the grandeur and glory of the public, and the universal happiness of individuals, were never so skillfully and successfully consulted as in that most excellent monument of human art, the common law of England."

To John Adams and the other Founding Fathers, the common law represented an embodiment of the supremacy of the law which was to influence their thinking when they wrote the Constitution. These men must have been impressed by this tough, tenacious, and yet flexible system of law. As men of wide learning, they were aware of the hard-won struggles of the common law and of the protective shield it had set up against sovereign tyranny. They knew that the servants of the common law had spoken out boldly and truthfully before kings to enforce the concept of equal public justice. Their unquenchable zeal for justice was expressed in the maxim: "Let justice be done though the heavens fall." This is the priceless heritage upon which our institutions were founded.

I have touched upon the origin and development of the common law, and its contribution to our legal system, because we, as lawyers, must be familiar with the past in order to understand the present and to plan for the future.

The adoption of our Constitution was another great landmark in the evolution of government by law as opposed to government by men. The authors of that great document succeeded in binding together those common law customs and traditions which had attained the exalted status of higher law, together with the concept of the separation of powers. The Constitution was made for an undefined and uncertain future. Conceived for the Government of a new Nation but recently carved out of the wilderness, it has proved to be an effective instrument for the orderly administration of a society, whose complexities could not have been imagined by the Founding Fathers.

The Bill of Rights and the subsequent amendments to the Constitution have provided a happy blend of authority and freedom. The system of checks and balances adopted therein has preserved the supremacy of the law with its guaranty of equal justice to all. The Constitution, designed for a government of freemen, permits us to live in an ordered society without fear of tyrants. It extends protection to the humblest citizen while exerting restraints against government itself. It remains a living, pulsating, document because it serves freemen in a free society. This is the priceless heritage of liberty, justice, and equality. Under the law which our forefathers bequeathed to us, we must guard it with continuous vigilance.

We respect the law because it is our servant, not our master. As Charles Evans Hughes once aptly said:

"We of the common law respect authority, but it is the authority of the legal order. We respect those who in station, high or humble, execute the law—because it is our law. We esteem them, but only as they esteem and keep within the law."

It is this characteristic of our law which distinguishes it from the decrees of totalitarian governments which rule by force and which exist only so long as its citizens are held in subjection.

Another significant characteristic of our law is its capacity for growth and adaptation. I need only mention in passing some of the tools employed to meet changing needs: The antitrust laws, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Reserve System, minimum hour and wage legislation, the Social Security Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Wagner Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and other regulatory bodies, many of which have counterparts in our State governments. In the field of civil rights we are slowly but surely also measuring up to our responsibility.

I do not suggest that those charged with the administration of our law have never faltered. Human fallability being what it is, trial and error is to be expected. But we have managed in the long run to provide our own corrections because of our system of free expression and independent courts. We have not permitted our Constitution to be subverted into a restraint upon governmental action required for the common good. On the contrary, it has been utilized as an instrument for healthy growth.

Today our law faces its greatest challenge. It must be developed and adjusted to meet the requirements of an age which has seen the secrets of nature unlocked by phenomenol advances in science and technology. We are living in an age of atomic fissure, missles, and man-made satellites. We are witnessing industrial development on an unprecedented scale. We are confronted with economic and sociological problems of vast complexity. Our security is being threatened on the international scene at a time when the weapons of desruction are capable of laying the world desolate. To permit our law to lag behind the times would be to court disaster. We must dedicate ourselves to the task of carrying forward the precious heritage of our law to the new horizons shaping up before us. We must teach our fellow Americans that respect for principled authority upon which the growth and development of the law feeds. We must make them understand that only in this way will they survive as free men in a free society.

Despite the remarkable advances in science which we are witnessing today, the character of man remains substantially unchanged. He still needs stability and justice in his social relations. He still needs protection against the arbitrary action of his government. To fulfill these needs will always be among the loftiest concern of mankind. Each of us, therefore, is under a stern obligation to respond to the law's command to secure justice between man and man and between the citizen and his government. We must pursue this goal with

unflagging determination and undeviating purpose.

Oppressed people throughout the world look to us for moral leadership. In the competition with dictatorships for the minds of men, more potent than any lethal weapon, would be an effective demonstration that our system of law assures more equal protection under the law, more security in person and property, and greater personal freedom, than any other system yet devised. We can and should, with the greatest moral pride, point to our system of law as the surest guarantee of individual and collective liberty and freedom in a peaceful and orderly life. We should proclaim that a deep respect by our people, for the rule of law, will ultimately lead to a lawful and peaceful existence for the world community.

And as lawyers, we must assume leadership in selling the rule of law and reason, to the peoples of the whole world as mankind's best hope for survival.

The Boom in United States Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the prophets of despair are again abroad in our land. They hopefully point to signs of recession and roll unfavorable statistics on their tongues with gusto.

I have always believed, Mr. Speaker, that agriculture is basically the most important of all industries and that without a healthy agriculture there could not be a completely sound economy.

It is, therefore, with great pleasure that I call the following article, appearing in Time magazine, to your attention.

Except for the false prophets, we can all rejoice at this good news for our farmers, the very cornerstone of our prosperity:

BOOM TIMES

The best economic news in the United States last week, bar none, was the boom in United States agriculture. From all over the country reports trickled into Washington showing that the farmer, after being the lowest man on the economic totem pole since 1955, is making an astonishing comeback. Agriculture Department experts scarcely dared believe some of their own figures. As of mid-April, the prices that farmers get are up 9.8 percent over the same time last year. The prices they pay are up, too—some 3 percent. But the net improvement is pushing their annual income to $13 billion versus $11.5 billion last year.

Moreover, the picture in individual farm commodities is even brighter. Items:

Thanks to a brisk competition between steak-hungry consumers and farmers trying to rebuild their drought-depleted cattle herds by holding back or buying up heifers, beef prices were running 30 percent above last year, spreading joy from Texas to the feed lots of Kansas City.

Hogs were up 20 percent above last year and holding long after most farm economists expected a seasonal price break; many counties in the corn belt reported the most favorable corn-hog ratio in history—up to 25-1. (Usual make-money point for hog raisers is when 1 cwt. of live hog sells for 12 bu. of corn.)

Even the egg—a big thing from California to Delaware—was selling for 25 percent above last year, so high that many poultrymen feared consumers might rebel.

Partly because of the Florida freeze, but also because of continued high food demand from city folks, fresh vegetables were selling 40 percent higher than last year.

And the once heavily subsidized potato was selling, unaided, more than 150 percent higher, carrying the new farm prosperity all the way up to Maine's Aroostook County.

MAIN STREET EVIDENCE

But as far as the general United States economy was concerned, the best evidence of farm recovery was on the main streets of farm towns. In Oskaloosa, Iowa, a typical Midwestern farm market town (population 11,000), where farmers long were sullen and resentful over drought and low farm prices, Time Correspondent Jonathan Rinehart found cash registers jingle-jangling more merrily than in years. Manager Ernest Dilley of the Thriftway Supermarket reported that farm wives, in a delicate shift in buying habits, suddenly had taken to buying cake mixes, scorning the economies of blending their own. Manager John Lilley of the local J. C. Penney store gloated: "We had the best April we've ever had." Predicted Mrs. Gilbert Howarth of Howarth Sales & Service: "Last year we sold 15 air conditioners. This year we expect to sell 20. And that's not bad when you consider there are eight other stores in town where you can buy them."

Chevrolet Dealer Robert Knoepfler sold 15 new cars and trucks in April, cleared out 25 used ones. At first he figured that he had simply cut into his competitors' business. Then Clay Carriker, manager of Greene's Ford, said that his new-car sales for the past 60 days were 20 percent ahead of 1957, used cars 30 percent; high-priced new trucks were slow, but lower-priced used trucks were hot. Another major beneficiary of the farmer's new-found prosperity was the farm-machinery business. Owner Don Berkemeir of the Lytle Implement Co. reported that he sold 25 new tractors so far this year, drew groups of up to 25 farmers at a time to his showroom to view the latest in mechanical hay balers. "Business," said Berkemeir, "is within a few dollars of double last year." Used tractors taken back as trade-ins scarcely stay in the shop long enough to be oiled and repainted. Fresh from selling off 160 head of feeder cattle, Farmer Bill Hynick, 45, dropped by recently, plunked down $1,950 for a 2-year-old model. "I've been thinking of buying for a couple of years," said Hynick. "Until now, I couldn't do it."

Not only has returning farm prosperity benefited virtually every Oskaloosa business (Lumber Dealer Jim Mathew figures his sales are up 50 percent, due largely to farmers fixing up the old home place or repairing the barn), but it has brought a flock of new civic improvements in progress, e. g., three new schools, a $200,000 bowling alley and amusement center. Two years ago Oskaloosa, hungry for an industry payroll to offset the setbacks to farming, almost landed an American Chain & Cable Co. plant, but at the last minute lost out. Putting its finger on the reason, the Iowa Development Commission said: "Poor community attitude." Last week a commission pulse-feeler passed through, asked a workman in overalls what he now thought of Oskaloosa. "Best damned town in Iowa," the workman roared.

BACK ON HIS FEET

Oskaloosa's good fortune was not unique. The Central Iowa Farm Business Association completed its annual report of 153 representative farms, reported net income in 1957 averaged $11,200, or 32 percent over 1956's $8,467 and more than 2½ times 1955's low of $4,235. For a national view, the Farm Journal polled its regional correspondents, found business noticeably better in every section except the Southeast, where row-crop farmers have been hit by weather and acreage cuts, but livestock and poultry farmers are prospering.

Having recently been through the mill, most farmers were being prudent with their new prosperity. In Fresno, Calif., heart of the San Joaquin Valley machine-farming area, Julius Neilsen, Bank of America farm-loan representative, said: "I never saw so many farmers come in ahead of time and pay off their loans." The Iowa Life Insurance Co., reported its sales to farmers through April were up 78 percent over last year. And, said Red Oak Agent Stanley Fagerland: "When the farmer gets around to buying life insurance, you know he is getting back on his feet."

Scenic Wonderland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the State of Oregon will celebrate its 100th birthday in 1959. Many special events are being planned and we invite everyone to share in our celebration.

However, an outstanding Oregon attribute, available at any time, is its scenery. Throughout the State it is ever-present.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following story which appeared in the May 5, 1958, edition of the Christian Science Monitor. The Bend writer, unidentified, has vividly described highway 126 between Bend and Eugene, a highway which winds through an outstanding scenic area I hope all you may see one day:

SCENIC GEMS PARALLEL MCKENZIE RIVER—TINY TOWNS, HIGH PEAKS, FOLLOW RIVER IN OREGON

BEND, OREG.—Across west central Oregon via Highway 126 between here and Eugene is some of the Green State's most appealing scenery.

Highway 126 runs through the McKenzie River Canyon, and there is much for the tourist to see there.

The summer climate is warm, with pleasant days and cool nights. Most of all, the McKenzie is a gray-blue, fast-moving stream of considerable size. One doesn't have to be a trout fisherman to enjoy this setting, but if he is he probably won't be disappointed.

All along the course of the McKenzie as it parallels the highway are little resort towns—McKenzie Bridge, Blue River, Nimrod, Vida—with excellent food and lodging accommodations. The cities at either end of the trip—Bend on the east and Eugene on the west—are excellent tourist headquarters.

The tourist will like the homey cabin accommodations along the edge of the river. If he is a fisherman, he can cast off the porch for his evening meal.

The journey from Bend westerly is an interesting one, scenically. A few miles out of town is the town of Sisters, named after the Three Sisters—a trio of high Cascade peaks, easily visible to the southwest.

The McKenzie Pass crosses through a vast lava bed upheaved by ancient volcanoes. A stone tower at the summit gives an excellent view of what might be said to be magnificent devastation.

Dropping down the west side one descends into cool green forest country. In late spring, sometimes as late as June, one may see vast displays of wild azalea in bloom.

In the McKenzie Canyon, at the resort town of Belknap Springs, the highway joins up with the dashing McKenzie River. From now on one is side by side with the river. The greenery of Oregon, the freshness and pleasantness of forest country, is in abundance. Side trips into lumber country are popular.

One of the most interesting items in the entire McKenzie River scene is the white covered bridge near Vida. Oregon in recent years had some 120 various-sized covered bridges, but some have been replaced with the improvement of highway facilities.

These covered structures were not put up for utility so much as for their atmospheric value. The Goodpasture Bridge near Vida is said to be Oregon's best example of modern covered bridge design.

It spans the McKenzie River below a wide spot and a turn. Large gravel bars lie below it, and with a background of lofty green trees behind it, and mountains rising into the sky, this is an awe-inspiring scene.

Prize-Winning Mollenhoff Stories Spurred Probes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include an article which appeared in the Des Moines Register, May 6, 1958, concerning one of the very efficient reporters for the Des Moines Register and Tribune, Des Moines, Iowa, Mr. Clark Mollenhoff, who was recently awarded a Pulitzer prize for his news stories:

PRIZE-WINNING MOLLENHOFF STORIES SPURRED PROBES

NEW YORK, N. Y.—Clark Mollenhoff, of the Des Moines Register's Washington bureau, Monday was awarded a Pulitzer prize for news stories resulting from 5 years of investigating corruption in labor unions.

His disclosures contributed substantially toward the McClellan committee's hearings on labor racketeering in the Senate, as well as toward other remedial actions.

The Pulitzer award for national affairs reporting cited Mollenhoff "for his persistent inquiry into labor racketeering, which included investigatory reporting of wide significance."

He was cited for news coverage which included investigations in Iowa, Minnesota, New York, and New Jersey.

The announcement said Mollenhoff's "investigations and reporting are credited with having assisted congressional investigations exposing James R. Hoffa, Dave Beck, Frank Brewster, and other teamster union figures."

Mollenhoff, 37, has been a member of the Register's Washington bureau since 1950. Before that he had been a reporter for the Register in Des Moines since 1941.

The Pulitzer award, announced here by the trustees of Columbia University, was the second award based on Mollenhoff's news coverage of labor racketeering.

Last month, the Register was awarded the 1957 public service prize of Sigma Delta Chi, professional journalism fraternity, for his work in the same field.

Mollenhoff previously won two other Sigma Delta Chi prizes, the Raymond Clapper Memorial Award for distinguished Washington reporting and the Heywood Broun Memorial Award of the American Newspaper

HIGHEST AWARD

The work which won for Mollenhoff the Pultizer prize, most coveted award in American journalism, began 5 years ago.

The series of investigations which he undertook in many States, and the stories he wrote from then through 1957, resulted in a series of congressional investigations of racketeering, misuse of funds, and mishandling of welfare and pension funds in labor unions.

Chairman JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in Labor and Management—a group which has conducted explosive hearings since its establishment a little over a year ago—has credited Mollenhoff with providing the impetus for the broad probe.

MCCLELLAN, in a letter to Mollenhoff, once said: "Your ideas, advice, and guidance have been invaluable."

BECK AND HOFFA

Beck's retirement as teamster president, and a tangle of legal problems in which Hoffa is now enmeshed, were results of the McClellan hearings.

The Senate recently passed a bill to reform the handling of union pension and health and welfare funds. Mollenhoff's detailed stories on abuses in various unions had focused attention on this area.

Mollenhoff, a native of Fort Dodge, Iowa, was graduated from Drake University Law School in Des Moines in 1944. He served 2 years as a naval officer in World War II. In 1949 he won a Niemann fellowship and spent a year studying at Harvard University.

IN IOWA FOR WEBSTER CITY TALKS

Mollenhoff heard the news of his Pulitzer award while in Des Moines Monday en route to Webster City, his former hometown.

Mollenhoff will speak tonight to the Webster City High School Quill and Scroll journalism society at Elm Park School, and Wednesday night to the Webster City Teachers Association at Washington Central School gymnasium.

Mollenhoff plans to visit Drake University, his alma mater, Thursday.

His wife, Georgia, formerly of Webster City, heard the award news at their home in Washington, D. C., The Mollenhoffs have three children, Gjori, 17; Sue, 14, and Raymond, 8.

Mollenhoff's mother, Mrs. R. E. Mollenhoff, lives at Waverly, Iowa.

UNDERWORLD TIES

Mollenhoff predicted here Monday night that labor news involving the underworld and the hold it has on the Teamsters union and some others will be of great national interest this summer.

"This underworld picture will be further dramatized in the summer months to give impetus to labor legislation in the United States Senate," Mollenhoff said.

"The Senate will try to enact legislation on the labor front, and may even jar the House into action."

Mollenhoff said responsible labor leaders such as George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, have tried to clean up unhealthy situations.

"Meany and others like him are faced with the problem of practical politics within their operation, and would be powerless to act if the Senate Labor Racket Committee were not continually putting fire on the subject," Mollenhoff said.

George Czech Receives Highest Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, a young school patrolman from my district, Mr. George Czech, of Little Falls, Minn., is being honored in Washington this weekend with our highest civilian award for valor—the gold lifesaving medal. We congratulate him on this occasion and know that the best wishes of the people of our district are with him.

We are proud that national recognition is being accorded his brave act. At risk to his own life, he saved eight children from the path of an onrushing car as they were leaving their school bus to cross a highway. His quick thinking and courageous action in pushing them from the highway with his patrol flag is credited with saving them from harm.

He has been rightly honored by the State of Minnesota and by the Minnesota State Automobile Association for his heroism. Tomorrow he will receive the lifesaving medal from Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in ceremonies at the Pentagon. On Saturday, he will review the parade of 30,000 school patrolmen down Constitution Avenue.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that his brave act will be an inspiration to the thousands of school patrolmen across the Nation who play such an important part in protecting the safety of our children. Theirs is an invaluable contribution toward teaching law and order to their fellow students on our streets and highways.

Our congratulations, too, to Mrs. Czech, who has accompanied her son here and who has every right to be proud of the honors being paid him. We hope they will both enjoy Washington and New York.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include an article on the award which was printed in the Little Falls Transcript on May 1, 1958, in the Appendix:

GOLD LIFESAVING MEDAL TO BE PRESENTED IN WASHINGTON—GEORGE CZECH TO RECEIVE HIGHEST AWARD

George Czech, 15, Little Falls school-bus patrolman, has been named 1 of 5 in the United States to receive the highest civilian award—a gold lifesaving medal—for valor.

The patrolman, who last year pushed eight pupils from the path of a car that was breaking through a patrol line, will be given the award May 9 in ceremonies at the Pentagon in Washington, D. C., by Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

He is the second boy in Minnesota ever to receive the honor, according to C. L. Bowar, Minneapolis, director of traffic and safety with the Minnesota State Automobile Association. The first to receive the award was Ralph Fuerst, Minneapolis, who rescued a girl, Carol Rosenthal, from the path of an approaching train. Fuerst is presently in the Armed Forces.

Czech and the four other youths also will lead a parade of 30,000 school patrol boys down the Capital's Constitution Avenue as part of the ceremonies. The following Sunday evening, Czech and the four other young heroes will be guests at the Ed Sullivan television show in New York City where they will be given further national recognition.

The awards and trips for the youths, and their chaperones, are sponsored by the American Automobile Association. The recommendation for the award was made by the Minnesota State Automobile Association.

Czech was honored February 18, 1957, by Gov. Orville Freeman for his bravery.

The incident, for which he is being honored, occurred February 12, 1957, in front of what is known as the brickyard school. He was a patrolman on the bus, operated by Richard LeMieur, that had stopped to discharge pupils at the school. While the bus' stop signals were blinking, and the stop arm of the bus was extended, a rapidly approaching car apparently was not going to stop. School children were already starting to cross the highway when Czech saw the impending danger. He took his patrol flag pole and herded the children back toward the bus, saving them while exposing himself to the danger.

LeMieur noted the license number of the car and reported the incident to authorities. The driver was later apprehended.

Czech will be accompanied on the trip by his mother, Mrs. George Czech, route 2, Little Falls. They will leave here next Wednesday morning for Minneapolis, where they will board a train for Washington, D. C. While in Washington, they will be guests of the AAA and will stay at the Mayflower Hotel. They will be feted to sight-seeing tours of the Nation's Capital, and also will meet Members of Congress.

Several special dinners are also being arranged for them during their tour, said Bowar.

While in New York City, they will be given tours of the metropolis, and again will be guests at another special dinner. In New York they will stay at the Manhattan Hotel.

They will return May 13, Bowar said.

For Boating Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, after 2 years of careful study by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, a bill has been reported, and is presently pending before the Rules Committee, which will be a major step in the modernization of our boating laws. The tremendous boom in recreational boating in recent years provides ample proof of the need for new legislation to cope with problems which are being created. Many State and local governments have either recently enacted legislation or ordinances to regulate boating, or are presently giving study to the subject. The great danger is that in the absence of coordinated effort among the various jurisdictions, a hodgepodge of boating laws are likely to come into being, which could set the industry and the sport back for many years.

The bill H. R. 11078 as reported by the Merchant Marine Committee is a sound step in the direction of coordination of effort toward the goal of reasonable uniformity between the States and the Federal Government.

The need for this type of action is well brought out in an editorial in the May 1 issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

Under leave heretofore granted, I insert the following editorial:

WARNING FLAG HOISTED OVER BOATING BOOM

(By W. Clifford Harvey)

One of the oldest of American industries—pleasure boating—is only in its infancy today with booming sales and families thinking in terms of taking to the water under sail, in cabin cruisers, dinghys, or on yachts.

This amazingly sudden spurt of customers trying to get into new boats and sparking their modern self-starters has just as suddenly thrust a completely new set of problems and regulatory formulas upon the lawmakers and boat owners. The problem is to develop a safety code before the waterways become as crowded as the highways.

The fast-ballooning pleasure boat business is now concerned over the possibility that local, State, and Federal governments might create a hodgepodge of boating laws that could set the industry back more than a decade.

BOATING ACT PROPOSED

Checks against this prospect are being referred to local boating organizations and legislatures with the idea of forestalling private groups said to be pressing their own favorite plans.

Representative HERBERT C. BONNER, Democrat of North Carolina, an ardent proponent of some model State boating law, has warned against building a "Tower of Babel in boating laws." He is fighting for the updating of Federal laws through passage of a boating act which he has introduced into the current Congress.

Safety is something that can be installed in a boat—or an automobile—only to a limited extent. Complete safety is dependent largely upon the operator. But protection against the carelessness or frailties of the human element can be solidified, according to Mr. BONNER, through carefully thought out, uniform laws.

One boatmaker is advertising that the amount of pleasure you realize from your boat investment is in direct proportion to how safe you make your boat. There are all kinds of devices available, he says, to make boating safer. And he goes on to list a few—automatic pilots, direction finders, radio telephones, depth recorders, radar, electric starting, and electric lighting.

EARLY ACTION DUE

The proposed Federal Boating Act goes further. It is the result of a 2-year effort by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. It aims at a workable framework of uniform legislation to regulate, but not to restrict, boating. It has the endorsement of the United States Coast Guard, Council of State Governments, the Outboard Boating Club of America, the United States Power Squadrons, American Power Boat Association, and the National Boating Association.

Early action by Congress is forthcoming, due to the mounting problems of handling the vastly increasing flotillas of pleasure boats. Pleasure craft, formerly numbering in the thousands, have increased to millions.

National recognition of the boat problems was given by the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, when he told a congressional hearing that the boating situation has mushroomed to the point where it is almost out of hand.

Several States have organized motorboat committees or advisory commissions to help in formulating sensible laws that will control and not hamper the operation of pleasure boats.

A Letter From General Counsel Robert Dechert of the Department of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include a letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, Robert Dechert, regarding a TV debate:

GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., May 6, 1958.

Hon. PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: I write this letter to supplement our conversation this morning at the meeting of the House Armed Services Committee about the statement introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for yesterday, May 5, 1958, by Congressman F. EDWARD HÉBERT, relating to the TV debate between him and me day before yesterday (Sunday, May 4, 1958). Unfortunately Congressman HÉBERT has returned to his constituency for a period, as he told me Sunday he planned to do, and I am therefore unable to see him. I am, however, sending to his office a copy of this letter.

Mr. HÉBERT's statement (on p. A4065) is headed "The Full Story." I suggest that whoever was responsible for this heading did Mr. HÉBERT an injustice.

Mr. HÉBERT said on page A4065 that Mr. Dechert stated that he was "a former marine himself." This is an error on his part. What I said was that as a Regular Army lieutenant I had served with the 5th Marine Regiment in the Battle of Belleau Wood in June 1918, and had in fact been in charge, for the 10 days which made up the second (and lesser) half of that battle, of the entire communications of the Marine Brigade of the Second Division in the Belleau Wood. This and many other contacts have given me an undying admiration for the United States Marine Corps.

Mr. HÉBERT in his CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statement then said, as to the Marine Corps, that I "set about chastising them and using language which was most inappropriate and shocking."

Lest these adjectives mislead anyone who did not hear our TV debate, it seems to me that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should contain the following exact transcript (taken from a tape recording) of my answer in the TV debate to Congressman HÉBERT, in which he finds "language which was most inappropriate and shocking." I hope that his view will not be shared by anyone else who heard the debate or who reads this, for no one regards both the Marine Corps and the Navy more highly than I, and what I was trying to say was that my regard for them was so widely shared that neither of those great organizations need fear that the public would allow them to be unfairly treated.

Here then is the stenographic transcript of the part of the TV debate to which Mr. HÉBERT referred in such strong language:

Mr. DECHERT. "As a newspaperman you know that the newspaper can never report a whole speech. Since you've asked this, you've got to give me a minute or two to read this. This is what I said, in pointing

out that reorganizations always bring growing pains, and that those growing pains need to be dealt with wisely and that you cannot always deal with them by legislation. I said:

" 'Let's take a specific example—the United States Marine Corps. I stand second to no one in my admiration for the fighting United States Marine Corps. I served as the signal officer under the 5th Marines—the 6th Marines—in the Belleau Woods for the last 10 days in the battle of the Belleau Woods. I was a Regular Army officer.' "

Mr. HÉBERT. "Are you reading? Did you say this last night?"

Mr. DECHERT. "I said it last night. * * * 'I was a Regular Army officer and I know the value of the Marine Corps, but you can't effectively preserve the status quo by legislation, nor is it desirable to try to do so. Note however that this bill, recognizing the admiration of the country and certain understandable concerns of the Marine Corps, contains three things:

" '1. The preamble provision;

" '2. Section 202 (c) (3), which says that "Within the policy enunciated" by section 2—the preamble—certain things will be done; and finally it retains

" '3. Title 10, United States Code 5013 (a), which says that the Marine Corps "* * * shall be so organized as to include not less than 3 combat divisions and 3 air wings, and such other land combat, aviation and other services as may be organic therein'."

"I then went on and said that 'no set of words could ever guarantee absolutely the status quo. The continued high status of the United States Marine Corps must be guaranteed, in the future as in the past, by three things:

" '1. Their deeds;

" '2. Their public acceptance;

" '3. The devotion of their members and past members.

" 'I suggest that it would be against the best interests of the United States Marine Corps to seek more specific guarantees by statute.'

"And I believe that."

The points which I was trying most to emphasize in my Saturday speech and in the TV debate were these:

1. In the face of changing methods of warfare (and surely the missile and space implications of today are omens of change), no legislation is effective to continue the methods of yesterday. I pointed out that no law could have preserved wooden battleships, once the *Monitor* and *Merrimac* fought their famous battle off Newport News, and that armored tanks spelled the end of cavalry after World War I, regardless of legislation.

2. Those who try to preserve the exact status quo by legislation in fact do a disservice to the military services. Those services have shown a great adaptability to change. They cannot be safely put into legislative straitjackets.

Very sincerely,

ROBERT DECHERT.

J. Edgar Hoover and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which summarizes J. Edgar Hoover's new book entitled "Masters of Deceit" devoted to the study of and combat against communism. This article appeared in the Elks magazine, issued for May 1958:

J. EDGAR HOOVER AND COMMUNISM

The Order of Elks was the first national American organization to condemn communism.

That action was taken at the grand lodge session of 1919.

That same year a young man named J. Edgar Hoover, a special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, was assigned to prepare a legal brief on the newly formed Communist Party.

Since his acceptance of the responsibilities of the Directorship of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. Hoover has, naturally, devoted himself earnestly to the study of and combat against communism in this country.

From time to time, articles by him pertaining to this subject have been contributed by him to the Elks magazine and have been read with appreciation and benefit by the members of the order.

In the foreword of a book just issued, entitled "Masters of Deceit," Mr. Hoover tells of the depth and breadth of his studies of communism and states that he concluded his 1919 report on the subject as follows:

"These doctrines threaten the happiness of the community, the safety of every individual and the continuance of every home and fireside.

"They would destroy the peace of the country and thrust it into a condition of anarchy and lawlessness and immorality that passes imagination."

His conclusions, he says, remain the same today and he adds that communism is the major menace of our time and threatens the very existence of our Western civilization.

When one concludes the reading of Masters of Deceit one cannot fail to be thoroughly convinced Mr. Hoover has proven his case.

We have read several reviews of the Masters of Deceit, but none which we feel does justice to the book.

We shall not attempt a review. An effort to give full justice to the book would require another 300-page publication and then fall short.

In brief, let us say that Mr. Hoover is the only man who could have written this book.

He covers the history of communism from Marx and Engels through Lenin and Stalin to Khrushchev and substantiates all charges of deceit, oppression, and murder by special instances.

He treats communism in the United States in the same manner, giving names, dates and instances.

He shows the great deceit and danger not only of definite Communist groups, but also of fronts and fellow travelers.

In short, it is a book that ought to be read by every American citizen interested in the preservation of the freedom we now enjoy. It should be in every library in our country and made a textbook in our schools.

All loyal American citizens of our country owe a debt of gratitude to J. Edgar Hoover, the author of Masters of Deceit.

Inflation and Automation: Cause of Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Little Businessman by Mr. William Castleman. As executive secretary of the Illinois Institute of Social Welfare, Mr. Castleman is particularly qualified to view the impact that the current economic picture has had on older people, and on those with fixed incomes:

CAUSE OF UNEMPLOYMENT: INFLATION AND AUTOMATION

(By William Castleman, editor)

The President in a recent statement stated that he would not be panicked by alarmists. It appears that he has already been greatly influenced by those who have brought to his attention the dangers confronting our Nation because of unemployment and business conditions. It was only a few months ago that he stated that the country was only taking a breather. Then why the appropriation of the billions of dollars for public works? The facts are that he has discovered that the alarmists had uncovered the true conditions that were prevailing throughout the Nation, and brought to his attention that the economy was deteriorating rapidly. That is why the billions for public works.

If the American people would only take time to properly evaluate the cause that has produced poverty in the midst of abundance—if they understood the two dynamic forces which are producing unemployment and poverty—inflation and automation, we could begin to take the necessary steps to create jobs for our unemployed workers, by building up the purchasing power of our poor and needy, who are in dire need of the things of life.

In the last 5 years billions of dollars have been spent on new plants and new labor-saving machinery. The robot worker is fast displacing the human worker in many of our factories and offices. And if we take the time to examine closely the workings of our mixed economy, we will find that the other big factor in creating unemployment has been inflation—inflation during a recession. This is something new in the economic picture. The rule heretofore has been, that when business is poor, prices drop. Not this time. The high prices in 1958 are not the result of scarcity. Our warehouses are full of merchandise. Then what is it? Could it be monopoly? Nobody seems to give us the answer.

We do know that the millions who are on low fixed incomes have had their purchasing power greatly reduced by inflation. This takes in about one-fifth of our population. Their reduced purchasing power resulted in their buying less food, less goods, etc. The effect, less help in the factories, stores, etc. Unemployment naturally followed, like night follows day. A vicious process was started. As more workers were let out of jobs, the buying power was further reduced. And so the vicious process goes merely on, where it will stop nobody knows. It can only be stopped by a reversal of the present trend.

Professor Neil F. Jacoby, of the University of California, in his book Can Prosperity Be Sustained? wrote:

"Price inflation during the past decade has pauperized millions of our elderly and disabled Americans living on fixed dollar pensions, State aid, social security, and annuities."

The professor had hit upon one of the basic causes which brought on our present recession. The other force is automation—the robot worker. He is rapidly displacing many of our human workers. He needs no food, clothing or shelter, and he is able to work long hours, if what he produces can be sold. In fact, he is a very much cheaper worker than the slave of the old south.

The first thing that the Nation needs to do is to restore the buying power to the millions that have lost it through inflation—

these are our poor and needy, our old folks. These people with small incomes are in dire need of the things of life. Why not restore to them their original buying power that they had when they first received their social security and old-age assistance checks? It would be far better if the Nation would not only do that, but raise their purchasing power in this critical period above their usual buying ability to purchase the needs of life. This will give a spurt to jobs everywhere, over the entire Nation.

To make the Nation stronger, we must remove poverty altogether. Franklin D. Roosevelt, in a statement he made during the depression of the thirties, said: "We have come to a clear realization that individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence."

Can this be a warning, that if we fail to build security for our people in all stratas of our social order, that it will be the end of our free enterprise economy?

The robot worker, automation, has made the good life possible for all. When our Congress makes the needed changes in our health, education and welfare policies, to meet the needs of all our people, it will spell the end of poverty in our Nation.

In the meanwhile, the pressure of unemployment will keep on increasing, regardless of the billions of dollars that the administration is planning to spend, until purchasing power becomes better balanced with production.

The road building and other Government projects, which require skilled labor, will help the wage-earners in the high income brackets. But the present unemployed army comes from our factories, stores, offices and service businesses. Most of them will remain unemployed, unless purchasing power is placed into the hands of those in dire need of the things of life. One big factor in a public works program, it takes nearly a year to get it underway. Can the Nation wait another year for to cure its ills? The extension of unemployment compensation for 13 weeks will only help to keep the wolf away from the door a little while longer. Jobs, not charity, is the only correct answer.

In the great challenge of 1958, will be have the will and the wisdom to reorganize our Nation on a more solid foundation? Or, will we follow the leaders of the blind, and move toward greater unemployment, and a much deeper depression than what we had in the thirties?

If we remain callous—indifferent to the misery prevailing in our midst—if we procrastinate on the vital problems of our Nation, we may be too late to act—the destructive forces will have made big inroads into our way of life.

The late Justice Louis Brandeis, once said: "The failure to solve today's problems only accentuates an complicates tomorrow's."

How correct he was, and how timely is his reasoning for us today. It is indeed tragic when one sees how indifferent we have become toward the millions of our poor and needy. Wider, wider, becomes the gap between production and consumption. A nation which has been able to reach a state of abundance, should have the intelligence and the will to correct this terrible condition which prevails in our democracy.

The Nazarene said to the people of His day, "Come unto me and I will give you life, and I will give it more abundantly."

In His day, the struggle to survive was very difficult. The people used crude hand tools to obtain their living from the soil. It was quite a task to produce the needs of life. How different it is today. One robot machine can produce enough for a hundred human workers. There is no need for poverty to prevail in our midst. The 65 million workers and the millions of robots can, and have, already produced a state of abundance of many products.

And, if we fail to understand the signs of our times—if we fail to appreciate our freedoms—if we fail to solve our economic problems, as the free nations down the ages failed, our weakness in the midst of strength, will destroy us.

A tax reduction will only be of great benefit to the wealthy. It will not solve the unemployment problem. A tax reduction will give inflation the biggest spurt it has had for many years. Some of the daily papers, with their well camouflaged headlines, are leading the people up a blind alley. A tax cut across-the-board will surely enrich the rich—more money will be put into banks, vaults and secret hiding places, but their dollars will keep sinking in value far faster than ever before.

America's political leaders and America's business leaders are facing the greatest challenge in the history of the Nation. Are they capable to meet the challenge of 1958? Have they the wisdom and the understanding to save this Nation and its freedoms from destruction? They can only do that, by building opportunity for all to enjoy the good life. Yes; it will take a great deal of spending which might be used to purchase a few more missiles. But it will unite the Nation, and it will become stronger than it has ever been. Its freedoms and progress will be assured.

The wealth this Nation had produced in the height of its prosperity will become a mere mole-hill, when once the Nation is fully united to produce abundance for all—it will build a mountain of wealth, and convince the world that our way of life offers the greatest opportunity for the well being of mankind.

This Nation can well afford to be lenient and liberal to its poor. It can well afford to lift our poor and needy out of the mire of poverty to the better life and greater security. It will cost much less than to keep up thousands of charity organizations, hospitals, mental institutions, large police forces, jails, racketeers and gangsters. Will our Nation's leaders have the will and the courage to tackle the great human problem of the ages? Then only will we be able to say that the dream of the Founding Fathers of this Nation is coming true—a Nation of freedom and opportunity for all.

Soil Conservation Districts: 1957 Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I just received a progress report from State Conservationist M. F. Schweers, of the Soil Conservation Service, indicating 1957 accomplishments made by the agency operating through the 71 county soil conservation districts in Wisconsin. This information was contained in a letter addressed to district supervisors in acknowledging their past year's reports.

I have an especial interest in the progress being made by the Soil Conservation Service because the first large-scale demonstration undertaken by it in the entire Nation was established in my congressional district, in the Cook Creek watershed to be precise. The practices originally established there have been a model for soil conservation work in the Midwest. This year, 1958, marks the 25th anniversary of the initiation of this project.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the progress report sent out by M. F. Schweers, Wisconsin State conservationist, May 5, 1958:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Madison, Wis., May 5, 1958.

To: Soil conservation district supervisors.
From: M. F. Schweers, State conservationist.
Subject: Acknowledgment of your 1957 SCD annual reports.

Recognition banquets and annual meetings for cooperators were among soil conservation district highlights for 1957, according to enthusiastic remarks contained in many of your interesting and informative annual reports. In quite a number of districts the outstanding soil conservation couple(s) of the year was selected and presented with an award(s).

I know we are all aware of the fact that the farm families who till the land are the ones responsible for the sucess of the soil and water conservation program. Your showing appreciation of their efforts through these recognition events was a commendable and appropriate gesture. I have been told that these people sincerely appreciate what you have done for them in this connection.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SEVEN REPORTS

Each year your annual reports get better in makeup, content and attractiveness. We have said this in past years, and 1957 is definitely no exception. Sending copies of these reports to district cooperators and the agricultural leaders of your county is an excellent idea.

Many reports contained some thought provoking philosophies as expressed in the following example:

"After all, what we are all striving for is better living for people. I'm confident that our district program here is making that contribution. I'm personally proud to be part of it and I'm proud of the agencies and people—particularly farmers—who are contributing to better living for all our people."

Several of your reports contained testimonials made by SCD cooperators, such as:

"We are not done with the program even though we started way back in 1949. I will say when a farmer says he is through with conservation he must be done farming."

"If you are interested in maximum production at a minimum cost, my advice is to contact your soil conservationist for help in developing a complete plan for your farm. You too will be amazed at the results."

I could have acknowledged each of your reports with a separate letter. However, it seemed that a single communication could be more effective and so I am following the pattern employed during the past several years.

SCS Administrator Don Williams asked me to convey greetings to you. I am sure he wishes that he had the time to personally acknowledge each one of your reports.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

In writing you 2 years ago we started this section with these words: "The best year we ever had." I am pleased to inform you that 1957 achievements surpased those made in 1955. As evidence, we present the following table showing work performed by the Soil Conservation Service through your districts:

Item	Unit	Accomplishments		1957/1955 percent
		1955	1957	
New cooperators	Number	2,996	2,004	67
Basic conservation plans	do	1,216	1,740	143
SCD cooperators serviced	do	13,022	15,829	122
Soil surveys	Acre	550,395	557,882	101
Soil descriptions	Number	102	60	59
Contour strip cropping	Acre	59,174	52,128	89
Waterways	Mile	345	390	113
Terraces	do	335	282	84
Diversions	do	198	195	99
Land smoothing	Acre	731	2,005	274
Surface drains	Mile	977	737	75
Closed drains	do	232	356	153
Pasture improvement	Acre	20,773	29,980	144
Prevention of grazing damage	do	20,969	26,140	125
Woodland management [1]	do	5,599	4,932	88
Tree planting	do	3,185	11,918	374
Field windbreaks	Mile	33	45	136
Wildlife area improvement	Acre	903	2,955	327
Drop inlets	Number	18	81	450
Drop spillways	do	7	95	1,357
Farm ponds	do	79	163	206
ACP referrals	do	14,670	15,153	103
ACP farms serviced	do	15,112	14,135	94
Soil Bank participants assisted	do	0	849	----------
Work in rural development counties	do	0	2	----------
Direct assistance to SCD's (includes part-time aids)	Man-years	155	175	113

[1] Employees of the Wisconsin Conservation Department were primarily responsible for the woodland management accomplishments and they cooperated very closely with Service personnel in the tree-planting program.

The increase in construction of drop inlets and spillways was a major factor in establishing this new record for the State. Upping the number of these structures from 25 to 176 is really an outstanding expansion of these much needed installations.

While the Service does not maintain records on items such as desirable land-use conversions, improved rotations, influence on increasing farmer purchases of needed liming and fertilizing materials, etc., these are basic factors considered while assisting farm families in developing and carrying out their conservation plans.

From time to time questions are raised concerning SCS policies on drainage. You are no doubt familiar with these policies, but it wouldn't be amiss at this time to quote a portion of a directive issued by Administrator Williams on March 30, 1956:

"In accord with the current policy of the Department of Agriculture, the Service will not provide assistance to cooperators in drainage, the primary purpose of which is to bring additional land into agricultural production."

The SCS also assisted district governing bodies and collaborated with the Agricultural Extension Service and the State Soil Conservation Committee in planning for and carrying out educational and informational programs. We do not have data on the extent of these activities.

In summarizing this section, I certainly am in accord with the statements made in many of your reports to the effect that "1957 was indeed a good year soil and water conservation-wise."

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Without ACP cost-sharing assistance, the record-construction program would not have risen to the heights it attained in 1957. This same appraisal is applicable to increased amounts of other measures for which cost-sharing assistance is provided.

County agricultural stabilization and conservation committees transferred more than $165,000 to the Soil Conservation Service under the SCS–ACP 5 percent agreements. Of this amount the Service earned about $155,000. These funds were used to supplement district staffs in handling the additional workload resulting from the agricultural conservation program.

The past year saw the completion of the first ACP pooling agreements in the State. Through this arrangement, two or more farmers can cooperate and pool their ACP payments on eligible practice.

WATERSHED ACTIVITIES

There are more than 60 informally organized watershed associations in Wisconsin. One of our work-unit conservationists estimated a 10 percent increase in accomplishments by working through groups rather than with individuals.

A brief rundown on watershed activities under Public Law 566, the watershed protection and flood prevention act, up to May 1 is as follows:

Watershed	Approximate acreage	County SCD's	Remarks
Lost Creek	7,000	Pepin	Approved for operations. Contracts for construction of 3 floodwater-retarding dams should be entered into prior to June 15.
Mill Creek	40,000	Richland	Approved for operations. Detailed surveys are being made and structural designs being prepared.
Mill Creek (Alma)	11,000	Buffalo	Work plan 15 percent completed.
Black Earth-Cross Plains.	30,000	Dane	Work plan 40 percent completed.
Bogus Creek	8,000	Pepin, Pierce	Work plan 5 percent completed.
Coon Creek	92,000	La Crosse, Monroe, Vernon.	Final draft of work plan being reviewed by the several agencies concerned. It has been approved by the local endorsers.
Bad Axe	122,000	Vernon	Application for planning assistance submitted to the State soil conservation committee and SCS.

COOPERATION

Every SCD annual report made some complimentary reference to the friendly and effective relationships existing among all people interested in the conservation programs of your respective soil conservation districts.

In your narratives you commend personnel of the Agricultural Extension Service, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, the State Soil Conservation Committee, Farmers Home Administration, Vocational Agriculture, Vet Trainers, Wisconsin Conservation Department and Soil Conservation Service for their contributions. Then there were county highway commissioners and committees, sportsmen's clubs, bankers' associations, machinery dealers, business organizations and several other groups who also participated in advancing your program.

Newspapers, radio and TV have evidently given you all the space and time you can effectively use in telling the people about your program.

And, we do not ever want to overlook the families on the land. As mentioned at the outset, they are the ones who hold the key to a successful program.

Insofar as the Soil Conservation Service is concerned, we sincerely thank you for the very fine tributes you paid our personnel. Bearing a bit of repetition taken from a previous acknowledgment letter, I am sure our field personnel join me in saying: "we thoroughly enjoy having the opportunity of working with you supervisors and serving the fine farm families in the district. We will continually strive to do a better job."

YOUTH PROGRAM

This is evidently an important activity in all soil conservation districts of the State. A few selected quotes on this matter are in in order, I believe:

"The aim of the education department is to develop and keep conservation attitudes in the minds of boys and girls from first grade through graduation from high school, and for these attitudes to remain there for life." (We pay tribute to the County Superintendents of Schools and teachers who spearhead this activity).

"Soil conservation as a 4–H project is encouraged to point out conservation needs and application to the rural youth. Through a combined effort we feel that conservation is being presented to and accepted by the people."

GOVERNING BODY ACTIVITIES

The holding of monthly meetings of supervisors is a standard practice in most districts of the State. We are told that these sessions are generally well planned and the programs carried out in an effective manner.

General tours and demonstrations and recognition events for cooperators have been carried out in many districts.

A number of county boards appropriated funds to district governing bodies in amounts varying from one to several hundred dollars. This permitted you and your associates to do some of the things that you would have been unable to do otherwise.

Your State association has several organized committees whose responsibility is to sponsor specific activities on a statewide basis. These are:

Rural Life Sunday and Soil Stewardship Week: At least two-thirds of your reports indicated that successful programs were carried out last year under your sponsorship and direction.

Farm Progress Days: The 1957 Juneau County SCD event drew over 40,000 people.

Goodyear soil conservation awards program: The Wood County SCD governing body won first place in the 1956–57 contest, with Marathon being runner-up.

Soil conservation speaking contest: This activity got a good start last year. A supervisor for the Marinette County SCD won the 1957 adult championship while a high-school student from the Outagamie County district won the youth title.

Dealer district program: Excellent plans have been developed for this project. According to reports very little was done in this activity during 1957.

Several soil conservation districts have set up some committees patterned after those

established by the State association. From what we have heard these have been very successful, particularly from the standpoint of bringing more local leaders into active participation in SCD affairs.

Effective semiannual area meetings of supervisors were mentioned in several reports. Reference was also made to the annual State conference held in Madison.

"Excellent meetings" was your appraisal of the four 2-day workshops held for supervisors of western Wisconsin last winter.

The above activities by no means present a complete picture of the numerous projects being sponsored by you and your associate supervisors. One must definitely acknowledge that your job is a big one and is getting even bigger year by year.

OUTLOOK

In retrospect, 1957 was the banner year in joint SCS-SCD operations. Looking forward, many of you predict, and we have every reason to believe, that 1958 will surpass it.

Generally, the workload in every soil conservation district in the State is on the increase. Several of your reports include formal requests for additional help from the Service. We hope we can satisfy your needs. We mush prefer having too much work rather than not enough. This is a healthy situation. We are confident that through a united effort we can make 1958 top all other years in terms of increased accomplishments.

THANK YOU

Extending personal regards and thanking you for the many courtesies and fine cooperation you have extended to all of us in the Soil Conservation Service, I am

Sincerely yours,

M. F. SCHWEERS,
State Conservationist.

The Agricultural Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD an address delivered by Earl L. Butz before a recent session of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

Director and Dean Butz, now head of the School of Agriculture at Purdue University, was formerly an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in the present administration. In the following remarks, which were edited to meet space limitations, Dean Butz sets forth a challenging analysis of the farm problem, and I am sure the farm future he pictures will be subject to sharp debate within the halls of the Congress:

THE AGRICULTURAL DILEMMA

Agricultural technology and farm-belt politicians have squared off for a major tug of war.

Modern agricultural science and technology are bringing far-reaching sociological and economic changes. This, of course, calls for adjustment in our whole agri-business complex. And adjustment is always painful.

Many farm politicians direct their energies essentially toward maintenance of the status quo. * * *

The main effect of many governmental programs in agriculture is to slow down adjustment to change that would take place in the absence of such programs.

* * * * *

We are now experiencing the third great agricultural revolution in this country. The first came in the middle of the 19th century, when we substituted animal power for human power. * * *

The second great revolution in American agriculture occurred beginning in the 1920's, with the substitution of mechanical power for animal power. * * *

Agriculture is now in the midst of its third great revolution. It is changing from a way of living to a way of making a living. It is changing from a business of arts and crafts to a business undergirded with large amounts of science and technology.

THE DILEMMA WE FACE

The dilemma we face, therefore, is this: Will the people who man the farms of America be permitted to share fully in the benefits growing out of modern science and technology, or must they live with a ceiling over opportunity imposed by governmental programs designed to maintain small, inefficient, often peasant-type production and living units on the land?

* * * * *

The present agricultural revolution, resting on basic science and closely allied with the widespread advance of automation in both production and distribution, is threatening the traditional patern of owner-manager-operator all wrapped up in a single person. * * *

FACETS OF ADJUSTMENT

There are five fundamental characteristics of the current agricultural adjustment which bear on the problem under discussion. These adjustments are the inevitable result of the scientific and technological revolution in modern agriculture. The pressure behind these adjustments is building up each year.

1. Capital requirements for agriculture will grow, in total, per farm, and per man. * * *

Many family commercial farms today have total capital investment exceeding $100,000. It's not uncommon to have capital investment approaching or exceeding $200,000 on family commercial farms in the Corn Belt.

Last year a group of 273 family commercial farmers throughout central Indiana kept records in cooperation with Purdue University. Their average size was 280 acres. They had a total capital investment per farm that exceeded $95,000. These farms used labor so efficiently that they averaged only 1¾ men per farm on an annual basis, including the operator. This means that on these farms there was an investment per worker in excess of $55,000. Many of the individual farms had an investment per worker that went up as high as $75,000 to $100,000. But the average for the entire group was $55,000 per worker. A comparable figure for investment per worker in American industry is approximately $15,000. This means that it takes between 3 and 4 times as much capital investment to create one agricultural job on our good family commercial farms in central Indiana as it does in American industry.

As agricultural science continues to advance, it is inevitable that the business units in agriculture will get bigger and bigger with still larger amounts of capital required. This trend cannot be stopped. Nor should it be. * * *

2. The trend toward larger and fewer commercial farm units will continue. Machines will continue to displace men on our farms. We will produce more with fewer farms and fewer workers than at present.

* * * * *

As our farms become larger and more specialized, with total investment per unit pushing hard against a quarter of a million dollars, there will be growing pressure on the combination of owner-manager-operator in one man as the typical institutional pattern of farm operation.

We have departed from this pattern in the majority of other major business sectors of America. Time was we had many family entrepreneurial foundry shops, tailor shops, bootmakers, corner grocery stores, and, yes, even automobile assembly plants. These have given way, in the main, to larger units, with more capital, with higher levels of management, with more specialization of labor, and, if you choose, with a higher degree of integration. * * *

It's not necessary to dwell at length on the difficulty of passing a $200,000 farm unit intact from father to son, without pausing at least to catch one's breath as he passes the tax collector.

Moreover, if the son has to face the prospect himself of getting on top of this kind of capital structure, perhaps by paying off 2 or 3 other heirs in the family, he may choose to spend more of his current income in living, and less in savings, than his father before him chose to do. This means that he will be not only willing, but anxious, to enter into some kind of financial arrangement whereby a third party puts up some of the capital, or perhaps becomes a financial partner, on a permanent basis, at the time of father's death.

Managerial capacity is even more difficult to pass from father to son than is accumulated capital. * * * It is equally true that fathers don't necessarily breed vocational preference into their sons. With the growing tendency for farm youth to be educated beyond the high school, many farm-reared youngsters will have their vocational preference tipped away from the "3-in-1" farmer their father was. They might prefer to train themselves for manager, for manager-operator, for part owner-operator with some "integrator" supplying part of the capital and part of the management, or for some combination of these.

* * * * *

3. Management has become the key factor in successful farm operation. * * *

The typical cycle of farm ownership and operation of our present system of fee simple ownership by individuals is essentially the life cycle of an individual. In the main, our farms need to be rather completely refinanced each generation. But still more impotrant, with the process of refinancing usually comes a shift in management and operation. This is seldom accomplished without considerable disruption of the farm as a going concern. This disruptive process in transfer will increase as the size of unit grows, as financing becomes more difficult, and as the importance increases of maintaining a unit large enough to be economically efficient.

Industry has met this problem by having divisible shares of ownership which in many cases are not even remotely related to management or to operation. This permits passing ownership from one generation to the next without disrupting management or operation. This permits the accumulation under single management and single operation, or under single management and multiple operation, of units so large as to be beyond the capacity of the ordinary individual to accumulate in his productive years, and yet large enough to attain the economies associated with scale of operation.

The pressure is in this direction in commercial agriculture.

This does not necessarily mean the growth of corporate farms. This may be accomplished in a number of ways. We shall see the gorwth of family shares of ownership of the family farm, instead of placing the farm in an estate to be sold as a unit. The family shares will be transferable, so that one of the heirs, wishing to convert his inheritance to some other form of property, may sell his share to a third party who may be entirely outside the family. But in this way the

farm unit will remain intact. Thus what starts off as essentially a family-owned farm may end up as a farm under group ownership, but still as a single unit and single operation, with single management for the entire unit. Increasingly, on units of this kind, management will be provided by a professional management group, standing between the individual owners and the operator of the farm * * *

Another way of meeting this problem is single operation of multiple tract ownership. The operator may be either a part owner or a complete tenant. In either event, he shares with others part of the traditional owner-manager-operator function. He surrenders certain freedoms and privileges in the process, but he gains greater rewards in return.

It is obvious from the above analysis that we will continue to develop a professional management group in agriculture. This won't necessarily be at the level of the general professional farm manager. The big growth will be in enterprise managers. After all, integration generally involves single enterprises—not whole farms.

Witness the managerial arrangements in contract broiler production, fruit and vegetable production under contract with canneries or freezing plants, and other specialized types of agricultural production where management can be easily separated as a package and assigned to someone other than the producer himself.

This may alter the traditional entrepreneurial, risk-taking function of the individual farmer. It may even move him in the direction of a quasi-riskless, semiguaranteed wage earner. But this is not necessarily bad per se. He may be, and frequently is, better off this way than he was before.

* * * * *

4. The commercial farm will increasingly assume the characteristics of a manufacturing establishment. * * *

5. Our countryside will be "rurbanized." Our modern science and technology have made it possible for farm and city folk to live alongside each other in our newly "rurbanized" communities. The effect of the resulting intermingling has been that there is no longer a clearly defined farm population and an industrial population, especially within 40 or 50 miles driving distance of our big industrial centers, and that includes practically the whole eastern and central parts of the country.

Today the commercial farmer not only takes on the financial aspects of a big-business man, but because he now associates with businessmen and laborers who live nearby him in the country and whose children go to the same school, increasingly this farmer is beginning to think like they do.

* * * * *

PREFERENCE FOR SMALLNESS

Political leaders will resist the trend toward large, well-capitalized units in agriculture, both in their oratory, in their congressional hearings, and in their legislation. The philosophy of the small, owner-operated family farm is deeply ingrained in our social and political mores. The controversy over this issue is often more emotional than economic.

Political pressure will continue to be on the side of maintaining small family farms, even though modern technology dictates strongly that family farms become larger.

Witness, for example, the language in the report of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations of the House of Representatives, issued March 28, 1958, as Report No. 1584. I quote from page 4:

"A job in town is no answer to the problems of the low-income farmer. * * * Yet the principal efforts of the Department (USDA) during the past few years have been directed toward urging farm families to obtain off-farm employment and to move off their small farms.

"To leave the farm for town under present conditions would only swell the unemployment rolls. * * * As a matter of fact, it may soon be necessary to start thinking in terms of moving people back to the farms where they can at least find food and shelter.

"Further, moving the small farmers off their farms will have very little effect on the level of agricultural production. The small farms contribute very little if any to surpluses. * * *

"Therefore if all small farmers were removed from their farms, and their land were allowed to remain idle, the maximum possible reduction of surpluses would be 9 percent. It is probable, however, that land released from small farmers would be added to larger producing units which, being more efficient, would increase production on that land and thereby further increase surpluses."

Seldom has the language been plainer in any congressional report that political influence will be on the side of preserving small, inefficient, low-income units on the land, even though it is clearly indicated that agricultural efficiency would be increased by reversing the trend.

* * * * *

We are all familiar with the fact that something over half of our farm units in the United States are so small or so inefficient that they don't yield their operators a decent standard of living. It's economically impossible for them to do so.

LET'S BE SENSIBLE

We must help the marginal farmer and the operator of an undersized acreage to become a better and more efficient farmer, or failing that, to find opportunity in other fields where he is better suited and where his income opportunities are larger. * * *

It is not at all coldblooded to suggest to a farmer that he seek other employment if he can't make a good living in farming. It is really coldblooded to attempt through legislative programs to keep him tied to a farm which everyone knows is inadequate to provide a decent living for himself and his family. * * *

In many areas of the country, in the years ahead, there will be a job waiting in industry, a job with good pay, for the farmer or member of his family who finds that farming is not his long suit. And if his children want to go into engineering, into medicine, into teaching, or into the skilled crafts in the city, they'll find a position there when they finish school. There's nothing dishonorable about this kind of vocational shift. It has been taking place ever since the founding of the Nation. Without it, our high level of living would have been impossible. We would have been a Nation of peasants, with each family tied to its small acreage of land. We would have advanced little beyond the current status of major agrarian populations in the Near East and the Far East.

Most of our low-income farm families on our more than 2 million small-scale, part-time, or residential farms get little or no direct benefits from price support and commodity stabilization programs. They are almost completely by-passed by the expensive commodity price-support programs the Government operates. Likewise, the soil bank doesn't have much to offer them. By the same token, their hope does not lie in easier and less expensive credit.

A large share of these farm units, although classified in agriculture, are operated by farm people who really need more opportunity to improve their situation either through enlargement of the individual farm business or by additional employment off the farm. Many of these people are so situated that the solution of their problem must be found outside agriculture. Indeed, for all practical purposes, many of them have already left agriculture. We just haven't stopped counting them. They are increasingly turning to off-farm employment as their principal sources of income. * * *

At the end of the Civil War, President Lincoln instructed General Grant to disband the Army and see to it that every soldier who wanted it could have 40 acres and a mule.

OPPORTUNITY CEILING

The modern counterpart of this philosophy is found in the politics of equal shares, when the Government rations the right to produce wheat, cotton, rice, tobacco, peanuts, and corn—the six basic commodities.

* * * * *

Consider for a moment what production allotments are doing to some of our farmers. The rationing of the right to produce among smaller and smaller production allotments results in a larger number of relatively inefficient production units. This tends to raise unit production costs for the entire production. As a result, important sectors of agriculture production, in our most scientific and mechanized agriculture in the world, now find they are being undersold in foreign markets by underdeveloped areas of the world.

* * * * *

Under this system, increasing numbers of growers who are efficient, ambitious, and capable, must live with a ceiling over opportunity imposed by their Government.

* * * * *

Let us sit for a moment alongside producers of our so-called basic crops and think through their problems. Many such producers have so small an allotment that they find it difficult to meet operating and living costs with production so curtailed.

A cotton farmer with his 3-acre allotment, a tobacco farmer with his half-acre allotment, or a wheat farmer with an allotment of only 60 percent of what he used to grow, needs something besides 90 percent of parity. One hundred percent of parity won't solve his problem. There isn't much that any kind of price support program can do for him. His big need is for an opportunity to expand production. But his Government prevents him from producing enough to make a decent living.

PERMIT TO FARM

Let us consider for a moment the case of a wheat farmer and his son. This is a farmer who has high yields, high quality, and low production costs. He is a good wheat farmer.

He has taught his son how to be a good wheat farmer also. His son decides he wishes to become a wheat farmer, and follow the vocational footsteps of his father.

How can he do that in America in 1958? There are 3 ways, and only 3 ways:

1. The son can take over the production quota assigned his father, as his father retires from the wheat business.

2. The son can purchase the neighboring farm and take over the quota assigned to that farm, as his neighbor retires from the wheat business.

3. The son can marry a quota, as father-in-law retires from the wheat business.

There is no other practical way for a young man to get started in the wheat business in this country today. Or the cotton business, or the tobacco, rice, or peanut business.

* * * * *

TECHNOLOGY WILL WIN

Many agricultural and political leaders are frightened by the technological changes taking place in agriculture. They should not be any more wary of these changes

than of other economic and sociological changes occurring in modern society.

* * * * *

It is clear from the preceding analysis that the forces of politics and the forces of economics are and will continue to be on opposite sides of many of the broad changes engulfing agriculture. In this engagement, politics will fight a delaying action. They will neither stop nor reverse the economic trend. They will only delay and confuse it. In the final analysis, the economic forces working in this process will be overwhelming.

* * * * *

It has been said that the proponents of the status quo are often the villains of history.

Those who resist inevitable change frequently perish in the process.

Those who manage our agricultural production, processing, and distribution firms are challenged to give intelligent direction to the changes ahead, so that our great food and fiber industry will function even better than now.

Those who man the political battalions in our legislative halls should be challenged to do likewise.

Mission for the Middle Class

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very timely article by Mr. Eric Johnston, which appeared in the Elks magazine for May 1958:

MISSION FOR THE MIDDLE CLASS

(By Eric Johnston)

The Soviet Empire has a mission and makes no secret about it. The Soviet Empire poses as the champion of the proletariat, of the marching majority of the 2.6 billion people who inhabit the earth. It defines the proletariat as everyone short of the upper class. By simple subtraction and tricky logic, the Kremlin promotes the doctrine that the free world leaders are rear guardsmen for an upper-class minority—and that this minority is now on the run.

The Soviet Empire conveniently and consistently ignores the democratic middle class, which is the real powerhouse of the free world. Unfortunately, the free world's middle class has also ignored its own power. It has not yet fully recognized and seized upon its own mission. Unless it does so, the Soviet Empire could ultimately win the world. It would do so through the oldest weapon in the Marxist arsenal—the doctrine of class warfare.

In all the advanced democracies, the middle class has been supremely successful. In our own country, it has been the vital shaper and molder of society. The middle class set the taproots of enterprise across our continent, it established our communities, it founded our schools, it became the repository of our freedom and strength.

With all its past and present success, why has the middle class failed to find its modern mission? The reason, I think, stems from the Communist concept of class warfare—a doctrine beloved by the Marxists and repugnant to democratic beliefs. Instead of meeting this concept head on and knocking it down as it deserves, the middle class democracies too often have turned their backs and buried their heads in the sand.

This ostrich attitude might be condoned if the Kremlin's tactics were not making headway. The trouble is that they are, particularly among the millions of impoverished and uncommitted peoples of Asia, Africa and the Middle East. The doctrine of class warfare is carefully designed to lure new followers to the Communist banner and to spread dissension among its foes. The doctrine is still succeeding by our default.

If democracy and freedom are to survive, the middle class must fight back and triumph in the class war which is being waged against it. In fighting this battle, the middle class needs a mission and a sense of urgency. It must frankly and openly assert that it is out to eliminate the proletariat not by liquidation but by mass conversion. It must assert that what the Russians call the proletariat is in reality simply the poor and oppressed. It must prove that middle-class democracy offers far more hope for the poor and oppressed than does Soviet Russian slavery.

This shouldn't be hard to prove if we have the imagination to prove it. Our clearest example is closest to home. In our own country, we've welcomed millions of immigrants since the turn of the century. They were, for the most part, an impoverished horde of landless peasants and unskilled workers denied human rights in their own homelands. In Marxist language, they were proletarians.

But in an unbelievably short span of time, these proletarians and their children have become dignified citizens with a stake and status in our society, a voice in our market place and in our voting booths. They did not become the petit bourgeoise of Marxist legend, the weaklings and functionaries at a decadent capitalist table. They became a vital and vitalizing force within our society.

Surely what has been accomplished in America without a blueprint could be expanded throughout the world through an organized mission backed by a carefully planned program.

Such a program would not get beyond the talking stage without the development of human skills and basic enterprise in the underdeveloped areas. But the middle class democracies already have a beginning in international cooperation through the sparking spirit of American economic aid programs.

It would take more a shift in emphasis than in philosophy to convert American technical and financial assistance into nose cones for the mission of expanding the middle class. The path is wide open and inviting for other advanced nations to follow the American initiative. Together, the middle-class democracies would assert that the objective of economic aid is not merely to achieve stability and development abroad but to convert the proletariat into a middle class and the middle class into democratic electorates.

Paralleling the new emphasis of overseas aid, a blueprint of specific middle-class aims and principles could be formulated. This charter of the middle class would set minimum standards for all segments of a modern society—from agriculture to manufacturing to education.

These minimum standards could be set by working parties of specialists in each field of endeavor. These experts from many nations would also set timetables, country by country, for achieving these minimum standards. Without realistic timetables geared to the problems and promise of each nation, unrealistic deadlines would be set, and failure to meet them would lead to frustration and bitterness.

For instance, a young and troubled nation like Indonesia has reputedly only one doctor for every 89,000 people, while in the United States the ratio is one in less than a thousand. The gap is now so wide that its mere realization by Indonesia could lead to despair, particularly if the country's leaders tried or promised to catch up in, say, 5 years. However, in a carefully worked-out timetable which called for an increase of doctors to a ratio of 1 to 50,000 in 5 years, and steady improvement thereafter, the progress made and the improvement noticed would generate optimism and even enthusiasm.

Above all, what the middle-class expansion program needs are evangelists and true believers. They must create a sense of personal involvement in the campaign—a sense of individual participation, responsibility, and benefit. They need to inspire and to recruit. They must rally the middle class and its converts behind their charter.

How could this program be brought into being? Where would it start? The United Nations would make an ideal instrumentality for the middle-class campaign, but the professional proletarians would be likely to block all efforts in that direction. Then should the United States Government take it over? In my judgment, the program should by no means be the sole responsibility of government.

Government has a role to play, of course. The major instruments of our foreign economic and political policy could be brought to bear upon this effort—from the mutual-security program to the Voice of America. But the preeminent and decisive role must be played by people. It is a job for organizations, and groups, and communities. It is a job for business, and labor, and agriculture—for all of us because all of us have a stake in its success.

The channel for all these energies, I think, should be a broad-based public organization. It might begin in this country. It could generate a global endeavor. As a start, the organization should bring together the separate and almost infinite efforts of private and public-spirited groups within our society; the corporations granting scholarships and training and job opportunities; the philanthropic foundations doing quiet but spectacular work toward human progress; the work of labor, and agriculture, and business generally to advance and strengthen our middle class.

I think it is time to make these sinews of democracy—of our middle class—clear and understandable throughout the world. It is a tremendous and vitalizing force. Outside of the western democracies it is seldom understood or recognized. It is time to gather this force under one roof, to make its good works evident, to employ it for the expansion of the middle class across the earth.

The middle class expansion drive could have a great impact and a decisive influence upon today's crisis in world affairs. It could go a long way toward pressuring the Soviet Empire itself into paying more attention to the needs of its own people and adopting a more neighborly attitude toward the rest of the world. It could drastically alter her priorities.

The fact that the Soviet Union has never gotten around to paving a road across Siberia, an engineering job the ancients could have performed without too much difficulty, did not discourage Nikita Khrushchev from recently challenging the United States to meet the Soviet Union in an electronics duel on the rocket range.

This gambit is typical of Kremlin tactics nowadays. The U. S. S. R. trumpets her strong points, built up through crash programs, while hiding the weakness of an unbalanced society brought about largely by such crash programs.

For instance, the Soviet Union was only too pleased to furnish the Economic Commission for Europe with figures showing an

impressive increase in Russian crude steel production. But it stood mute when asked for data on infant mortality rates and life expectancy within its own borders.

By the same token, the Kremlin readily cooperated with the United Nations in revealing statistics showing a sharp gain in Russia's output of electrical energy. But it hastily rang down the iron curtain when queried on crops and harvests.

These tactics are strictly in line with the Russian concept of competitive coexistence, which is to compete in hand-picked events and run them off under Kremlin ground rules. In these circumstances, it's no wonder that the U. S. S. R. often looks good by comparison.

In the same fashion, the Kremlin has succeeded in jockeying the democracies into an arms race which, in the long run, must take place at the expense of the civilian economy. For Russia, seeking glory in the sky while ignoring misery on earth, this should prove much less of a hardship than for the advanced democracies.

Continued indefinitely, the arms race could mean the virtual disintegration of the democratic way of life without a shot being fired or an enemy soldier setting foot on our soil. Our social, political, and economic systems could ultimately stumble and crumble under the crushing weight of a modern war machine maintained indefinitely. It might mean living permanently in a garrison state where political freedoms and economic rights could be stunted if not uprooted altogether. The bleak and terrifying alternative under present circumstances would be a general war of utter devastation.

As matters now stand, competitive coexistence, Russian-style, gives the Kremlin frightening influence over the way we live today. It has an important if not direct voice in the determination of our budget, of our foreign policy, and even of our domestic programs right down to the county level.

If Soviet influence in our own country can't be discounted, it can't be discounted elsewhere either. The policies and attitudes of our allies clearly reflect the impact of the Soviet Union upon them. In the uncommitted nations where we have given far more material assistance than have the Russians, Soviet influence seems to be growing, sometimes at our expense.

The Soviet Union is trying to hold the initiative in the contest between the democracies and the police states. Unless it is wrested from her, she could be the eventual winner. If the free world is to endure, the present state of affairs must be altered in our favor, it must be altered sharply and it must be altered without delay.

Arms alone cannot safeguard political independence and social integrity, important as it is to deter potential aggressions by military strength. To survive, political independence must be reinforced by economic and social stability. The government that fails to meet the needs of its people cannot endure.

To this rule, the Soviet Government is no exception. It cannot go on forever slighting the desires of its own people. Therefore, as one flank of our middle class mission, we should launch parallel campaigns to build up pressures within Russia herself to whet consumers' appetites, to stoke popular demands for better living.

Such campaigns could induce the Kremlin to divert manpower and resources from its military crash programs to meet growing consumer demands—or run the risk of increased internal discontent. This in itself could serve as a deterrent to aggression, for no government at odds with its own people would dare to arm them and trust them in any outside adventure.

The time is ripe for us to counter the Russian impact by exerting our own influence on the Russians—on their budget, their policies, their priorities. A dynamic drive to expand the middle class at the expense of the proletariat will do just that if it succeeds, no matter how much jamming the Kremlin does.

By fighting fire with light, the middle class should find in the so-called proletariat highly eager recruits for its ranks. We would draw them as surely, as directly as a magnet. We would draw them because of the unique attribute of middle class democracy, an attribute which the Communists, whatever their priorities, cannot equal or imitate.

The Soviet Russians have achieved industrial and technological strength at the expense of their people. The middle class democracies have achieved it at the behest of their people. In building our strength, we have not sacrificed our freedom, our individuality, our right to share in our own success. Instead, we have enhanced these attributes.

And this is our drawing power today, the source of our middle class mission. It is a magnet the Kremlin abhors and can do nothing whatsoever to demagnetize. It is high time we put it to use.

World Law or World Holocaust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "World Law or World Holocaust," delivered by Charles S. Rhyne, president of the American Bar Association, at the annual meeting of the New York State Bar Association on January 31, 1958.

Mr. Rhyne, president of the American Bar Association, is exemplifying what we look for in those who from time to time lead our great professions and civic organizations. He is dedicated to his task, and is working hard at it. He is displaying an initiative and a consciousness of the public interest which is extraordinary and admirable.

I mention this fact particularly with respect to Mr. Rhyne because he has been addressing himself to subjects with respect to which lawyers are truly the guardians for the whole public interest, based upon their special professional knowledge. I think it should be noted that as a man builds a reputation for service, it is gratifying to his friends and colleagues in the profession, as it must be gratifying to him, to have it recognized as he proceeds step by step.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD LAW OR WORLD HOLOCAUST—LAW AS A REPLACEMENT FOR WEAPONS AS DECIDER OF DISPUTES BETWEEN NATIONS

(By Charles S. Rhyne, president, American Bar Association)

I am highly honored and pleased to have the privilege of speaking to you lawyers of New York. Through the many leaders you have furnished to the American Bar Association I have acquired quite an intimate knowledge of this great New York State Bar Association and its tremendous achievements. Your outstanding record under my dear friend Clarence Runals insures that your productive past is but a prelude to even greater accomplishments in the future.

If civilization is to survive in the space era, law and reason must replace weapons as the ultimate mechanism to resolve disputes between nations. That is the thesis I am here to present for your consideration.

One must concede that weapons must maintain peace and remain as the ultimate decider until the mechanism for peaceful settlement of disputes between nations under the rule of law is developed and accepted. That such development and acceptance cannot come dramatically and be achieved overnight is also conceded. The use of law to replace weapons in the international arena must go through many growing or formative stages before the idea can function as it should and must. But "the longest journey begins with the first step." I am here to ask your help in achieving that first step.

Let us begin by focusing upon the broad picture of the world in which we live. The miraculous technical and scientific achievements of our day have created unprecedented peril from abroad and unprecedented growth and change at home. Distance is now almost meaningless as rapid transportation and communications have shrunk nations to neighborhoods. Our era has witnessed such achievements as flight faster than sound, man-made satellites in space, the splitting of the atom, miracle drugs and other rapid and turbulent changes in the scientific, economic and social fields almost too numerous to name or to evaluate under prior standards and experience. The whole pattern of our existence is being reshaped at an undreamed of pace.

At this critical turning point in mankind's history we must face the fact that some of the traditional thinking and concepts of the past are no longer a secure basis for the dynamic present and the uncertain future. I hasten to say, however, that the idea I here espouse does not fall into the area of new concepts. It is rather an expansion of an old idea to a new frontier and the new horizons created for us by the marvels of our day.

In what one can justifiably call a new world where technological and intellectual advances can make mankind's existence so truly wonderful, we are engaged in an all-out struggle with an enemy who seeks to destroy us through clever economic, psychological, and subversive tactics as well as by weapons. And it is unrealistic not to realize that this is a struggle that may well last for months, for years, and even for generations.

This in capsule form is the background picture against which I would like to discuss with you a readjustment of our thinking so as to take a new approach to the all important problem of disarmament and peace. No one can deny that the No. 1 problem of our day is how to achieve and maintain a lasting peace. Certain it is that this problem has plagued man since the beginning of time. Certain it is also that never before has its solution been so imperative. A generation that has achieved so much heretofore deemed nearly impossible should not be dismayed by these past failures but should in fact be spurred on by the challenge of our times to achieve this great goal of peace.

We are engaged in an ever-accelerating arms race with Russia. And we must win this race for supremacy in capacity to destroy—on that point I find no disagreement in Washington or elsewhere. It is recognized that peace in today's world can only be maintained by our winning the arms race and by our keeping on winning it even though this requires billions upon billions of dollars and a great economic drain upon our Nation. No one can or will quarrel with the fact that 64 percent of the proposed new budget goes for national security—in fact the only quarrel is that the amount may be too small. But

a world divided into two mighty armed camps is no pleasant future to envision. The peril from such a situation is obvious. History teaches that every arms race has ended sooner or later in war. We must, therefore, conclude that war with Russia is as certain as tomorrow's sunrise unless a formula or mechanism can be developed to maintain peace other than through arms. It is such a formula or mechanism which the rule of law offers, with persuasion and reason replacing weapons in the all-important international dispute arena. We cannot be saved from the holocaust of war by science or weapons alone.

Russia makes no secret of her ceaseless efforts to carry out her plan to create a peaceful world by making it 100 percent Communist. We must not only say but we must demonstrate beyond question that we offer both peace and freedom. With the contest thus narrowed to freedom or slavery the decision is certain if we but seize our opportunities and provide the essential leadership.

As we listen to the roar of current history it is absolutely clear that we must learn to live together or see our civilization go up in the senseless devastration of war. The atomic and hydrogen bombs, the sputniks, and ICBM's have attuned the people of the world to an overwhelming desire for peace which is probably stronger than any such desire in all history. There is a common realization that under present conditions every man, woman and child will be in the front line trenches if the holocaust of world war explodes. This most urgent desire to prevent war thus offers a unique and unparelleled opportunity to develop the legal machinery that is essential for peace with the overwhelming support of world-wide public opinion. Never have the people of the world needed or demanded leadership on the issue of peace in a more concerted way. Either we furnish that leadership or someone else will.

In ancient times disputes between individuals were settled by brute strength in a fight. The rule of the jungle prevailed and might made right. We have now largely progressed to a point where such person versus person disputes are settled under the rule of law in the courts. But from ancient times to now the rule of the jungle has largely prevailed as the ultimate decider of disputes between nations. We must now progress to point where the rule of law is applied in the courts to disputes of nation versus nation. The need for law in the world community is indeed the greatest gap in the legal structure of civilization.

Law exists now in some form in all nations. It is a universal term which all peoples understand. Justice and law connote innate fundamentals of fairness embodying the wisdom of the centuries. They are so understood by all peoples. The average person is not learned in the law but the idea of justice under the law is to him very real. We need not so much then to acquaint the people of the world with law but to strengthen and use it in an area where it is little used today. Of all human institutions, law has the best historical claim to satisfy the need for peace and order. Law could offer the long sought common denominator for the creation of a method of the settlement of disputes between nations short of war. I firmly believe that law offers the best growing point toward order in a disordered world and the best path to disarmament and peace.

The most important public service open to our legal profession today is therefore the opportunity to mobilize the prestige and the power, the sanity and the skill, the judgment and the judicial temperament of the lawyers of the world in behalf of the goal of peace under law. We must build upon the experience of the past and the possibilities of the present to insure a peaceful future. To do this we lawyers must evaluate world law and develop new international legal machinery which will maintain essential national sovereignty, yet still provide for peaceful settlement of disputes between nations under the rule of law.

Let me give you two simple illustrations of instances where law has replaced weapons as a decider of disputes in situations somewhat similar to that prevailing in the international community today. This summer during our pilgrimage to the fountains of the common law in England we were reminded that the barons and lords of England maintained private armies and fought out their disputes in pitched battles, until the time came when the law became enforceable in the Kings' courts. A homely but nevertheless realistic lesson is also found in the western movies your children and mine watch so avidly on TV. Before the law arrives the good men must stay armed to the teeth in order to exist and fight off the bad outlaws. But when the law arrives armed might ends as a decider of disputes.

Disarmament conferences have been held down through the centuries, but no agreement resulting from such a conference has ever contained a successful formula to maintain peace. The best evidence of this is the fact that every disarmament conference or agreement has been followed sooner or later by an arms race—then war. My study of the conferences and agreements of the past 100 years reveals that the reason they have failed was an inherent inability to devise a method for so weighing armed might that all participants in such conferences would always feel that they were treated fairly. In essence this means treated equally.

The formula here presented does not contain this inherent defect, as under it all nations would be on a basis of equality before the law.

Are there reasons why nations should not be on a basis of equality before the law? I think not. There are perhaps some disputes to which present legal principles cannot be applied, but we of the legal profession have always developed new law to meet the needs of new problems. Our creative capacity should not be paralyzed now by the constant crisis in which we live, but it should be in fact spurred on to even greater achievements. We must not allow law, legal procedures and legal tribunals to continue to lag behind the needs of the world in this vital field of settlement of disputes between nations.

And so it is that on the vast new frontier of the international community, disputes previously settled by the bloodshed of a war must be settled by tribunals of justice. The International Court of Justice is perhaps the best known but the most unused existing tribunal of justice for the decision of international disputes. It has decided only an average of slightly more than a case per year since its creation in 1945. This situation indicates that as presently operated it may be inadequate and need changes to make it more acceptable, effective, and useful.

The statute creating this Court allows it to sit—in its discretion—all over the world and in chambers of three or more judges. So far it has sat only at The Hague. The inaccessibility of the International Court and lack of knowledge of its jurisdiction, procedure, and precedents are major reasons why it is not used by nations to settle their disputes. This Court should make known its willingness to sit elsewhere than at The Hague. The entire Court, or even a chamber of the Court, should sit rather constantly at United Nations headquarters in New York, for example, so that its advisory jurisdiction would be used more than it is now, and law would move more to the forefront in the deliberations of the United Nations.

Just think of the possibilities for calm and considerate use of law in this Court in such disputes as Suez, border incidents such as that between Spain and Morocco, and similar controversies now fought out in the arena of power politics and backstage diplomacy or by armed might. Public opinion which forced an end to the use of arms in Suez could—if properly and justifiably directed—so crystallize as to require use of this Court, or of other such tribunals, and force reluctant nations to take their disagreements there for decision.

The latest example of a provision for peaceful settlement of international disputes under law is in the treaty creating the European Economic Community. There a seven-member court is created to decide disputes between members of that Community. The Charter of the Organization of American States provides that "every American State has the duty to respect the rights enjoyed by every other State in accordance with international law." But there is no court such as the new European Court to decide disputes. There is an Inter-American Council of Jurists which now serves as an advisory body and could easily be transformed into a court. Here is a chance for the Americas to show leadership in the search for machinery to maintain peace by creating such a regional court as a part of the Organization of American States. Such a step could well be a historic breakthrough of momentuos proportions because of the example it would offer to the world.

It is my earnest belief that we should take a new approach to the problem of peace and concenttrate first on obtaining an agreement among the nations of the free world to submit their future disputes among themselves to international tribunals of justice for decision under the rule of law. We must go beyond the largely unused and inaccessible International Court of Justice as presently administered. If that Court will not or cannot meet the needs of the world by opening regional branches or chambers all over the world, we must create new regional and other courts. Those new courts must be assured of immense prestige by appointing our greatest jurists as judges, with their independence of judgment insured by lifetime tenure. These new courts should be set up and operate like our Federal circuit courts and move from nation to nation for the speedy hearing and decision of such disputes. A clerk's office should be opened and maintained in many areas of the world so as to be easily accessible for the filing of complaints.

The organized administration of justice historically and logically precedes the development of detailed rules of law so it is essential that we should first provide courts and the development and codification of a law of nations will then grow out of the decisions of those courts. We should invite all nations to join in this agreement to develop the court mechanism for peace under law. The possibilities of armed force use, such as in Suez and the Spain-Morocco border incidents should then be gradually narrowed as this mechanism begins to work and demonstrates its worth. Other nations including the neutrals and the uncommitted should come into the fold after the precedents of successful use of law are amply demonstrated and the pressure of world-wide opinion begins to make itself felt in support of law and order through the courts.

Nations which have been accustomed to settling their disputes by hard bargaining, with little regard for justice or law, will begin to realize that it is to their advantage, in the long run, to submit their disputes for decision by impartial judges under the rule of law. The idea of the supremacy of intellect over physical violence should ultimately be decisively accepted and put into practice by mankind. Thus, on a gradual basis our goal can become a reality. Let the free nations of the world agree on a plan to snuff out war

among themselves before the next step of tackling Russia. Let us offer this plan for settlement of disputes under the law in the courts as the free world's path to world peace. If we are not willing to do it among ourselves we cannot expect others to agree.

What of enforcement of court decrees against sovereign nations? The chief reliance must be the forceful pressure of crystallized public opinion. Such pressure should take care of most enforcement needs. The multilateral convention or agreement to use only law as a decider of disputes—an agreement going far beyond the statute of the International Court of Justice or the Charter of the United Nations—could also provide for economic and other sanctions against any signatory nation which did not honor a Court decree.

Certain it is that this is a long, hard road to travel, with many pitfalls and problems and much hard work to achieve success. But there is no easy road to world peace. Law has replaced force as the best means for settlement of disputes between individuals. It should be given the chance to prove its value in peaceful settlement of disputes between nations.

We have here one of the great new frontiers not only of the law but of the world. It is a frontier, too, in human relationships through governments. By success on this frontier we not only save billions, now consigned for destructive purposes, for constructive purposes, of improving mankind's peaceful existence, but we move mankind out from under the shadow of the almost certain death and destruction of atomic warfare.

World government, which will not, and should not, arrive in the foreseeable future, is not a part of the picture I paint. Such a government has inherent defects similar to those of disarmament agreements. This idea of peace under law envisions law which can grow out of the enlarged use of the law by the world community and does not require any super or other world legislative body.

No system of international law can be the overnight creation of any individual genius. Our own legal system has grown up through experience and is based upon the combined wisdom of past centuries. The writers of our Constitution were not supermen who created the ideas contained therein by their own tremendous intellect. They borrowed from the great lawgivers of history, Moses and Aristotle, Locke, and Montesquieu, and others too numerous to list. Our Constitution is not made up of novel and untested principles, but it in fact contains the best of those already known at the time it was written. That is the main reason it has endured and met new and novel needs. The idea of due process came from Magna Carta. The natural rights of man, or our Bill of Rights, are in substance the common law rights of Englishmen. And so it can be in the international field. The courts can decide according to fairness and reasonableness in rendering justice upon each case's facts. The body of law needed here can grow as did the common law out of the use of law in judicial tribunals. The decisions under law of the tribunals in each international dispute can serve as precedents until a common or universal law of nations grows into a reality.

No plan for peace is worth mentioning unless it takes Russia into account. And Russia could not be expected to favor a plan for peace under law and justice. But this plan can capture the minds of the uncommitted peoples of the world for its sponsors and leave Russia naked of friends. Even Russia does not envision such nakedness as desirable—that is the reason for her constant propaganda efforts. To launch this plan—unlike a disarmament agreement—we do not need her, nor do we need to trust her word. She can hurt only herself by her failure to cooperate. Russia's often dishonored signature is worthless on a disarmament or any other agreement, but here only actions would count and all could evaluate those as we go along developing peace under law.

We should, therefore, counter Russia's sputnik fear-propaganda and her fake peace blackmail letters by a plea to the peoples of the world based upon freedom and justice and peace through law. The mere mention of freedom will recall Hungary. The mere mention of justice will recall its absence behind the Iron Curtain. And the idea of peace—of peace through law rather than weapons—will appeal to the foremost yearnings of all men everywhere. In the world-wide fight for the minds of men we would thus emphasize the moral principles which distinguish us from communism. Such a program can aid in regaining the psychological initiative we may have lost through the sputniks.

Without a vision of better things to come we cannot capture the minds of men for the freedom under law which is the great idea and ideal we offer to the world. We must not let the appeal of that great idea be dimmed by any Soviet technological achievement or boastful claim.

The history of the rise and fall of nations and civilizations is the history of the rise and fall of ideas. Among all the contending ideas which have fought for the minds of men since the dawn of history, the concept of individual human freedom has been outstanding. On this concept, which embodies the natural law, which was the heart and core of Magna Carta, which is the spirit and guiding light of our Bill of Rights, we can build with every confidence that it is a foundation not of sand but of everlasting rock.

An idea can be more powerful than any atom; and an idea whose time has come is too powerful to deny. Our task is to see to it that the time of the rule of law as a decider of international disputes arrives before atomic annihilation overtakes us.

Mankind stands at the crossroads of one of the great dramatic and decisive moments of history. One road can lead to war and annihilation or, what is worse, the slavery of communism. The other road can lead to peace and freedom under law.

We have arrived at this crossroad through the tremendous achievements of the scientists. I sincerely believe that the combined brainpower of lawyers can create and achieve as greatly as our scientists in meeting the needs of the world today. From its inception to the present zenith of its power our governmental machinery has been in large part conceived, formulated, and operated by lawyers. Now is the time for leadership in a broader and more difficult area. Let us use our talents in taking the broad vision of a formula for peace under law herein presented and making it a reality in the world community. As lawyers we should be proud that our profession is afforded this opportunity to render such a magnificent service to mankind. No greater challenge exists for any profession. No greater public service can be performed.

The Importance of Adequate Nutrition for Teen-Agers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the interesting findings of current surveys is this fact:

Despite the fact that most of the people of the United States can afford good nutrition, a great many of them fail to get adequate nutrients. They do not drink enough milk. They do not eat enough other vitamin-rich products for their own good health, such as good Wisconsin cheese.

One such group in our population which is sadly deficient in its eating habits are the Nation's teen-agers. It is a sad thing to note that in this land of abundance, where we have surpluses, our youngsters do not receive sufficient nutrition.

Somehow, a considerable proportion of youngsters has gotten out of the milk-drinking habit and into the habit of poor nutrition.

Yet, obviously, these youngsters, boys and girls soon to be full adults, should be among the soundest eaters in this country.

I was interested, therefore, to receive from the National Dairy Council a text of an interview with the chairman of the board of that fine organization, pointing up the importance of good nutrition for these youngsters.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEEN-AGERS: A VITAL MARKET FOR THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

(By George S. Bulkley, chairman, board of directors, National Dairy Council)

Question. Mr. Bulkley, why is the National Dairy Council concentrating strongly on teen-agers as a special market for dairy foods?

Answer. There are several reasons but perhaps the paramount one is that teen-agers, a as group, are a nutritional problem. These young people, according to surveys and health leader observation, are inclined to break away from sound eating habits—such as sufficient milk drinking—and this will have an effect on future national health.

Question. That sounds pretty important, But is it really as serious as that?

Answer. Yes. It is serious. For example, many childbirth complications are the result of earlier teen-age malnutrition. As you know, a large proportion of American mothers have their first child before they exceed the teen years. Many girls are marrying at a younger age than they used to. Their eating habits as teen-agers can be a powerful force for healthy motherhood.

Question. I know that a large part of the philosophy of dairy council is to be of public service. Dairy farmers and dairy industry men supporting the dairy council program are proud of this fact. Does that tie in with the teen-age emphasis?

Answer. Absolutely. The dairy council concept is to promote the consumption of dairy foods, in line with scientific recommendations, and by this action to help improve national health and at the same time strengthen the dairy industry and American agriculture. If teen-agers were eating as they should, health leaders would not be worried about them and the dairy council program would not be throwing its weight so heavily in that direction.

Question. To be strictly practical, from a business standpoint, for a moment—how big is the teen-age market?

Answer. One of the largest. It has been estimated that during the summer of 1957 the teen-age working force was approxi-

mately 10 million youngsters. In terms of money, reliable sources say that teen-agers control the saving and spending of at least 25 percent of all income. National Dairy Council estimates there are 16 million teen-age consumers (13 to 19 years of age) and every projection I have seen insists that the teen-age portion of our population will increase by 1965 far more than any other age group. And that teen-agers will have over $14 billion to spend as they wish.

Question. How much milk do they drink?

Answer. National Dairy Council sponsored a survey conducted by the Rand Youth Research Council which covered 10,000 teen-agers. According to that study, the average is 2.72 glasses of milk per day for boys and 2.45 for girls—in the 11 to 13 age bracket. At the 17 to 18 age level, however, girls were down to 1.79 glasses a day, and boys to 2.05 glasses. This is, in my opinion, a challenge to the dairy industry to tie in with the Dairy Council program to reverse this trend and sell more milk.

Question. How much milk would be involved if all teen-agers consumed what they should?

Answer. About 6 billion quarts of milk per year (12.9 billion pounds of whole milk) would be used by teen-agers if they all drank at least 1 quart a day. A projection from our Rand survey indicates that teen-agers are drinking slightly more than 3½ billion quarts of milk per year. Consequently, the increase, if they consumed the 6 billion quarts, would amount to about 80 percent—or roughly 2⅔ billion more quarts of milk each year. This is a handsome market to strive for, and a wonderful secondary impact would be that if teen-agers can be induced to drink enough milk and consume adequate amounts of other protective foods, they will be healthier adults and better consumers throughout their lives.

Question. The catch, then, is to keep young people from throwing good eating habits out the window when they reach the age of freedom of choice?

Answer. That's it. As teen-agers progress in years, they start identifying themselves with adults who are regarded generally as poor milk drinkers. I imagine that a certain proportion of the teen-age breaking away will never be stopped. Perhaps asserting one's independence, even to the point of not doing some things that are good for you, is all part of growing up. But we ought to be able to keep this sort of thing at a minimum, at least where something as crucial as good-health eating is concerned.

Question. If teen-agers progressively like to imitate adults, why not go after the adults to set better a example?

Answer. We are. National Dairy Council has four major program projects giving special emphasis to its overall programs of nutrition education for all segments of our population. The teen-age project, we have been discussing. Overweight and underweight people are covered by National Dairy Council's weight control project. Senior citizens is the name of another project which hammers at the food needs of an increasing segment of our population. And National Dairy Council's young homemakers project works to consolidate and expand the gains which have been made in teaching nutrition in terms of the American family at a time when young women are health conscious in terms of personal responsibility. But if we get off on these projects, this interview is going to be of record length.

Question. I'll agree to that. So, what else do you think the dairy industry ought to know about the Dairy Council approach to teen-agers?

Answer. Well, it seems to me when you have a specific target, a market opportunity that is sharp, concise, and backed up by research facts, you have an ideal chance to increase sales and make them stick.

Question. Want to elaborate?

Answer. Yes. I think National Dairy Council and its network of affiliated dairy council units across the Nation are doing a marvelous job of aiming market conditioning efforts toward practical goals. The educational activities aimed at teen-agers reach these young people in three ways as I see it. First, there is the formal approach through the school classroom. National Dairy Council currently has 22 printed pieces of material, especially slanted at teen-agers on how they should eat. Also, there are specific National Dairy Council motion-picture films. These educational tools help the teachers of teen-agers.

Then there are youth groups outside the sphere of formal education who work with National Dairy Council and local dairy councils. These include groups such as Key Clubs, YMCA, YWCA, 4–H Clubs, Senior Girl Scouts, and Campfire Girls, to name only a few. Finally, there's the public press, radio and television through which news releases and subject matter are disseminated on teen-age nutritional needs.

Question. That sounds like market conditioning of the first order. Is there evidence of its effectiveness?

Answer. Yes; there is. National Dairy Council asked the Rand Youth Research Council to break down its findings, to compare markets included in the study in which local dairy council programs have not been organized.

The results were revealing. It turned out that per capita teen-age milk drinking in dairy council markets is 13 percent higher than in similar cities not served by dairy council community health education programs. Also of real interest is the fact that in the dairy council markets, 17 percent more teen-agers stated that physicians and teachers influence their eating habits.

Question. Sounds to me like physicians and teachers in dairy council markets may have a greater appreciation for dairy products, as well as better teaching aids with which to put across the story of nutrition.

Answer. That's right. And when you say that, you've hit on the crux of dairy council value in terms of practical market conditioning. If health leaders are recommending your product, it means your sales-promotion efforts are going to be far more effective.

Question. Do dairy farms tie in with themes such as the dairy council teen-age project?

Answer. Some do. It varies. But National Dairy Council wishes a great many more dairy foods distributors would tie in. There are materials and information available from National Dairy Council to help them do it. That way, everybody would be going down the same street at the same time and the impact would be that much greater in terms of healthier teen-agers and greater sales of dairy foods.

Governor Blair's Recommendations on Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, the State of Missouri is most fortunate in having a great and outstanding Governor, James T. Blair, as our chief executive. His courageous conduct and magnificent leadership in the complicated affairs and problems of our great State is and will continue throughout his administration with national distinction.

On the 9th day of last month, he made a brilliant and informative speech on the subject of public welfare and social security problems. In his speech Governor Blair made some of the most sound, practical and sensible recommendations I have heard as a solution and improvement of the Social Security Act. I urge the Ways and Means Committee and all Members of this Congress to give favorable consideration to his speech and recommendations as follows:

SPEECH BY HON. JAMES T. BLAIR, JR., GOVERNOR OF MISSOURI, AT THE OPENING SESSION OF THE CENTRAL STATES REGIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC WELFARE ASSOCIATION, STATLER HOTEL, ST. LOUIS, MO., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9, 1958

Bishop Byrne, Dr. Winston, Mr. Carter, ladies and gentlemen, Missouri is honored to be host to the Central States regional conference of the American Public Welfare Association, and, as Governor, I extend to you a warm welcome.

The accomplishments of the American Public Welfare Association in the field of social welfare are well known. The majority of the social-security measures that have been enacted into Federal law and translated into State law in recent years, for the benefit of the aged, dependent and neglected children, the blind, and disabled have had the active support of the American Public Welfare Association. As spokesman for the public welfare departments in the States and Territories, the association represents the well-being and security of over 6½ million people who are receiving public assistance within these jurisdictions.

Since I have been governor, and during some 30 years in public life in Missouri, it has been my good fortune to know firsthand the work of the American Public Welfare Association. I recall the valiant fight made in the 85th Congress when most of the welfare programs in the country were threatened by legislation which would have radically changed the formula for Federal-States sharing of public welfare costs, and would have greatly decreased the amount of Federal funds for administration. This, in itself, would have seriously crippled most of the welfare departments throughout the Nation.

I know of the efforts you are now making in behalf of needy unemployed people in our Nation to persuade the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Congress, to allow Federal participation in a program of general assistance on a basis similar the Federal-State sharing in the categorical aid programs. I find myself wholeheartedly in accord with your stand in this matter.

Your meeting comes at a time when the Nation is in a period of business and economic recession. The latest unemployment figures show over 5 million Americans out of jobs. Missouri has its share of the unemployed, with 71,000 people out of work in the St. Louis metropolitan area, and serious unemployment facing other major urban areas in our State. Plans have been developed recently to provide Federal surplus commodities for the unemployed in St. Louis city and county and Kansas City.

The Congress is moving rapidly, I believe, in its efforts to halt the recession and start our Nation back on the road to full employment. I was particularly pleased to note that Federal funds for highway construction have been accelerated through congressional action. Here in Missouri we will be able to take advantage of additional State and Fed-

eral highway programs and thereby provide more jobs. I hope this will also be true in your home States.

The recession has increased the problems of our State division of welfare, particularly with respect to aid for dependent children. When unemployment increases, women and the physically handicapped are generally the first persons to lose jobs. Working mothers who have previously been able to support their children have been forced to apply for assistance. At the same time, physically handicapped persons have swelled the disability and general assistance rolls. I am told the same situation prevails generally throughout the Nation, and this, of course, adds greatly to the burdens of you in the field of public welfare.

Much social progress has been made in Missouri through legislation enacted last year by the 69th General Assembly. It is not as much as we hope to attain in the future, but in planning for the future, the citizens of our State must first and foremost determine the methods of obtaining revenues to pay the bill. Public asistance programs in this State now take $1 in every $3 derived from all tax sources. Missouri ranks very high among the States in the Nation in total expenditures for public assistance as compared to total tax income. But on the other hand, assistance grants to those on assistance rolls in Missouri are far too low, due principally to the fact that relatively liberal welfare laws in this State qualify large numbers of persons in each of the welfare categories.

To cite a few recent major improvements in welfare legislation in Missouri, I point to the following:

An obsolete juvenile court code was completely revised by the 69th General Assembly and we now have a statute in effect which incorporates the modern approach in the treatment of children. However, I think the code should be amended and strengthened in certain respects and the administration made more compassionate.

The age maximum for aid to dependent children has been increased from 16 to 18 years. This will enable many children to finish high school and will, we believe, have a salutory effect on the problem of juvenile delinquency.

Following the terrible fire in the Warrenton nursing home which cost the lives of 73 aged and disabled persons, the legislature passed a modernized nursing home licensing law which incorporates a number of safety features now being rigidly enforced.

Much progress has been made in the education and care of handicapped children. Three laws were passed by the legislautre establishing a commission for handicapped children, establishing training centers for trainable mentally retarded children, and providing special education for handicapped children where there are 6 or more such children between the ages of 6 and 20 in any school district, where such children are educable but special facilities are needed.

A major reorganization of the division of mental diseases has also been accomplished by the law which created a mental-health commission and placed the administration of the mental-health program under a trained and experienced psychiatrist.

We have great hopes for improvement of the health care situation in rural Missouri as a result of the establishment of a 4-year school of medicine at the University of Missouri, accompanied by the construction of one of the most modern hospital facilities in the country.

Since the prison riot in 1954, marked progress has been made in the administration of the penal institutions in Missouri. Plans are going forward for the construction of a completely modern medium security institution, which will reduce the population at the main penitentiary and will permit us to use modern techniques designed toward rehabilitation of the adult offender.

As you well know, and as you will hear in detail at other meetings of this conference, there are a number of vitally important legislative proposals being considered by the United States Congress which will affect the welfare programs of each State represented here. Among those which I would consider most important in their effect on Missouri are the following:

1. For immediate help with the extremely critical problem of unemployment, I believe the Congress should add a new category to the Federal Social Security Act, to establish a program for general assistance, and one which would include both the unemployables and the unemployed unemployables.

2. Another change which would have a significant place in long-range planning would be the elimination of the age requirement in the Federal disability-insurance program. I believe we have had enough experience to demonstrate that the disability phase of old-age and survivors insurance can be properly handled. Extension of the program to the totally disabled regardless of age would result in smaller numbers of persons having to receive assistance under the Federal-State program of aid to the permanently and totally disabled in the future.

3. An increase in the amount of the benefits in the old-age and survivors insurance program would likewise reduce the number of persons in the future who will need to be helped through the old-age assistance program.

4. Special emphasis needs to be given to the problems connected with juvenile delinquency. I believe the Federal Government should enact legislation on this subject similar to that proposed by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appropriate funds to the States to assist them with this problem. Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., of Missouri, our senior Senator, headed a subcommittee which did a magnificent job in connection with pinpointing and suggesting solutions to the problem of juvenile delinquency.

5. In order for the States to be able to use better methods and knowledge in rehabilitating assistance recipients, the Congress should provide funds to implement the 1956 amendments to the Federal social security law in regard to staff training, research, and demonstration projects within State welfare departments.

Enactment by the Congress of the program set forth above would go far toward helping to alleviate many of the unnecessary and tragic effects of poverty in this wealthy land in which we live.

Among measures which are needed in Missouri, through action by the State legislature to improve the welfare program, I would list the following as being of greatest importance:

1. We must have a medical care program in this State for the recipients of public assistance. An adequate medical care program would, in my opinion, reduce the number of our citizens who will need to receive assistance in the future solely because of the lack of proper medical care now.

2. We need to give a great deal of attention to the special problems of the aged. Many States have a special agency or commission of the State government established for the purpose of studying the problems of aging, making recommendations for legislative changes, and encouraging activity on the part of local communities toward bettering the lives of our older citizens. I believe that the establishment of such a program would be highly desirable for Missouri.

3. Our State mental hospitals have a sizable number of senile persons who could be released if there were an adequate plan for their care outside the institutions. The space they now require could be made available to mentally ill persons who are potentially curable, many of whom could be returned to society. I believe a family care or boarding plan for aged persons, and others, who could be released from the mental hospitals is much in order.

4. Our probation and parole department has for many years been operating with insufficient staff. I believe many persons now in our penal institutions could be given a much better chance for a new and useful life if we had enough trained probation and parole workers to give the offenders proper supervision upon their release from the correctional institutions.

5. The vocational rehabilitation program in our State needs to be expanded as we know we have many persons who could use its services who are not now being cared for. Increased appropriations to take advantage of presently available Federal funds are needed. Increased staff would also be necessary in order to give more services to more persons. The main focus of vocational rehabilitation should be directed toward the welfare rolls with a view to restoring welfare recipients to gainful employment.

6. In order to make available the vastly increased knowledge we have in preventive services in the field of public health, we need to increase the number of local public health units in this State.

As I have mentioned before, any improvement in the social order for the betterment of our people requires the expenditure of major sums of money. Social programs are costly, but when thinking in terms of better health, better housing, more adequate nourishment and clothing for dependent children, the aged, the blind, the disabled, and others, some way must surely be found to meet the cost.

The program for this central States regional conference of APWA presents many challenging subjects. I am sure you will derive much benefit from your meetings. At the same time, I hope you will not overlook the opportunities you will find in St. Louis to enjoy yourselves and visit the many points of interest in Missouri's largest city. May your stay in Missouri be most enjoyable and may God guide you in your task of helping to shape a better way of life for our less fortunate citizens.

Agriculture's Importance in the Total Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in a statement to the House on March 24, and on several other occasions, I have expressed my dismay that the President's anti-recession economic proposals completely ignore the Nation's agriculture.

Not only does the President make no mention of agriculture in his program to fight the current business slump but he has vetoed our efforts in the Congress to prevent prices of major farm commodities from dropping this year below the price levels prevailing in 1957.

Mr. Speaker, this disregard of farmers seems to be associated with a growing

attitude in some quarters that the income position of the millions of people engaged in agriculture no longer is of any substantial importance to the health of the general economy. I pray that, before it is too late—before we have a full-blown depression in this country—the people in high places may develop some comprehension of the interdependence of our rural and urban people.

I recently have received a communication from Mr. D. C. Flowers, of Kinston, N. C., vice president in charge of sales of the Dixie Chemical Corp., enclosing a release from the University of Georgia which embraces a very clear discussion of the importance of agriculture in our total economy. So that this statement may be available to all Members of the House, under unanimous consent, I ask that it be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE OF THE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE ALUMNI ASSOCIATION,
UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA,
Athens, Ga.

A most unfortunate and dangerous situation in America is the widespread viewpoint that the prosperity of this Nation is no longer related to or dependent, except in a limited and minor way, upon the economic well-being of agriculture. Such is without foundation of fact and, if it persists, will result in untold damage to the total economy of this country.

No industry can for long withstand a continuing decline in sales with a concurrent increase in production costs. Such has been the experience of agriculture for 6 years. Cash receipts from farm marketing were $30,019,000,000 in 1957 against $37,060,000,000 in 1951. Farm production expenses during this 6-year period rose more than $600 million while cash sales were dropping $7 billion. A decline of almost $3 billion in net income is a drastic loss in purchasing power. It is the equivalent of 1 percent of the disposable personal income of America in 1957. No problem is of greater concern to this country at present than the loss in personal incomes resulting from unemployment. Could it be that this loss in farm purchasing power was a warning of what was to come which this country did not heed?

This decline in the income position of farmers if reflected in an increase of $5.6 billion in farm debts during this period. Non-real-estate debt rose $1.8 billion. Real estate debt went up $3.8 billion. Farmers continue to increase their debts at an alarming rate. A gradual deterioration in income position with sharp increases in debts can lead to widespread bankruptcy within this great basic industry. This must not be permitted.

America should never forget that agriculture serves as the basis for 35 to 40 percent of the jobs of all workers in this country. Even though only 12 percent of the people of this Nation make their living from the farm, never have so many people depended upon so few for their food, fiber, and economic livelihood. The well-being of millions of nonfarm people is directly related to the level of prosperity of those who serve as the foundation of their living. They in turn undergird the economic well-being of millions of other town and city dwellers. Agriculture as a basis industry is thus entwined with the prosperity of this Nation.

Farmers of the United States go into the towns and cities and purchase around $17 billion worth of manufactured goods to use in production each year. They carry home more than $3.8 billion in manufactured feed; $1.3 billion in fertilizer and lime; around $3 billion in farm machinery and equipment, and more than $1.9 billion in miscellaneous products ranging from insecticides to baskets and boxes to use in marketing their products. Agriculture must spend each year almost $3 billion to keep its machines running. The farm business is a user of basic commodities—steel, petroleum, electric power. A nation fares well as these great industries which serve as the mud-sills of a national economy progress.

It is significant that the industries from which farmers draw great quantities of supplies for production are at present the ones suffering rather severe economic recession.

Out of a declining net income farmers have made diligent efforts to maintain purchases of consumer items, strengthen their savings program and invest in capital items essential in the operation of modern farms. Obviously, it has been an impossible undertaking. The decrease in buying by farmers is evidenced in the widespread complaints of merchants and others who provide farmers and their families with production and consumer goods and services. The chain reactions which emanate from a slowing down in purchases by farmers and their families cannot and must not be underestimated as to their potential and ultimate effect upon national economic welfare.

Throughout history the welfare of the rural and the urban, agriculture and industry has been inseparable. No nation can long exist which thinks of agriculture as separate from industry and the purchasing power of people generally, to do so would be national folly and suicide. Yet, America trends in that direction today. Before too late, this great country must look to its foundation, return to its traditional assessment of basic values, correct its mistakes, and provide the economic environment in which a strong and prosperous agriculture can help build, as it must, the Nation that will be the leader of the world.

The Phony Panic Over College Admissions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the May 4, 1958, issue of the American Weekly. The article follows:

THE PHONY PANIC OVER COLLEGE ADMISSIONS
(By Theodore Irwin)

Last December the anxious mother of a high-school senior in Philadelphia virtually locked her daughter in her room every evening for 10 days, banning all dates. The nerve-racked girl had to write and rewrite a brief autobiographical statement for a college application until it achieved perfection.

Tension that often verges on hysteria has gripped many high-school seniors and their parents in the currently ballyhooed college crisis. In recent years, the scholastic press and popular magazines have been sounding a strident alarm: it's tough to get into college.

Under such scare headlines as "College Jam-up" and "Tidal Wave" we've been warned that "the squeeze is on for space on almost every campus * * * large numbers of students have been frozen out of classrooms filled to capacity * * * waiting lines are a lot longer * * * the enrollment pressure has begun to build up alarmingly * * * it's a crisis of major proportions."

As a result jittery high-school seniors have been applying simultaneously to as many as 20 colleges to make sure they'll be invited somewhere. Special coaching courses for college entrance exams are mushrooming.

In one community, a college skills center was even set up at a local hotel. Many youngsters are pushed into expensive prep schools on the theory that they'll have a better chance of getting into college.

An increasing number of distraught parents are flocking to high school guidance counselors. "A panic has been created in the minds of parents and students," says Miss Cleo Richardson, guidance coordinator at the White Plains (N. Y.) High School.

Elsewhere, counselors observe that many students have become "highstrung and nervous" and that the senior year—which should be a happy one—has turned into an ordeal of waiting for college decisions.

In Cleveland, Chicago, and other cities, schools have had to augment their guidance staffs. PTA's invite experts to address them on "the serious college problem." Even parents of children in the fifth and sixth grades are showing concern.

The father of one high school senior went so far as to obtain letters of recommendation for his son from a governor, a United States Senator, a bishop, and 13 other prominent citizens. As it turned out, the boy was accepted by the college he wanted, solely on his merits.

Is such extreme anxiety justified? How real is the college emergency?

The truth is, as recent surveys show, that any qualified high school senior can get into a college today, on his own level.

"The fright aroused in parents and students has been one of the greatest frauds perpetrated on the American public," says T. Leslie MacMitchell, visiting representative of the college entrance examination board.

"The overselling of the scare is disgraceful," maintains Bernard Ireland, the admissions director at Columbia College.

Last year, MacMitchell visited over 200 high schools in the East, Midwest, South, and west coast. "I have yet to talk to a counselor," he reports, "who has had any difficulty this year, or last, in placing students in college."

William C. Reich, guidance supervisor in Chicago, last month told the American Weekly: "There's always at least one good educational institution for each high school senior who realistically wants to go to college."

Actually, of the 1890 colleges in the United States, a genuine traffic jam exists in only about 40 popular or prestige schools, including the Ivy League and the Seven Sisters (the Vassar-Radcliffe type).

Evidence comes from Robert J. Norwine of Weselyan University (Connecticut), who recently conducted a survey of colleges in 36 States for the Association of College Admissions Counselors that a vast number of accredited colleges opened their doors last fall with many empty seats. "I felt," he explains, "that many admissions officers were being fooled about the difficulty of getting into college."

Of the 200 accredited colleges answering the Norwine questionnaire, 150 frankly stated they would have liked to have had more freshmen in the present class. Not counting the larger State universities in the Midwest, the 150 schools conceded there were about 10,000 more openings.

The American Council on Education reported last January that 17 States had actually shown a decline—as high as 9.7 percent—in the number of students attending college for the first time. States with the heaviest drop included Indiana, South Dakota, Virginia, Georgia and New Hampshire.

Another survey disclosed that the following schools—a fair sampling—had room last fall for more students: University of Alabama, Loyola (Chicago), Washington University (St. Louis), University of Chicago, Carnegie Tech, Tennessee, New York University, and Louisiana State.

Other colleges with vacancies included Vanderbilt, Dickinson, Syracuse, Bates, Bowdoin, Emory, Oglethorpe, University of Texas, West Point and Annapolis, the service academies reporting a decrease of 15.9 percent.

Some officials of well-known institutions which want to be known as being in demand are reluctant to confess they can accommodate more freshmen and want them. As Dr. Thomas Robinson, New York University admissions director, observes: "Nobody likes to go into a department store that is not doing a booming business."

Last June, the admissions dean of 1 excellent college in Pennsylvania was instructed by his president to sign up 100 more freshmen for the coming year. He fell far short of his quota.

Far from being overwhelmed by freshmen, a number of colleges have quietly lowered entrance requirements and recruited students who barely slipped through high school. Fifty of the colleges that participated in the Norwine poll said they would gladly accept applicants who finished in the bottom third of their classes.

"To fill their quotas, many accredited colleges and universities are offering admission to poorly qualified students," observes Charles R. Dalton, admissions director at the University of Rochester, which maintains its high standards.

The popular notion that all our colleges are faced with an avalanche of freshmen stems chiefly from impressive but misinterpreted statistics which infer that 5 or 10 times as many freshmen knock on campus gates as can be admitted.

The whole picture is badly clouded by the phenomenon known as multiple applications. Too many high school seniors apply to 5 or 6 colleges, which means that all but the school finally selected are left with ghosts.

"What we have now," R. L. Tuthill, registrar at Duke, informs the American Weekly, "is more new applications rather than new applicants."

Harvard, for example, had to accept 1,800 last year in order to enroll 1,100 freshmen; it was rejected by 700 candidates who finally preferred other schools. Another topflight university was turned down by 55 percent of the high school seniors who were notified they were "in." Thousands of youngsters never bother to reply when the deadline arrives for answering offers of acceptance. Vacancies in the fall are largely due to these "no shows."

The origin of the shortage scare and the resulting confusion probably can be traced to a complacency-shaking brochure, The Impending Tidal Wave of Students, prepared 3 years ago by Dr. Ronald B. Thompson, of Ohio State. Projecting college-age population trends to 1973, when Dr. Thompson predicted we'll have about double the number of students, his "tidal wave" alarm swept the Nation. At the time, he stated flatly that "most of our better colleges are turning away more and more students each year." Ironically, Dr. Thompson's Ohio State acknowledges that it could have taken 1,000–2,000 more students this year.

"A sober second look at the situation," says Dr. Frank P. Bulger, president of the Association for Higher Education, "indicates it's certainly not as serious as we thought."

While a bona fide crisis doesn't exist today, Dr. Bulger and other authorities estimate it probably will begin within about 5 years. Census figures point to a sharp rise in college-age youngsters by then.

To combat the "no show" chaos in our colleges this year and next, admissions deans are urging high schools to limit the number of applications permitted each senior.

College advisers recommend that a youngster should start thinking about college in his sophomore or junior year at high school. He should scrutinize college catalogs, visit campuses, freely consult his high-school counselor. His chances at specific colleges should be evaluated realistically.

To parents of college-bound offspring, Dr. Bulger advises, "Don't let such panic phrases as 'tidal wave' lull you into a false sense of insecurity."

The premature crisis apparently has had some good side effects. "If the false alarm," says Miss Maureen Rush, Cleveland guidance director, "has alerted students and parents to approach the college problem seriously, they are the gainers."

Address by Hon. Walter Rogers Before Panhandle Producers and Royalty Owners Association, Amarillo, Texas, May 1, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK IKARD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, Hon. WALTER ROGERS, my distinguished and able colleague from Texas, delivered an address to the Panhandle Producers and Royalty Owners Association at its annual meeting in Amarillo, Tex. This address covers a subject of great importance to our Nation:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE WALTER ROGERS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 18TH DISTRICT OF TEXAS, BEFORE THE PANHANDLE PRODUCERS AND ROYALTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION MEETING, MAY 1, 1958, AMARILLO, TEX.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Panhandle Producers and Royalty Owners Association, and distinguished guests, it is always an honor and a privilege to be back home. And, I am especially honored on this trip to have brought with me a very distinguished gentleman who hails from the great State of Arkansas and who has made such an outstanding record in the field of statesmanship. He is my chairman on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—the oldest committee in the Congress—and I am highly pleased that he is with us and will address us tonight on a subject that will be of great interest to all of you, and a subject on which he is thoroughly qualified to speak.

I am most happy to have this opportunity to discuss with you a matter that is of great concern to all of us and one that must be corrected without delay if we are to escape some telling effects on the general economy of the entire Nation.

All of you have been reading in the newspapers and hearing over the radio and television during the past few months the stories of recession and the many suggestions as to how the problem should be handled. I have received a sizable amount of mail on the subject. Some of these letters undertake to spell out the causes of recessions and the cures therefor; others condemn those who speak of a recession and insist that there is no economic setback; while others take the position that economic recessionary periods are part of life and that the thing to do is to make the best of it. Needless to say, I am most grateful to those who write, because it provides the opportunity for a clear-cut broad view of what the people are thinking, and it is out of this thinking of the people that answers to all of our problems must come.

Economics has always been somewhat of a mystery because of the human element involved. It is the inability to anticipate the future reactions of human beings that will always prevent economics from being an exact science. Economic ills that arise in the general trend of events must be dealt with as they arise. There is no one-shot cure, and there never will be. In order to mount an effective attack on the economic front, we must first find the cause behind the problem, and there may be many, many problems at the same time. It is one of those problems that I want to discuss with you today—a problem that, in my opinion, can be solved, and the solution of which will contribute much to the overall welfare of our country. I speak of the import problem as it affects the fuels industry. I say fuels industry, because although I refer to petroleum imports, I point out that these petroleum imports affect our entire fuels industry in this country.

Only recently I held several days of hearings on a number of bills that had been introduced that were designed to set up a new bureau, agency, Board, or whatever you desire to call it, for the research and development of coal resources. There seemed to be no objection to the adoption of such a program at Government expense. The only controversy that seemed to arise was the manner in which the program was to be administered. Some wanted to set up an entirely new and independent agency; others suggested placing the program under the present Bureau of Mines in the Department of Interior; while the Department of Interior, itself, recommended that a new agency be created inside the Department of Interior and answerable to the Secretary of the Interior. Some wanted the Government to operate the program as a Government installation, while others suggested a joint operation between Government and the coal industry. The administration supported the theory that the program should be administered under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior who would have the discretion of contracting much of the work to private enterprise on long-term contracts. The beginning cost was estimated at $2 million, but a realistic look would indicate that its cost would be a continuing one and could very easily absorb many times the $2 million figure in the first few years. We listened to a number of witnesses who outlined the economic distress that was gripping many of the coal areas of this country. At the conclusion of the testimony of each, I asked the question: "What is the major cause of this economic distress in our coal fields?" Almost without exception the answer was: "Residual oil from imports." I then asked the witness "How much the cost of coal would need be reduced in order to compete with the residuals of this imported crude." The answer to that question was "that it would make no difference how much you reduced the price of coal, because the price of the residual oil would be dropped below it." Their position was that the residual oil was what you might call, economic gravy, and whatever price it brought over and above its transportation cost would be profit. Whether or not this is true, I am not here to say, but I am telling you what the import problem is in the coal fields. It is associated with your own problem because the residual oils, upon which they blame their economic troubles, is only a part of the imported crude that is causing yours. In addition you have another interest in this problem, because if

the legislation to set up a research and development program to be paid for by the Government is passed, you will be required to pay part of the taxes to support that program.

At the same time that these efforts are being made to bring the Government directly into one segment of this fuel problem on the primary basis of the existence of distress economic areas in this country, a great number of the people on the eastern seaboard are being led to believe, by a subtle but very effective advertising program which borders on propaganda, that if it were not for petroleum imports many factory furnaces would grow cold and many people would be put out of work.

One major oil company, and I will not call it by name, is presently conducting an advertising campaign that must have been designed to convince the American public of a great and continuing need for petroleum imports. It was a representative of that same company who was testifying before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee during the Suez crisis and insisting that the production of this State and this section of the country be increased to meet the needs of Europe and sections of our own east coast that had been using imported oil. I asked this witness at the time what, in his opinion, would be done with this increased production as soon as the Suez Canal was reopened. I had hoped that he would say that some degree of balance would be sought in order to maintain the economic situation created by the increased production from our own wells. However, he simply stated in effect that he could speak only for his own company and that they would expect to pursue in the future the same program that they had pursued in the past, and that was a sound import policy. What he failed to say was that he meant a sound import policy for his company. Whether or not such a policy would be a sound import policy for the country as a whole is a debatable question, but if I am allowed an opinion on the subject, I would suggest that experiences since the Suez crisis clearly indicate to me that the import policies that have been followed have not been for the best interests of the country. And, in other fields concerning natural resources, it is my opinion that our import policies have not been in keeping with what in the future we may well wish we should have done. I especially refer to many of the strategic minerals and metals which we might find ourselves unable to produce in needed quantities on short notice. We have permitted our needs to be met by foreign sources at the expense of domestic development. It is true that much of this policy was based upon a sound foreign-trade policy, but on the other hand, much of it was based upon an economic situation that permitted these minerals and metals to be produced at much less cost in foreign countries. Our activities in this regard could well prove us to be penny wise and pound foolish, although we hope that such will not turn out to be the case. I refer to the possibility that should a conflict break out, it would be a swift and devastating thing and we would not be given the time to prepare that we have had in previous wars.

Should our foreign sources of supplies be cut off overnight, our needs for strategic minerals and metals cannot be met by reserves that are in the ground, but will require from 6 to 18 months to produce.

It is true that we have a large stockpile, much of which came from foreign sources, but we cannot and must not depend on that alone. Our petroleum reserves are vast, but the next war, if we have one—and God forbid that we do—will not be won by petroleum reserves that are in the ground but untapped. It will be won by petroleum reserves that are available for immediate use. It will be won by strategic minerals and metals that are available.

On the economic side, and I feel that a sound and vigorous economy is an indispensable essential in a defense program, speaking not only from a military standpoint but from a political standpoint, in the eyes of the world, many of the ills that can flow from an unrealistic import policy affect us more directly. If we are to yield to the rest of the world on the foreign trade issues, we must be prepared to pay as a price our standard of living. This we are not going to be willing to do. Yet, that will be the final result, voluntarily or involuntarily, unless we search for and find a proper balance in this program. It was only a few years ago that some very able statisticians estimated that within a very few short years, the demand for petroleum products in this country would reach such proportions that we would be dependent upon imports; that our reserves were just simply not sufficient to even begin to meet the demand. The fact is that these statisticians were wrong twice. In the first place, they underestimated the demand for petroleum products. They estimated a daily demand in the United States much greater than productive capacity. The fact is that the daily demand increased much more than the estimates. The second mistake that was made by these statisticians was that they underestimated the ability and the know-how of the oil people in this country to search out and find petroleum products and to develop them. Contrary to the statisticians' reports, the increased demands found us not only not dependent upon foreign oil, although much had been discovered in foreign places, but in fact ready, able and willing to meet our own needs and to export petroleum and petroleum products. Yet, what is the reward that we are receiving for such enterprising activity? Tools are being stacked, businesses shut down, people thrown out of work, and the possibility of increased State taxes to absorb losses created by cutbacks in oil production.

I do not want to appear unrealistic in approaching this very serious problem. In fact, I think that I am most realistic when I take the position that the primary premise in this whole complexity is Mr. and Mrs. United States citizen. If they are not the primary premise, then what are we working for? What are we disturbed about? The fact is that they are and should always be the number one concern. I fully realize that foreign trade is an essential element in the welfare of all of us, but by the same token I also realize that foreign trade should be incidental to our economy and not the controlling factor thereof. Whether we undertake to find an answer through tariff controls or through a quota system, or through any other method, we must not permit any of our people to be blinded by a temporary economic advantage that will redound to the detriment of all. We must keep in mind at all times the welfare of the individual citizen of the United States, and when we fail to do this, we can expect to eventually suffer from the impact of the force that injures him or her, as the case may be. I think it is well to point out that our economic situation with relation to many different materials and items is such that tariffs may work in one case while quotas might be required in another. Each of these situations must be carefully weighed with relation to the particular circumstances surrounding it. It was this thinking that caused the Congress to adopt the so-called peril-point amendment in 1951 and subsequently in 1955 adopt the national defense amendment to the Trade Agreements Act. The Senate Finance Committee report in the 84th Congress stipulated in effect that the national defense amendment was adopted so that the President, "when a proper showing was made that the national security was threatened with impairment, could take whatever action was necessary to adjust imports to a level that would not threaten to impair the national security." The President's Cabinet Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy had found and reported to the President that if the imports of crude and residual oils should exceed significantly the respective proportions that these imports of oils bore to the production of domestic crude oil in 1954, the domestic fuels situation could be so impaired as to endanger the orderly industrial growth which assures the military and civilian supplies and reserves that are necessary to the national defense.

When these imports in 1955 exceeded the 1954 ratio; when these imports in 1956 exceeded the 1954 ratio by double what they had exceeded it in 1955; and when these imports continued to grow larger and larger in 1957, the people of this country had the right to expect the President of the United States to act in accordance with the powers accorded him under the national defense amendment.

Percentagewise, this ratio had increased from a little over 16 percent in 1954 to over 21 percent in 1957. The President acted by appointing a special committee to investigate. This committee found that the national security was being threatened and recommended action. That action was a voluntary program on the part of the importers made up mostly of major American oil companies. Great effort was put into this gesture to make it suceed, but we all know, that noble as it might have been, it was doomed from the beginning. It had about as much chance of success as a voluntary conservation program in Texas would have had. We were whistling in the dark when we told ourselves that such a program would work. We knew in our own hearts that sooner or later we were going to be required to face up to the issue, and when I say, we, I am talking about the President of the United States as well as everyone remotely interested in the problem. It makes no difference how good a law might be, it is ineffective unless it can be enforced.

The time has now come for the issue to be faced and to be dealt with. It is in this session of the Congress that we must act on the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Everyone, I feel, believes in reciprocal trade, but the big question that is in the minds of many is whether or not our foreign trade is reciprocal, when a vital segment on our economy is placed under the burden that it has been carrying these past several years with no effective action coming from the executive branch of the Government. It is patently obvious to me that the first step that must be taken if we are to bring about a cure or a hope of a cure, is to act through legislative processes to create an enforceable procedure of a protective nature. Much thought has been given to the problem and a vast amount of research has been done. A proposal has been offered to the Congress in the nature of an amendment to the Trade Agreements Act. It was orginally introduced by our neighbor and good friend, the Honorable FRANK IKARD, of Wichita Falls, Tex., who presently serves on the Ways and Means Committee, which is the committee that has held extensive hearings on this subject. FRANK has done an outstanding job on this subject and is entitled to the thanks and acclaim of all the people of this country for a basic realistic approach to the problem. The proposed amendment is being supported by a number of other Members of Congress, some of whom have introduced the bill. I might say at this point that whether or not a Member of Congress is in support of a proposition does not depend upon whether or not he introduces the bill,

The fact is that it might be a mistake for all members of the Texas delegation to introduce the same identical bill. This legislation affects people all over the United States, and it would certainly not be a good idea to create an original impression in the mind of some member far removed from the State of Texas that the proposal was primarily a Texas proposal.

What we want to do is to adopt some effective legislation and get it on the books. We are not looking for notoriety; we are looking for results. The proposed amendment would direct the President to limit imports of petroleum to or below the ratios that existed between domestic and imported crude and all petroleum products as they existed in 1954. In other words, it would fix a definite guide for the President and not leave the question of threatened impairment to the discretion of the President. It would provide certain rules and guides for the limitation of the petroleum imports. The bill would vest the President with discretionary authority to allocate the import quotas among the several countries or areas from which our oil imports come. It would require the President to put up for bid each quota. Persons desiring to import petroleum or petroleum products could bid for the license to so do. It is contemplated that the highest bid for these import licenses would be the controlling factor, but discretionary authority is left in the President because the award of the import license is subject to approval by the President. The duration of the license would be at the election of the President and could be determined by him.

The question has been asked as to how the amounts to be imported would be determined. This would be done by a Bureau of Mines forecast of the daily average domestic petroleum production during the next calendar year. By applying the 1954 ratio between imports and domestic production to the Bureau of Mines forecast, an initial quota could be determined, and import licenses could be issued on that basis. Of coure, the quota could be adjusted for each quarter of the year in order to take in seasonal variances in consumption. Public notice would be issued as to the quota established and also that bids would be received. Should the forecast prove erroneous for any particular quarter, the bill allows proper adjustment to be made in the following quarter. It was felt that the licensing procedure as outlined would be fair, would be based upon the economics involved, and would be as free as possible from Federal Government control. It would also provide a safeguard against possible corrupt practices that are so reprehensible in the administration of many of these programs.

The bid basis would not only provide some additional income for the Government that would go a long way in defraying the administrative expenses involved, but it would also provide a quasi-bulwark against the economic advantages incidental to foreign oil.

There are other features of the bill that I will not undertake to discuss at this time because they have to do with certain emergency situations concerning petroleum, and there are other features that have to do with fluorspar. The points that I have mentioned are the ones that are necessary as a beginning to the solution of our problem. I would say that if this bill proves successful, it is my opinion that its provisions will be extended to include many other items in the natural resource field not now mentioned herein.

I would conclude by saying that this proposal is, in my opinion, basically sound and provides a possible early solution to a very knotty problem. It will go a long way toward enabling the independent to survive. Unless he does survive, we can not only look forward to the deterioration of the towns and communities whose economies are tied so closely with the fuel industry's, but we can expect a definite and speedy trend toward monopolism in this industry—a monopolism which you and I know the American people will not tolerate for long. The serious question is where do we go from the monopoly category. Some think that we would probably go to nationalization of the fuels industry. May I say that unless some action is taken on our present import problem that will produce the proper results, nationalization of the fuels industry during our lifetime could very easily become a probability rather than a possibility. Private enterprise could well hang in the balance. Let us all hope that we are successful in our efforts to control these imports.

A Resolution Opposing Quotas on Imported Hardwood Plywood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution which expresses the position of the San Francisco Area World Trade Association of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce on the matter of placement of quotas on imported hardwood plywood. This resolution expresses in its text the very concise point that the United States Tariff Commission has found the increasing imports of hardwood plywood have not injured the domestic industry, but actually have opened up new markets here in this country and, further, that hundreds of American firms and thousands of workers in various industries such as flush-door firms, boatbuilding companies, and others are largely dependent upon the maintenance and flow of imports. I am happy to join with the World Trade Association in expressing their position on this matter. The resolution as adopted follows:

RESOLUTION OPPOSING PLACEMENT OF QUOTAS ON IMPORTED HARDWOOD PLYWOOD

Whereas the imposition of arbitrary quotas on any phase of the American economy is inconsistent with the principles of free competitive enterprise; and

Whereas legislation now pending in the Congress (including S. 1598 and H. R. 5837) would impose an arbitrary quota on imports of hardwood plywood; and

Whereas the United States Tariff Commission has found that the increasing imports of hardwood plywood have not injured the domestic industry but have, in fact, opened up new markets within the United States; and

Whereas hundreds of American manufacturers and thousands of workers in the flush door industry, the boat-building industry and others are largely or completely dependent upon the maintenance and flow of imports; and

Whereas the Congress has established the United States Tariff Commission as the expert body to investigate claims of import-caused injury to a domestic industry, under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the San Francisco Area World Trade Association opposes the pending legislation that would impose arbitrary quotas on imports of hardwood plywood; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the appropriate Members of the Congress.

APRIL 1958.

(This is an extension of an existing world trade policy statement of the association.)

Alaskan Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues a suggestion that many of the country's foremost conservation leaders are making regarding Alaskan statehood. Under the terms of a law enacted last year by the Alaskan Legislature, the invaluable fish and wildlife resources of the Territory will be handed over to commercial fishing interests on the attainment of statehood. The proposal became law without the Governor's signature, because, as he pointed out in a message to the legislature, it discriminated against the many others who are interested in those resources.

Conservationists in the United States and Alaska suggest that the Federal Government retain administrative responsibility for the fish and wildlife resources, after statehood, until such time that the Secretary of the Interior can certify that the Alaska Legislature has taken steps to provide for the administration, management, and conservation of those resources in the broad national interest.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that recommendation is sound and fair. It is one that the proponents of Alaskan statehood should consider favorably. The conservationists do not want to delay Alaskan statehood. Rather, they want to strengthen it by making sure that the basic economy of the Territory which is dependent on its fish and wildlife resources is not put in jeopardy. I include for the RECORD a communication received recently from the conservation leaders and suggested wording for an amendment that should be considered:

WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE,
Washington, D. C., May 5, 1958.

To All Members of Congress:

The undersigned representatives of national conservation organizations believe that the Alaska statehood bill now pending before the House Committee on Rules contains no safeguards for the future welfare of the Territory's fish and wildlife resources. Adoption of the statehood bill, without a clarifying amendment, would jeopardize those invaluable resources upon which a major part of the Territory's economy is based.

The stage already is set in Alaska for the commercial interests to take over the administration of the invaluable fishery resources upon statehood. Under Alaska Senate bill No. 30, which was passed last year and permitted to become law without the Governor's signature, commercial interests are assured complete domination over the Territory's fish and wildlife resources on the advent of state-

hood. That law has been denounced vigorously in Alaska and in the States.

It is believed that the responsibility for managing Alaskan fish and wildlife resources should not be relinquished by the Federal Government until the new State legislature makes provision to protect the broad national interest. This could be achieved by amending the pending bill to stipulate that the fish and wildlife resources will be turned over to the new State as soon as the Secretary of the Interior can certify to the Congress that the Alaska State Legislature has made adequate provision for the proper administration, management, and conservation of the fish and wildlife resources.

Sincerely,

C. R. GUTERMUTH,
Vice President.
RICHARD W. WESTWOOD,
President, American Nature Association.
JOSEPH W. PENFOLD,
Conservation Director, Izaak Walton League of America.
FRED M. PACKARD,
Executive Secretary, National Parks Association.
CHARLES H. CALLISON,
Conservation Director, National Wildlife Federation.
GEORGE B. FILL,
Executive Director, Nature Conservancy.
HOWARD ZAHNISER,
Executive Secretary, the Wilderness Society.

Provided, That the administration and management of the fish and wildlife resources of Alaska shall be retained by the Federal Government under existing laws until the first day of the first calendar year following the expiration of 90 legislative days after the Secretary of the Interior certifies to the Congress that the Alaska State Legislature has made adequate provision for the administration, management, and conservation of said resources in the broad national interest.

Still Going Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include an editorial entitled "Still Going Up," which appeared in the Savannah (Ill.) Times-Journal on May 5, 1958. The editorial follows:

STILL GOING UP

There has been so much gloom and doom written for and about the farmer in recent years, that we simply must record the good news now on every occasion.

Farm prices shot up another 4 percent during the month ending March 15. This is the highest level reached since May 1953, and that, gentle reader, was smack in the boom years of the Korean war.

Further, farm prices are now at 87 percent of parity—4 points above a month ago and 6 points better than a year ago. Potatoes are actually at a parity rating of 133; beef and calves, 94; eggs, hogs, and grapefruit, 93.

It is further significant that the greatest gains are being made by commodities which have not had price supports from the Government. Least well off—and most fondled by the Washington fumblers—are the grain farmers where subsidies still exist.

I Am the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on April 14, I had the honor and privilege of attending the opening of the DAR convention. At this session Miss Jill Visnak, a senior at Upland High School, Upland, Calif., delivered a dissertation on our flag which was one of the most effective presentations I have ever heard on this subject.

Her statement, entitled "I Am the Flag," was written by Ruth Apperson Rous, national chairman of the flag of the United States of America committee of the Daughters of the American Revolution. It was most inspiring, not only for content but for delivery which made every word ring with sincerity and meaning.

I am sure that it will inspire others as it has me. I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I AM THE FLAG

(By Ruth Apperson Rous, national chairman, the Flag of the United States of America Committee, Daughters of the American Revolution)

I am the flag of the United States of America.

I was born on June 14, 1777, in Philadelphia.

There the Continental Congress adopted my stars and stripes as the national flag.

My 13 stripes alternating red and white, with a union of 13 white stars in a field of blue represented a new constellation—a new nation dedicated to the personal and religious liberty of mankind.

Today 48 stars signal from my union, one for each of the 48 sovereign states in the greatest constitutional republic the world has ever known.

My colors symbolize the patriotic ideals and spiritual qualities of the citizens of my country.

My red stripes proclaim the fearless courage and integrity of American men and boys and the self sacrifice and devotion of American mothers and daughters.

My white stripes stand for liberty and equality for all.

My blue is the blue of heaven, loyalty, and faith.

I represent these eternal principles: Liberty, equality, justice, and humanity.

I embody freedom: Freedom of speech, religion, assembly, the press and the sanctity of the home.

I typify that indomitable spirit of determination brought to my land by Christopher Columbus and by all my forefathers—the Pilgrims, Puritans, settlers at Jamestown and Plymouth.

I am as old as my Nation.

I am a living symbol of my Nation's law: The Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights.

I voice Abraham Lincoln's philosophy, "A government of the people, by the people, for the people."

I stand guard over my Nation's schools, the seedbed of good citizenship and true patriotism.

I am displayed in every schoolroom throughout my Nation; every schoolyard has a flagpole for my display.

Daily thousands upon thousands of boys and girls pledge their allegiance to me and my country.

I have my own law, Public Law 829, the Flag Code, which definitely states my correct use and display for all occasions and situations.

I have my own special day, Flag Day; June 14 is set aside to honor my birth.

Daughters, I am the sacred emblem of your country. I symbolize your birthright, your heritage of liberty purchased with blood and sorrow.

I am your title deed to freedom, which is yours to enjoy and hold in trust for posterity.

If you fail to keep this sacred trust inviolate, if I am nullified and destroyed, you and your children will become slaves to dictators and despots.

Eternal vigilance is your price of freedom.

As you see me silhouetted against the peaceful skies of my country, remind yourself that I am the flag of your country—that I stand for what you are, no more, no less.

Guard me well, lest your freedom perish from the earth.

Dedicate your lives to those principles for which I stand, "One nation under God, indivisible with liberty and justice for all."

I was created in freedom—I made my first appearance in a battle for human liberty.

God grant that I may spend eternity in my "land of the free and the home of the brave" and that I shall ever be known as Old Glory, the flag of the United States.

Adley Express Co. Story Is One Typical of Success in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, on April 12, I had the great pleasure of partaking of the ceremonies in observance of the 40th anniversary of the Adley Express Co. and the opening and dedication of its new magnicent maintenance terminal in Orange, Conn., in the Third District which I represent in this Congress.

The Adley Co. is one of the largest and most efficient freight networks in the Nation. Hard work and ingenuity have placed the Adley name on over 1,600 trucks which roll night and day over the highways of the eastern United States through all kinds of weather. The company now has 24 freight terminals located in the main cities of the East, and its operation is often described by businessmen as one of the smoothest in the industry. The newly dedicated terminal is of ultramodern design and one which will contribute to the movement of raw materials and finished goods through freight arteries to the retailer and the consumer.

At the ribbon-cutting ceremonies, I noted that the story of the Adley Express Co. is one typical of success in America, and indeed it is. For the three Adley brothers, Dan, Mike, and Ralph, have

shown their faith in the future and the economic growth of America.

Their beginnings in the climb to the pinnacle of success could not have been more humble. They were the children of Italian immigrants. A good part of their childhood was spent in an orphan asylum after the passing of their parents. With a minimum of financial means and a maximum of courage, imagination, and foresight, the Adley brothers started off with one truck and through the years built their business into the vast operation as it is known today. They are men of integrity, keen business acumen, and character. It is these characteristics which have helped to make the story of success come true and to bestow upon these men the admiration and respect they have today from the community. Dan, Mike, and Ralph Adley can take a good measure of justifiable pride in their business accomplishments and their many civic contributions. They count hundreds among their friends in the New Haven area, of which I am honored to be one.

The Adley story is one which serves as an inspiration to others who recognize that perseverance, teamwork, and unwavering faith in one's self have their reward. These men have truly earned their success and the congratulations and best wishes which have been heaped upon them by so many.

The Security of the Country Demands an Increase in Size of the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on May 5 I appeared before the Appropriations Committee to urge approval of additional funds to increase the size of the Army to 925,000.

Special Subcommittee No. 1, of which I am chairman, has held extensive hearings on the adequacy of the strengths of the military services and the Reserve components. After hearing the testimony of our military strategists, all of which was taken in executive session under oath, I am convinced that the security of the country demands an increase in the size of the Army.

Certainly, world conditions do not justify our cutting the Army to 870,000 but rather indicates that we should increase it to 925,000.

So that all Members of the House may be informed on this important matter I am including the statement I made before the Appropriations Committee, the statement of Hon. CARL VINSON, chairman, Armed Services Committee, which was sent to the Appropriations Committee for insertion in the RECORD, and a letter I have received from the Director of the Army Budget, Maj. Gen. David W. Traub, which shows the cost of increasing the size of the Army from 870,000, as recommended in the President's budget, to 925,000:

STATEMENT OF HON. OVERTON BROOKS, OF LOUISIANA

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I wish to thank you for permitting me to appear before you today in support of an increase in strength of the United States Army to 925,000.

I regret that Chairman VINSON cannot be with you today, but I know you recognize that the Full Armed Services Committee is holding both morning and afternoon sessions on the proposed reorganization of the Defense Department. In lieu of making a personal appearance I understand he has submitted a statement for the record which concurs in my views to the effect that the size of the Army should be increased.

At the outset I should tell you that shortly after the Congress convened the chairman of our committee appointed several subcommittees to conduct inquiries, on assigned subjects, concerning the state of the national defense. As chairman of Special Subcommittee No. 1, I was assigned the following mission: "To conduct an inquiry into the adequacy of strengths of Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and Reserve components (including National Guard), to meet assigned missions for the defense of the United States, and to comply with treaty obligations. Soundness of a stable force concept for the foreseeable future. Analysis of the present combatant capabilities of armed services, including major combatant forces (aircraft, divisions, naval vessels, etc.). The capability of our Armed Forces to wage nuclear, conventional, limited and/or total war."

Subcommittee hearings were held on these important subjects in executive sessions, with all witnesses put under oath. We took testimony from the Chief of Staff of each service and the Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Marine Corps. In addition, we heard from the Assistant Chiefs of Staff for Operations in order to get the full picture insofar as material and equipment were concerned.

Now much of this testimony was of the highest security classification but I can say in this open session that the Chief of Staff of the United States Army is definitely of the opinion that the security of the United States is being impaired by the drastic reductions in the size of the Army.

When will this country learn that we should not pare down our Armed Forces to a point where it invites aggression?

Haven't we had sufficient experience following World Wars I and II to realize that we are now repeating these sad chapters in our history?

Are we all so complacent that we fail to recognize that the Soviet Union is watching these moves with the greatest of interest and satisfaction?

What has changed in world conditions which justify our taking this drastic action?

The Soviet Union still maintains over 2½ million men in its land forces, to say nothing of the millions under arms in its satellites. This force is not all needed for the defense of the Soviet Union. Is Russia keeping all of these 175 Soviet divisions in the field fully equipped with modern tools of war because it fears our 5 divisions in Western Europe may go on the march?

We have started the same old pruning business all over again. In 1956 we had a strength of over 1 million in our Army. In 1957 it was cut to 950,000. By July 1, 1958, it will be down to 900,000. And if that isn't enough, we plan to cut it to 870,000 by the end of this next fiscal year. By that time we will be down to 14 divisions. Mind you, I said 14 divisions.

Logistic and support forces are being decimated. The strategic Army Corps is being riddled. We will have two divisions in Korea without a division in reserve—not a division for replacement.

Does time pass so quickly that we have all forgotten that our forces were almost pushed into the sea by the Chinese Communists in Korea in 1950? One of the reasons was that we had no replacements, no divisions in reserve.

The American soldier is the finest fighting man in the world but you can't expect the impossible of him. He is not a superman. He needs rest and relief and replacements for combat losses just like any other army in the field.

Of course, I recognize that we have built up a substantial force in Korea made up of Republic of Korea troops but, even so, about 15,000 Korean Army troops will have to be used to fill up United States combat and logistical units which cannot otherwise be kept at full strength.

We cannot expect the Republic of Korea troops to carry the entire brunt of battle if the Chinese Communists again go on the march. If we do we will not be keeping faith with the thousands of Americans who laid down their lives between 1950 and 1953 in order to keep South Korea out of the hands of the Communists.

All of the leading military strategists who appeared before my subcommittee agreed that the possibility grows, day by day, that we may be reaching a stalemate insofar as an all out atomic and hydrogen war is concerned. Both the United States and the Soviet Union are rapidly approaching the point where their arsenals will be bulging with weapons of such utter destruction that neither side will dare use them against the other for fear of retaliation. But this fear does not extend to conventional warfare and these same military strategists have urged us not to permit our Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps to be decreased to the point where they may, for all practical purposes, become impotent.

If we are to maintain our international commitments there is a point below which we cannot decrease our forces and, at the same time, provide for our own security. We have reached that point. It has become necessary for our Strategic Army Corps to become training divisions because each of these divisions are required to accept 6,000 trainees who are receiving basic training in order to keep the strength up to an acceptable level. This same Strategic Army Corps is the one which will be committed to battle immediately in case of an all-out war. So, if we do not change this plan we will do as we have done before—send partially trained men into the worst type of combat.

The Chief of Staff of the United States Army has stated unequivocally that we have had to reduce our support type logistic units in Europe to the point where they are only marginal. Any further reduction will be disastrous. Both General Norstad and General Gruenther have expressed the feeling that the ground forces in Europe at the present time are unduly weak.

Has this great country come to the point where we cannot afford to adequately support our troops deployed overseas?

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, one of the matters stressed over and over again to my subcommittee by members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was that we should have a stabilized force. We should put an end to the peaks and valleys which continue to occur in our military strength. If we would stabilize our forces we could make great savings and we could put an end to the personnel turbulence that characterizes an army that is going up or down. There would be lesser requirements for the intake of new people, lesser require-

ments for men who would be either trainers or recruits, so that out of the total force, in a matter of 1 or 2 years, the Army could anticipate much greater combat effectiveness. There would be fewer in training camps being trained or giving training and those men would therefore be in combat units for greater effectiveness.

General Taylor says that he could not begin to estimate the savings but he believes they would be great and certainly, in terms of combat effectiveness, there would be great savings.

The Chief of Staff of the United States Army has said that in his considered judgment he believes that the minimum size of the United States Army should be 925,000, and I submit to you that if we do not peg the size of the Army at that figure we are allowing budgetary considerations to override considerations of national security.

STATEMENT OF HON. CARL VINSON, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

For the past 3 years I have watched the continuing reductions in our armed services with growing concern. The situation has deteriorated to a point where I can no longer remain silent. In my judgment the time has come to take a stand and that is the object of my appearance here today.

In order to have a clear perspective of our situation, let me briefly review the current situation with reference to our armed services.

In fiscal 1959 the Navy is programed at a strength of 630,000. With that manpower strength it will operate 864 active ships, of which 396 are warships. Included in this total are 14 attack carriers which, with their assigned carrier air groups, constitute a potent nuclear deterrent and, in addition, have an outstanding capability in the field of conventional war. Of course, the Navy is developing its family of missiles, as are the other services, and I think it quite likely that the Polaris submarine and its assigned missiles will prove to be the most important advance which we have made in the missile field.

I realize that the Navy has heavy responsibilities and probably desires to have greater numbers of both men and weapons. But, in the current balance of forces, I think our Navy is strong, highly efficient, and fully capable of discharging the missions currently assigned to it.

The planned manpower strength of the Air Force for fiscal 1959 is 850,000. With this manpower the Air Force will man 43 strategic air wings, 27 air defense wings, and 35 tactical air wings, for a total of 105 wings. In addition, the Air Force is in the process of activating units to man the various new missiles which will become operational beginning in 1959.

In addition to replacing our B–36's with B–52 jet bombers, a recent decision of the Secretary of Defense will add an additional number of B–52's over those previously planned. Limited procurement of the B–58 supersonic jet bomber is also scheduled for fiscal 1959.

I think all of us will agree that the great striking power of the Strategic Air Command, their high degree of training, and their ability to react within minutes, has been the greatest deterrent force which we have possessed in our military arsenal. Obviously the Soviet Union is well aware of that capability and of our determination to maintain it.

But I want to point out that if the Strategic Air Command is required to drop a single atomic or hydrogen bomb, or fire a single long-range missile with an atomic warhead—in anger—those weapons will have completely failed in their primary purpose—to deter a third world war.

This brings me to the principal reason for my appearance—the future of the United States Army.

On January 26, 1955, Secretary of Defense Wilson appeared before the House Armed Services Committee to discuss our military capabilities. For some time prior to his appearance I had been urging a national military policy which was based upon a stabilized-force concept. For 40 years I had watched the rise and fall in military strength and preparedness, and had witnessed the tragic results of our unwillingness to remain militarily strong. Each succeeding war found us unprepared, and at the close of each of those wars our military strength simply disintegrated in response to the public hue and cry. We remember only too well, that the outbreak of hostilities in Korea found us with one untrained battalion of ground troops which we could air lift from Japan to Korea and commit to the fight. What a tragic record for the Nation which claims to be the greatest on the face of the earth.

For a little while after Korea we were able to maintain a respectable military ground force, simply because Korea was settled with a truce, not a victory. But then complacency again set in and history is again repeating itself.

At the end of fiscal 1955 we had an Army of about 1.1 million men. That force remained relatively stable until about a year ago. You will recall that in 1957 Secretary Wilson ordered a 100,000 reduction in all of the armed services. But the Army had to absorb half of that reduction. Rumors persisted that there would be other cuts. This prompted me to seek a conference with Secretary Wilson, and I talked with him at some length just before the first session of this Congress adjourned. He confirmed my fears that he planned a further cut in the Army. I did my best to try to hold the line for an Army of 950,000. In any event I hoped it would not be cut below 925,000. But we had scarcely returned home following the adjournment of the first session when another 100,000 cut was ordered. Again, the Army was ordered to absorb half of that cut. So, the Army is now going down to a strength of 900,000 by June 30 of this year. Then to further compound our difficulties a third cut of 100,000 has been ordered, with the Army again being required to absorb one-half of that cut.

Even Secretary Wilson concluded that he had gone too far and in response to the plea and obvious justification made by General Taylor, Army Chief of Staff, 20,000 were restored. So, we are now faced with an additional cut of 30,000 for the Army in fiscal 1959, from 900,000 down to 870,000.

When Mr. Wilson appeared before the House Armed Services Committee in January 1955, he agreed with my concept that we should maintain a stable military force. Here is what he said:

"The lack of reasonable stability in our military programs is a most wasteful and expensive practice. We cannot afford to revert to the feast and famine pattern of our past history, not just because of the effect upon our economy but primarily because we cannot take the military risks involved in such a policy. Development of a sound long term security requires that we design our forces so as to assure a steadily increasing efficiency, in step with scientific advances, but characterized by a stability that is not materially disturbed by every propaganda effort of unfriendly nations or wishful thinking on the part of ourselves or our allies."

The hearing which we conducted before the committee on that day will show that we discussed this particular point at great length. Secretary Wilson did not want to be confined to a finite number in discussing the future size of our Armed Forces. However, he was quite firm in saying that we should have a stable force and when we attempted to reach a mutual understanding as to how much those forces could vary and still be considered stable the figure that was generally understood to be acceptable was a variation of 5 percent. But what has happened during the intervening period? The Army is already in the process of absorbing a reduction in force of almost 18 percent, and if it is cut to 870,000 in fiscal year 1959, it simply means that we will have reduced the Army by approximately 24 percent since January 1955 when we were talking about stability of forces.

I am not at all certain just what I can do about this. But I am certain that I am in disagreement with it. As a matter of personal judgment, which is shared by a substantial majority of the House Committee on Armed Services, these Army cuts are too deep. They not only jeopardize the ability of the Army to discharge its roles and missions, particularly in the area of conventional warfare, they may make it impossible to do so.

Now let's analyze the situation confronting the Army.

The Army strength of 1.1 million at the end of fiscal 1955 enabled us to have 20 active divisions. A strength of 870,000 will produce 14 divisions by the end of fiscal 1959.

Of the 6 divisions then remaining in the United States, only 3 would be available for early deployment. The other 3 divisions and the armored combat command would be heavily involved in the training of replacements and would be incapable of early deployment.

With an Army of 870,000 men, we would still retain 8 divisions overseas, with 5 in Europe, 2 in Korea, and 1 reduced strength division in Hawaii. But these overseas commands would be required to accept an additional personnel strength reduction of about 20,000. The servce and logistical support of those activities have already been reduced to the minimum. For instance, in Korea about 15,000 Korean Army troops must be used to fill up United States combat and logistical units which could not otherwise be kept at full strength. Yet, we are told that we must further reduce the Army.

We have our international commitments overseas. These cannot be reduced to any extent. The Army has a training and logistical base to support these overseas units and this base has been reduced to the minimum. As a result the declining strength has taken its toll in combatant and logistical support units for our deployed forces and our strategic Reserve forces in the units. We have reduced these support units until we are in a dangerous state.

Is there anyone who seriously contends that the Soviet threat has lessened any in view of the Soviet missile successes, the Communist penetration in the Middle East, and the current strength of Soviet military forces? I think we can only safely conclude that the threat is greater, not less.

The Soviet Army has a strength of more than 2½ million men. They have been completely re-equipped and modernized since World War II. Therefore, they have greatly increased mobility and firepower. It is common knowledge that they have a new family of missiles, new type artillery and small arms, new combat vehicles to include armored personnel carriers, medium tanks, amphibious vehicles and helicopters. We have done much less.

Our five divisions in Europe comprise the hard core of the NATO shield. Does anyone question the magnitude of the task which they face? In Korea our 2 divisions, with our allies, face Korean and Chinese forces of over 2½ million men. I am sure those divisions take no comfort from the withdrawal of Chinese forces back of the Yalu River. Like a pocket pistol, they are out of sight but immediately available.

The strategic Army forces maintained in the United States are necessary in the cold war to demonstrate to both our allies and

our friends that the Army has the backup strength ready to reinforce the overseas forces if they are attacked, or ready to put out brush fire conflicts wherever they may occur. Continued reduction of these forces from their present understrength levels might well require the abandonment of our forward strategy and the dissolution of our system of collective security. These continued reductions are simply an invitation to renewed aggression on the part of the Communist bloc.

While Secretary Brucker is a good soldier and follows the directions of his Commander in Chief, both he and General Taylor have clearly indicated in their testimony before the House Armed Services Committee that the 870,000-man Army provided by the fiscal 1959 budget falls short of the kind of Army they feel that they should have. They have indicated that 925,000 and 15 divisions would be a desirable goal for the Army, and I support that objective. If the Army were given a strength of 925,000, we would be able to add one missile command in the Far East, and give some badly needed help to our combat and logistical support units.

Our new forces in Europe would be augmented by one air transportable missile command, and an increased number of combat and logistical support units.

Approximately 45 percent of the additional strength would be allocated to the strategic Army forces. This would provide for one additional division, one heavy missile command, and an increased number of combat and logistical support units.

Furthermore, it would increase from 3 to 4 of the number of divisions available for early deployment.

Mr. BROOKS, chairman of our Subcommittee No. 1, has held extensive hearings on the strength of our Army National Guard and Army Reserve and will report the recommendations of the House Armed Services Committee on this subject to you in greater detail. I simply want to point out that as the science of warfare progresses and warning time diminishes, it seems to me more important than ever that those Reserve forces should be maintained at their present strength, be adequately trained and prepared for early entry into combat.

The basic problem facing the Army is an inadequate budget. Even though the Army does sound planning and programing for a modern and well equipped force, adequate funds have not been available to implement these plans and programs. The Army suffers from inadequate strength and the inability to keep its forces modernized.

Of course, with the forces permitted by the limited budget, the Army has moved forward with its pentomic reorganization. But reorganization alone will not maintain a modern army nor give effectiveness to the reorganized units. They must have improved firepower, communications and mobility. But since the end of the Korean War the Army has had progressively less money to keep its forces modern. New ideas and increased technical skill have moved ahead, but the Army has simply lacked the necessary money to convert the ideas and skills into reality. New rifles, mortars, rockets, and other new weapons are available to improve the firepower of our ground forces. New lightweight cross-country vehicles, armored personnel carriers, self-propelled artillery, and tanks have been developed to meet the requirements of ground mobility on the atomic battlefield. But, the money simply is not available to procure them.

All of us realize the great importance of missiles and the more glamorous items in our defense arsenal. But I am fearful that the natural appeal of these new weapons is causing a disproportionate amount of material support to be diverted to them. This can only occur at the expense of our capability to wage conventional warfare.

For example, consider the tank. Since the end of the Korean war I believe we have produced about 8,000 tanks, and during the same period we have disposed of or sold to our allies about the same number of tanks. So, while there has been some improvement in the quality of our tank inventory, it has not increased in numbers.

I recognize as well as you that appropriated funds do not come from a bottomless pit, nor can we be unmindful of national solvency. But, on the other hand, I do not subscribe to the current practice of allocating an arbitrary number of dollars for defense and then requiring our military services to adjust themselves to that dollar limitation. That is precisely what is occurring today, and, in my judgment, it is almost disastrous to the Army.

I continue to believe that we must maintain the capability to fight any kind of war which is thrust upon us. All of us have the greatest pride in the capabilities of our Strategic Air Command, the support capabilities of the Navy's weapons, and the other deterrent weapons which are calculated to prevent an all-out nuclear war. They are achieving their mission and we must keep them sharp and ready. To the extent to which we succeed in this area we will have produced a nuclear stalemate, and those weapons will not be fired in anger. So, in my judgment, the most likely type of conflict which we face is conventional warfare rather than atomic warfare. But it is precisely in this field of military capability that we are becoming the weakest. It is this conviction which has prompted me to come before you today with recommendations which I believe to be required in behalf of the defense of America.

My recommendations are:

First, to maintain an active Army strength of 925,000 men for fiscal 1959.

Second, to maintain the Army National Guard at a strength of 400,000, and the United States Army Reserve at a strength of 300,000.

Third, to accelerate the modernization of the Army.

Of course, the attainment of these objectives would cost money. But it is my firm opinion that some readjustments, even within the projected fiscal 1959 budget, should be made, if necessary, in order to accomplish these objectives. While I would far prefer that our troops be fully equipped with modern weapons, I would reluctantly agree that it would be better to have an Army of 925,000 well-trained men, equipped with the best weapons available, than to have an Army of 870,000 being modernized on a piecemeal basis. If the conflict should come tomorrow we will fight with what we have on hand, not what we hope to procure in fiscal 1960.

I would not presume to tell you gentlemen who deal with this subject every day the precise amount of additional appropriations which would be required to implement my recommendations. For military pay for the active duty force of 925,000, I would estimate it to be approximately $138 million. Operation and maintenance funds would also be required and that could involve any sum up to $450 million, but I am sure that it could be accomplished in a reasonable manner with considerably less.

The maintenance of Reserve forces would require approximately $87 million more.

Modernization would depend entirely upon whatever internal adjustments could be made which would increase the program above the $1.6 billion presently scheduled.

Since the projected defense budget for fiscal 1959 is already in excess of $40 billion, I want to assure you that I would not make this request for an increase in funds for the Department of the Army unless I had the deep conviction that it was not only justified but required in behalf of our national defense. Let us not become so preoccupied with our new missiles and other glamorous weapons with all of their natural appeal, important as they undoubtedly are, lest we become unprepared to meet the most likely type of conflict which we will face. If we should be faced with brushfires and conventional warfare and find ourselves unprepared to meet such a challenge, that unpreparedness would undoubtedly force us to atomic warfare, the very thing we are trying to avoid.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., May 6, 1958.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Armed Services Committee,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BROOKS: In response to your request to me today, the following appropriation increases are directly relatable to increases in and strengths of the Army from 870,000 to 900,000 and 925,000, respectively, for fiscal year 1959:

	End strength increase of from 870,000 to 900,000 (col. 1)	End strength increase of from 900,000 to 925,000 (col. 2)	End strength increase of from 870,000 to 925,000 (col. 3—cols. 1 and 2)
Military personnel, Army	$45,000,000	$72,000,000	$117,000,000
Operation and maintenance, Army	39,000,000	59,500,000	98,500,000
Cost of additional military personnel	(34,000,000)	(54,500,000)	(88,500,000)
Retain troop installations	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(10,000,000)
Total	84,000,000	131,500,000	215,500,000
Increased man-years above the plan of reducing the Army from 900,000 to 870,000	15,500	24,800	40,300

You will note that the additional fund requirement for the 900,000 to the 925,000 man plan exceeds that for the 870,000 to 900,000 man plan. This is explained by reference to the difference in man-years above which indicates a faster phasing of personnel under the 900,000 to 925,000 man plan than under the 870,000 to 900,000 plan. Thus the units to be organized from the additional personned under the 900,000 to 925,000 man plan will be trained and available at an earlier date than if the input were accomplished more slowly.

The question might well be asked as to why the phasing in the 870,000 to 900,000 man plan was not planned as rapidly as in the 900,000 to 925,000 man plan. The answer lies in the fact that the dollar figures in this plan are the savings in reverse from the plan which phased the Army down to a strength of 870,000 from 900,000, and in this plan the Army was, with reason, retaining its men as long as possible, that is phasing them out relatively slowly.

Sincerely,

DAVID W. TRAUB,
Major General, GS,
Director of Army Budget.

Let's Bring Our Wiretap Laws Up to Date

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two wiretapping bills designed to augment the Justice Department's organized crime drive and generally to bring our communications laws up to date. These bills have been drafted to meet new conditions and thus expand and make more explicit portions of a wiretapping bill I have sponsored for a number of years in Congress.

One bill would reverse a recent Supreme Court decision by giving congressional approval to wiretapping by State officials when authorized by State law. Such evidence would be admissible in both State and Federal courts.

The second bill would permit agents of the FBI, Bureau of Narcotics, Internal Revenue Service, and Secret Service to tap wires in felony cases where authorized by the heads of their departments. It would also allow the introduction in evidence of information thus obtained if a Federal court order authorizing the tap had been secured in advance. Under the bill, all unauthorized intereeptions, not just interception and divulgence, would be proscribed.

These two bills are designed to clarify and extend a wiretapping bill I have sponsored for a number of years, in the light of a recent court decision and the coordinated drive by the Federal Government against organized crime. The portion of my original bill, which would allow wiretapping by Federal officials in national security cases, is still sound and necessary and should be enacted. But recent developments have highlighted the need for broader and pinpointed legislation dealing with certain parts of my original bill.

Congress never intended to prohibit State officials from tapping wire when authorized by State law. My first bill would set this straight and at the same time correct the Supreme Court's Benanti decision. This bill spells out explicitly that evidence obtained by authorized State wiretapping would be admissible in Federal and State court. Enactment of this measure would give State officers the weapons with which to complement and coordinate effectively with the Federal Government's efforts to curb big-time crime in this country.

The State-authorized wiretapping approval by Congress would be especially helpful in New York State, which for some time has made careful and effective use of its wiretapping laws. Since many of the kingpins of organized crime in America operate in and out of this State, and the drive will be initially concentrated there, use of wiretapping by State officials can be of inestimable help. I would estimate conservatively that over half of the 100 top hoodlums sought by the Justice Department have their roots in the Empire State. Proper wiretapping can help wipe out the power of invisible government which has infected portions of the State.

The second bill would, under proper safeguards, allow the Federal agents most directly concerned in the anticrime drive to tap wires in important cases. It expands the tapping right beyond the FBI, as provided in my original bill, to all agencies working to curb organized crime in the new campaign. This is in keeping with the need for coordinating the work of all these agencies which is the keystone of the drive.

By requiring executive approval for taps and, in addition, judicial approval for court use, the bill assures that innocent individuals involved would be amply protected. Thus, it in no sense provides a carte blanche to law enforcement agencies, but simply makes our laws more realistic and more attuned to the modus operandi of the modern criminal.

In addition, it would strike hard at all snooping by outlawing all interceptions by unauthorized persons. This would tighten the present statute, which requires interception and divulgence before the law is broken. Thus, private eyes and other telephonic snoopers could be stopped in their tracks. The law would not have to wait until the damage had been done before stepping in to prosecute.

Radio, telegraph, and telephone lines are now efficient and dangerous channels through which criminal conspiracies can operate with impunity. Our present laws make the wries a sanctuary for criminal elements while blocking their use to those who are trying to protect the public.

Giving Federal and State agents the power to tap wires, under trustworthy surveillance, would shut off this legalistic no-man's land for criminality. It would allow tried and true Federal agencies to act swiftly where great need was demonstrated. It is one of the most effective means by which Congress can implement the Justice Department's full-scale war on bigtime crime.

Congress has dallied long enough in modernizing our communications laws. Now, while the iron is hot and the Government is about to make an all-out drive on the big-shot crooks, is the time to give them the tools to do it. I hope Congress will respond with the action so sorely needed.

Texts of the two bills follow:

A bill to amend chapter 223 of title 18 of the United States Code to permit the introduction into evidence of certain communications intercepted by State law-enforcement officers, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 223 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"§ 3501. Evidence of intercepted communications.

"(a) There may be introduced in any court of the United States evidence relating to the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of any communication by wire or radio which has been intercepted by any law-enforcement officer or agency of any State or political subdivision thereof, where the interception of such communication was authorized by the laws of such State and was carried out in conformity with such laws.

"(b) No law of the United States shall be held to prohibit the interception of any communication by any law-enforcement officer or agency of any State or political subdivision thereof, or the introduction in any State court of evidence relating to such communication, where the interception of such communication is authorized by the laws of such State and is carried out in conformity with such laws.

"SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 223 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting immediately below

"3500. Demands for production of statements and reports of witnesses."

the following:

"3501. Evidence of intercepted communications."

A bill to authorize the interception of communications by certain investigatorial agencies of the Government, to establish a procedure for the admission into evidence of information so obtained, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That no person shall intercept or attempt to intercept any communication by wire or radio, not being authorized in advance by the sender or recipient thereof, except (1) authorized agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice upon the express written approval of the Attorney General of the United States, and (2) authorized agents of the Internal Revenue Service, the Bureau of Narcotics, and the United States Secret Service of the Department of the Treasury upon the express written approval of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, in the course of any investigation to detect or prevent any felony as defined in the United States Code, as amended, and conspiracies to commit any such felony.

SEC. 2. Information lawfully obtained after the effective date of this act through the interception of any communication by wire or radio in accordance with the provisions of Section 1 of this act shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1103), be deemed admissible, if not otherwise inadmissible, in evidence in any criminal proceedings in any court established by Act of Congress in criminal cases covered by Section 1 of this act: *Provided*, That prior to intercepting the communications from which the information is obtained, an authorized agent of any one of said investigatorial agencies shall have been issued an ex parte order by a judge of any United States Court of Appeals or a United States district court, authorizing the agent to intercept such communications. Upon application by any authorized agent of any one of said investigatorial agencies to intercept communications in the conduct of investigations pursuant to this section, a judge of any United States Court of Appeals or a United States district court may issue an ex parte order, signed by the judge with his title of office, authorizing the applicant to intercept such communications, if the judge is satisfied that there is reasonable cause to believe that such crime or crimes have been or are about to be committed and that the communications may contain information which would assist in the conduct of such investigations.

SEC. 3. No person shall divulge, publish, or use the existence, contents, substance, purport, or meaning of any information contained in any aforesaid ex parte order or obtained pursuant to the provisions of this act otherwise than for the purpose hereinbefore enumerated.

SEC. 4. Any person who willfully and knowingly violates any provisions of this act shall be fined not more than $5,000 or im-

prisoned not more than 1 year and a day, or both.

SEC. 5. All carriers subject to the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1103) are authorized to permit such interception and disclosure of any such communications by wire or radio.

SEC. 6. If any provision of this section or the application of such provision to any circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this section and the applicability of such provision to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

You're Very Wrong, Mr. Eaton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I invite your attention and that of our colleagues to the vicious and unfounded statements concerning the Federal Bureau of Investigation which were made by Cyrus Eaton on a national television program last weekend. Mr. Eaton is a wealthy industrialist from Ohio whose great affection for the Soviet Union has earned him headlines time and again in recent years.

Fortunately for those of us who love freedom and abhor the tyranny of atheistic communism, Mr. Eaton's manner of showing his affection for this—his adopted country—is strange, indeed. In 1955, for example, he was approvingly named in the Soviet press as a millionnaire who endorses the Communist propaganda slogan of "peaceful coexistence." Mr. Eaton has entertained Soviet representatives at his country estate in Ohio. He presented a Shorthorn bull to one Soviet delegation, and he has fed invaluable quotations to the Iron Curtain propagandists.

Last October, a weekly magazine published in Moscow printed an article by Cyrus Eaton in which he hailed the progress made by the Soviet Union in the past 40 years. In this article, he told the enslaved people of Russia that it was good "to observe a nation of such sturdy, healthy people enjoying more and more of the good things of the world." In an article which was published last March, Mr. Eaton asserted that the United States is primarily responsible for the tension which exists between our country and the Soviet Union.

Innocently or otherwise, Cyrus Eaton has done much to ingratitiate himself to the international Communist conspiracy. Like the Soviets, he has not allowed the facts to influence his inane babblings. That is why I feel the following editorial from the May 6, 1958, edition of the Miami News is an excellent rebuttal of Mr. Eaton's baseless attack upon the FBI:

YOU'RE VERY WRONG, MR. EATON

Ordinarily, the Federal Bureau of Investigation needs no defense of its manner of operation. However, when a person of the stature of Cyrus S. Eaton, Cleveland industrialist, likens the FBI to Hitler's gestapo it is time to speak out.

The FBI is not and never has been a gestapo. Under its longtime director, J. Edgar Hoover, it has developed into a superb investigating arm of the Government.

In a filmed television interview, Mr. Eaton asserted that freedom in the United States was in jeopardy because scores of agencies were engaged in investigating, in snooping, in informing, in creeping up on people.

Then he singled out the FBI for particular criticism. Science in the United States has been retarded, he said, because the American scientist is aware that the FBI is breathing down the back of his neck all the time.

It is true that we have had witch hunts in this country, particularly those conducted by the late Senator Joseph McCarthy, but the FBI was in no way involved.

The high standard set for the Bureau by Mr. Hoover has kept the FBI from becoming a national superpolice agency. The Bureau's agents are carefully chosen. Most of them are college men and they usually possess law degrees.

The FBI has kept close tabs on the Communist movement in this country. Undercover agents have operated within the Communist Party and from time to time have exposed the working of that criminal conspiracy against our form of government and our freedoms.

What is wrong with that? Would Mr. Eaton have us remain ignorant of the machinations of the conspirators?

Rather than jeopardizing our freedoms, the FBI is constantly guarding them. An important part of the Bureau's work is investigating violations of civil rights by local police.

Mr. Eaton is noted as a shrewd and capable businessman of vast interests. He has done his country a disservice by his thoughtless and baseless charges against the FBI.

American Ownership of Shipping Under Foreign Flags

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in the quest for authoritative information relating to controversial questions before the Senate, it is most helpful to have the views of experienced and well-informed citizens whose accuracy and reliability are unquestioned. Such a situation obtains in reference to the subject of American ownership of shipping under foreign flags. This topic was the subject of discussion before the National Security Commission of the American Legion in Washington when Carl F. Vander Clute, general manager of the Gulf Oil Corp., marine department, delivered a most interesting address. Mr. Vander Clute is considered as a knowledgeable and clear-thinking industrialist, and in order to have all information available to the Congress I ask unanimous consent that a portion of his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTNERS IN AMERICAN SECURITY

The merchant marine has always been an indispensable part of American military security. However, in contrast to all other defense instruments, this one is almost entirely a private, nongovernmental enterprise in time of peace. Nowadays, it falls into three broad categories: passenger liners, dry cargo ships, and tankers, with a few specialized carriers thrown in for good measure. The tankers, vitally important to the mobility of naval, air, and land forces today, are the group with which I have been most directly connected.

* * * * *

In connection with our forward picture I feel we are fortunate to have a Maritime Administration that has the know-how and an Administrator that has the initiative to step out in an effort to give the American merchant marine a transfusion. Results may be seen in the new building program of subsidized lines, the passenger and cargo ships, the United States Lines, Grace, Moore-McCormack, Lykes, and others. The Administration demonstrates the forward thinking through its activities with the atomic ship, free piston, gas turbines, submarine tankers, and hydrofoils. With all the indicated initiative toward progress it must be disappointing to meet with demands such as a 20-percent increase in pay by the engineers on the free piston ship, or the demand in Puerto Rico by the stevedors to be paid for work not required to unload the lift-on lift-off ship. The ship sailed back after 27 days with its cargo. It is tough to make progress in the light of such actions. It is, nevertheless, reassuring to have such forward-looking people in Government because today we find ourselves again at a crossroad in maritime history. However, we are now faced with the incontrovertible conclusion that in any conceivable war in the future we will not have the time to rectify, at leisure, errors of judgment of the moment.

Now you may properly wonder whether we, in the maritime industry, are not living in a world of the past, considering the progress made in the weapons of war. Some may think that in this sputnik world the traditional role of the merchant marine in our Nation's defense will never again be played. I cannot dissuade the doubtful that this is a totally unrealistic point of view. I will leave it to General Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who within the past few months said the following:

"It seems incredible to me that anyone could argue seriously or with justification that new concepts of warfare obviate the necessity of further fostering a merchant navy. * * * If the catastrophe of a general war should be forced upon us by the necessity of retaliation against surprise attack, the merchant marine, after the initial period of devastating nuclear exchange, would play a most vital role. Indeed, it might well be the one source of strength of the free world which would pluck victory from chaos."

* * * * *

In case of another international military struggle, would the United States control enough tankship tonnage to meet our needs at home and overseas? The most recently published joint Maritime-Navy Planning Group recommended that the size of our oceangoing tanker fleet to support our defense should be roughly 10.5 million deadweight tons.

I am happy to report that our efficiently controlled tanker tonnage is in excess of 12 million deadweight tons. This fleet is broken down roughly half owned under American flag and half owned under the flags of Panama, Liberia, and Honduras. In addition to our controlled tanker fleet now is existence, there is under construction or on order approximately 8 million tons,

mostly to be registered by American companies under what I call flags of necessity.

* * * * *

A closer look points out certain severe limitations. About half of our tanker tonnage is war-built and subject to pressing problems relating to block obsolescence. Over half is not capable of speeds in excess of 16 knots.

A glimpse at a few figures will immediately reveal a few facts about the recent history of petroleum transportation by sea and indicate why our commercial fleet has come such a long way in becoming a vital part of our military potential. According to United Nation's figures, in approximately the 3 decades since 1929, the world's seaborne trade in nonpetroleum products has increased from 385 million tons to about 460 million tons or by some 20 percent. Petroleum has gone from 70 million tons to 360 million tons or an increase of over 400 percent. In 1929, 15 percent of the world's seaborne trade was in tankships while today it is about half and petroleum is far and away the largest single commodity class moving by sea.

I am pleased to be able to say that my own company has played a proud role in adding to the progress of humanity created by this increased use of petroleum and in the augmentation of the tanker fleet available to this country. Both are vital segments of modern civilization, creations of free enterprisse but always available to our Nation in an emergency. Since the close of World War II, we have been consistently optimistic about the petroleum industry and our investment in new transportation and other petroleum facilities is a manifestation of our faith in the future. Yes, we had faith and have a large building program underway including 10 super tankers and 9 T-2's being jumboized all in United States shipyards to operate under the American flag. We also have a number being built which will sail under flags of necessity. Our optimism has been sorely tried in recent days by the drastic reduction in crude oil importations which will materially reduce ship utilization and increase costs to the ultimate consumer.

As I have indicated it would appear that, omitting considerations of vessel retirements and losses, our citizen-owned fleet under effective American control will reach in the neighborhood of 15 to 20 million tons, of which approximately two-thirds will be under the flags of necessity.

It is perhaps logical than that some issue should arise over the extent of the effectiveness of this control and why the necessity for non-American registry.

* * * * *

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 declared that the United States shall have a merchant marine owned and operated under United States flag by citizens of the United States insofar as may be practicable. Your particular attention is called to the words "insofar as may be practicable." We do know that the number of ships that it is practicable to have under the United States flag is far from sufficient to satisfy the needs of our Nation in the event of an emergency. History has taught us the sad lesson that we cannot depend upon foreign-flag tonnage to come to our rescue in the event of war. History has also shown us that the presently term European western nations were unable to fulfill their own needs as far as tonnage was concerned in the last war, particularly insofar as tankers were concerned: witness the crash program on the T-2 tankers.

How can we put ourselves in a position to prevent a reoccurrence of such a situation? Bear in mind that the next war is not going to be one that will allow a long period of time for the construction of ships to put ourselves in a position where we can properly carry on a campaign. How then can we put ourselves in a position to avoid the dire consequences of an unwarned attack and an undeclared war? I like to think that the legislators that passed the Merchant Act of 1936 were farsighted enough to realize that the number of ships operating under the United States flag would be insufficient to meet our needs and that the choice of words "insofar as practiable" were put there for the specific purpose of indicating that the postion was recognized and, at least by innuendo, indicating that ships American-owned and American-controlled, regardless of what flag they sailed under, would be considered a part of our merchant marine.

The importance of American-owned and controlled vessels under flags other than the United States flag was amply demonstrated during World War II. In fact, many of the vessels urged into Panamanian registry by our own Government because of our Neutrality Act were the very ships which brought victory in the Battle of Britain before our entry into the war. During the Korean situation we had the voluntary tanker plan, under which all American owners pooled their tankers for the benefit of the United States Government and these tankers included vessels owned and controlled sailing under foreign flag. These vessels sailing under foreign flag owned and controlled by American citizens were made available to the United States Government at a nominal charter hire even though the charter market at that time was sky high. It has been estimated in various sources in the industry that the cost to the industry to make vessels available under the voluntary tanker plan cost in the neighborhood of $35 million.

What happened during the Suez Canal situation? Our friends in Europe were pleading and praying for aid and assistance to have oil transported to their countries to prevent the shutdown of industry and avoid the hardships of a winter that could have been experienced by their peoples. Our Government requested the oil companies and tanker owners to cooperate, and I might say the oil companies and tanker owners were commended by our Government for the great spirit of cooperation with which the Government's request was answered. The United States-flag tankers and the American-owned and controlled ships under foreign flag did a yeoman job in carrying oil to our friends in Europe. If, as as has been stated in some quarters, all ships American-owned should be placed under the United States flag I regret to say that the number of tankers that would be available to the Government would diminish exceedingly, because United States-flag vessels cannot be operated in competition with foreign-flag vessels, which operate anywhere from 30 to 50 percent cheaper than United States-flag ships. The United States Government could put them on a parity, through a subsidy, to make up the difference between the cost of operating under foreign flag and that of operating under United States flag. I might say, however, that the American businessman is imbued with the doctrine of free enterprise and, therefore, the tanker owners, particularly, do not look kindly upon the Government getting into its business and taking out of the pocket of the taxpayer money to subsidize the operation, when it can be done just as effectively and with the same degree of protection for our Nation without subsidies or imposing upon the American citizen the burden of added taxation.

It being impracticable to put all ships under the United States flag, then in the language of the Merchant Marine Act if the number of ships under the United States flag fulfills the requirement, "insofar as may be practicable," and it having been shown that it is impracticable to have all ships under the United States flag, then it follows that in order to have ships available to the United States Government we must find them somewhere else. They have been found and are in existence by being American-owned and controlled but operating under foreign flag on a basis which puts them in a position where they will be competitive with our competitors.

* * * * *

Bear in mind also that these American-owned American-controlled ships under foreign flag are a great asset to the economy of the country and aid and assist in continuing and maintaining the ship repair business in this country. Many of the ships presently sailing were built in the United States and a large number of them have repairs accomplished in the United States. Supplies are purchased in the United States, bunkers are taken aboard; at least a good piece of the insurance is bought here. There is a constant flow of money into the coffers of our people which would not flow if cargoes were carried in foreign-owned bottoms and we abdicated from the field of foreign competition and left all of such transportation to our competitors, as they would like to have us do and for which purpose they are creating all this hullabalioo about flags of convenience.

They have bombarded our shores before; most recently in an attempt to eliminate the so-called 50–50 provision which has meant so much to the well-being of the American freighter fleet. Then, as now, their attack was clearly devised and patterned to fit the particular issue. During that campaign one of Europe's most prominent maritime leaders, in seeking an end to American-flag preference, asked, "Is the United States really going to side with the forces which are for government interference, restrictions and discrimination—with inherent and ultimate dangers to the continuance of private enterprise in international sea transport?" We now ask, is this not exactly what our competitors in Europe are seeking? We would answer this inquiry in almost precisely his own earlier words, "It is, therefore, obvious that barriers to the free international movement of shipping inevitably serve to increase transportation costs and to retard world trade." Is this what our European competitors seek?

Our foreign competitors, knowing that the high cost United States flag ships cannot compete with them, broadcast their propaganda for the sole purpose of eliminating competition so they may have the field to themselves. If they succeed in their efforts, the American-owned fleet of ships under the "flags of necessity" would not be available to us in the event of an emergency and, likewise, would not be available to them if they come pleading for help again. We hope such a situation will not arise but we must be prepared.

I leave with you the thought that the ships I am talking about are our partners in our security and are not sailing under flags of convenience but under flags of necessity—necessary for us to meet foreign competition to remain in foreign trade and bring into our country some of the money which our foreign competitors would like to have flow into their coffers but, above all, to maintain ample tonnage to meet the needs of our Nation and its Armed Forces in the event of an emergency and give us that vitally needed security.

Proposed International Development Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, one of the most constructive, new proposals for the strengthening of our international policies was recently made by the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], when he introduced his bill for an International Development Association. Senator MONRONEY's proposal has met with a very favorable reaction in many places, including the editorial columns of the Springfield (Ill.), State Journal. While I do not endorse all of the critical statements in the article about our aid programs, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD, the editorial entitled, "Loans versus Giveaways: New Approach on Foreign Aid," published in the State Journal for March 12, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Springfield (Ill.) State Journal of March 12, 1958]

LOANS VERSUS GIVEWAYS: NEW APPROACH ON FOREIGN AID

Taxpayers in this area as well as elsewhere should cheer the bipartisan effort, led by Senator MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, to shift the emphasis on our foreign aid program from a giveaway basis to a loan basis.

Outright gifts seem to have bred contempt for the United States in some countries as witness the familiar tag of "Uncle Sugar" or "Uncle Sap," hung on this country.

Furthermore, the foreign aid program has been sharply criticized in recent months in connection with waste and inefficiency. Public projects abroad, financed by American giveaway money, have been partly built, then abandoned. Jet planes have been given away that are now rusting from disuse.

It was entirely proper and efficacious to give money to countries devastated by Communist-initiated wars, such as South Korea and Vietnam. It was to our best interests to give money to Guatemala after it overthrew communism.

But many countries like India don't want free money. They do want loans. For instance, Brij Kumar Nehru, a cousin of Prime Minister Nehru of India, is now in the United States seeking a $225 million loan for India's 5-year plan. He doesn't want charity. He wants long-term loans, and this he prefers to short-term loans which the Russians have made to India.

Loans have one big advantage over outright gifts. The Communists can't accuse the United States of attaching "imperialistic strings" to loans. It has been a popular propaganda line in the Kremlin to label all "giveaway" money as a form of imperialism—a line, incidentally, which demagogs in Asia have echoed.

The Kremlin propagandists couldn't very well label a loan program as "imperialistic" when Russia itself is making loans.

In fact, under MONRONEY's plan we would be one step ahead of the Soviets. MONRONEY suggests that a multilateral loan system be set up through an International Development Association. Such countries as the United States, England, Canada, and West Germany would put money into the IDA. As a starter, MONRONEY suggests a billion dollars with the United States contributing a third of that sum.

The advantage of a multilateral system over the unilateral system is obvious. Russia's unilateral loan system was set up to further the cause of communism. A multilateral system would have no doctrine attached to it. The countries receiving loans through that plan would retain their feeling of independence.

MONRONEY thinks the United States' share of the capital for the IDA could be taken in part from tax revenue and part from the sale of farm surpluses abroad. He believes that the plan "would have the triple advantage of (a) ultimately lessening the need for direct economic aid by making more effective use of local currencies (money from surpluses), (b) promoting the sale of agricultural surpluses, and (c) promoting international trade and economic well-being."

Whether it would actually work out that well would remain to be seen. At least the plan, or a modified version of it, ought to be tried. We can't go on giving away money forever. We would go broke in time.

Edna Ferber's New Novel Emphasizes Case for Alaskan Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, earlier this week the able junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] in an outstanding address highlighted the urgent justification for statehood for Alaska.

There is also extant in the Nation today a new novel by the gifted American writer, Edna Ferber, entitled "Ice Palace." Several years ago Mrs. Neuberger and I had the privilege of entertaining Miss Ferber at luncheon in the Senate dining room when she was visiting in Washington with that illustrious advocate of Alaskan statehood, Delegate E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT. As a result of her visit to Alaska under the auspices of Delegate and Mrs. Bartlett, Edna Ferber has written a novel which will bring to millions of readers the case for Alaskan statehood in dramatic and vivid form.

An informative editorial in the Oregonian of Portland, Oreg., for May 5, 1958, under the title, "Brief for Statehood," highlights how Miss Ferber's new novel underscores the reasons for Alaskan statehood. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Oregonian be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIEF OF STATEHOOD

There are a good many parallels between the Texas of Edna Ferber's widely read novel, Giant and the Alaska of her first novel in 5 years, Ice Palace. Both are immense areas with tremendous resources. Both are remote in the sense that they are distant from the capitals of United States Government, finance, and culture.

The heroine of Giant raged against the exclusiveness of the male talk of booted Texans. The heroine of Ice Palace does the same when Alaskan males huddle. What could be more in the spirit of Texas than the following response of Christine Storm of Ice Palace when shown some Seattle roses?

"Such dear little things," she says with obvious sarcasm. "That's the trouble with all our Alaska flowers, I suppose, except the tiny ones that grow on the tundra. The cabbages are as big as bushel baskets, the strawberries are 3 inches around, and the delphinium grows 9 feet high."

The boastfulness of Texas was the foundation of the satire of the earlier novel. But the Texan qualities Miss Ferber finds in Alaska—its roughness, bigness, expansiveness—re judged generously in Ice Palace. She could poke fun at Texas, but she is deadly serious about Alaska.

Perhaps the reason for the sharp difference in attitude can be found in the fact that Texas, as a State, is to a great degree the master of its fate. It has come of age. Its juvenile traits are cause for laughter. But Alaska, giant though it is, is still held in subjugation by the parent States. Miss Ferber admires rather than derides its efforts to impress the Nation with its importance.

"The forests, the metals, the great fishing industry," says Miss Ferber's protagonist, Thor Storm, "it's all the same, it goes outside, it's owned outside, the world doesn't hear about it, or care. * * * It's part of a past era, like the old days of the grabbers and what they called the Robber Barons. It's still going on here, full blast, with Seattle and San Francisco and the lobbyists in Washington as the powerplant. But who cares."

The outside will be hearing much of Miss Ferber's case for Alaskan statehood. The book is already among the best sellers, and motion-picture rights have been sold for more than a half million dollars. Congress has just a few months to meet the challenge of statehood. If it fails to do so, as it has failed in the past, it can properly be cast among the villains in Ice Palace.

Plight of the Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Big Train Then and Now," published in the Norristown, Pa., Times-Herald of May 6, 1958, dealing with the plight of the railroads in America. This is an editorial which I think every Senator should read.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BIG TRAIN THEN AND NOW

Any railroad buff used to get a thrill to hear the train caller announce: "The 20th Century Limited—first section." First section? That was right. There were more to come.

The long all-Pullman train thundered away. Then, at roughly 5-minute intervals, came a second section, a third, a fourth. All full-length trains. On the busiest days, the Century, glamor train of modern Amer-

ica, ran between New York and Chicago in as many as seven sections.

Quite a sight to see. Seven trains barreling through, loaded to the vestibules with prosperous Americans bent on business and pleasure, all seven bearing the proud name of a famous limited.

To that plush estate had the Century risen from its modest beginnings as a 5-car train in 1902.

And from that estate has it now fallen, as rail travel has declined through the after-war years, until at last, one day not long back, it was stripped of its elegance and became just another day coach and sleeper train, with the extra fare abolished.

In its long life it has earned the railroad $200 million. So haughty had it become as it clung to its glory in the later years that it made no passenger stops at such big cities as Cleveland.

Maybe one day the Century will be restored to its old eminence. But men who know the railroad business as it is today are not counting on it.

The 20th Century Limited was frankly a luxury train. But as such it was a symbol of the throbbing business American railroads enjoyed for years as a key factor in the growth and maintenance of United States trade and industry.

What has happened to this train is a dramatic exclamation point which highlights the grim statistics of our tottering railway system. Further emphasis came from the Baltimore & Ohio's abandonment of all rail passenger service between New York and Washington.

How much more service will have to be abandoned or curtailed or downgraded before solid national effort is made to put the rails back on a sound footing where they can serve this country in both peace and war?

The Narcotic Addiction Problem in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD an excellent statement entitled "Documentation of the Narcotic Addiction Problem in the United States," prepared by Mr. Lee Speer, field supervisor of enforcement activities of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics.

Mr. Speer, who served as chief investigator of the nationwide narcotics investigation conducted by the Senate Judiciary Committee, has spent nearly 20 years in narcotics enforcement in this country and in the Far East. He is a recognized authority, and I highly commend his statement to the reading of Senators.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOCUMENTATION OF THE NARCOTIC ADDICTION PROBLEM IN THE UNITED STATES

(By W. Lee Speer, field supervisor of enforcement activities, Federal Bureau of Narcotics, before the annual symposium of the American Psychopathological Association, New York, N. Y., February 23, 1957)

A little more than 50 years ago, narcotic addiction in this country was recognized as a hideous, unnecessary social evil founded on crime and aimed at the destruction of masses of individuals. Legislative curbs were placed on the spread of traffic in 1909, 1914, and again in 1924, followed by the organization of the Bureau of Narcotics in 1930. From an ominous addict population of 250,000 in the United States in the twenties we have now progressed to the point that, after a thorough combing and searching of this country for 4 years by all enforcement agencies, we have of record 34,729 individuals who sometime during those 4 years illegally used narcotics. This survey coordinated by the Bureau of Narcotics, and found to be 95 percent accurate as to coverage by an independent agency, is being continued by the Bureau of Narcotics to provide an accurate and reliable yardstick of the extent of the narcotic traffic in this country.

Narcotic traffic and narcotic addiction are certainly not limited to the United States, although some countries are loath to admit the presence of a narcotic problem. In the United States, the Bureau of Narcotics under the able direction of Commissioner H. J. Anslinger is on top of the problem and has provided every assistance to congressional committees investigating the narcotic traffic with the result that the situation in this country has been well documented and well publicized. The point has been made repeatedly that addiction in the United States hinges on heroin. Nevertheless, the Bureau of Narcotics has a system in effect which immediately flags the purchases of a registrant, that is, a physician, hospital, druggist, dentist, etc., when they become excessive. In this manner diversions of legitimate narcotics are not only brought to the attention of the Bureau promptly, but the number of such diversions is kept to a minimum.

Under the above system there could never occur unnoticed in this country a situation such as has recently been publicized in England, a country often cited as being free of drug addiction. In the Dr. John B. Adams case, this doctor is reported to have enslaved some 400 people in narcotic addiction before he brought about their premature deaths and scattered their ashes over the English Channel. Excessive purchases by such a doctor in the United States would be evident immediately. In England the investigator wearing the derby hat and fawn-colored gloves was alerted to the narcotic diversion not by notice of excessive purchases of narcotics but rather by the town of Eastbourne having the highest death rate in the country. This case highlights one of the many instances in which there may be extensive undetected addiction unless enforcement authorities are abreast of the situation.

Another example of how the narcotic traffic, long smouldering, may break out and reveal addiction of startling proportions was brought to light by the 1956 report of the Permanent Central Opium Board of the United Nations which shows Denmark to be the world's biggest consumer of codeine, methadone, and ketobemidone, a synthetic drug so highly addicting that its production and use are prohibited in the United States and most other countries. In addition, the report reveals that Denmark's per capita consumption of the above drugs together with morphine and demarol exceeds by 11 percent that of the next highest consumer. Excess purchasing and prescribing of narcotics have brought this about. Approximately one-half the addicts in Denmark are known to be in Copenhagen. A superintendent of a mental hospital in Denmark, Dr. Jorgen Ravn, stated the medical profession must bear a large share of the blame for the present narcotic situation in Denmark.

Following several congressional investigations into the narcotic traffic in this country, from 1950 to 1955, former Senator Price Daniel, now Governor of Texas, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code, conducted a nationwide investigation into the narcotic traffic with particular emphasis on the causes and treatment of drug addiction. Extensive hearings were held in 13 principal cities of this country including New York City. A hearing in the latter city was devoted exclusively to an investigation of drug addiction and lasted several days during which time testimony was taken from medical experts who have made studies of drug addiction for a quarter of a century. The testimony of these experts, that of other medical witnesses, and lay witnesses as well, is a matter of record and was used as a sound basis for the attack on the drug traffic embodied in the Daniel-Boggs Act of 1956 which, as stated by Commissioner Anslinger, is the greatest step forward our country has taken in the fight against the drug traffic.

The above-mentioned Daniel-Boggs act attacks primarily the availability of narcotics in this country, and aims at reducing the availability by removing convicted sellers of illegal narcotics from society for long periods of time, even providing for the death penalty in extreme cases. The penalty provisions of the act are mandatory. The effect of this act on the traffic was felt immediately following its passage, and the cumulative effect has become tremendous now that traffickers are realizing the full impact of the law which denies probation, suspended sentences, or parole to these illegal sellers of narcotics. Under this law, 5-year sentences now are equivalent to 15-year sentences formerly, and 10-year sentences, provided for second and subsequent offenders, are equivalent to 30-year sentences when parole was available. Reports throughout the country show the remarkable deterrent effect of such a severe penalty law in the gradually decreasing numbers of recruits entering the narcotic traffic from the underworld.

Senator Daniel's committee concluded that "whenever and wherever the penalties are more severe and strictly enforced, the incidence of both drug addiction and narcotic offenses has decreased proportionately." Congressman Boggs' committee, having conducted a simultaneous investigation into the narcotic traffic, reported, "the precipitating factor in drug addiction is contact with the drug" and added, "because contact with a drug is the essential prerequisite to addiction, the elimination of this contagious pestilence from our society can be most effectively accomplished by striking at the illicit trafficker."

The factor other than availability of the drug which leads to addiction is association. The fact that addicts create addicts is axiomatic and means that removing one addict from society not only saves another person from becoming addicted; it saves a geometric progression of possible addicts. Testimony of experts before Senator Daniel's committee established the extreme need for protecting society against this contamination through compulsory commitment of addicts to an institution for long periods of time. Dr. Leonard Scheele as Surgeon General of the United States testified that any "treatment of drug addiction must take place in a drug-free environment," reemphasizing the statement made by Dr. Royal Copeland some years before as health commissioner of the city of New York that "without absolute control of the (addict) and his complete isolation from clandestine sources of supply, there is no hope."

Dr. Harris Isbell, Director, Addiction Research Center, Public Health Service Hospital, Lexington, Ky., stated, "addicts do not want to be normal—they want to be loaded." Again Dr. Isbell, Dr. Victor Vogel, and Dr. Kenneth Chapman, all of whom have treated thousands of addicts at the Public Health Service Hospital at Lexington, have written, "Addicts connive to get more (drugs) than their allotted amount so they can continue to obtain a euphoric effect. They may sell or give away part of the extra supply—to

persons not addicted. This creates new addicts who are potential customers for the contraband market."

Dr. A. M. MacLeod, director, John Howard Society of Montreal, who has treated addicts both in Canada and in England, stated that addiction has the contagious qualities of a social disease, adding that, "without exception every addict whom I had in treatment either attempted to give expression to or fought against a clearly recognized desire to involve nonaddicts. It was my opinion this activity indicated a perverse inner need of the addict to turn his self-destruction against those around him as well as against himself."

The Senate committee concluded, "We believe that initial treatment must take place in an institution, and that rehabilitation of a drug addict (does not) begin until he is off of narcotic drugs and has undergone extensive physical and psychiatric treatment within an institution," and "It should be noted these recommendations for treatment and rehabilitation are not intended as a substitute for criminal confinement and punishment of those addicts who are convicted of law violations. They should pay their debt to society the same as nonaddicts, and proper law enforcement and confinement in such instances will do much toward minimizing the narcotics traffic and addiction in the United States."

Dr. Elmer Hess, president of the American Medical Association, recently expressed the following view of the so-called Daniel-Boggs Act: "A narcotic addict lives a living death and those who contribute to it deserve the punishment we reserve for those who take human life. The death penalty is justly deserved by the craven creatures who make narcotic victims out of our teen-agers."

Thus there is general agreement among medical, enforcement, and legislative authorities that narcotic traffickers, addicts, and nonaddicts alike, must be removed from society for a long period of time as a deterrent, to bring about possible rehabilitation, and to prevent the contamination of others. Midway of the 20th century it appears that only the uninformed and publicity seekers would attack this problem otherwise. This point is made clear by Dr. James V. Lowry, Medical Director, United States Public Health Service Hospital, Lexington, Ky., who says, "We cannot forget what happens to that person (an addict)", and classifies him as being in a "state of disease."

Of the 34,729 addicts of record, the general classification of addicts accounts for 29 percent of the total or 9,870 addicts; the Negro classification of addicts accounts for 60 percent of the total or 20,835 addicts; the Puerto Rican classification of addicts accounts for 5 percent of the total or 1,857 addicts; the Mexican classification for addicts accounts for 4 percent of the total or 1,399 addicts; and the Asiatic classification of addicts accounts of 2 percent of the total or 768 addicts.

The records of the Bureau of Narcotics also show that approximately 60 percent of all addicts are between the ages of 21 and 30 while another 12 percent are under the age of 21 years. However, in this latter group, 85.1 percent are 18 years of age or older. The age group from 31 to 40 accounts for 17 percent of the total number of addicts, which is a 43 percent drop in the incidence from the 21- to 30-year group. Those addicts over 40 account for only 11 percent of the total.

The above statistics point up the fact that entry into narcotic addiction is made by individuals between the ages of 18 and 30, indicating the attack on the narcotic traffic must be toward discouraging and preventing recruits in the younger age groups from toying or playing with narcotics in the underworld. For narcotics may be obtained in this country only by those individuals who are associating with or are a part of the underworld. This fact is remarkably demonstrated by the fact that 93 percent of all addicts in the United States use heroin, a drug which is completely outlawed in this country, and which has been obtainable as such only from the illicit traffic for 33 years. Therefore, a heroin user is per se a law violator, and is actually supporting and contributing to the Sicilian-Mafia, French-Corsican or Red Chinese gangsters who supply the drug to this country.

Some of our States through citizens committees have taken action to eliminate the destructive drug traffic from their jurisdiction. The outstanding example of such a State is Ohio. The citizens and legislature, led by the then State Attorney General C. William O'Neill, now Governor of the State, enacted legislation providing minimum mandatory sentences of 20 to 40 years for convicted sellers of narcotics. The law became effective September 16, 1955. During the next 7 months, only 19 traffickers were convicted and sentenced under this law, but the deterrent effect of the law was such that the narcotic traffic dropped more than 80 percent. There had been 328 addicts reported in 1955. In 1956 there were only 94 and none of the latter was under 21 years of age, indicating the people of Ohio have found the answer to the rather extensive narcotic problem which existed in that State prior to the enactment of the 20-year minimum mandatory penalty law. Police in Cincinnati and Cleveland have reported that associated crimes also took a sharp drop, illustrating the close connection between the narcotic traffic and other types of crime.

Texas is a source of supply State in that heroin and marihuana are brought into this country from and through Mexico by way of Texas where the cities of San Antonio, Austin, Houston, Fort Worth, and Dallas have felt the full impact of the narcotic traffic in addition to being transit points supplying other parts of the United States. Addiction is now a felony in the State of Texas and there is a likelihood of high minimum mandatory penalties against narcotic traffickers being enacted. Governor Daniel has remarked that narcotic violators will receive no clemency in that State.

Another source of supply State, California, has a low penalty law for traffickers, and a 90-day to 1-year penalty for addition with the minimum rather than the maximum being invoked generally. The result is that traffickers, addicts and nonaddicts alike, are in and out of jail, and only minimal progress has been made by the State in eliminating the narcotic problem. A pilot project in Alameda County (Oakland) has offered some hope of reducing the traffic through working toward a form of permanent confinement for addicts. Release would be possible but only under long-term probation further restricted by the courts requiring periodic determination of relapse or nonrelapse. Upon relapse quick recommitment is provided without further procedure. This project has the support of the University of California medical authorities, who have assisted in the rehabilitation of addicts during long-term confinement in a county jail-farm type of minimal security institution whereby the addicts are assigned responsibilities within the institution along with other inmates after a brief period of convalescence following withdrawal of the drug.

In Chicago, Ill., where there is one of the greatest concentrations of narcotic traffic in this country, litle progress has been made in solving the addition problem. Sentences in Federal courts have averaged near the minimum permitted under the law. In Chicago, sellers of pure heroin in volume quantities supply the interstate traffic to Indianapolis, St. Louis, Kansas City, Dallas, Houston, and New Orleans. Sentences in State courts remain at even a lower level under laws which permit penalties ranging from 2 years to life. Sentences hinge on the minimum with numerous continuances, cheap bail, suspended sentences and probation adding to the favorable conditions for narcotic trafficking. There is a constant recruitment of young addicts in the city and recidivism has reached the highest point of any place in the country, ranging from 67 to 80 percent. Upward of 1,000 young people each year are coming into the section of the underworld ravaged by heroin. This situation has continued even though for the past several years three followup projects with liberal budgets have been in operation to provide help and supervision to addicts released from confinement. Senate hearings in Chicago showed that the Sicilian-Mafia element in the underworld has joined with distributors on the South Side to supply not only Chicago traffic but interstate traffic as well. Under the present climate in Chicago, even with thousands of arrests annually, it is not possible to keep either traffickers or addicts off the streets for a sufficient period of time to reduce the two addiction-spreading factors, availability and association. However, a narcotic commission and other authorities are presently considering remedial legislation. The situation calls for, and it is hoped the result will be, high minimum mandatory laws that will make it as unprofitable and as unpalatable for narcotic traffickers and addicts in the State of Illinois as it is under the minimum 20-year mandatory law in the State of Ohio.

In New York State the narcotic traffic is concentrated in New York City which is a source of supply for the entire United States. Through this port heroin is brought in from Europe, the Middle East, and even the Far East through the machinations of Sicilian-Mafia traffickers and French-Corsican gangsters operating in this country, Europe, Mexico, and Canada.

New York has reported 15,019 addicts during the past 4 years which is almost half the entire number reported in the United States. It is one of the few areas in which the number of addicts has showed little decrease. Although there are notable exceptions, in this area narcotic traffic and narcotic addiction generally are not classified as a serious type crime and minimum rather than maximum sentences are the vogue. It is here the expression "revolving door," as applied to the narcotic traffic, originated since narcotic violators are in and out of confinement so rapidly. During the Senate hearings in 1955 it was revealed that some authorities and other witnesses in a sense actually encourage the narcotic traffic by recommending some fancy treatment of a fine-feather variety for narcotic violators. This has led some top smuggler-dealers to claim they are merely supplying the demand for the drug, and the addicts expect to be gingerly handled and coddled.

New York surely demonstrates the havoc which can be brought about by not classifying narcotic traffickers and addicts in the most serious categories of law violators, and by not dealing with them in a manner commensurate with the gravity of the crime. In New Jersey, just across the Hudson, there is little addiction trouble, illustrating the vast difference the approach to the problem makes. Under New Jersey State law, any person who uses a narcotic drug for any purpose other than the treatment of sickness or injury as prescribed or administered by a person duly authorized by law to treat sick and injured human beings is a disorderly person. The law also provides that such a person, an addict, may be sentenced to a year in the county workhouse, penitentiary or jail.

A 20-year minimum mandatory penalty law for illegal sellers of narcotics would dry the traffic up in New York City, a city which reported 3,468 new addicts during the first 10 months of 1956. It would also be a

mortal blow to the heroin traffic throughout the United States.

Medical experts of the United States Public Health Service who have made a life study of narcotic addicts agree that compulsory commitment of addicts for sufficiently long periods of time to effect their rehabilitation, followed by a realistically supervised period of probation and swift recommitment upon relapse, offer the best hope of taking and keeping addicts off the streets of our cities, thereby preventing the contamination of others. They are in agreement that addiction is curable, and believe the most humane treatment of an addict is to free him from drugs quickly, then offer him all the therapeutic assistance available to prepare him to stay free of drugs when the compulsory commitment is ended.

Of all the difficulties which face the addict upon his release from confinement, the greatest is staying clear of the underworld, finding his place in legitimate society. As one authority has emphasized, the average citizen has no contact with either drug addicts or their sources of supply, and normal human beings living within the law are not likely to become addicts. For this reason, among others, public opinion scorns addicts, and looks with horror and distrust upon a former addict.

Prospective employers are reluctant to hire former addicts, rating them as unreliable and undependable workers. Their reluctance is usually justified. During 1956 the sociology department of New York University, in studying a group of addicts, found that two-thirds of them had never held jobs for longer than 6 months even though the average age was 30 years.

Addicts are changeable, immature persons who require careful guidance to attain emotional maturity. The difficulty of providing this sort of guidance to addicts is quite obvious. A more realistic approach is to prevent the acquiring of addiction, to stop the evil at its source. It is certain the evil cannot be stopped with sympathy and remonstrating with either the traffickers or the depraved addict victims who spread addiction and contaminate all with whom they come in contact. Steps taken to meet the menace of drugs must be aimed to deter, must be equal in gravity with the known consequences of the traffic.

Reports of mild-mannered addicts are misleading. Recently in the Midwest 3 hoodlums, 2 of whom were addicts each with an ounce of heroin, robbed, bound, gagged, beat, and kidnapped a family of three. A few years ago in the same area a district supervisor of the Bureau of Narcotics was shot down by an addict who had just finished smoking a pipe of opium. A few months ago an addict hoodlum from Dallas was arrested in Little Rock, Ark., and made a play for the officer's weapon. This same hoodlum was wanted on a charge of gasoline-bomb throwing in Dallas.

To ferret out the traffickers in every part of the United States, the Bureau of Narcotics, under the authority of the 1956 Federal legislation, is augmenting the work of its 250 agents, who concentrate on wholesalers, interstate and international traffickers, by conducting a National Narcotic Training School for local and State officers specializing in narcotic enforcement. The school is held in Washington, D. C. The officers trained at the school are providing a strong force to cope with local and State narcotic traffic and addiction. The results of the school have been monumental in the coordinated drive of Federal, State, and local enforcement agencies to beat down the narcotic traffic in the United States.

There is strong evidence in the United States today that the narcotic traffic can be driven from this country by the no-compromise position taken by the Congress in affording us the best tools to date with which to combat the traffic. The high minimum mandatory penalty with no probation, suspension of sentence, or parole is by far the most potent of these weapons.

The position of the Federal enforcement arm is gradually being strengthened by actions in the States to outlaw addiction, to take addicts out of society for long periods of time for complete rehabilitation to prevent contamination, and to set up high minimum mandatory penalties as circumstances indicate necessary.

With the development of this firm wedge against the narcotic traffic, and, with the support afforded through all the years by the medical profession and other registrants in this country to prevent diversions of medicinal narcotics, the Bureau of Narcotics in cooperation with local and State agencies will drive out the traffic, which even now is losing its appeal and profit for those calloused, unmoral scavengers who heretofore have profited through the sale of illegal narcotics, through the destruction of the individual.

Appellate Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the public discussion concerning the Jenner bill to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, the principal point made by the opponents of this bill is the argument that this bill somehow would have the effect of injuring the Court.

The fallacy of this argument is neatly exposed in an editorial entitled "Cave Cant," which appears in the National Review for May 3, 1958.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAVE CANT

It is heartening news that the Judiciary Committee has voted favorably on three of the numerous proposals that lie before it (a) to clarify the law, (b) to affirm the 10th amendment, and (c) otherwise to protect the people against perverse textual interpretations, and preemption of authority, by the Supreme Court of the United States. Specifically, the Judiciary Committee has voted by a 9 to 6 majority in favor of legislation that would (a) remove from the Supreme Court jurisdiction over standards set down by the individual States governing qualification for the practice of law (i. e., undo Konigsberg), and (b) assert the right of Congress exclusively to determine whether a question asked of a witness is relevant to the congressional purpose that committee was set up to serve (i. e., undo Watkins).

Several additional proposals that go into making up the Butler bill and the Jenner bill will be voted on next week. It appears clear, at this moment, that, at long last, the entire Senate will be given the opportunity to take up, some time during this session, the problem of how to cope with the Warren Court. A national debate is sure to follow—and the liberals have got themselves a tuning fork.

Last week, participating in a symposium on the Court at Notre Dame University, David F. Maxwell of Philadelphia, immediate past president of the American Bar Association, urging opposition to the Jenner and Butler bills, recalled that the Nation's lawyers rose "almost to a man" to fight the 1937 Court-packing plan. "Now that the pendulum has swung in the other direction, it is equally essential that they unite in defending the Court as an institution."

That will be, we predict, the line most often played in the ensuing weeks: The fight against the Jenner and Butler proposals is a fight for principle. We urge our readers to bear in mind that the principle at stake is constitutional government. Mr. Roosevelt, in lashing out at a recalcitrant Court, wanted men who would constitutionalize New Deal ideology. Mr. BUTLER and Mr. JENNER want to do whatever is necessary to prevent the Court from (a) misinterpreting Congress' will, and (b) arrogating authority unconstitutionally. In some cases it is merely necessary to make plain what Congress intends, to clarify the law. Thus, when the Supreme Court rules that the Smith Act in effect intended to set aside State antisubversion laws, Congress must, taking stock of the decision, pass a law saying such is not Congress' intention, and that is that. In other cases, Congress, protecting what the venerable Prof. Edward Corwin describes as its "primal right of investigation," must, either by declaratory legislation, or by legislation limiting the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, affirm its plenary investigative rights.

So beware the cant: Beware the oversimplification that asks us, in the name of judicial integrity, to "protect" the Court from Congress. Congress, in Burke's classic phrase, is merely moving in the name of the Constitution to correct a peccant part of the Constitution. It can do no other.

American Camp Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to join with the senior Senator from Indiana, the Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART, in calling attention to the fact that from May 1 through today, May 8, American Camp Week was celebrated. I know that those of you who remember with nostalgia your own camping experiences will be delighted to learn that the organized camping movement now has more vitality than ever.

The American Camping Association, which sponsors Camp Week and which has its headquarters near Martinsville, Ind., which is in my congressional district, reports that more than 5 million boys and girls will attend organized camps this year.

Through the work of the association important strides have been made in recent years in developing a strict standards program for camps.

It is also a pleasure to report that, in helping to launch American Camp Week, Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton stressed the fact that opportunities are

now greater than ever for American children, regardless of economic or social background, to enjoy the experience of organized camping. In a meeting on April 30 with Mr. T. R. Alexander, president of the American Camping Association, the Secretary made an excellent statement which, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR FRED A. SEATON TO OPEN AMERICAN CAMP WEEK

It is a pleasure to participate in the opening of American Camp Week, sponsored by the American Camping Association. I am happy to learn that nearly 5 million children, of varied economic and social backgrounds, are expected to attend the 13,000 camps throughout the country this summer.

Through the thousands of camps sponsored by such agencies as the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Camp Fire Girls, 4-H Clubs, YMCA, YWCA, churches, schools, and other organizations, public and private, opportunities are greater than ever for American children to participate in organized camping.

In observing American Camp Week I would like to emphasize the extraordinary educational and wholesome recreational values provided by our National Park System. In virtually all park areas camping facilities are being expanded and new sites are being developed by the National Park Service through the Mission 66 program to accommodate the ever-increasing number of campers.

Camping serves to strengthen the character and develop the fitness of our children, our country's most important resource for the future.

I urge all parents to explore camping opportunities to avail their children of the benefits of this pleasant and significant experience.

Postal Employees Adopt the "You Auto" Slogan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the campaign now underway by the automobile manufacturers and dealers to persuade people to buy automobiles, using the "You auto buy now" slogan.

Following is a telegram which I have received from Mr. Cornelius J. Venneman, secretary-treasurer of the Allied Postal Employees of St. Louis and vicinity, who has a different "auto suggestion":

You auto get us a long overdue pay raise. Once again we urgently request that you exert all the power of your elected high office by leaving the Senate-House conferees know that a pay increase is long overdue. You auto do this so we can purchase the necessities of life and later an auto.

Thanking you for past consideration of postal legislation.

CORNELIUS J. VENNEMAN,
Secretary-Treasurer, Allied Postal Workers of St. Louis and Vicinity.

Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. Venneman is right. We "auto" speed up the pay bill. I urge the conferees to act as promptly as possible.

Reciprocity and Customs Simplification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, most of the items the United States imports from Brazil are on the free list. Hence, the extension of the Trade Agreements Act is not essential in any way to the stabilization of the Brazilian economy.

The trade agreements program has been presented to the Congress as a reciprocal program. We have taken this same approach in connection with our legislation to simplify customs procedures. The lack of true reciprocity is clearly indicated by a recent order from the customs revenue department of the Brazilian Government. This is circular No. 17 of February 20, 1958, which instructs all customs inspectors to assess the ad valorem import tariffs on the basis of the invoiced list price or, if warranted, on the internal wholesale price of the respective merchandise. The order specifically states that quantity or cash discounts are not to be taken into consideration for tariff assessment purposes.

According to a recent dispatch from the American Embassy in Rio de Janeiro, there have been considerable protests by local trade associations against Brazilian customs' policy of computing the tariffs on the basis of list prices rather than on the net prices. The dispatch indicates that Brazilian importers are now instructing their suppliers abroad to show net prices only on commercial invoices. Recently importers have been encountering difficulties with the customs authorities with respect to value declarations on imported merchandise under the new tariff.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include at this point the translation of circular No. 17 of the Brazilian Government Director of Customs Revenue dated February 20, 1958:

The Director of Customs Revenue, acting under orden of the General Director who approved decision passed by this office on Dossier No. 17726/58 informs the Customs Inspectors and other Customs officials of the country for their information and guidance, that for purposes of assessment of ad valorem import tariffs referred to in law No. 3244 of August 14, 1957, the value of the merchandise is that which prevails on the internal wholesale market in the exporting country without any deductions except those referring to reduction of taxes granted to merchandise intended for export.

In consequence thereof and in view of said law, the collection of the ad valorem tariff is not computed on the invoice price of the merchandise but on its normal value or quotation in the foreign market (country of origin). For this reason any special discounts given for quantity purchases as cash or advance payments will not be taken into consideration.

It is recommended to Customs Inspectors and other officials that where there is a doubt concerning the real value of the merchandise intended for clearance, the following norms should be followed:

(a) If the Customs Inspector has sufficient reason to contest the importer's value declaration, he will do so by means of signed statement in accordance with article 6, paragraph 1 of law No. 3244–57;

(b) If the official does not have sufficient evidence to prove the real value but can show fundamentally that the declared value is prejudicial to the National Revenue, he will apply the norms of article 7 of said law, calculating the tax on basis of the internal market value;

(c) In any case, there shall not be considered as infringement of exchange regulations any difference of more or less 10 percent of the invoiced price (art. 60, par. 2); however, the difference in tax shall be collected and the exemption of penalties for the difference not exceeding 5 percent (art. 83, sole paragraph) shall be observed.

Fair Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on May 7, 1958, by George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, on H. R. 10527:

FAIR TRADE

I am George Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

We are the largest business organization in the Nation. Our membership is exclusively among small, independent business, and professional people. These people who are your independent enterprise constituents, and they alone, set our stand on bills and issues by direct signed votes which they send to you, in our mandate polls. In that sense, when I speak here, I speak only with their collective voice, as though they were here before you to speak for themselves.

First, let me make one point clear: We haven't been able to poll our members on the particular bill before your committee, H. R. 10527. For that reason the federation cannot take a stand on that bill. But I can tell you definitely that it is the sense of a majority of our members, founded in their repeated votes, that Congress should write and maintain the strongest possible fair-trade legislation. For that reason I want to compliment you on the action you are taking to study this proposal.

The need for this action is plain. As far as we are concerned, the fair trade law seeks only one thing: the protection of the small-business man against unfair price competition that in and of itself promotes monopoly. There are other benefits, but I do not intend to discuss them here.

Now the present fair trade law, the McGuire Act, is on the ropes. It is groggy from repeated pastings in the State courts. It's head is spinning from the recent court decision which clears the way for mail-order cut-raters to sell freely into fair traded areas, pulling the rug out from under antimonopoly protection.

Now, why do we want the strongest possible fair trade law? Our reasoning is simply this:

I think we are agreed that our American business system, which has helped give us one of the highest standards of living ever

known in the world, is rooted in a policy of free and fair opportunities for all, to make it possible for and to encourage more and more people to strike out on their own, making their contributions to progress, and to compete for success on the basis of their efficiency. I think we are agreed, too, that this policy is one of the underpinnings of our unrivaled social and political liberties.

Now, if our economy were working freely the way it should, if all suppliers were voluntarily following equitable pricing policies to both large and small customers, providing fair opportunities for all, then there'd be no need for fair trade laws. But you know from your own observation, from the studies by House and Senate Small Business Committees, and from reports by the Federal antitrust agencies, that small-business men are increasingly being whiplashed by merciless cut-price competition founded largely on unfair price preferences granted to their giant competitors. This puts independents in the position of fighters sent into the ring with both hands tied behind their backs.

Such being the case, these small-business men have come to Government as the guarantor of their freedoms, as the agency with the power and duty to insure the presence of right order in our society, and asked it to use the antitrust laws which Congress has enacted to restore and preserve freedom and fairness in the marketplace. But the record shows that while they asked for what to them is the bread of life in an economic sense, all they have gotten, largely, is a stone.

Let me tell you a story: Shortly after the courts killed the Miller-Tydings fair trade act, and while price wars were bleeding many independents to death, I went to Federal Trade Commission with a request for action. I asked them to get busy with section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act which prohibits sales below the seller's cost where the purpose or effect is to create monopoly, and with a broad-scale program on section 2 (a) of the Robinson-Patman Act, which prohibits unfair price discriminations between customers of a supplier. I got absolutely nowhere on this, despite the fact it might have been of much help to suffering independents.

Now please don't think that I'm trying to brand these antitrust people as "dead-end kids." Nothing can be further from the truth. They have made good progress, in the past few years, with antitrust enforcement. There is increasing promise in their work.

This, then, being the situation: (1) That our national policy is one of fair and free opportunities for all; (2) but that the pricing policies of some giant suppliers are running contrary to this policy, with damaging effects on independents; (3) and that Government has failed in its duty to remedy this situation through the antitrust laws. Then I say that small businessmen have a claim on you gentlemen for action toward the strongest possible fair trade protection. Failure to secure this for them amounts, under the circumstances, to denying them the right to fair and free opportunity.

But there are pitfalls you must be careful of. For instance, there's been much talk—and sound talk I think—about a need for industry to reduce prices to restore some momentum to business and employment. Some people may try to convince you that a strong fair trade law is "high price" legislation. But this simply isn't so. Manufacturers who must remain in competition with one another have it clearly within their power to reduce their costs to their customers, and in this way they can establish fair traded prices that are at once reasonable for independents and promotive of greater business activity.

One final thought: we have all been reading the warnings by the Gaither, the Rockefeller, and other groups that Soviet Russian armed might threatens our security and our liberties. You are taking action to close the door on these threats by appropriating the funds needed to give the arms and equipment needed to our military, to cope with this threat.

But just a few weeks ago, my daughter-in-law out in California met a group of Hungarian escapees, Benedictine priest-educators, who have set up one of those tough schools you've been reading about, out at Portola Valley. During conversation she mentioned that I am in the small business movement. And here is what they told her, these men who had been there, who saw the Red Communist terror develop in their nation, and who lived for years under a system which a midnight ring on the doorbell meant years in a slave labor camp:

"Dear lady, that is most important work. We must have many, healthy small businesses. For if they are bankrupted, the middle class goes with them, and the few take over. Then the way is open for the Reds to walk in without firing a shot."

So I say that unless you enact the strongest possible fair trade law to secure for small business a last ditch defense against unbridled monopoly competition that can surely bankrupt them, by appropriating funds for greater military strength you are only bolting the front door against communism, while leaving the back door wide open.

Thank you.

A New Geriatric Research Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 30 our Government reached a new high in public service with the announcement of an award for research on the medical and biological aspects of the aging. I am particularly proud that the grant was made to the Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University because of my long and pleasant association with both the college and the university.

The new grant to the College of Medicine was recommended by the National Advisory Heart, Mental Health, and Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases Councils, and will be supported by funds from the National Heart Institute, the National Institute of Mental Health, and the National Institue of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases.

The grant, covering a 5-year period, provides for the employment of 12 senior investigators in such fields as biophysics, metabolism, physiology, endocrinology, neurology, radio-biology, and psychophysiology, and 12 other personnel. Plans also call for the conversion and equipment for laboratory use of 4,500 square feet of space in Van Etten Hospital made available by the city of New York. Renovation of the laboratory area will begin in a few weeks; the program is scheduled to get underway in September.

Although the Albert Einstein College of Medicine now has a research program on aging, the new grant will not duplicate the existing work; but will be a distinct program in itself. It will be supervised by the college's committee on gerontology, whose members are: Dr. Irving London, chairman, professor and chairman of the department of medicine; Dr. Arthur Abramson, professor and chairman of the department of rehabilitation medicine; Dr. Howard A. Eder, associate professor of medicine and radiology; Dr. Henry B. Makover, professor of preventive medicine; and Dr. Abraham White, associate dean and professor and chairman of the department of biochemistry.

Speakers at today's ceremony, in addition to Dr. Burney, were Dr. Samuel Belkin, president of Yeshiva University, Dr. London, Dr. Morris A. Jacobs, commissioner of hospitals of the city of New York; and Dr. Hollis S. Ingraham, deputy commissioner of health of the State of New York. Dr. Marcus D. Kogel, dean of the College of Medicine, presided.

The grant to the Albert Einstein College of Medicine is the second in the Public Health Service's new program to encourage comprehensive efforts in the field of aging. The program is under the Center for Aging Research, established in October 1956 at the National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md., under the direction of Dr. G. Halsey Hunt. The first grant was awarded to Duke University, Durham, N. C.

The new program of research on aging at the Albert Einstein Medical College is the first of its kind to be established in a large urban center. It represents a unique collaborative venture of a privately supported medical school, the Federal Government through the United States Public Health Service, the Municipal Government through its Department of Hospitals, and the State government through its public home and infirm care program. The project is of particular importance to New York because, according to Dr. Kogel, there are now a million people over 60 years of age in the city, which has a voting population of two and a half million.

I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the remarks made on that occasion by our distinguished Surgeon General, Dr. Leroy E. Burney, as follows:

A PROBLEM OF SOCIETY: COMPREHENSIVE RESEARCH IN AGING

(Address of L. E. Burney, M. D., Surgeon General, Public Health Service, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, at meeting inaugurating new geriatrics research program at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University, Wednesday, April 30, 1958)

First, let me express my pleasure in being with you on this occasion. It marks an event that may be as historic as the foundation of Yeshiva University and of Albert Einstein College of Medicine. For the need to know more about aging has never been more apparent than today. And we meet for the practical purpose of launching a new, concerted research attack on the problems of aging.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

It is a distinct satisfaction for me to announce financial support, by the Public Health Service, of this broad new program through a research grant to the Albert Einstein College of Medicine. The plan is the result of many deliberations: First on the part of your committee on gerontology and other members of the faculty; then between representatives of the college and the National Institutes of Health; and finally, by three of our National Advisory Councils in their first meetings of this year.

Each of the three Councils—Heart, Mental Health, and Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases—gave its approval. I know that the distinguished citizens who serve on these Councils were gratified by their study of your plan. Otherwise they would not have recommended to me the award of this type of research grant which, in itself, represents a growing awareness that the interrelated, complex problems of aging must be examined in their entirety and in dynamic relation to the social environment in which they occur. Many leaders in medical research believe that a comprehensive approach to the study of aging is an essential supplement to research on the particular diseases which chiefly affect older people.

The Councils have recommended, and I have approved, a grant of slightly more than $300,000 for the first full year, beginning on September 1, 1958. The Councils have also recommended that continuing support of this project be assured at essentially the same level for a period of at least 5 years. An additional grant of somewhat over $100,000 is being made, effective immediately, to provide for the conversion of space in the Nathan Van Etten Hospital into research laboratories for this project.

In this connection, I am particularly happy that the city of New York, through its department of hospitals, is participating in this joint research program. Not only is it making space available for necessary laboratories, but it has also promised to make available, and to support, 90 ward beds in the Nathan Van Etten Hospital which will be used for the clinical aspects of this research program in aging.

The broad support which underwrites this new research program is, in fact, a point of importance. The private resources of this university, the public resources of your city, your State, and of the Federal Government are here combined to give concrete recognition of the serious nature and wide scope of the problems you propose to study.

In a word, society supports your plan. I might add, it's high time that our society should support additional comprehensive research on aging.

The old patterns which once gave older people respected status and participation in family and community life have been largely disrupted and discarded in industrial societies of the 20th century. In the United States especially, the old values, the old ties that bind, have yielded to the impact of industrial, economic, and social change. Only in a few individual families that remain stable and in a few cultural groups within our midst, do we find the three-generation family living under the same roof or in the same neighborhood. Yet at the turn of the century, it was the common way of life.

The high speed of technological change and the extraordinary mobility of our population are the two most potent forces creating stresses that affect all ages, but that are particularly disturbing to the very young and the very old. Even a casual view of our deteriorating central cities, our waning small towns, and our swollen suburbs shows that our society is undergoing a painful birth of new patterns of family and community life. What they will be like we do not know. That we have taken so little thought and done so little to assist in this birth is a social lapse which will cost us dealy in the years to come.

For the transformation already made has not occurred without human cost. Older persons in particular have had to make difficult adjustments to the new ways. Happily, many of them have been able to do so. Significant numbers—increasing numbers—have been grievously hurt by circumstances which, although unintentional, are part and parcel of our neglect of the social impact of the tremendous changes we are undergoing.

The new patterns of family and community life which our society is producing must fulfill two seemingly contradictory obligations. They must permit full exploration of the mysteries of nature and the full development of our material resources for human welfare. At the same time, they must foster and bring to a new and richer flowering the intellectual powers of our people, and our love for our fellow men—in the family, the community, and the world at large. For our material exploits, our vaulting ambitions to conquer time and space are utterly vain if they do not help us to live in concord with all sorts and conditions of men—the old and the young; the wise and the foolish. And we are in peril if we allow our material exploits to cut us off from the thousands of years of human experience and intelligence, and from our very own kith and kin.

Perhaps this is what many of our older people are trying to tell us in their rejection of some of the new ways of life. This is what we are beginning to realize dimly as we thrash about to find better ways of educating our children, of dealing with behavior that knows neither love nor law, and of caring for the aged.

It cannot be expected that solutions of the problems affecting one segment of society, one generation, will produce the ideal patterns of living. But society will have made a more constructive move in this direction when it increasingly takes a comprehensive approach to the problems of aging, such as this university has planned in its research program.

It is not possible to acquire full comprehension of the physiological processes of aging without simultaneous efforts to comprehend the psychological processes. No more is it possible to achieve full understanding of the older person without gaining at the same time new perceptions of the other age groups around him. Adjustments and solutions of the social and economic problems in the later years are being sought by both public and private agencies. But we don't yet know the full dimensions of the total problem, let alone what its impact may be in the future.

There is, I am happy to say, a considerable stirring among National, State, and local organizations toward a joining of forces for more action in the field of aging. This month, in fact, a joint council to improve the health care of the aged was established by the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, the American Nursing Home Association, and the American Dental Association. The National Committee on Aging of the National Social Welfare Assembly, one of the pioneers for better care of older people, has recently extended its excellent consultation services and social studies with financial support from the Ford Foundation.

The Federal Council on Aging, formed 2 years ago with representation of all agencies having interests or functions related to the problem, has improved the coordination of the Government's activities for older citizens. Thirty-one States have councils or committees on aging, including the Desmond committee of the New York State Legislature, long active in the field.

At the Federal and State levels, we have made some important advances in such broad areas as income maintenance, employment, and retirement. Many local organizations have established pace-setting programs in such fields as housing, health maintenance, recreation, and education for older people.

The health and medical aspects of aging, however, remain the core of the problem. And we are far, very far, from first base in dealing with the personal, family, and community burdens imposed by ill health in older people. The so-called chronic diseases and mental illness stand out as their major health problems. But we know a good deal more about the diseases than we do about the people who acquire them. Meantime, the United States population acquires a net gain of some 350,000 persons in the age groups 65 years and over every year.

The urgent need now is for increased research effort in the medical and biological sciences, not only to clarify further our understanding of aging, but also to discover scientific means for leveling upwards the health status of all age groups and both sexes. That is why the Public Health Service is so much interested in the research plan of this college and of other institutions concerned with comprehensive studies of aging.

In general, the health and medical aspects of old age have received less intensive study than the economic and social aspects. Granted that all aspects are interdependent; granted that the biological status and disease problems of the older person cannot be untwined from his social and physical environment. Nevertheless, society cannot adopt sound policies and develop practical programs for coping with the social and economic disasters of old age without much more scientific information than we now possess concerning the medical and biological aspects.

Will the "four generation" family become a widespread problem, as our young marry early and their parents and grandparents live into the later years? Since women are living longer than men, will industries of the future have to accommodate larger numbers of women workers? Will male breadwinners be able to build up sufficient insurance benefits to sustain their widows over very long periods? What sort of housing is really safe and acceptable for very old and frail persons—sick or well? These are social and economic questions. Medicine and biology must give us the basic answers.

Clearly, the medical and biological answers cannot be obtained exclusively in the experimental laboratory or in the study of clinical cases. The individual and the entire environment in which he is conceived and born, grown, matures, and ages must be examined. And this must be done in a research environment that focuses upon the problems the full range of pertinent scientific disciplines.

The Public Health Service has been giving more and more thought to such comprehensive research, and to the ways in which we might help augment it. We have long conducted medical and public health research on problems of fundamental importance to the Nation. For the past 13 years, we have been privileged to administer a broad program of increasing scope in support of medical and biological research, through our National Institutes of Health. Each of the seven Institutes conducts research and administers an aid-to-research program, largely in the form of grants to individual scientists.

Much of our own research and many of the projects we are supporting are concerned with one or more aspects of aging. It may interest you to know, for example, that we are currently supporting about 120 research projects specifically concerned with

gerontology, at a current annual cost of over $2 million. Many other research grants support studies indirectly related to aging.

To encourage new research activity, especially comprehensive research, and to coordinate our own efforts, we established a Center for Aging Research at the National Institutes of Health in 1956. At the same time we began to examine our grant-awarding function to see how it could be adapted to meet the need for broadly conceived projects involving many disciplines and several departments of the institutions sponsoring such experiments. A satisfactory procedure has been developed and approved by the Congress, so that two or more of our Institutes may now jointly support activities related to their specific missions.

This procedure was successfully applied for the first time 1 year ago by the National Heart Institute and the National Institute of Mental Health in jointly supporting a regional Center for the Study of Aging at Duke University. We were highly gratified, therefore, when the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases and its advisory council joined with the other two Institutes in supporting a similar plan for Albert Einstein College of Medicine.

The differences in populations and environments under study give unique importance to each of these trail-blazing programs. At Duke University, the problems of aging are being explored in a large and varied geographic area, and in a predominantly rural and small-town population of relative stability, whose members pursue a leisurely pattern of living. At Albert Einstein College, the same problems will be explored in a small, highly industrialized area, and in a population of very high density and mobility, whose members—some say—maintain the fastest pace anywhere in the world today.

Society cannot fail to learn much of the greatest importance from these comprehensive studies of aging by outstanding scientists with excellent laboratory, clinical, and community facilities—in strikingly different settings. I am confident, too, that all our Advisory Councils and Institutes, as well as many other research groups throughout the country, will follow these programs with intense interest. What you accomplish here in New York City and your colleagues accomplish in North Carolina will undoubtedly influence the direction of research on aging in other parts of the country.

The Albert Einstein College of Medicine, under the aegis of your fine university, has every advantage that insures success in this great adventure. The competence and high motivation of your staff are known to all of us. The adjacent hospital facilities and the active support of your community provide an admirable setting in which to launch your research program.

But more than these tangible advantages, I like to think that the spirit of Albert Einstein will give potent inspiration to your efforts. For it was he, above all other scientists of our times, who taught us that truth is not to be found in the obvious, but must be sought by sweeping away familiar axioms and substituting others which may seem absurd, until we see that they are new truths. If we are to solve the problems of aging in our society—no more difficult, no more certain of solution than the problems of time and space—we must do so in the spirit of the man whose name this college bears.

Again, let me express my pleasure that the Public Health Service is to have a share in your exploration of this vitally important sector of the great unknown. As you embark upon your voyage, our best wishes go with you—as does the anxious hope of millions of aging men and women.

Holding Back the Handout Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, the House of Representatives passed an amendment to the Unemployment Compensation Act. For some reason, many of the news releases that went over the wires and appeared in the papers failed, in my opinion, to properly explain the situation as well as the legislation. The passage of the legislation was hailed as a victory for the present administration. Actually the measure as passed was not the administration's proposal nor was it the committee's proposal. The bill as passed could properly be termed a States rights proposal. It would provide some help on the part of the Federal Government to the States but purely on a voluntary basis.

The best analysis of the situation that I have seen in the press, on television, or heard over the radio appeared in an editorial in the Richmond News Leader on Wednesday, May 7. It is a concise statement of the true situation.

In the hopes that it will bring enlightment to a confused situation, I desire to include it with my remarks so that the people who subscribe to the RECORD may know the true facts. The editorial is as follows:

HOLDING BACK THE HANDOUT BOYS

The role of the conservative in today's society seldom has been demonstrated more effectively than in the current debates over Federal supplements to unemployment compensation payments. It now seems likely that because of this conservative force, and only because of it, the people will be spared the heavy expense and the grave consequences of proposals that 2 months ago appeared to have much support behind them.

Under present law, States individually fix a tax upon employers, the proceeds of which go into unemployment compensation trust funds that are State-administered. Out of these funds, benefits are paid according to State law. From their inception 20 years ago, these programs have been regarded as insurance programs, maintained on an actuarial basis, with benefits predicated upon an unemployed person's earnings.

The proposals brought forth by the Eisenhower administration would have made a shambles of the principle of State responsibility; under Mr. Eisenhower's plan, the States would have been compelled to accept Federal supplements, to be paid to workers whose regular benefits were exhausted. The proposals advanced by liberal Democrats would have wrecked the whole concept of an insurance program; their bill called for an outright dole to the unemployed.

For a few panicky days, it appeared probable that the House Ways and Means Committee would adopt every misguided feature of both proposals, and add a few of its own. Then congressional conservatives, led by Virginia's HOWARD W. SMITH, began to mobilize some counter arguments; they discussed, debated, delayed, brought up amendments and substitute bills. And when the House adopted a bill last week, it adopted a measure sponsored chiefly by Virginia's own BURR HARRISON. His bill does not compel any State to take anything from the Federal treasury; it merely authorizes the States to borrow from the Federal Government sums sufficient to supplement their present benefit schedules. Behind conservative leadership, the House overwhelmingly defeated all schemes for a Federal dole.

On the Senate side, Mr. BYRD has not even scheduled hearings on the House bill until May 13. He has announced that his Finance Committee intends to inquire into the adequacy of existing reserves in State hands. At the last report, State unemployment compensation funds had some $8 billion already available; and Mr. Byrd reasonably wants to know why a substantial part of this backlog could not be utilized first. He also commented upon the fact that many States are not now taxing employers as much as their own laws permit employers to be taxed. He wonders why not.

This week brought announcements that Mr. Eisenhower is willing to settle for the House version. So, too, is the Majority Leader, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON. A score of Senate liberals, still wedded to the idea of a handout, now face almost certain defeat. It is not often that conservatives win a battle as decisively as they have won this significant little clash; their lot ordinarily is to fight and fall back. This time they carried the field, and it was a remarkably gratifying sight.

Tobacco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Eric Johnston, Charlie Taft and company do not quote from the record. They claim that the present administration of the Reciprocal Trade Act helps the tobacco farmer. The reciprocal trade program, as administered, is sacrificing the American tobacco farmer in favor of the foreign tobacco grower.

Now is the time for this Congress to adopt a trade bill similar to mine or the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON]. We could then export more tobacco through bilateral trade agreements. Our tobacco farmer should be consulted. He should not be placed in competition with low-wage foreign producers of tobacco as the State Department is presently doing.

The following report is from the Department of Agriculture:

FOREIGN MARKETS FOR UNITED STATES TOBACCO

The United States exports unmanufactured tobacco to about 100 countries and territories, but in recent years about 75 percent has gone to West Europe. Approximately 45 percent of United States exports are taken by the United Kingdom and West Germany.

WEST EUROPE

Since the war, there has been a loss of about 60 million pounds annually of United States tobacco exports to the United Kingdom and France. This has been more than offset by gains of 75 to 80 million pounds in exports to West Germany, Netherlands, Belgium, Switzerland, Ireland, Denmark,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Austria, Spain, Italy and Finland. However, the use of United States tobacco remains at the 1950–51 levels, while imports from other areas have expanded by 110 million pounds, or 30 percent.

In 1956, the level of factory use of United States leaf was about the same as in 1950 (360 million pounds) despite an over-all increase of nearly 200 million pounds in the use of foreign tobaccos during this period. This has been met by increased production in the area and greater imports from non-United States sources. The United States share declined from 37 percent in 1950 to 30 percent in 1956.

The drive toward self-sufficiency has been augmented by production incentives, protective tariffs and other measures. Increased consumption of non-United States imported leaf has been encouraged by expanding bilateral trade arrangements, purchase agreements and colonial preferences.

Compulsory Unionism Versus Compulsory Open Shop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following pungent remarks of Finley Peter Dunne's Mr. Dooley on right to work, which the Washington (D. C.) Trades Unionist recently published as an editorial. Although Mr. Dooley spoke at the turn of the century, the relevancy of what he had to say endures. The truth of his little dissertation is just as apt as it was then, but his wit these days is rare.

The editorial follows:

Right to work, voluntary unionism, open-shop advocates (that's what these proposals really are) proclaim their concern for every worker—or his right to a better way of life to freedom of choice.

No better explanation of the open shop and what it means to the man or woman who works for wages is to be found than the famous item by Finley Peter Dunne in which he tells what Mr. Dooley thought about it. Dunne's famous character, whose views were published in a Chicago paper 50 years ago or so, had this to say:

"What's all this talk that's in the papers about the open shop?" asked Mr. Hennessey.

"Why, don't yer know?" said Mr. Dooley. "Really, I'm surprised at yer ignorance, Hinnissey. What is th' open shop? Sure 'tis a shop where they kape th' door open t' accommodate th' constant shtream of min comin' in t' take jobs cheaper thin th' min what has th' jobs.

" 'Tis like this, Hinnissey. Suppose wan av these freeborn Amerycan citizens is wurkin' in an open shop fer th' princely wage of wan large iron dollar a day of tin hours. Along comes anither freeborn son-of-a-gun, and he sez t' th' boss, 'I think I could handle th' job for 90 cints.' 'Sure,' sez the boss, an' the wan dollar man gets th' merry, jingling can, an' goes out into th' crool wurrld t' exercise his inalienable roights as a freeborn Amerycan citizen an' scab on some other poor divil.

"An' so it goes on, Hinnissey. An' who gets the bennyfit? Thrue, it saves th' boss money, but he don't care no more fer money than he does for his roight eye. It's all principle wid him. He hates t' see min robbed of their indepindince. They must have their indepindince, regardless of anything else."

"But," says Hennessey, "these open-shop min yet minshun say they are fer th' unions, if properly conducted."

"Shure," said Mr. Dooley, "if properly conducted. An' there ye are. An' how would they have thim conducted? No shtrikes, no rules, no conthracts, no scales, hardly iny wages, an' dam' few mimbers."

Statement on Lead-Zinc Tariff Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the United States Tariff Commission has sent to the President its report on an escape clause investigation into the plight of the domestic lead and zinc industry.

To no one's surprise, the Commission found unanimously that imports of these strategic metals have increased in such quantity as to cause serious injury to the domestic industry. I say that this was to no one's surprise, because it is inconceivable to anyone at all familiar with the situation that any other finding could have been made.

Unfortunately, the recommendation for relief was not unanimous. It split right down the middle. Three of the Commissioners found that to save domestic production of these strategic metals, maximum permissible tariffs as well as quotas would be necessary.

This, too, was not unexpected to anyone familiar with the seriousness of the lead and zinc mining industry within the United States.

What is surprising is that the balance of the commission, while finding injury, recommend that duties be increased only to the 1930 rates, and that no quotas be imposed. This is actually less help—substantially less help—than the Tariff Commission recommended for this industry in 1954. How anyone can imply that the American lead-zinc industry is in better shape today than it was 4 years ago is beyond me.

Which of these recommendations, if either, is to prevail is now up to the President. If the stronger recommendation is followed, the lead-zinc industry will get the kind of relief it must have to survive. But the alternative recommendation, which amounts only to increasing present tariffs by a fractional part of a cent per pound when market prices are several cents below the break-even point for American producers, would be of no real help.

If the latter course is taken, this Congress will be faced with a clear-cut decision: whether to step in with a legislative remedy, or standby and watch the United States become dependent upon foreign sources of supply for lead and zinc.

Getting at the Big Shots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post pinpoints one of the strongest parts of the current Federal Government drive against organized crime; namely, that it is to be a coordinated, comprehensive campaign to round up the kingpins behind the scenes who really pull the strings.

As Attorney General Rogers has correctly pointed out, in the past such efforts to curb the big-money crooks have failed because they have been sporadic and have lacked overall cohesive direction. These shortcomings have been corrected in the present drive and prospects are bright for its success.

However, if the Government is to make this plan really effective, new laws are needed to enable the weeding out of the big shots in these nefarious interstate operations. Several bills I have already introduced, and several I now have in the drafting stage can help open the doors to the inner sanctums of the elite of the criminal world. They will provide the means whereby underlings and small-fry can be brought before grand juries and encouraged to reveal the higher ups in the operations of organized crime organizations. They deserve speedy approval by Congress if we are to do our part in helping to wipe out the power of bigtime crime in America.

Under leave previously granted, I insert at this point the editorial from the Washington Post of May 8, 1958:

PRIORITY ON RACKETEERS

Attorney General Rogers' long-range plan for uprooting major criminal elements operating in the United States holds a good deal of promise. Unlike the usual sporadic drive against criminals when public sentiment is aroused by a few sensational depredations, this movement will proceed slowly but with sustained and well-organized force. Instead of picking off the little fellows on the fringe of criminal operations, it will be aimed at the masterminds at the top. For this purpose all the information and resources available to the various Federal law-enforcement agencies are to be brought together in a sustained and intensive effort.

In many instances, Mr. Rogers points out, it is possible to identify the top racketeers who are directing lucrative criminal activities, but difficult to find evidence that would lead to their indictment. This is where the special group recently added to the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice comes into the picture. Its expert investigators will assemble all possible information on the big-money hoodlums who have carefully shielded their operations. And if the evidence does not permit their prosecution for dealing in narcotics, for theft or extortion, the investigation may show that some of them have violated the tax laws, the immigration laws, or other statutes.

The value of this procedure is that it is aimed at major sources of crime rather than its lesser instruments and victims. To assure a concentration of effort, the Attorney General has directed that priority be given to prosecuting 100 top racketeers—with due re-

gard, of course, for constitutional procedures. These leeches on our economic and social life are wisely not identified. If they can be brought to book and their rackets broken up, a substantial dent will be made in the $20 billion annual crime bill.

The Urban Renewal Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a study of the urban renewal program:

THE URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAM, MAY 2, 1958

Admittedly Dallas has need for improvement of some homes and other buildings, and perhaps whole areas. Most cities throughout the Nation have such problems. Urban renewal, the improvement of homes and neighborhoods, is approved and applauded by everyone. Many cities are now engaged in slum clearance and rehabilitation through local private and public initiative without Federal aid. The lessons to be learned from these urban renewal programs and the others, using Federal funds, are quite clear. From these lessons all can benefit.

Since Congress acts as the city council for Washington, D. C., for 3 years I have been, in effect, a councilman studying an urban renewal program in progress in Washington. In addition, we study other projects throughout the Nation as part of the housing bills.

Even earlier, I was a realtor, land developer, and builder, working in conjunction with the city, conforming to city restrictions on building and developing. I am interested in urban renewal by natural inclination and as a Member of Congress. A Member must study the effects and size of Federal expenditures to fulfill his oath to uphold the Constitution. I seriously doubt (1) the constitutionality of this law, and (2) that the Federal Government can afford urban renewal expenditure.

In Congress I observe, vote on, and report to the citizens of Dallas County the legislation considered, the Federal encroachment upon, and the violation of personal and States rights, the boondoggle and political tradeouts, the hasty and wasteful spending. My interest in Federal assistance programs was sharpened by the attack upon Dallas by a California Representative who accused Dallasites of grabbing greedily for Federal money for the fifth district. This erroneous attack was answered and laid to rest on only one test—the facts.

The facts and documentary evidence on urban renewal are here presented in several parts:

1. The Federal and State urban renewal laws.
2. Eminent domain—of the right and use.
3. The relocation problem (of people affected by urban renewal).
4. Cost and time factors.
5. A constructive plan—how to do it locally.

The question is how best to do the job. Do it we can, I am confident, in the spirit of Texas and Dallas. As our mayor said:

"Dallas' greatest resource is its people. Dallas will remain bright because of its people."

My hope is to see that job done, and done well, for our own community, even to set an example for others who face the same grave problem. Everyone in Dallas has a part, if only as taxpayer.

Those who doubt the job can be done locally might listen to Representative CHARLES VURSELL of Illinois, a member of the subcommittee responsible for urban renewal:

"Mr. Chairman, * * * what I'm questioning is the necessity of forcing the Federal Government to continue this program (urban renewal) that, in my judgment, and I believe in the judgment of most of those who understand it, never should have been started in the first instance.

"It is my judgment that the average small cities or the larger cities of the Nation generally are more able to build their own improvements than is the Federal Government, which has had to undergo the expense of financing the recent World War II, the Korean War, and now has to maintain the most expensive military force we have ever had to have in peacetime, because of world conditions, and the Russian threat of communism.

"It is unfair to extort taxes, so to speak, from millions of people who are housing themselves, and financing their own places of business, and force them to contribute to cities all over the land, hundreds of miles distant from the taxpayer.

"It is the responsibility, so to speak, of the officials in the city halls throughout the Nation, the mayors, the aldermen, the city commissioners, and the taxpayers to take care of their own community and housing needs. All cities, with the cooperation of their citizens, should take care of their own needs, and in the end will make the most progress. The citizens and public officials who turn to the Government deaden their own morale and the morale of the citizens of the community."

For those who say we must competitively get all the money back from Uncle Sam that we can, I quote President Eisenhower:

"The completely spurious argument is frequently advanced that because the Federal Government skims off so much of the valuable tax revenue, it must, as a consequence, bear more of the local expenditure. This is putting the cart before the horse. If local communities do their job, then there will be no need for additional centralized revenues for nationwide subsidies of an essentially local character; and we will avoid the certain pitfalls of extreme centralization.

"Very frankly, I firmly believe that the army of persons who urge greater and greater centralization of authority and greater and greater dependence upon the Federal Treasury are really more dangerous to our form of government than any external threat that can possibly be arrayed against us. I realize that many of the people urging such practice attempt to surround their particular proposal with fancied safeguards to protect the future freedom of the individual. My own conviction is that the very fact that they feel the need to surround their proposal with legal safeguards is in itself a cogent argument for the defeat of the proposal."

Before any referendum, I hope these matters will be carefully studied by all Dallas residents. This material is intended to be of some help.

THE LAW

The pamphlet, Federal Laws Authorizing Assistance to Slum Clearance and Urban Renewal (exhibit 2) contains the major pertinent Federal Statutes involved, including public housing (pp. 74–76) and FHA mortgage insurance for rehabilitation and construction of privately owned homes (pp. 64–73). A helpful summary is contained on the page following the table of contents. The Federal loan and capital grant program for land clearance operations (title I of the Housing Act of 1949 as amended) which would be applicable to the project under discussion in Dallas, is contained on pages 2–25.

The mechanics under the Federal law are:

1. The Federal Urban Renewal Administration, bypassing the appropriations process of Congress, lends money (currently at 3½ percent interest) to a local authority authorized to accept Federal aid to make preliminary studies (sec. 109 Federal law).

2. The URA similarly lends additional money for detailed planning of a project.

3. The URA lends large sums, to acquire by condemnation under power of eminent domain and otherwise, land and buildings now belonging to private citizens and used for their homes and businesses.

4. The local authority generally demolishes and clears all the structures from the project area.

5. The cleared land is then offered for sale, generally at tremendous loss, for reuse by other private citizens for sites for their businesses and homes.

6. The loss (the difference between what the cleared land will bring when resold, and the cost of acquisition, demolition, preparation for reuse, plus all project overhead) is made up by the taxpayers. One-third of the loss is paid by taxpayers in their local taxes, as a so-called local grant in aid (sec. 104 Federal law). The other two-thirds is paid by taxpayers in their Federal taxes.

That Federal control and dictation follow Federal aid is abundantly clear. For example, section 109 on pages 15 and 16, details instructions for wage payments according to the United States Secretary of Labor in Washington under the Davis-Bacon Act, by which local officials must abide, and from which wage setting there is no appeal, no court protection. The Secretary of Labor is prosecutor, jury, and judge.

Aids to Your Community (exhibit 3) lists the programs of the Housing and Home Finance Agency (HHFA), an attractive presentation, and explains the program more readily. The problem, planning, financing, housing for displaced families (public housing and FHA assisted private housing) and community facilities help (streets, sewers, schools, etc.) are presented. Lots of Federal aid is offered.

An HHFA News Release (exhibit 4) outlining the 7-point workable program and the Dallas Little Mexico project, gives credit to Dallas for having the Nation's first nonfederally assisted urban-renewal project. Dallas already has a tradition to maintain.

The Texas Urban Renewal Law (ch. 298, General and Special Laws of Texas, 55th Legislature, exhibit 5) is the act enabling Texas communities to participate under the Federal urban renewal law. The law became effective August 22, 1957. The eminent domain sections are quite significant (see especially sec. 10 on p. 11 of the Texas law and sec. 2 of this statement).

EMINENT DOMAIN

Private ownership of property is a basic right to be jealously guarded, as we do personal freedom. We are most aware of this when confronted with the power of eminent domain, by which law, property can be condemned and taken (see exhibit 5 sec. 10, p. 11). Basic protection is given individuals by the fifth amendment to the Constitution which says (1) "No person shall * * * be deprived of * * * property without due process of law; (2) Nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation." The Constitution thus assures protection of individuals and minorities from majority rule.

The Supreme Coure upset this protection in 1954 in reinterpreting the traditional application of eminent domain. In this case, in a district court, the owner of a department store (see exhibits 6 and 7) challenged

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the validity of the act which gives the local redevelopment authority the right to condemn property which is not substandard or slum property merely because the property is part of an overall redevelopment plan. The Supreme Court then upheld this right to take property because in its concept of public welfare "the values it represents are spiritual as well as physical, esthetic as well as monetary. It is within the power of the legislature to determine that the community should be beautiful as well as healthy, spacious as well as clean, well-balanced as well as carefully patrolled." Losing your property through eminent domain because of someone else's judgment of these values seems quite contrary to the fifth amendment. Further, this decision means that the courts, generally the final respository of the peoples' rights against arbitrary action of the legislature, are not available to those whose property is taken and destroyed for redevelopment purposes. The remedy is in the legislature which may impose whatever restrictions on redevelopment authorities it may deem necessary (see exhibit 8). So the Court seems to switch the historic roles of legislature and judiciary.

As the district court said: "We are of opinion that the Congress, in legislating for the District of Columbia, has no power to authorize the seizure by eminent domain of property for the sole purpose of redeveloping the area according to its, or its agents', judgment of what a well-developed, well-balanced neighborhood would be. This amounts to a claim on the part of the authorities for unreviewable power to seize and sell whole sections of the city."

A congressional committee then commented about the inequities and injustices involved (see exhibit 9).

The Urban Land Institute editorialized on this new Supreme Court application of eminent domain, police power, public welfare, and public purpose rather sagely, summarizing the scope of legislative determination (see exhibit 10).

Later the Richmond News Leader took A Hard Look at Redevelopment (exhibit 11) declaring: private property is losing its importance.

Very significant are the decisions of the supreme courts of Florida and Georgia, both of which declared eminent domain in urban renewal to be unconstitutional according to their respective State constitutions (exhibits 12 and 13). While George modified its constitution, the basic reasoning of the Supreme Court decision was not altogether set aside.

Finally, the statements of Marshall Heights residents demonstrate the unfairness and inequity of this application of eminent domain (see exhibit 14).

Another example which illustrates the inequities of eminent domain is provided by the Washington renewal agency which took property from one private business (Standard Oil) and transferred it to another (an auto parts dealer).

The major danger, therefore, is the taking of private property for private use.

RELOCATION AND PUBLIC HOUSING

Relocation housing is a basic requirement of the urban renewal law (exhibits 2, 3, 4). The seven part workable program (exhibit 4) requests "the city's plans for relocating families to be displaced by slum clearance." (Also see 15a.)

There are two basic types of housing available (1) private construction through FHA insured mortgages; (2) public housing, existing or new units, constructed with Federal money. The FHA help (sec. 220) is specifically designed for help whenever urban renewal is involved (see exhibit 2, pp. 64-73) or whenever any Government action results in displacing families (FHA sec. 221, see exhibits 15 and 16).

Public housing, the other alternative, may be used to relocate families, either in existing or in new housing units. The housing law of 1949 (see exhibit 2) established urban renewal as title I and public housing as title III. In practice the two are closely linked as the congressional hearings show, almost by definition.

Dallas now has 6,372 public housing units. At the national average of 30 percent yearly turnover. Dallas would have 1,900 units available per year for dislocated families as new occupants. Further, there is a remarkable connection between urban renewal and more new public housing units. The attached list shows some urban renewal projects by location and date and the new public housing units which were contracted for shortly thereafter (see exhibit 17). That this may be more than coincidental is documented by the Chattanooga case (see exhibit 18). The mayor was given assurance from insurance, banking, and real estate leaders that private enterprise stood ready to supply the necessary housing. Yet the field man of the HHFA stated that they first must file an application for 1,000 public housing units before they could qualify for urban renewal funds. (See p. 1002, congressional hearings, Appropriations Committee.) This has been variously called the entering wedge, the shoehorn, the blackjack, or the trap, whereby urban renewal is used as the entry for public housing.

Texas law prohibits the use of the redeveloped land for public housing, but this does not prevent the construction of public housing on other sites. The net result could be Dallas being forced into the position of reluctantly accepting more public housing in order to get the Federal money for urban renewal. Federal aid means Federal control. This is the lesson taught by experience. Welfare programs by Federal Government are replete with administrative determinations or decisions.

Why not have public housing? The lessons learned from approximately one-half million units do not make a pretty picture. The inherent weaknesses of public housing are sociological, economic, and political. The attached exhibits clearly state the case (19 through 31).

The Dallas public-housing figures are rather interesting (exhibit 32). The unused subsidy of $568,000 raises the question, are these units presently housing the families in direst need, for whom the projects were intended?

Some communities have already decided against public housing. Attached are the articles recounting these expressions of disapproval of public housing in other localities (see exhibits 33-39). Shreveport, La., slum property owners promised to clean up their properties (exhibit 33), a Natchez, Miss. alderman applauded the rejection of the direct dole from Government (exhibit 34), a Rockford, Ill., alderman pointed out the public housing cost more to construct than private and the newspaper declares Federal money shouldn't be taken just because it's available (exhibit 35), the High Point Enterprise editorial on Federal housing says "socialism is socialism" and Federal housing does more harm than good (exhibit 36), the South Haven, Mich., Tribune editorializes that the city commission rescued the city from a welfare project of great expense and entanglement in rejecting public housing (exhibit 37). These arguments are doubly applicable to public housing and to urban renewal with or without public housing.

There are inherent dangers in public housing unthought of by the average citizen. This is brought out by a former chairman of a housing authority himself (see exhibit 30). Further proof is seen in the fact that a number of former executive directors of public-housing authorities are now in prison, including the former directors of Houston, Galveston, Los Angeles, Contra Costa County, Calif., and others.

COST AND TIME FACTORS

Cost and time factors are most revealing in the study of urban renewal. The cost is truly fantastic, almost without limit. Practically every community throughout the Nation has older buildings. Every building ages, and some have the built-in weaknesses of faulty construction. Inspection, repair, and rehabilitation are needed.

No matter who foots the bill the cost of complete and immediate urban renewal would be prohibitive, so redevelopment and rehabilitation must be accomplished gradually. The cost must be spread equitably. And this costly program is added to a long list of existing programs of all kinds at all levels of government demanding heavy expenditures of the taxpayers' money.

The Treasury isn't just broke; it has one-fourth trillion dollars less than nothing. It is a tricky job in fiscal management just to pay current operating expenses of Government. Only the borrowing power of Government makes possible the continuation of the deadly overspending spree. Federal bills are to be paid from future revenue, gambling on the continued high income of taxpayers. Simultaneously Congress adds to the Federal spending to help the financially drained taxpayers from whom the money is taken. Any sign of local financial trouble is the signal for more Federal spending with little thought that the aid distributed must first be taken from the same people in taxes. So the burden increases. (Tax cuts could be substituted for Federal spending.)

The cost of urban renewal authorized to date approaches $2 billion (see exhibit 38). The administrative expenses are running approximately $5,730,000 a year and increasing. The public housing bonds as of March 1957 total $2,268,723,000. The yearly cost to taxpayers who must pay the principal and interest on these bonds is $193,446,405. This means that the taxpayers over the 40-year program will pay $7,737,856,200 for projects which originally cost $2.2 billion.

The Federal grant contribution to urban renewal will be two-thirds of "write-down" or loss, the difference between the resale or reuse price and the expenses of acquisition, demolition and clearing. This "write down" of two-thirds will be paid by the citizens of Dallas as Federal taxpayers and one-third by citizens of Dallas as local taxpayers. Also almost no one escapes being a taxpayer.

This slum clearance or land preparation is just the start of heavy expenses for the local community. True, if the job must be done, the cost must be borne. Yet the very costliness is all the more reason for trying to cut every corner, to exercise judgment and discrimination in how best to do the job. Other costs include the relocation housing that will be added, either privately or publicly through public housing, the latter approach again on the taxpayer. Some of the folly of governmental invasion of private enterprise may be seen in Castles in the Air (exhibit 39) applicable to public housing and urban renewal.

The fiscal danger can be shown by the fact that if communities sought all the Federal money available under existing law, there wouldn't be enough to go around, not with printing presses running ceaselessly. The competitive inducement to States and communities to seek and bid for this money postpones realistic appraisal of the facts, and heightens the potental danger of complete socialism (see exhibit 2).

The write-down or shrinkage of value which occasions the Federal loan and grant is subject to serious question in itself (exhibit 40). Why the excessive drop in value when raw land, stategically located, is cleared and ready for use. Generally, the

availability for a higher use should enhance the land values sufficiently to offset the cost. At the least, an appreciable write-down suggests some question of judgment on the part of the urban renewal authority's setting a reuse value not in conformity with the highest and best use of the land. Misuse of land is always reflected in lower value.

Another financial danger is the windfall, the heavy profit which might be made by individuals in the private development after purchase of the land. Profit in free enterprise is one thing but profit off the taxpayer is another. Existing cases (see eminent domain sec. 2) show the inequities already occurring. Would it not be possible under this law to buy up older areas, as older downtown sections, sell them under eminent domain valuations with the possibility of tidy profit, then buy them back from the urban renewal authority at a written down price, to redevelop and make a handsome profit?

The time factor of Federal urban renewal is another drawback which is unlike the Texas and Dallas spirit of performance. Even if the people of Dallas were to overlook the unconstitutional, financial, and Government administration aspects, there would be the same old story of redtape and delay. For example, local initiative built a Dallas-Fort Worth Highway in the time that Federal Government would have been preparing and signing forms. In Washington it took 7 years to get an urban renewal project underway (exhibit 41). Admittedly, this may be longer than some but the pattern is there. It just isn't the Dallas pattern of doing business. In fact, it's worth a chuckle just to think of our first citizen, Mayor Thornton, trying to put up with Federal forms, endless consultations, and bureaucratic determination from Washington. No, the Texas spirit, seen in Bob Thornton and the cut of all Dallas citizens is in performance, in get the job done—now. It's one thing for the scope of the job to slow us down; it's entirely another to be delayed by redtape.

CONSTRUCTIVE PLAN AND SUMMARY

The job of urban renewal in Dallas can be done locally, even the most skeptical must agree. The proof—the accomplishments of the people of other cities who have met and overcome terrific slum problems—without Federal aid. What other communities can do, Dallas can do. Indeed Dallas already is the pioneer, gaining nationwide recognition for the Little Mexico project, the first of its kind accomplished without Federal funds. Let's not abandon our leadership. Even without this success in our background Dallas can match or outdo the efforts of those cities listed in the Blueprint for Neighborhood Conservation (exhibit 42) as the Tale of 7 Cities, which are New Orleans, Los Angeles, Charlotte, Chicago, Cincinnati, Newark, and Kansas City. These projects here mentioned were without Federal money.

Take Charlotte, N. C., for example (exhibit 42, pp. 25–25, exhibits 43–44). As of today 12,000 residences have been rehabilitated (10,000 bathrooms were added). Two thousand buildings could not be saved and were demolished, at the owner's expense. Meanwhile the city did its part by paving 65 miles of streets, adding street lights and providing playgrounds, parks, and other needed improvements. Two thousand families were relocated in privately owned homes, rehabilitated or new. Two thousand new private housing units were built—all of this without Federal aid. Note also the financial impact with increased revenue to the city. There are expenses but urban renewal also generates revenue.

The New Orleans story is much the same, so is the Los Angeles story and the others—each without Federal aid. In fact, the cases where there was no Federal aid involved suggest that the other areas getting Federal aid could have done it on their own.

The case of Memphis, Tenn (exhibit 45), is another example of the local people—bankers, insurance men, builders, realtors, and citizens doing the job—without Federal aid, and without eminent domain. The power of eminent domain, the taking of private property, does not necessarily have to be used in urban renewal, where owners are given a chance to participate. True, they must be told to clean up, sell, or have the city clean it up at the owners' expense. The result is greatly increased property value so the owner can hardly object. Even in cases where property does not conform to the zoning requirements, the owner can be given a chance to abate the nonconformance through remodeling or removal of the building, still retaining the land ownership. The property is not taken away without his having a chance to participate.

In Gadsden, Ala., it is my understanding that no right of eminent domain was used in redeveloping a rundown area. Neither did this city have a proper housing code or proper enforcement (compared to Dallas). City teams talked to owners about rehabilitation. When the owners refused to clean up the slumlike property, the city teams went directly to the property tenants. Each tenant was asked if he wanted a new home in a nearby residential development to be built with FHA financing under section 221. When most tenants signed up the realtors, builders, mortgage men, and bankers went to work. A lovely new development was completed. The tenants moved into the new homes. The old shacks were left vacant. The owners then agreed to cooperate.

The definition of bad housing and what can be done about it is meaningful to property owners, as outlined in the pamphlet The Real Estate Man and Housing Reform (exhibit 46). Another good summary of a positive program without Federal aid is described in the Washington Star article entitled 'Realtors have a plan for better housing" (exhibit 47). Their way is neighborhood conservation carried out by private enterprise. It requires areawide, community-wide planning embracing a good housing code, proper zoning, a suitable assessment and tax structure, health and safety code with the necessary enforcement inspection. This is simply good city operation, something understood by Dallas people and their officials.

Two pamphlets put out by the chamber of commerce entitled "Urban Development Guidebook" (exhibit 48) and "City Planning and Urban Development" (exhibit 49) further outline the necessary program to accomplish urban renewal—and without Federal aid, although such aid is recognized as available. The need for private enterprise and local initiative has been rediscovered by the residents of Gary, Ind., who have offered for sale Duneland Village, a complete public housing development of 165 units (exhibit 50). Upon the sale of public housing these advantages would accrue (1) revenue from the sale would be realized, (2) stop further Federal subsidy using the taxpayers' money, (3) the property would start to pay its full share of local taxes, (4) the morale of occupants would be greatly boosted, no longer ashamed over others helping to pay the rent, (5) and no political worry over being evicted if their salary is increased.

Section 406 of the Housing Act of 1954 permits a resolution or ordinance by the city council or a referendum by the citizens to call for the liquidation of a project (see exhibit 50–51). The city would then negotiate with the Federal Government and the project will be sold by the public-housing authority to the highest bidder after public advertisement. The bonds supporting the project would be repaid and any receipts above the indebtedness would be paid to the city and Federal Treasuries.

CONCLUSION

Urban renewal is a local problem, concerning local property, and local property owners. The local citizens, as property owners and taxpayers, also foot the bill in every instance. "That government is best that is closest to the people" is no empty axiom. Our mayor and city council backed by local judgment can better solve our local problems than the distant Federal Government. Further, Federal aid weakens local government, costs more to do the same job, and violates the individuals and States rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

We shouldn't try to transfer our problems to the Federal Government for solution. The Federal Government will accept them always and try to do the job; this is the politically expedient thing to do.

In our conscientious recognition of the need for slum elimination, a view we all share, we must beware of dubious means to a very justifiable end.

The matter of Federal regulation following the use of Federal funds will no doubt continue to be misunderstood by some in Dallas, just as in Washington. So let me point out examples of controls we must accept (1) forced integration is part of public housing, so the Court has ruled, (2) the wage rates on urban renewal land clearance will be set by the Secretary of Labor, not by local people or the local economy, and there is no legal recourse from such wage predetermination. These are just two examples of imposed control.

I believe the acceptance of Federal money for purely local projects to be wrong. So I oppose this use of Federal money. Can I take any other course than to oppose what I think wrong? If, in fact, Federal aid is wrong, and those who think it is wrong fail to oppose it, what is our Nation's future?

As I see it, the truth is the job will be done locally. It is just a question of recognizing responsibility and properly labeling what must be done, and then doing it. This will require responsible property owners (and responsibility accompanies ownership); it will require a courageous mayor and city council; it will require an understanding and willing citizenry.

All these ingredients of success Dallas has, no less than any other city. We can do the job locally without Federal aid.

Hon. Emanuel Celler

SPEECH

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I am most happy to add my voice to that of the other Members in congratulations to the dean of the New York Democratic delegation, Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, on his 70th birthday.

I have been privileged to know MANNIE CELLER for more than a quarter of a century and have observed him in action in the Committee of the Judiciary and on the floor of the House, as well as in his native Brooklyn. Chairman CELLER combines many rare qualities and today at 70 is a vigorous as many men half his age.

He is known far and wide both here and abroad for his stanch support of minority groups. He has achieved an enviable reputation for his zeal in pro-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

tecting these groups. His support of small business and his implacable stand against monopolies has made him famous through the United States.

May I extend to my colleague and friend, MANNIE CELLER, my fondest wishes for many more years of service to the people of Brooklyn and of the United States, and join with the other Members in wishing him well in all that he does.

Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, we in Detroit give full credit to the people in the other areas of Michigan for their great contribution to the welfare of the State and of all the people. We share their pride as citizens of the State of Michigan. However, this does not detract one bit from the pride we feel in our city and in our part of the State, and in what Detroit itself stands for in the country and in the world.

More than that, Detroit is so varied in its activities and in the origins and interests of our people, that to understand Detroit is to understand many of the essential characteristics of our time and of the world we live in. Whether one thinks in terms of industry, commerce, or the people for whom this all goes on, Detroit is like a mirror that highlights the world around us and brings out clearly and sharply the lessons that need to be learned for the good of all.

For example, industry in Detroit highlights sharply the lesson that whatever helps or hurts an important industry anywhere in the country helps or hurts the total economy and affects what goes on in the far corners of the earth. In the minds of many people, Detroit is automobiles, and, truly, half of what is manufactured in the Detroit area has to do with automobiles. But the car that comes off the assembly lines in a Detroit automobile plant is also steel from nearby and distant mills, and ore from nearby and distant countries. Backtrack the tires on that car and you reach rubber plants in other States of the United States and rubber plantations in remote countries. And the same kind of thing is true of the millions of square feet of glass, the millions of yards of textiles and leather, and of the paint and plastics and everything else that goes into the cars that Detroit made famous.

When Detroit prospers, these places—close by and far off—prosper, too, and depression in Detroit is shared by people in these places as well. Today, the lesson of Detroit is that the productive plant of America is one plant, and neither prosperity nor depression can be isolated or quarantined.

When you follow what Detroit makes away from the factory gates, you get the same lesson in interrelatedness—both domestic and international. The drugs and chemicals produced in Detroit, like the cars, machinery and other products manufactured there, turn up in countries all over the world. They help to increase the living standards in those countries as well as to pay for what America imports from them. Put your finger on Detroit on a map of the world, and in any direction that your eye may travel, goods made in Detroit have already gone; they have become part of the complicated international trade on which America depends for many of its comforts and even for many of the essential natural resources of the world.

Detroit reminds us that economics and trade are today worldwide, and no country gets along well today without the rest of the world to help it.

But it is the people of Detroit who themselves provide the best evidence that Detroit and the world are one. Nearly every country of the world, no matter how strange its name may first have sounded to American ears, has been the old country for some group of Detroiters. Detroit has always been a kind of United Nations, with the diplomats rubbing shoulders in the factories and stores of the city instead of in conference halls and committee chambers. In Detroit, people from all over the world have learned to live and work together, trusting to their common humanity, and providing a lesson in neighborliness that all the world might copy.

The lessons which Detroit can teach sometimes make headlines, but often they do not. Often, they are common, homely lessons which may however be even more important than headlines for the long pull and for the daily lives of the people. But for those who want to learn, the lessons are clear. Detroit teaches us that the country we live in is one country and that we are prosperous and depressed together. As we trade goods with the countless cities and towns of America and of the world itself, we also trade prosperity and—unhappily—depression, too, when that is the order of the day.

As one of the Members of Congress privileged to represent the people of Detroit, I am pledged to work for that legislation which will increase the well-being of the people of Detroit, knowing that the result for America and for the rest of the world will be the same increase in well-being and in the kind of prosperity on which peace itself can be built.

Just Tell 'Em "Nyet"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, we must ever be on our guard against Communist deception and treachery. Red China seeks to have United Nations troops withdrawn from South Korea. It is our solemn duty to see that the Communists do not take over this area—our boys who died in the Korean conflict must be backed up—we cannot let future generations say that they died in vain.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial on this subject from the New York Daily News. The editorial follows:

JUST TELL 'EM "NYET"

Red China is giving another spin to an old phonograph record—the one about how the United Nations should pull all its forces (chiefly United States) out of South Korea, after which unification of the peninsula could be discussed.

This is only the latest attempt by the Peiping bandits and murderers to kid us into exposing South Korea to Red conquest, followed by unification of Korea as a Communist country. Such a retreat on our part would round out the infamy of President Truman's and Dean Acheson's refusal to let Gen. Douglas MacArthur win the Korean war, and would take another big package out of our prestige in the Far East.

Instead of answering this proposition with a mess of high-flown State Department wordage, let's just tell Peiping "Nyet"—a word which we can be sure the Kremlin's Peiping puppets will understand.

The Biggest Mistake We Could Make

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Somersworth Free Press on April 17, 1958. The editorial follows:

THE BIGGEST MISTAKE WE COULD MAKE

As Congress debates the question of President Eisenhower's mutual aid program in the weeks just ahead, we suspect that the cry will increase to cut from that program any aid to the populous Asian land of India.

The reason ostensibly will be the failure of that country to chart its course in world politics directly on a path with that of the western allies.

If, because of this display of independence by India, the meager aid to which it is now entitled from the United States is cut back, then Russia will be achieving one of her greatest victories of the cold war.

In a section of the world in which totalitarianism runs rampant, India has cast its lot with the forces of freedom. It has provided for democratic institutions and is attempting to remain free from entangling alliances with the East or West. That it continues in this position is important to the cause of freedom. The largest non-Communist nation in the world, India is rich in resources. It is in the midst of a region which is ablaze with strife and into which Russian influence has been fast moving.

A stirring, restless Asia and Africa are watching the democratic experiment in India and waiting to compare the results with those produced by the coersive forces loose in Communist China.

Should Congress cut into the comparatively nominal amount of foreign aid intended for India under the President's program, then we leave that country no recourse but to turn to Russia to accept the

financial credit its leaders are now offering. The resulting economic dependence will be a severe blow to the forces of freedom and a victory for the forces of Russian tyranny.

Mississippian Would Fight Yankee Slump With Dixie Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the March 28, 1958, edition of the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News:

HE'D FIGHT SLUMP WITH DIXIE DOLLARS—NO RECESSION IN MISSISSIPPI, SAYS MAN WHO'S MADE STUDY

(By Robert Harper)

Keep down the recession talk, Yanks; southern money will put you back in business.

That's what Bill Gupton, Hinds County farmer and regional director of a periodical circulation service seems to think. Just to prove his point, Gupton went on a buying spree through one of Jackson's largest shopping centers and spent more than $25 on items that he could use but didn't need just to help recession-ridden Yankee industries.

"The Yankees may be suffering, but we are living high on the hog so to speak," said Gupton.

Gupton's circulation service has a Chicago office. He is in charge of some 37 States, most of them in the South. He says there is no sign of recession in the places he has visited in Mississippi, Texas, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina and Florida. Especially is he impressed with the rapid growth of industries and the amount of money being spent on the Mississippi gulf coast around Pascagoula and in the Hattiesburg area where the new Pontiac Eastern oil refinery is located.

Mobile, Ala., and Pensacola, Fla., are other areas where industry is booming and housing is a problem. "The house trailer manufacturers can't meet the supply demand along the gulf coast," Gupton said.

GOOD WILL BUYING

Gupton's idea is for each person in the South to buy at least $5 worth of northern merchandise each week that may not be needed at the present, but can be used in the future.

His venture through the shopping center left him with a garbage can, antiseptic, aspirin, pliers, car wax, square rule, electrical supplies, chisel, shirt, shoes, dog meal, cosmetics, and something he probably won't get around to using for a long time, a caulking gun and weatherstripping.

Gupton said, "I always wanted a caulking gun, so I decided now was a good time to buy one."

He tried to choose something from each of the Yankee States that is suffering from a recession. Represented among the suppliers were the States of Illinois, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Indiana, New York, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Missouri, and Massachusetts. For good measure he added some imported goods from Canada and Western Germany that are received through New York customs.

Gupton, who has lived in New York, Chicago and other northern cities as well as on the west coast, says he still has friends and relatives in the North and maybe his purchases will help their business.

It may, however, cost him more than he expected. When his wife saw what he had bought, she decided to aid the Yankees, too, and now she plans to go on a shopping tour. She wants a few new clothes.

Boston Has Much To See, Much To Do

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting article on Boston, which is to be the host convention city for the National Federation of Post Office Clerks beginning August 25, 1958.

The article appeared in the official publication of the NFPOC, entitled "The Union Postal Clerk" for May 1958.

BOSTON, OUR HOST CONVENTION CITY, HAS MUCH TO SEE, MUCH TO DO

Boston is a city with a past. Down the cobblestone streets in the old section of the city, you can almost hear the clatter of hooves as Paul Revere begins his midnight ride. You look up to the tower of the Old North Church and you remember the lantern swinging there. From across the Charles River you hear the echoing roll of Redcoat drums as the military flanks form at Bunker Hill.

But Boston is a modern city, too—a city with the stimulating scents of clam chowder, lobster, and brown bread. The rattle of the subway and the sounds of business activity on Tremont Street mingle with the flutter of pigeons off the Common.

The city on the bay is a bustling city today just as it was more than 300 years ago, when it became the center of the New England colonies.

Delegates to our 30th national convention, who assemble in Boston, August 25–30, will find much to see and much to do in the host city. They can journey down the Freedom Trail, which begins on Boston Common and goes through many old historic shrines, finally ending at the river wharves and the site of the famous Boston Tea Party.

Shopping for the wives is simple and easy, as the big department stores and specialty shops are conveniently grouped on downtown Washington and Tremont Streets, not far from the headquarters hotel.

Boston's famous for seafood. First, as the country's largest fish-shipping port, it can choose the best of the catch that the cold, flavor-heightened North Atlantic waters yield. By making use of the old-fashioned Yankee cooking and handed-down recipes, Boston restaurants have developed many distinctive and taste-thrilling ways of preparing lobster, shellfish, and saltwater fish dishes.

Boston has been called the hub of New England's great vacationland. It's within easy reach of some of the country's finest winter and summer resorts. Cape Cod, for example, is only a few hours drive away. There's fresh and saltwater fishing and sailing. There's swimming at both fresh and saltwater beaches.

As for spectator sports, there's horse and dog racing, big-league baseball, major-league hockey, and basketball. In addition, the athletic teams of a dozen colleges and a hundred preparatory schools number among them several familiar to followers of the postseason football bowl games and basketball tournaments.

The city is the traditional tryout town for Broadway plays, with five legitimate theaters. There's an opera and ballet season and the famous Boston Symphony, with its outdoor Esplanade concerts along the banks of the Charles in summer. Also, local theatrical productions, summer stock theaters and countless movie theaters add to the number of places to visit. There's dancing and afterhours entertainment at many hotels and clubs.

Delegates will find the city very compact, travelwise. You can do much of your sightseeing on foot. And a single fare takes you anywhere on the MTA's surface, subway, and rapid transit lines. In addition, you'll find plenty of cabs, sightseeing bus tours, and a wide selection of cars which you can rent and drive yourself.

Travel connections with the convention city are good, no matter how you come.

By air: No major airport is nearer the business section it serves than Logan International Airport. It's only 1½ miles from downtown Boston and is easily reached via MTA or Sumner Tunnel and a super highway system. Nine airlines offer local air service and direct or connecting service to all major cities in North America.

By train: The city has direct rail connections with all other major cities in the country via three major lines.

By bus: Nationwide and regional bus routes lead to convenient terminals in the Park Square area.

By car: For those delegates who want to drive their own automobiles, Massachusetts offers many scenic attractions in the summer. Fine roads connect the city to all parts of New England.

Boston is a city of many firsts, including one significant to our own service. The first contract by the Federal Government to carry mail went to a Bostonian, Levi Pease, in 1786.

Among the other firsts are the following:

The first public school in the world supported by direct taxation was established in what is now Dorchester in 1630.

The first meeting house, with mud walls and thatched roof, was built in 1632 at what is now 27 State Street. Across the way the first stagecoach took off in 1772.

America's first industrial landmark—the Saugus Iron Works—which produced cast and wrought iron 310 years ago has been authentically recreated on the original site.

The first patent in North America for a mechanical device was granted by the General Court of Massachusetts in 1646 for a sawmill.

If you dip underground for a ride, you will be in the oldest subway in the world, except possibly the one in Budapest, Hungary. There is a longstanding dispute between the two cities over the honor. The Boston subway was opened in September 1897.

There are many surprises for visitors to the city. Delegates to the convention will find things to see and do during recesses between business sessions. It's only a few minutes from the hotel each evening to some outstanding eating or entertainment spot.

Now Is the Time To Act for the Good of Retired Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the two bills—S. 72 and H. R. 607—to provide

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

additional benefits for retired civil-service employees have passed their respective bodies of Congress. A conference has been requested and a committee appointed. It is my sincere hope that the conferees can speedily reach an agreement on which we can act and which the President will approve.

I am one of the introducers of legislation intended to help these deserving people. I feel that liberal legislation is deserved in this case and I believe the provisions of my bill H. R. 943 would have been of great assistance to those it was intended to benefit. The important thing, however, is to complete the enactment of legislation so that a uniform program based on modern costs of living will be in effect.

All of this legislation was designed, in large measure, to provide additional retirement benefits to meet the increased cost of living for those who retired prior to October 1956. Those who retire on and after October 1, 1956, receive substantially greater annuities than those who retired prior to October 1956. Such discrimination should be corrected.

I trust that the bill will be reported out soon; that it will retain, to a substantial degree, the provisions of S. 72, so richly deserved and sorely needed by many of our faithful former Federal civil service employees. They are now existing on a fixed income which, in many cases, is wholly inadequate.

The Growth in Management Science and Its Impact on Management-Worker Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a speech made by Louis Hollander, president of the New York State CIO Council, and vice president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, before the American Management Association on April 30, 1958, at Saranac Lake, N. Y.

His remarks follow:

THE GROWTH IN MANAGEMENT SCIENCE AND ITS IMPACT ON MANAGEMENT-WORKER RELATIONS

It is rather unique for a trade union leader to be invited before a managerial gathering such as this, and I wish to pay a tribute to the sponsors for their enterprise and courage. Labor and management have not always seen eye to eye, and regrettably, there are large areas still in American industry where the American labor unions are not accepted as part of the community, nor as a full-fledged participant in industrial democracy.

Those of you who have not yet dealt with organized labor or labor leaders probably regard us as strange creatures wearing horns or breathing fire. I have to destroy this image, because I know these men, and speaking modestly, consider myself one of them. I have had the occasion to meet with various representatives of labor every day of my adult life, and have found them to be on the whole reasonable men concerned with the welfare of their neighbors and their friends and their families, as patriotic as the next man, and concerned with the welfare and security of the thousands and millions of men and women whose interests they are sworn to protect.

ART OF HUMAN RELATIONS

My subject today is not the responsibility of trade unions. I could speak on that subject at considerable length without a single note, but you have been good enough to invite me to speak on the growth in management science and its impact on management-worker relations. I think this is an important subject. I wish you had added to the words "management science" the words "management responsibility." I shall therefore, in discussing this subject, refer with your permission, to management responsibility and management-worker relations, as well as to management science.

There is no easy short cut in these relations. There are simple rules that will automatically insure labor-management peace, or a greater concern between the two parties at the collective bargaining table for each other's rights and equities. But there are certain fundamental principles that we might profitably examine here today.

UNIONS ARE HERE TO STAY

A first basis for good industrial relations is a full recognition by management of the existence, the validity and the positive values that are inherent in trade unionism. Management must accept trade unions as an essential and desirable part of the basic economic and social structure of our free society.

And it must also accept the fact that the clock cannot be turned back to the time of the first industrial revolution in the 19th century, when the new technology came into being and when enormous progress in the production of wealth marched side by side with widespread poverty, insecurity, unrest, and hardship.

We fought our way out of the dark jungle. From an unorganized and helpless segment of our population, labor became a built-in guaranty of security for America, and one of the basic foundations of democracy. We are today stronger than ever in our history in terms of membership, in benefits won through collective bargaining, in solidarity in our ranks, and in the contributions we have made and still make to the progress and welfare of the whole Nation. In short, labor unions are here to stay.

NEW DIMENSIONS OF RESPONSIBILITY

Management must recognize the changes that have taken place in the social and economic life of America. In fact, it has been part of the change itself. Consider how management's role in our society has changed since the early history of corporate life, since the early days of the Hills, the Harrimans, the Morgans, the Vanderbilts. All that was expected of the management of a corporation then was that it should do a good job for the stockholders. Free enterprise was an end in itself, one that justified every kind of means.

Industry was merely an instrument of exclusive and unique self-advantage. This still remains the responsibility of corporate management, but a new dimension has been added. It might be called the social dimension. Management has had to assume social and economic responsibilities to the workers, to the consumers, and to the community. Business can no longer act as it pleases. It has to conduct its affairs so that it conforms to the public interest. It has to realize that it has become a full-fledged citizen of the community, with responsibility toward the welfare of the community.

But has business responded fully to these demands of modern industrial society? Has it fully recognized its new community citizenship? Has the new management philosophy found its way into the actual operations of much of American business? I am afraid that there are huge areas where the answer to these questions will be in the negative. I am referring, of course, first of all to the disturbing problem of the growing concentration of economic power in our national economy, and the significance of this development for those involved in managerial functions.

IN THE GRIP OF GIANT MONOPOLIES

The giant corporations have become private governments. They are already in the moppingup stage throughout the country wiping out small businesses by the tens of thousands.

Their decisions influence the size and distribution of the national product, and the levels of employment and purchasing power of the workers. In effect, in fixing prices, they levy taxes on the consumer. In addition, they squeeze out competitors, divide the market, keep profits high, and determine production volume. There is a definite divorce of ownership and control, and it is difficult to know where to place corporate responsibility at all.

As the editors of Fortune put it, the control of the typical big corporation is now in the hands of managers who do not own it, and its ownership is in the hands of stockholders who do not influence its behavior.

Nobody knows any more who hires whom, whether it is ownership that hires management, or management that hires capital. And nobody knows to whom the manager is responsible. But he manages just the same. He manages not only production and distribution, but also the owners themselves—in most cases the stockholders—who have nothing to say as to how the corporation shall be run, nor how it shall handle its labor-management relations.

The classic Berle-Means study on this subject shows that only in 5 percent of the largest corporations is the control in the hands of the stockholders who held a majority of the stock, while for the other 95 percent, the control is in the hands of a small group of men representing either a management group, holding company, or a bloc of minority stockholders.

This trend toward a monster type of business, and the development of the present-day managerial system make for totalitarianism in industry and threaten the extinction of the private enterprise system in the sense in which it was known less than half a century ago. Absentee ownership characterizes this profound development in American industry.

Corporate wealth is so concentrated that half of all American manufacturing is controlled outright by about 150 corporations. About two-thirds of the productive assets of the United States, excluding agriculture, are owned by not more than 500 corporations. Mind you, 500 out of 325,000 manufacturing companies. To only one-half of 1 percent of the manufacturing corporations of the United States went 57 percent of the sales, in dollar value, of all manufacturing corporations, leaving only 43 percent for all the rest—large, small, or medium in size. As Professor Berle points out in his most recent study of the Fund for the Republic, these 500 corporations represent a concentration of power over our economy which makes the medieval feudal system look like a Sunday school picnic.

The tendency toward concentration in industry contains within it the seeds of great danger. We are confronted with economic forces at work in our country today, which

I fear are setting up within the framework of democratic government an invisible government which I am inclined to call the corporate state, or even the monopolistic state. I think you will admit that whenever we get into such a situation that monopoly has its hands around the economic throat of America, then we will have economic totalitarianism controlling our economic life. And if economic totalitarianism should ever control the economic life of our country, we would discover that it also controls the Government, because after all our political and economic life are inseparable.

There must be economic democracy as well as political democracy if the people are to have economic and political freedom. I think history—and very recent history at that—will show that loss of political freedom follows loss of economic freedom as certainly as night follows day. We have seen this in Communist Russia and its satellites. And now we see it extending to the Middle East and Far East. And don't say that it could not happen in the United States.

The impact of giant business on management-labor relations can never be overemphasized. Big business became the major employer of millions of production workers who process, handle, and haul the commodities produced by big business. Sixty percent of the total labor force employed in manufacturing and mining is on the payrolls of 500 largest United States industrial corporations. Roughly 1 person in every 7 gainfully employed in our country depends upon the automobile industry, directly or indirectly, for a livelihood—and mind you, this is the same automobile industry that shows the heaviest monopoly concentration. These scores of millions of workers and their families feel the whole impact of the corporate ideology, and it is expressed today by modern managerial bureaucracy.

I think the problems posed by the economic giants in our country, and by the growing concentration of economic power in a few hands, must be frankly confronted and resolved. One of the great Communist propaganda arguments is that corporate concentrations in our private enterprise system become ripe plums for the Communist bureaucrats to shake off the tree. Obviously American industry has the same stake in democracy as its employees. Long ago the American trade unions taught that freedom without bread is a mockery—and bread without freedom is slavery. American corporate enterprise must understand that democracy, a decent standard of living, security and a hope for the future are indivisible. Their employees share these aspirations. They are not robots, not just so and so many units of production. They are not hands, as they were regarded before the advent of trade unions. They are whole human beings, with pride in their skills, with a lively concern for their children and for their future.

Collective bargaining is the only way devised by the mind of man in our industrial system for protecting, safeguarding, and cherishing these imperishable dreams of American men and women who work for a living. Collective bargaining may not be perfect, but a better system has not yet been devised. Industry for years tried paternalism, benevolent feudalism, and worse, in an attempt to solve employer-employee problems. These outmoded methods failed, because they did not recognize the essential human dignity of the worker.

THE THREE-LEGGED STOOL OF AMERICAN INDUSTRY

The growth of management responsibility can be gaged only by a commensurate growth in labor-management relations. Only full recognition of this new dimension of management's responsibility can bring proper balance into labor-management relations. You are all probably familiar with a favorite device of conservative economists. They picture American industry as a 3-legged stool, with management as 1 leg, the machine another, and the third leg, labor.

Fair enough, but all too often in the collective bargaining process, some men of management act as though the management and machine legs were twice as high as that of labor, and that the leg that represents labor must be cut down. Needless to say, we do not like such a view of the elements that make up industry. Machinery is not more important than labor. There is, in fact, a partnership between the worker and the machine.

Together they produce all of this world's goods. Without the worker the machine would be a monster uncontrolled. Without the machine, the worker would be chained to backbreaking manual labor of primitive times.

I have asked management to understand and appreciate this partnership between the workers and the machine. When machines were first introduced on a large scale in industrial England a little over 100 years ago, the workers revolted and smashed the machines. In their desperation they felt that the machine would replace them, and that it would undermine still further their already low wages and living standards.

The modern worker, protected by his labor union and the safeguards of collective bargaining, does not fear the machine. He does not fear automation. He says, and I think quite properly, that he wishes to share in the benefits of the new machine of automation. If with his help and his supervision the machine produces more, he would like a fair share of this increased product. He is a consumer as well as a worker. Most usually his only source of income is wages. He would like to buy back, for himself and his family, an important part of the product he produces, whether it is an automobile or a home, a television set or a refrigerator, or anything else. He would like to share in the medical care and the health benefits which his work makes possible for others. He would like his children to share in education opportunities—yes; including higher education in the colleges and universities of this land.

We think all of this is quite reasonable. We think, as a matter of fact, that should industry help meet these objectives of its employees, it will make for a prosperous and peaceful land. Communism would not have the slightest appeal to the lowliest of these workers. And capitalism would be more certain of survival under such an economy of abundance, than under an economy of scarcity. An economy of abundance makes for more and bigger profits as well as for more wages and a higher standard of living.

I am not an economist; I am a trade unionist with no formal professional education. But I do know that the most prosperous eras we enjoyed in this country were those in which wages were comparatively high, prices moderate and our industrial workers as well as our farmers had substantial purchasing power.

AUTOMATION

Automation is very much in the news, and some of the unions operating in those industries where it is being rapidly introduced on a large scale are showing a proper concern about its effects. Automation can reduce the hours of labor as well as its back-breaking toil. It can and does increase our productive wealth. It ought to be able to develop true leisure for workers everywhere, so they can devote more time to their families, their children, to education and recreation. Certainly automation is not to be used just to reduce the labor force. Remember, machines may produce, but they cannot purchase or consume.

What we in the trade unions say is this: Throw proper safeguards around automation the way you would around the moving parts of a machine, that if exposed would threaten the life or limb of the operator. We say that if a worker is displaced by a machine, retrain him or relocate him, so that he can continue to earn a living for himself and his family. Whether he is displaced by a machine or not, he and his family still remain part of the American consuming public. They must continue to eat, wear clothes, live under a roof, and meet other necessities of life from their only source of income, which is wages. Industry objects to the so-called welfare state, and labor objects to it, too—if by welfare you mean charity, handouts, breadlines, or staggering relief rolls.

It is part of the managerial responsibility especially if it prides itself on its scientific growth, to see to it that whatever progress it makes in terms of increased efficiency, the development of new machines, the discovery of new processes and so forth, are reflected in terms of the health and security of the labor force.

STATESMANSHIP IN PROFIT AND PRICE POLICY

Profit and price policy is another area where more responsibility and more statesmanship on the side of management is necessary. The profit motive in business is essential. It is natural and certainly not harmful. Any man who puts his money into a business certainly has a right to a reasonable return on it. But he has a duty, also, not to place his profit above the common good of the community, or at the expense of the life of someone else. What is to determine an honest profit? That is hard to say, but there are a few negative norms that can be applied to gage the justice of profit. Profits accrued through manipulation of the market, or by a conspiracy with competitors to cheat the consumer by unfair prices, by adulterated products or deceptive advertising, by unwarranted executive salaries and and bonuses that deprive the workers of their just wages—all these and similar gimmicks in common use nowadays cannot be considered legitimate means of profitmaking. And these are certainly not just theoretical examples of business misbehavior, but harsh facts of life.

It is a fact that the United States is already dangerously far gone into recession. Every day newspapers report an ever-increasing number of basic industries that are cutting back production with resulting increases in unemployment. For instance, the steel industry was reported operating at 53 percent of capacity, and the great automotive industry at 60 percent. One-third of the major industrial centers have been designated as areas of substantial unemployment. According to official statistics, unemployment has already reached 5,200,000. We in the labor movement say unemployment has reached more than 6 million.

It has been obvious to many for a long time that the kind of inflation we are experiencing is rather unique, in the sense that prices have gone higher in a period of falling production and demand. The concentration of power in the hands of supercolossal corporations has permitted them to ignore the usual operations of supply and demand and achieve fantastic profits by gouging the buying public through round after round of excessive and even needless price increases. They raised prices without regard as to whether production was high or low, whether supply exceeded demand or the demand exceeded supply, whether costs went up or down. In fact, they raised prices at any and all times, motivated by one reason only, that is, to maximize profits at the highest possible level. At the same time a calculated attempt was made to obscure the issue and place before the public a scapegoat, organized labor, as the factor responsible for price increases.

But the truth, as it has been so clearly demonstrated in one study after another, in

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

one congressional report after another, is that it is management's price policies and its greed for bigger and bigger profits that have caused sky-high prices, rather than the efforts of workers to catch up with zooming cost of living.

In the 2 years between 1954 and 1956, profits went up 36 percent for manufacturing industries, while manufacturing wages went up only 7 percent in the same period.

Industry could thus have easily absorbed the wage increase, cut prices substantially, and could still have received a high return on its investment. As Prof. Paul Craig, of Ohio University, points out in his most recent study of wages, prices and productivity for the years 1947–56, labor costs per unit of output rose 5.2 percent, while prices rose 28.2 percent. His study also showed that more than two-thirds of the price increases took place in a period when labor costs were declining. In summarizing his study, Dr. Craig wrote: "The rise in real labor costs accounts for less than one-fifth of the price rise for the decade. It is quite clear that prices are related much more closely to what the traffic will bear than to labor costs."

Saying that prices are related more closely to what the traffic will bear is a nice polite way of saying that industry charges whatever it thinks it can get away with. But how can management get away with billions of dollars worth of plant and equipment lying idle and unproductive, while so many people, because of today's inflated prices, lack the purchasing power to buy the goods already produced? How will management make good for the 6-million-member army of the unemployed denied the means of providing for themselves and their families? And how can it reconcile with the public interest the practice of fabulous bonuses to company executives, ranging from the poorest $249,800 at Chrysler to $575,000 at General Motors, paid to single individuals even in years when hundreds of thousands of workers suffered weeks and months of layoffs, layoffs that brought hardship and suffering to workers' families, and imposed heavy burdens of welfare costs on communities. Should perhaps this price and bonus policy be an example of good corporate citizenship about which we read so much and so often in business magazines?

INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY—ULTIMATE GOAL

I think this monopoly control which giant business has exercised, and which has affected to such a terrifying extent employment and prices, places a much greater obligation on management to provide jobs by maximum production than is ordinarily realized. Full employment wherever possible has become a necessity of present-day society. It is the common and mutual obligation weighing on the conscience of each of us. Management has the duty to cooperate with labor for as complete and correct a solution of this basic problem of full employment as possible.

Only through the awakening of the corporate conscience, with full cooperation between management and labor, and an expanded collective bargaining process, can we build a form of American industrial democracy that will be a credit to our traditional concepts of fair play and decency.

If there is one lesson I can leave with you, and I do not talk like a professor but like a trade unionist, it is that the managerial corps of America must preserve the most precious thing in our life—democracy—and especially in the domain in which they are called upon to operate—democracy in industry. By encouraging and preserving democracy, management will preserve itself.

Management will thereby make its contribution to a way of life unequalled since the dawn of history. The future can be boundless. They, together with their workers, will be able to explore the furthest reaches of nature's bounty, coupled with man's inventions and his skills. There will be no limit to what we could do jointly.

In conclusion, let me leave this message with you. Respect your workers, and recognize their rights. Whether you are in a plant with 100 or 100,000 workers, remember they help to make up our communities; therefore when they prosper, the community prospers. The community reflects the well-being of its people. We cannot preach democracy the world over, unless we practice democracy ourselves.

I thank you for this opportunity of talking to you today.

Proof Germany Financed Lenin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, at the specific request of one of my constituents, Mr. Julius Epstein, of 92–40 Queens Boulevard, Rego Park, Long Island, N. Y., I am inserting, herewith, an article by Mr. Epstein, which appeared in the April issue of the National Republic:

PROOF GERMANY FINANCED LENIN

(By Julius Epstein)

It was early in 1945, when the British troops, stationed in Germany, discovered the greatest wealth of top secret German documents ever to be found. The documents found by the British in five different castles in the Harz, belonged to the archives of the German Foreign Office, the "Auswaertiges Amt" or simply "Wilhelmstrausse." They covered the period of German foreign policy from 1867 to 1920. This half century includes the Bismarck era, the Hohenzollern Reich and the first 3 years of the Weimar Republic. Never in history has one nation got access to the innermost secrets of a defeated enemy on such a scale.

The fact that the German Foreign Office documents fell into the hands of the British instead of the Soviets, who were the first to occupy Berlin, is primarily due to Dr. Johannes Ulirich, who was archivist in von Ribbentrop's Foreign Office. It was Dr. Ulirich's antinazism, imagination, and initiative which let him plan the excavation of the Foreign Office documents as early as 1943. To suggest evacuation of the documents at that time was enough to be looked at by the top Nazis as a defeatist who had obviously lost faith in a Nazi victory. Realizing that danger, Dr. Ulirich had to proceed with greatest care and secrecy. One day, the drama of the rescue of the greatest treasure ever to fall into the hands of future historians will be written with all its innumerable progress, retrogression and agonies, and its ultimate triumph. For the purpose of this article, suffice it just to notice the unprecedented deed of Dr. Ulirich who is today still legation councilor—the rank he held 20 years ago—in the Bonn Foreign Office. Whenever a German Foreign Office official recommended himself to promotion and a high decoration for an action of greatest importance, it is Dr. Johannes Ulirich who paid for his courage with 10 years in Siberian slave labor camps; he was arrested in Berlin by the Russians who knew very well that he was responsible for the rescue of the German state papers from Soviet hands.

I had the privilege to meet Dr. Ulirich in Bonn in his capacity as director of the political archives of the Foreign Office. Through his courtesy I was able to study hundreds of original documents, now being returned by the British. Before that, I had studied thousands of microfilmed German "Wilhelmstrasse" documents in the National Archives in Washington as well as originals in the British Foreign Office in London.

The following documents—most of them herewith published for the first time—deal with two historical aspects of great importance: With the role of the Austrian Foreign Minister Count Berchtold as instigator of World War I and with the financial support the Imperial German Government gave to Lenin in the years of 1917 and 1918. Without exaggeration it can be said that it is hardly thinkable that Lenin would ever have succeeded without the Kaiser's millions. While this has been known for a long time—in fact since 1917—only now it can be proved beyond the shadow of any doubt by official German Government documents. The Bolshevists from Lenin to Khrushchev have, of course, always most energentically denied what now evolves as a historical fact completely documented by the German state papers.

The following three telegrams signed by von Tschirschky, who was the German Ambassador in Vienna in 1914 and by the Legation Councilior Stollberg, prove once and for all the mala fide shown by the Austrian Government in 1914. These telegrams—published for the first time—are documentary proof that the Austrian Foreign Minister, Count Berchtold wanted war and not peace; he wanted the war against Serbia although he knew perfectly well that such a war could not have been restricted to the Austrian-Serbian frontier or even to the Balkans, but would spread into a world war.

The text of the three telegrams follows:

1

VIENNA, *July 8, 1914.*

The IMPERIAL AMBASSADOR TO THE AUSWAERTIGES AMT.:

Count Berchtold expressed the opinion that if the Kaiser (Franz Joseph I) should approve the idea of claims against Serbia, he (Berchtold) would advise his Majesty that the demands should be of such character that their acceptance would appear impossible.

Count Berchtold also remarked in strictest secrecy that according to Frh. Conrad von Hoetzendorf (the Austrian Chief of the General Staff of the Army) 16 days would be needed for the completion of the mobilization.

TSCHIRSCHKY.

2

VIENNA, *July 11, 1914.*

The IMPERIAL AMBASSADOR TO THE AUSWAERTIGES AMT.:

Count Berchtold just related the following concerning his audience with His Majesty, Emperor Franz Joseph in Ischl: The deadline for the response (to the Austrian ultimatum) should be the shortest possible, certainly not more than 48 hours. However, even such a short time would be enough for Belgrade to receive instructions from Petersburg. Should the Serbs accept all demands made of them, Berchtold would not like it. Therefore, he is still pondering what kind of demands could be made, demands which would make acceptance by the Serbs a complete impossibility.

TSCHIRSCHKY.

3

IMPERIAL GERMAN EMBASSY,
Vienna, July 17, 1914.

To the AUSWAERTIGES AMT.:

Count Berchtold let it be understood that he was hoping that Serbia would not accept the demands of Austria-Hungary, since a mere diplomatic success would only create

again a weak mood in this country, a mood which one could not use at all.

STOLLBERG.

To Bethman-Hollweg (Imperial Chancellor of the German Reich).

* * * * * *

The next eight documents prove that the Germans did not only lavishly support Lenin in his struggle for power, that they did not just want a separate peace which they got at Brest-Litovsk, in order to throw their 70 divisions from the east to the west, but that they wanted more: a real alliance, a friendship pact with the Bolshevists.

1

HEADQUARTERS OF THE ARMY,
November 29, 1917.

To the SECRETARY OF STATE (KUEHLMANN):

His Majesty (Kaiser Wilhelm II) requests your Excellency—in case we should have in the foreseeable future peace negotiations with Russia—to try if we could not conclude some kind of alliance or friendship pact. Perhaps that would be easier to achieve than we think, just as it was after the Russian-Japanese war. His Majesty has already convinced the Supreme Command of the Army of the necessity to start the operation of the Russian railroads and to put for that purpose the railroad experts of the General Staff at the disposal of the administration. The Emperor also expressed his hope that we will establish later on commercial relations with Russia.

LERSNER.

2

(The following document is by far the most important one as far as the great German financial contributions to Lenin are concerned. It is a memorandum written by Baron von Kuehlmann, German Foreign Minister in 1917. The memorandum is addressed to the Kaiser. The Kuehlmann memorandum—herewith published for the first time in the United States—is, of course, a historical source of the first order. Not only because this document is the ultimate proof for the imperial Government's assistance to Lenin, but also because it so clearly outlines the later German attitude toward the Soviets.

(The implementation of Kuehlmann's policy in regard to Russia was carried out not only by the Kaiser's government when it still was hoping to be victorious in World War I, but also by its successors after Germany's crushing defeat, the governments of the Wiemar Republic.

(The statesmen who carried out that policy of raprochement to the Soviets were then the German Chancellor Dr. Joseph Wirth, his Foreign Minister Dr. Walter Rathenau, and the creator of the Weimar Republic's Reichswehr, Gen. Hans von Seeckt. How successfully they circumvented the Treaty of Versailles is a matter of history. The same policy resulted 20 years later in the Stalin-Hitler pact. The Kuehlmann memorandum proves to the hilt that this policy of a German-Russian alliance, irrespective of the political and social regime prevailing in Russia, was a most popular one, at least since Tauroggen. Tauroggen is the Prussian town where on December 30, 1812, Count York von Wartenburg and General Clausewitz, the genius of German strategy, concluded the convention of Tauroggen, whereby Prussia declared its neutrality in the French-Russian war and the Czarist forces were allowed to occupy unopposed East Prussia. As a result of Tauroggen, Prussia declared war on Napoleon on March 17, 1813. The specter of Tauroggen may well again become a menace to the free world, if the present Chancellor of the Bonn Republic, Dr. Adenauer, should ever be defeated by his Social-Democrat opponents.)

The complete text of Kuehlmann's memorandum as well as of the German Emperor's answer read as follows:

BERLIN, *December 3, 1917.*

The disruption of the Entente and the subsequent creation of political combinations agreeable to us constitute the most important war aim of our diplomacy. Russia appeared to me to be the weakest link in the enemy's chain. The task therefore was gradually to loosen it and, when possible to remove it. This was the purpose of the subversive activity we caused to be carried out in Russia behind the front—in the first place vigorous promotion of separatist tendencies and support of the Bolsheviki. It was not until the Bolsheviki had received from us a steady flow of funds through various channels and under varying labels that they were in a position to be able to build up their main organ, Pravda, to conduct energetic propaganda and appreciably to extend the originally narrow basis of their party. The Bolsheviki have now come into power; how long they will retain power cannot yet be foreseen. They need peace in order to strengthen their own position; on the other hand it is entirely in our own interest that we should exploit the period while they are in power, which may be a short one, in order to attain, firstly, an armistice and then, if possible, peace. The conclusion of a separate peace would mean the achievement of the desired war aim, namely, a breach between Russia and her allies. The amount of tension necessarily caused by such a breach would determine the degree of Russia's dependence on Germany and her future relations with us. Once cast out and cast off by her former allies, abandoned financially, Russia will be forced to seek our support. We shall be able to provide help for Russia in various ways; firstly, in the rehabilitation of the railroads (I have in mind a German-Russian commission—under our control—which would undertake the rational and coordinated exploitation of the railroad lines so as to insure speedy resumption of freight movement) then the provision of a substantial loan, which Russia requires to maintain her state machine. This could take the form of an advance on the security of grain, raw materials, etc., etc., to be provided by Russia and shipped under the control of the abovementioned commission. Aid on such a basis—the scope to be increased as and when necessary—would in my opinion bring about a growing rapprochement between the two countries.

Austria-Hungary will regard the rapprochement with distrust and not without apprehension. I would interpret the excessive eagerness of Count Czernin to come to terms with the Russians as a desire to forestall us and to prevent Germany and Russia arriving at an intimate relationship inconvenient to the Danube monarchy. There is no need for us to compete for Russia's good will. We are strong enough to wait with equanimity; we are in a far better position than Austria-Hungary to offer Russia what she needs for the reconstruction of her State. I view future developments in the east with confidence but I think it expedient for the time being to maintain a certain reserve in our attitude to the Austro-Hungarian Government in all matters including the Polish question which concern both monarchies so as to preserve a free hand for all eventualities.

The above-mentioned considerations lie, I venture to believe, within the framework of the directives given me by His Majesty. I request you to report to His Majesty accordingly and to transmit to me by telegram the all-highest instructions.

St. S. (STATE SECRETARY).
K. (KUEHLMANN).

3

Emperor Wilhelm's response to Kuehlmann's memorandum arrived the very next day. It was signed by Baron Van Gruenau, the liaison officer at General Headquarters. It is the following document (A. S. 4607):

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS,
December 4, 1917.

THE IMPERIAL LEGATION COUNCILLOR AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE:

(Decypher)

With reference to your telegram No. 1925 A. S. 4486. His Majesty the Kaiser has expressed his agreement with your Excellency's exposé concerning a possible rapprochement with Russia.

GRUNEAU.

4

Moscow, *June 3, 1918.*

THE IMPERIAL AMBASSADOR TO THE AUSWAERTIGES AMT.:

In view of strong competition by the Entente about 3 million marks per month necessary. In case of perhaps unavoidable change of our political line, we'll have to reckon with an increased requirement.

MIRBACH.

(Count Mirbach was at that time German ambassador in Moscow; he was later assassinated.)

5

June 5, 1918: Notes for the Secretary of State's conference with Count Roedern.

During the latest attempts of the Entente in Russia to persuade the Soviet of the workers' delegates to adopt the demands of the Entente, demands which would certainly result in Russia's pro-Entente orientation, Count Mirbach was compelled to spend large amounts in order to prevent such resolutions.

He succeeded for the time being in preventing the Bolsheviki from switching to the side of the Entente. However, every day may well bring new surprises.

As Count Mirbach has reported, he now needs each month 3 million marks for expenses in that connection. But it must be anticipated that in the case of any change the double amount would be necessary.

6

Plan for the support of the Russian (Bolshevik) press.

Moscow, *June 17, 1918.*

To the Auswaertiges Amt.:

The whole operation (the financial support of the Russian Bolshevist press) can be carried out with a capital of 200 million marks.

7

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Berlin, June 17, 1918.

Under chapter 6, section II, concerning the expenses of the extraordinary budget, 40 million marks are being appropriated.

JAAN.

8

The Imperial Ambassador in Moscow to the Auswaertiges Amt, August 2, 1918:

In accordance with the secret degree 205 of June 29.

I beg to pay 6 million marks (3 for July and 3 for August) to the Reichsbank which should empower Mr. Deluerant in Petersburg to deposit the countervalue at my disposal on the banking accounts of the Consulates General in Petersburg and Moscow. Mr. Deleurant has been informed.

HELFFERICH.

(Mr. Helfferich was the successor to Count Mirbach as German Ambassador in Moscow.)

Picasso's Latest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is utterly amazing, fantastic,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and unbelievable when we see what some people call art. The Washington Evening Star in the following editorial expresses concern over the painting by Picasso on the walls of UNESCO headquarters in Paris. Since no one seems to know what Picasso is trying to portray, maybe it is his political philosophy and political affiliations which, too, is difficult to understand. The Congress should examine more closely some of the activities of international organizations before supporting them with American money:

PICASSO'S LATEST

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 7, 1958]

Although the avant garde may be outraged, there will be a vast and overwhelming amount of agreement with Sir Charles Wheeler's blunt criticism of the big fresco Pablo Picasso has painted for the Paris headquarters of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. Sir Charles, a noted sculptor and head of the British Royal Academy of Arts, has looked closely at photographs of the work, and he has concluded that it amounts to "nonsense—800 square feet of absurdity." This may seem to be a harsh commentary on so massive an effort, but we ourselves have seen some news pictures of the thing, and we must say that it baffles and repels us. According to those who profess to understand it, it is a splendid composition made up of a butterfly skeleton, a woman in white, and a few other unrecognizable figures, and it depicts the dark forces of evil being vanquished by the forces of light. As for Picasso himself, he is reported to have said that it actually has no meaning that can be expressed in words. That's certainly unclear enough. The most unintelligible thing about this business, however, is why UNESCO couldn't have thought up something better to spend its money on.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 4, 1958, the Federation of Polish Organizations, of Elizabeth, N. J., sponsored and arranged a most impressive celebration of Polish Constitution Day.

More than 400 people attended the interesting and colorful affair at Polish Falcons Hall in Elizabeth. I believe that a detailed summary of the commemoration would be of interest to many of our colleagues.

The color guard for the program included: The Legion of Polish-American Veterans, Post No. 91, and the Ladies' Auxiliary; Polish Army Veterans, Post No. 57, and the Ladies' Auxiliary; Polish-American Army Veterans Club of Joseph Pilsudski; and the Polish Combatants, Circle No. 6, of Elizabeth.

Commissioner of Health Jacob W. Krowicki, president of the Elizabeth Federation of Polish Organizations, delivered the opening address.

Master of ceremonies for the day was Mr. Stanley Pelkowski, chairman of the Polish Constitution Day Committee.

Mrs. Amilia Wozniak sang the national anthems of Poland and the United States.

The Reverend John Pietrzykowski delivered the invocation, substituting for the Reverend Joseph Smolen, pastor of St. Adalbert's Church and chaplain of the federation.

Members of the Polish Immigration Club, under the direction of Mr. Stanley Nimczyk, president, performed Post-War Portrayal, depicting Miss Theresa Pluta as Poland with chains on her hands and Adam Jodlowski at her feet as a fallen soldier.

The Honorable Steven J. Bercik, mayor of Elizabeth, delivered an address.

Several Polish songs were sung by St. Cecilia's Choir of St. Adalbert's Church under the direction of Prof. Albert Wozniak.

A recitation, entitled "Jankiel's Concert," was given by members of the Polish Youth Circle, and the champagne music of Mr. Mikolajczak's orchestra was enjoyed.

Attorney Leo B. Wojcik, past president of the federation, also addressed the gathering.

Garland No. 408, of St. Elizabeth's Society, Group No. 793, Polish Women's Alliance, presented Polish dances entitled "Polka Belongs to Me" and "The Mountaineers," under the direction of Mrs. Antoinette Bialkowska. Miss Michelle Zielasko danced a ballet.

Mr. Walter Zachariasiewicz, executive secretary of the Polish Immigration Committee of New York, and vice president of the Polonia Congress, address the celebration.

Boy and Girl Scouts recited The Marriage of the Flags, American and Polish.

The benediction was offered by the Reverend Joseph Sapeta, of St. Hedwig's Church. The closing was marked by the singing of the Polish National Hymn, Nie Rzucim Ziemi, by the entire group.

In addition to Mr. Pelkowski, chairman of the Constitution Day Committee, other members included: Mrs. Mary Machos, vice chairman; Mrs. Marion Wedzilowicz, secretary; and Mr. Jacob Krowicki, Mr. Karl Lenard, Mr. Adam Zbikowski, Mr. Bronislaus Slowinski, Mr. Thaddeus Trzcinski, Mr. Stanley Niemczyk, Mr. Walter Kaczmarski, Mr. Joseph Hoynowski, Mr. Albert Sieratowicz, Mr. Thaddeus Gora, Mr. Victor Davidowicz, Attorney John T. Soja, Mrs. Jean Krok, Mrs. Stella Zajack, Mrs. Grace Sniezek, Mrs. Caroline Kielbasa, Mrs. Antoinette Bialkowska, Mrs. Helen Pomykalo, Mrs. Kiczek, Mrs. Clara Jablonska, Mrs. Ludmila Raczynska, and Mrs. Helen Dudek.

Honorary chairmen of the committee were: Rev. Joseph Smolen, pastor of St. Adalbert's Church; Rev. Joseph Amlicki, pastor of St. Hedwig's Church; and Rev. Edward Kozlowski, pastor of St. Theresa's Church.

The text of the address which I was privileged to give follows:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE FLORENCE P. DWYER, REPUBLICAN, SIXTH DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY, AT THE ANNUAL OBSERVANCE BY THE FEDERATION OF POLISH ORGANIZATIONS OF POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY AT THE POLISH FALCON HALL, ELIZABETH, N. J., MAY 4

Thank you very much for inviting me to join with all of you today to celebrate an occasion which means a great deal in the never-ending history of man's fight for freedom.

Polish Constitution Day marks a high point in the life of one great nation. Only a few short years after an infant United States was born, thousands of miles away, the people of Poland—several of whom played leading roles in securing American freedom—succeeded in establishing their own constitutional system which guaranteed their rights and secured their liberties as free people.

Since that time, many more men and women and children have come to this new land, bringing with them the memories and traditions of a freedom that was worth fighting for, and by their devotion to that freedom adding new strength and vigor to the freedom they searched for here.

It has long been recognized that the American people are a composite, so to speak, of all the nations of the world—probably to a greater degree than any other people in history.

An average American citizen in 1958 may well have ancestors whose birthplaces number 2 or 3 or even more different countries, principally in Europe but also throughout the rest of the world. Beyond that, however, we have all been deeply influenced in our beliefs and our attitudes by the fact that we have as neighbors and friends people whose roots go back to many nations and participate in many traditions.

The dynamic quality of American life, the ever-opening opportunity and the growing fronties have often been credited to this wonderfully varied and diverse national inheritance of ours.

We who live in Elizabeth and in Union County have known at first hand the truth of this fact. We have watched and been a part of an impressive period of growth and development just in the last 10 years. New opportunities have opened up, new jobs created, new public and private facilities have been provided which have helped make our lives richer and better in many ways.

The responsibility for this progress must go to the people who live here. And no city in America can claim a greater or more varied population of the sons and daughters of the foreign-born than Elizabeth. We number among our people many from Italy and Lithuania, from Germany and Greece, Ireland and England, from too many countries to mention here.

But no nation has contributed more to Elizabeth and to its progress and prosperity and to its fine civic spirit than has that great Eastern European nation of Poland—whose Constitution Day we celebrate here.

Indeed, among our city's many claims to fame is the fact that more people of Polish ancestry live among us than in any other city of comparable size in the United States.

All we need do is look around us to appreciate what Poland, through her sons and daughters, has meant to the city of Elizabeth. Our politics, our schools, our business, industrial, and sports activities, and our religious and cultural life have all been enriched and strengthened because so many people from that great country chose to make their new homes here.

For me, who have been privileged to represent in the Congress of the United States this city and this county and all its people, the experience has been greatly rewarding. I have learned to appreciate more than ever the contributions you have made, your sense

of personal and civic responsibility, your loyalty and patriotism, your concern for your neighbor and his welfare.

I am deeply grateful for the opportunity to join you here today and to add my voice to the many others proclaiming once again the greatness of Poland and the heritage of freedom and liberty which still struggles for life in these difficult days.

It has been said that the history of Poland as a nation has been dominated by its geography. It would be more accurate, I believe, to recognize that the truly dominant factor in Polish history has been the spirit of its people.

Nevertheless, her geographical location has greatly influenced the events which themselves have shaped the map of Poland and of all Eastern Europe down through the centuries.

Early in history, the Polish people accepted Christianity from Rome. With it, they developed in Eastern Europe a deep and prevading western culture. As the stronghold in the East of western civilization, Poland withstood for centuries the onslaught of barbaric hordes from the East. Tested under fire almost continuously, Poland grew strong and by the 16th century was the largest state in all Europe.

Throughout the succeeding centuries, the influence of Poland spread. Her advanced political development, her impressive cultural achievements, and the aristocratic sense of good taste that has come to be associated with all her people, whether princes or peasants, came to influence deeply the developing standards of Europe.

During these same centuries, however, Poland's neighbors were growing in size and in strength—and with their new strength came aggressiveness against Poland. Prussia, the militaristic heart of a future Germany, bordered on the west, Austria pressed in from the south, and the giant Russia loomed up in the east.

Russia in particular was the mortal enemy of Polish freedom. With religious differences embittering the many other differences, Russia constantly violated Polish frontiers and invaded Polish territory. On all sides, the story was repeated and Poland found herself pressed far beyond her strength. Thus, the tragic story of Poland's partition was begun.

Caught within the huge jaws of her aggressive neighbors, Poland was gradually removed off the map of Europe. For more than a hundred years after 1815, Poland was not to appear in European history as a political or geographical unit.

But Poland was not dead. In 1791, her people's spirit of freedom had brought forth a great constitution. In many respects like the Constitution of the United States, the Polish Constitution was a living document of freedom and democracy. Its strong idealism weathered the utmost misfortunes of the Polish people and its memory helped sustain the Polish spirit.

So strong was that spirit of freedom—for which its people everywhere are justly famed—that Poland rose again as an independent nation after World War I.

Tragically, Poland's independence was doomed to be short lived. The ruthless dictators of Communist Russia and Nazi Germany overran that proud nation during World War II. And since that time, Russian armies have imposed upon the Polish people a form of government repugnant to all their traditions.

The spirit of Polish resistance has not and will not die. We have watched with awesome pride the raw courage of the Poznan riots, and we have applauded as Poles have won, bit by painful bit, each new concession from their Moscow-imposed and Communist-directed government.

The courage and fortitude and love of freedom displayed by the Polish people under the most difficult conditions deserves the encouragement and support of the American people. Our own Government, I am sure, will do everything possible to help strengthen those forces in Poland now at work toward further liberalization and ultimate freedom. These efforts deserve all our patient, understanding support.

Meanwhile, however, Poland continues to influence the rest of the world—through her culture, her traditions of freedom, and most of all through the people she has sent into every corner of the world. They are a gallant and courageous people, a gifted people whose intellectual, artistic, political, and cultural contributions have been honored everywhere and which continue to inspire others by a universal beauty and genius.

Clearly, the despots and dictators of the world will never dominate the Polish soul.

Centennial of Temple B'Rith Sholom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the congregation of Temple B'rith Sholom in Springfield, Ill., this year is celebrating the 100th anniversary of its founding. In tribute to the temple's valuable spiritural and cultural work down through the years, I include here a history of this pioneer Jewish congregation of the Midwest. This history was abridged and compiled by Mrs. Clyde Meiers and Mrs. Joseph Hammerslough, Sr.:

TEMPLE B'RITH SHOLOM, 1858–1958

It is the year 1858. The place, Springfield, Ill.—just 18 years after Springfield was chartered as a city, and 40 years after Illinois was admitted to the Union. The coming of Jewish settlers had begun at a somewhat earlier date, and arriving in the United States, made their way to Springfield and nearby surrounding towns, a family at a time, from their early homes in the Old World. Most of them came from Germany. They came to the New World seeking the freedom which it offered.

With only 19 members, the first Jewish congregation was organized under the name of the Springfield Hebrew Congregation on Sunday, April 2, 1858. The young congregation could not afford a house of worship of its own, and therefore held services every Sabbath morning in a room on the third floor of a building at 216 South Sixth Street, later moving to somewhat better quarters in what was known as Hart's Hall at 221 South Fifth Street. Services were conducted in accordance with Minhag Ashkenaz (German ritual), and were semi-orthodox. Since the congregation at that time was not in good financial circumstances to engage a rabbi, one of its members, a Mr. Schaffner read the services without compensation, until 1866 when the congregation engaged as its rabbi, Mr. Bernhard Deutsch, newly arrived from Bohemia. The first president was Mr. Julius Hammerslough, a friend of Abraham Lincoln, and the secretary was Mr. David Goslin.

In this same year, 1866, a plot of ground was purchased in Oak Ridge Cemetery as a burial place for members of the congregation, and two additions were procured by 1884.

A charter for the newly organized congregation had been sought, but was not granted until February 25, 1867. The incorporators were: Louis Benjamin, David Gottlieb, Silas Leon, Morris Myers, William Myers, Benjamin Nusbaum, Samuel Rosenwald, Elias Salzenstein, Daniel Seligman, and Solomon Stern.

As the years passed there was a growing desire for permanent quarters. The main obstacle was the division of the congregation over one of Jewry's oldest question, the mode of worship. Many of the immigrants had brought reform ideas with them, as here there did not exist the old framework of strong community traditions and an established way of life. The spirit of the New World, too, was one of change, freedom, and pioneering. About this time, Mr. Gustave Ensel of St. Louis came to Springfield, and through his efforts the members of the congregation were persuaded to change their form of worship to Reform Judaism. He also started the first Sunday school with a membership of 12 children.

It is now 1874, and a plot of ground for a temple at 426 North Fifth Street "one of the finest streets in the city" had been purchased. The ladies of the congregation accumulated $450 for a building fund, and the temple is underway. The erection of the modest brick structure went along rapidly and was completed at a cost of $7,500, a stupendous sum for those days, and for so small a membership which now numbered 30 persons. On September 10, 1876, just before the high holy days, the first Jewish house of worship in Springfield was dedicated, and at the same time the decision on the mode of worship was made. The die was cast when the congregation became affiliated with the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and became dedicated to Reform Judaism. Rabbi Isaac Mayer Wise, the founder of American Reform Judaism headed the Union, and was the inspiration to congregations all over the country during these days of change. The union was 3 years old, having been organized in 1873.

The North Fifth Street Temple served its congregation for 40 years. During these times, there is litle of factual record available, but we do know that the congregation followed the trend of development of reform groups everywhere. We learn that in the early years after the dedication of the old temple, services were conducted in German and Hebrew every other Sabbath as a concession to those who were not yet conversant with English. The first prayerbooks to be used were one written and compiled by Dr. Jastrow with English translation, and one in the German language, written by Dr. Szold. Later the more well-known Einhorn prayerbook became the established form for worship, and many years later was replaced by the union prayerbook.

Confirmation and Bar Mitzvah services were conducted, and an organ and a mixed choir were used. The men and women worshipped together. The Religious School became an even more important part of the congregation's life and interest.

It is interesting to note here that the President, Sigmund Benjamin, who was elected to that office at the time of the dedication of the first temple served in that capacity for 41 years, that the secretary, Simon Hammerslough, served for 25 years, and the treasurer, B. A. Lange, served for 52 years, and at the time of his retirement about 1928 was elected honorary president of the congregation for life.

During these early years, the women of the congregation played an important role in Jewish life. There was an active group who called themselves the Ladies Hebrew Benevolent Society. They gave assistance to the newcomers to Springfield, and helped them establish themselves in the community. As well, they worked to aid the temple, and raised the funds to purchase the first

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

organ. The Mite Society was an outgrowth of the earlier organization, and there, too, the women banded together to aid the congregation by providing the social hub for temple life. There were a variety of entertainments such as dances, dinners, picnics, euchre parties all held in the temple vestry rooms. There was no kitchen in the old temple so that everything had to be brought in ready to serve.

The membership grew steadily from 30 families in 1876 to more than twice its original number, and about the year 1914 or 1915 it became apparent that the temple and its facilities had become inadequate. Plans were made and the building of the new temple began in 1916. The cornerstone was laid with an appropriate ceremony on May 18, 1916, and many of those who were founders of the congregation were present. For 40 years, the congregation had been known as Brith Sholom Congregation though its charter was in the name of Springfield Hebrew Congregation. On January 27, 1916 a new charter was procured and the change of name became official.

The building on the present site, Fourth and Scarritt Streets, was completed in 1917, and the temple was dedicated September 9, 1917. The newspaper account of this ceremony lists an impressive program which included the participation of five Rabbis, and again many of the founders of the congregation. It is interesting to note that at this dedication, children were not permitted to attend. What a contrast to today's thinking.

At this same time, the members of the Mite Society became interested in affiliating with the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, and in 1915 became a part of the vast group of Jewish women all over the country who are dedicated to the service of their temples. Officers of the sisterhood at the time of its organization were: President, Mrs. Louis Myers; vice president, Mrs. W. L. Ensel; second vice president, Mrs. D. Seligman; secretary, Mrs. Michael Eckstein; and treasurer, Mrs. L. J. Samuels. The sisterhood has now certainly earned the name "right arm of the temple." Its membership numbering 162 is an integral part of the temple, and its energy and enthusiasm as a cultural and financial support is immeasurable.

By 1922, the membership had grown to 92 families with 77 children in the religious school. The system, much as it is today, was instituted and rather than the 4 classes and 4 classrooms used for so many years, classes numbered 7 plus a kindergarten and confirmation class.

In 1928, the last note on the mortgage of the temple was paid, and in 1930 negotiations were begun to buy the property south of the temple to be used as a center and meeting place for the group of young people who had organized just 2 years earlier.

The years following the financial crisis of 1929 were difficult ones for B'rith Sholom congregation. The minutes of the board of trustees meetings reflect the serious problems of finance. The membership was reduced to 70 members, but the religious school increased to 93 children. Many members, though devoted to the temple, were forced to resign, and others were greatly in arrears. But, as the economic conditions of the country improved, so did the affairs of the congregation. As soon as was practical, repairs and remodeling were begun on the center house, which then served for many years as a social hall.

About 1945, plans were begun to establish a building fund for the purpose of increasing the facilities of the congregation. Considerable moneys were subscribed and pledged at that time, and put into trust for use at a later date.

During World War II, the members of the congregation joined in an all-out drive to help in the war effort. Many members served in the Armed Forces. Several gave their lives for their country. Those at home worked actively in the USO, sent supplies to Jewish chaplains serving overseas, and worked voluntarily in war industry. Following the end of the war Springfield Jewry was honored for having sent more than 55,000 pounds of food and clothing to the survivors of Hitler's persecution in Europe.

World War II had interrupted any hope for immediate building, and the Center House was converted into a religious school building, which in a matter of a very few years was overcrowded. In 1954 plans were made to conduct the religious school in a public school building, and to replace the small Center House building with adequate facilities for all temple activities. The membership today numbers 242 families and 204 children in the religious school. On November 24, 1957, the cornerstone of the Memorial Building was dedicated with appropriate ceremonies. Placed in the cornerstone were the day's newspaper, a Union Prayerbook, a brief history of the congregation with a description of its various affiliated activities, and membership lists of all of the participating organizations of the temple.

In addition to the sisterhood, a strong and active men's club is in the process of being formed under the able guidance of our much beloved Rabbi Meyer M. Abramowitz who came to our congregation only in November 1957. The young people of the congregation now have two groups, the Temple Youth, a high school group, and the Tabs who are seventh- and eighth-grade children. These groups play an important part in the development of leadership for the future, and they are of prime interest and importance to the congregation.

During the flow of years, the roots of the congregation have gone ever deeper into the community. A hundred years in the life of a congregation merely marks the beginning and is a prelude, through the grace of God, to a larger and more glorious history to come. May we serve our God in such a way that our temple will continue to be a center of spiritual power for its membership, and a source of blessing in the community. This is not a conclusion of the story of our congregation. Passing years and changing times bring new anniversaries, new leaders and new ideas. As the spiritual and cultural leadership of our temple continues into the next century, we must be strong in the faith and hope that the building of a "house for the name of the Lord, the God of Israel" will never cease.

Good News From the Midwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention an excellent editorial written by Roy A. Roberts, president of the Kansas City Star Co. This editorial is entitled "This Is the Second Ad I Ever Wrote." I commend this advertisement to the attention of every thoughtful citizen and especially to every Member of the Congress.

One phase of this advertisement covers the tremendously improved agricultural situation in the Midwest.

In the current legislative discussions regarding agricultural policy there has been a good deal of smokescreen spreading and misstatements of the factual situation. It should be noted that the agricultural price and income situation has improved greatly in recent months.

The April 15 index of prices received by farmers was 266 percent of the 1910–14 average, an increase of 14 points (5 percent) in 2 months. Nearly all commodities have joined in the rise but most important were the continued higher prices for meat animals. Higher prices for potatoes, fruits, and eggs also contributed substantially to the increase. The April index was 10 percent above a year earlier and was equal to or higher than any month since January of 1953. It is just about the same as the January 1953 level.

With prices received by farmers running substantially higher than a year ago, it now seems likely that a substantial gain in farm income will occur this year. Cash receipts in the first quarter of 1958 totaled close to 6 percent more than in the same quarter of 1957. Although part of this increase reflects delayed marketings last fall and the accumulations of crop inventories at the end of last year, the higher prices are being reflected in higher farm income.

The Department of Agriculture preliminary estimate of realized net income in the first quarter of 1958 is about 13 billion dollars compared with 11.7 billion in the same quarter of 1957. The data follow:

Quarterly rates	1st quarter	
	1957	1958
Cash receipts from farm marketings	30.3	32.0
Nonmoney income and Government payments	4.2	4.5
Realized gross farm income	34.5	36.5
Farm production expenses	22.8	23.5
Farmers' realized net income	11.7	13.0

Prices received by farmers in the first quarter of 1958 averaged more than 7 percent above the first quarter of 1957, in mid-April they were at the highest level in almost 5 years.

These figures show that as the policies of this administration could be made effective, farm prices have recovered. During the last 18 months, the price policies advocated by this administration have had limited application and farm prices have gone up. Today we are enjoying substantially higher prices. This is gratifying.

Sales at retail food stores are showing substantial increases over a year earlier—8 percent in February. While retail food prices are up about 5 percent; prices received by farmers in mid-April were 10 percent higher than a year earlier.

To date the demand for agricultural products has not been significantly affected by the current business recession. The favorable figures shown above makes extremely questionable the statement made by some people that the recession is "farm fed and farm led."

As a matter of fact, the agricultural segment has been an outstanding source of strength in the current business recession.

This administration's primary task is to further improve farm income on a sound basis, not with short-term panaceas which disregard sound economics and basic facts. The facts of recent history speak for themselves.

Under unanimous consent, I include the above-mentioned advertisement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS THE SECOND AD I EVER WROTE

(By Roy A. Roberts, president, the Kansas City Star Co.)

This is my second attempt at ad writing. My first effort was in 1951 following the historic flood that damaged a section of Kansas City's industrial area. The purpose of that ad was to assure the Nation that adversities were not new to Kansas City and that it would triumph over this one as it had over those of the past.

The heading on that first ad was "You Can't Lick Kansas City." How superbly Kansas City has fulfilled that challenge is well known to everybody.

Now, 7 years later, I am writing my second advertisement. This one, too, is addressed to the Nation.

If you admit that the first requisite of our national well-being is a prosperous agriculture, then it is a matter of vital importance to everybody of whatever rank or station that the farming industry in the heart of America is now enjoying one of the greatest revivals in its history.

To regard this as simply a local incident is to miss its true significance. Rather, it is a resurgence of economic health of such far-reaching effect that it may well be the national turning point from fear and hesitation to a program of confidence and constructive accomplishment.

THE IMPORTANCE OF AGRICULTURAL PROSPERITY

The entire Midwest and all our great range territory have made an amazing recovery. From drought and every form of disaster, including low farm prices, the pendulum has swung spectacularly. The great Midwest is green again. Pastures and ranges are filling with cattle. Hog prices have soared. Our whole economy is definitely on the upgrade.

This comeback of the farm is cushioning the industrial recession. Our people have faith and confidence. They are going ahead.

WHAT'S HAPPENED ON THE FARM

It may be premature to say our Midwestern and Southwestern farmers and ranchers are out of the woods. We still have a farm problem. We'll probably have one for years. But right now our farmers are doing splendidly and everyone out here knows it—everyone, apparently, except the politicians.

It's an amazing story. After a drought cycle of years, millions of once parched acres are lush and verdant. Ponds are full; creeks are running; the all important subsoil is saturated. Great crops are in prospect. Livestock prices are climbing toward the peaks of war years.

You know what a wretched, cold, rainy, snowy, blizzardy winter we had. Well, it was uncomfortable, but we needed the moisture, and the rains have continued.

FARM INCOME UP IN KANSAS

Farm income in Kansas in 1957 was 12 percent greater than in 1956. Income per farm was highest in 5 years. Inventory of livestock and poultry on the farms in Kansas alone was $333,497,000 in January 1957. On January 1, 1958, that same inventory stood at $530 million, an increase of 59 percent. It's still going up.

Seldom have we had such wheat prospects. In Oklahoma and Kansas alone the past winter, pastured wheat returned as much as $30 an acre, and now the grain crop is coming through in great shape. The Government estimates Kansas alone will produce more than 200 million bushels of wheat.

A year ago we wondered if much of the range country wasn't permanently drought damaged. Even Ike was out here on a drought tour. Somehow, someway, ranchmen and cattlemen, rugged individualists all, tightened their belts and hung on. Now their herds are being restored. With $30 cattle and $20 hogs, they're making money again.

All this means farm buying is rapidly on the increase. Merchants and farm machinery dealers in our smaller towns are enjoying big gains in sales. This channels money into Kansas City, trade capital of the Midwest.

TRACTOR AND IMPLEMENT SALES BOOMING

Farm implement and farm tractor sales are highest in years. Nearly all major companies reported their best March and April in a long time. Kansas City, home of big branch houses and distributing agents, as well as one of the largest combine factories, is experiencing the best farm business in years. As one workman in an implement house remarked to his boss: "I hope we have a recession like this every year."

That's what I mean when I say the farm comeback is cushioning the readjustment or depression.

THE INDUSTRIAL PICTURE BRIGHTENS

Of course, Kansas City and its market have felt the recession, as has the rest of the country. But Kansas City never reached the heights of the boom and it won't reach the recession depths, either. Closing of 5 or 6 big war plants here left us with a labor surplus. We were beginning to absorb it in peacetime industrial expansion when the current readjustment set in. We have major assembly plants for General Motors; a large, separate plant for Chevrolet; a big Fisher body works; and one of the larger Ford assembly plants outside Detroit. These plants have had to cut back, along with the rest of the motor industry. The start of farm buying should see quicker sales improvement here than elsewhere.

Are you thinking of expansion? Don't laugh; we're serious. This country isn't through growing. Kansas City's pivotal position, marvelous distribution facilities and surplus of fine, skilled workers make it one of the most inviting market situations in the country.

BIG KANSAS CITY GAINS

Kansas City has just received a national award from Look magazine for achievement in coordinating Federal, State, and local government and private capital efforts in a great urban redevelopment program. The job done here has been widely cited as a model for other cities in solving the problem of declining downtown districts and in converting slum and blighted areas to modern uses. But, despite the recession, Kansas City is not slowing up or stopping, because the job isn't finished. We're steadily moving ahead.

Within the past 10 days a new $17 million project was announced for Kansas City. Included are apartment, motel, and parking project buildings on old Quality Hill, where the Lewis and Clark expedition started for the Northwest. Ground will be broken this month for the first units. These projects are financed by private capital; and under special redevelopment provisions of State, city, and Federal laws.

On the north side, in the heart of the redevelopment area, a big structure to house the long distance lines of A. T. & T. is rising. Privately financed, it will cost more than $5 million.

Two blocks north, construction of a million dollar downtown motel will get underway by early summer.

EXTENSIVE URBAN RENEWAL

On the Kansas side, another big gateway urban renewal project is emerging from planning to construction stage. This project of 15 square blocks, costing more than $7 million, has been approved and financed.

In Kansas City, Mo., construction will begin on a $5 million public library this very month.

On the Kansas City south side, a huge new junior high school is set for summer construction. Our educational facilities are keeping pace with the city's growing needs.

The seventh annual Greater Kansas City Science Fair attracted 1,855 student exhibits and an attendance of 38,906, both new records. Kansas City is keenly aware of the tremendous implications of atomic energy, for peacetime use as well as for national safety in war. Our young people in astonishing numbers are preparing to participate in science's search for a better future.

Montgomery Ward & Co. has just announced a multi-million-dollar warehouse and distributing center serving six Midwestern States. Construction is to begin this month. Planned to serve more than 135 retail and catalog stores, it will be 1 of 4 such Montgomery Ward establishments over the Nation. It encompasses nearly a half-million square feet of floor space.

In the 6-county Kansas City area, permits for home building are up more than 10 percent over last year. Within recent weeks, subdivisions totaling more than 1,200 units were announced and are scheduled for development starting in early summer.

MILLIONS FOR NEW TRAFFICWAYS

As part of the big accelerated road program in the metropolitan area, trafficway projects costing many millions are in full swing in Kansas City, Mo., Johnson and Wyandotte Counties. Between Johnson and Wyandotte Counties on the Kansas side, two major projects have been started. One, a toll road—the 18th Street Expressway, will carry the teeming population of Johnson County to the recently completed Kansas Turnpike. This expressway will cost $19 million. A multimillion dollar freeway link to the Kansas City expressway system also has been started.

In Kansas City, Mo., demolition is in progress for a great southeast trafficway, to link the downtown with outstate Missouri. This project, costing more than $39 million, is part of a 5-year, $48½ million expressway program which the Missouri Highway Commission approved last year.

NO HALT IN INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION

In eastern Jackson County, the Missouri Public Service Co. is erecting a new, multimillion dollar steam powerplant to serve the rapidly expanding population in that area.

Over the whole Greater Kansas City area, scores of smaller commercial and industrial projects, ranging in cost from $100,000 to more than $1 million, are proceeding. Several huge new shopping centers have passed the planning stage. For instance, ground was broken just this week for a new insurance office building costing more than a million dollars.

TWA, with home offices in Kansas City, and some of the railroads here have started or completed developments which enhance Kansas City's status as a travel and distribution hub. We have a new airport building designed for the jet age.

We in Kansas City look to the future with confidence. Timidity, retrenchment, sitting tight, have no place in our philosophy. That sort of attitude would cost more later.

THE STAR EXPANDS TOO

To keep abreast of the tremendous business expansion in Kansas City, the Star has completely modernized its plant at a cost of millions. New presses have been installed and new machinery added in every mechanical department. We are just completing a big addition to our newsprint warehouse across the street from our main building, bringing storage capacity to nearly 10,000

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

tons, an increase of almost 100 percent. The Star has faith in its country, its community, and the great Midwest of which Kansas City is the trade and finance capital and, above all, in its own product—Star advertising.

We have turned the corner in local advertising lineage, with a nice gain in April this year compared with April 1957. In classified, we virtually broken even, while in national we took the same shellacking other metropolitan papers are suffering. This showing reflects the go-ahead spirit of advertisers who are here on the ground. It also indicates that the good news of Midwest revival has not percolated more distant areas.

A MARKET OF RICH PROMISE

Savings in Kansas City saving and loan companies and commercial banks have jumped nearly $20 million since the first of the year.

This money is waiting to be tapped by manufacturers and companies with products that appeal. The Star offers an efficient, economical sales tool to do it.

We are used to adversity in the Midwest. In fact, we thrive on it—and learn from it. Our folks don't panic. There's plenty of rugged, pioneering, frontier spirit still in us.

Business is good in Kansas City—and getting better. That's the purpose of this ad—to tell national advertisers they're missing a bet if they overlook the Kansas City market.

The Truth About Russia's Weakness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the April 11, 1958, edition of U. S. News & World Report. This article was recommended to me by our former colleague, Hon. John E. Rankin, who distinguished himself in this body as a relentless and effective defender of Americanism and an unyielding foe of communism and subversion:

THE TRUTH ABOUT RUSSIA'S WEAKNESS

What is the truth about today's Soviet Russia? Is the Soviet Union a colossus among nations, inhabited by men 10 feet high? Or is Soviet Russia actually an ailing giant, living in fear?

The Soviet Union launched the first earth satellite, and immediately much of the world thought it saw a new leader in science, thought and industry. Now, a business setback in United States has intensified the propaganda picture of a Soviet Russia that holds all the answers.

Yet, look at the facts, and you find another picture of Soviet Russia. It is a picture of a troubled nation, not as secure in her position or as confident of the future as Communist propaganda would suggest.

GOVERNMENT OF FEAR

The world, for example, is impressed by the fact that Soviet science and industry apparently produced the first intercontinental ballistic missile, with a hydrogen warhead—a feat not yet matched by United States.

What is not referred to is this added fact:

The government that possesses this newest weapon lives in fear of the scientists and workers who built it. Secret police are maintained to spy upon those workers. The right to strike, or even freely to change jobs, is denied them. No worker or individual in the Soviet Union today can read anything—or hear anything—not approved by the government without risking punishment.

Every individual in Soviet Russia is registered with the police. Siberia looms for any who dare to differ openly with those in power.

The reason for all this: fear of the people on the part of a government that is imposed upon those people, not chosen by them.

BAN ON TRAVEL

Or take another Soviet first—one that is impressing the world. The Russians converted a jet bomber to a passenger plane and today operate the first turbojet transport service.

What almost never is mentioned, however, is this set of added facts:

No ordinary citizen of the Soviet Union can even hope for permission to board a Russian jet to travel to other lands where he can see life as it is lived in the outside world.

No one from the outside world, except under the most rigid conditions, can board a Soviet jet, or even a railroad train, and travel freely to and within the Soviet Union.

Within Soviet Russia there is no freedom to travel without restraint, either for Soviet citizens or for persons from abroad.

The meaning: The Soviet Government that impresses so many in the non-Communist world is afraid to permit its own people to move freely about, even within their homeland. It fears any large-scale contact between the people of the Soviet Union and those from the outside world.

Why? Because of fear of comparison.

RUSH TO GET OUT

Rulers of the Soviet Union note this: In all Communist countries, when the opportunity offers, there is a scramble on the part of the people to get out. More than three million have fled Communist-ruled East Germany. When the chance came, there was a rush to escape from Communist-ruled Hungary. Refugees make their way out of Tito's Yugoslavia in a steady flow.

In Soviet Russia's case, the Government fears a mass flight of its citizens if ever the bars should be lowered. This is true in the Soviet Union after 40 years of communism, and in spite of sputniks and intercontinental missiles and jet transports.

Then glance at some other facts that often impress people:

Soviet Russia covers one-sixth of the land area of the earth. Within its borders are 200 million people. Add Communist China and the captive countries of Eastern Europe, and the area becomes one-fourth of the earth, containing 900 million people, or one-third of the earth's population.

Soviet Russia uses that figure to awe people. Intelligence agencies of western nations, however, now break it down and are less impressed.

WEAKNESS IN NUMBERS

As these western officials see it: Red China's vast population is a problem, a growing disadvantage for the Soviet Union as well as for Red China, not an advantage. The vast population of Red China, pressing upon resources that cannot support the people above a bare subsistence level, is interpreted as a guaranty of endless trouble.

Soviet Russia, with great open spaces in Siberia, must look upon Red China as a potential enemy, coveting that space for her spawning populace.

Then look at this empire from its western borders.

Here Soviet Russia holds captive nearly 100 million people—almost all of them possessing a fierce nationalism and living for the day when they can throw off their colonial rule. In these captive countries, ruled by puppet regimes and held in check by armed forces of the Soviet Union, are 17.5 million East Germans, 27 million Poles, 10 million Hungarians, 12 million Czechoslovaks, 16 million Rumanians, 7 million Bulgarians, 6 million Latvians, Estonians and Lithuanians.

WHEN WILL EXPLOSION COME?

The imperialism of the Soviet Union, exploiting these captive people, is described as the last great imperialism of the modern world.

Explains an official intimately acquainted with Soviet Russia's European colonies:

"If you think that you can measure today's troubles of France in Algeria, then multiply that by five and you get some idea of the present and potential trouble that faces Khrushchev's Soviet Russia in Eastern Europe. Khrushchev is committed to subjugation of peoples with a history of independence and a fighting ability that has many times been proved. The task of maintaining those people in a colonial status will grow with passing time."

Resistance, sabotage and an eventual explosion—all are regarded by this appraiser as inevitable.

PRESSURE FROM INSIDE

And what of the Soviet Union's 200 million people? Do they make up one big, happy family of well-integrated groups?

Here again, the facts reveal a situation far different than the outside world usually is aware of.

Of the 200 million people in the Soviet Union, 110 million are persons of Russian nationality. The 90 million others represent 50 nationalities, speaking 80 different languages. Most of these minority groups were incorporated by force into the Soviet Union, and many continue to harbor a desire for independence.

Stalin was 1 of 2.4 million Georgians within the Soviet Union. Khrushchev is 1 of the 36 million Ukrainians. Khrushchev's Ukrainians, in World War II, hailed the German invaders as liberators until the Germans betrayed them. In 1955, Stalin's Georgians rose up against the Moscow regime. And all through the vast expanse of Asiatic Russia there is unrest and trouble.

The picture that the world has of a great, unified Soviet Russia, with Khrushchev as dictator over a happy people, is not one that is justified by the facts.

PRIORITY FOR MILITARY

How then to explain the great accomplishments of the Soviet Union? What accounts for the fact that Soviet Russia was first to get a satellite into space, first to come up with an intercontinental ballistic missile, and now has a jet transport in service? How to explain Russia's progress in output of steel and electricity and many other products of modern industry?

The answer to these questions is one that gives concern to those who shape policy in non-Communist countries.

In Soviet Russia, informed officials explain, the dominant energy of the country is channeled into industries that supply the Red military establishment. The effort of science, of industry and of Government is directed primarily into the development and production of modern weapons. Hitler, with far fewer people, much smaller natural resources and with less drain on the civilian economy, created an Air Force and tank corps that came within a hair's breadth of conquering all of Europe, including Soviet Russia.

REDS STRAIN, UNITED STATES SLACK

It is pointed out that, if the United States devoted to the output of modern weapons a proportion of its national energy and its resources comparable to that devoted by the Soviet Union, the result soon would be an overwhelming American superiority.

Soviet Russia strains every muscle to catch up and keep up with United States in the creation and production of modern weapons. The United States, until recently, strained its muscles turning out new cars, new homes, new gadgets for the enjoyment of its people—producing modern weapons as a sideline.

While Soviet Russia still strains, the United States today has a great slack in her industry. America is pushing ahead of the Soviet Union in space conquest, while surfeiting her people with goods.

HUGE FARM FORCE, POOR DIET

But back to the story of the weaknesses in the Soviet Russia that Khrushchev rules as its third Communist dictator—

Soviet Russia has a labor force of 110 million persons. This appears to be an imposing figure when compared with the 69 million in the United States labor force.

Then note this: Of the 110 million in the Soviet labor force, 52 million are workers on farms—just about half. Even so, these 52 million, farming 480 million acres of land, are able to provide the Russian people with no more than a low-standard diet.

Something wrong? Now look at the situation in the United States. Instead of 52 million workers on farms there are 6 million, or 1 out of 11 instead of 1 out of 2 in the working population. Those 6 million workers farm 260 million acres, and do it so efficiently that the American people—fed and clothed better than any people in the world—still are not able to consume all that the farmers produce. The problem is one of surplus, not scarcity.

WASTE OF LABOR

Or, look at it another way: In Soviet Russia, with 52 million workers engaged in agriculture, there are 58 million people available for all other work. In the United States, by contrast, with only 6 million engaged in agriculture, there are 63 million available for other work. The United States, with a smaller total population, actually has 5 million more persons available for nonfarm work than has the Soviet Union.

Against that background, read the comment from one of a team of Americans—Richard Scammon, of the Governmental Affairs Institute—who observed the recent elections in the Soviet Union. In those elections 99.9 percent of the voters cast their ballots for Communist candidates.

Said Mr. Scammon: "One impression that struck me was what we would regard as a great waste of manpower. For instance, pencils are all sharpened laboriously by hand. Evidently, there ar eno pencil sharpeners in the Soviet Union. Hordes of people work in wardrobes and cloakrooms as checkers. There must be hundreds of thousands of persons who make their living this way.

"Another impression is the low standard of living of the people. A blouse that might cost $1.90 in a Washington store goes for $30. A can of salmon that might cost you 75 cents in a chainstore is a $5 item. And, until you actually see them doing it, it is hard to picture a crew of women shoveling snow off the streets when it's 10 below zero."

SHORTAGE AND SURPLUS

In Soviet Russia, with one of the world's lowest standards of living for the average man, there is an acute shortage of labor. In United States, with the world's highest standard of living, there is a surplus of labor, measured by more than 5 million unemployed. Put those millions to work, and the margin of American superiority becomes that much greater.

Nikita Khrushchev, ruling as absolute dictator in a land of many people and vast inefficiency, has his problems, too.

Remarked one of the American team of election observers who visited with Khrushchev recently:

"We had an hour and a half with him. He's older, more tired and softer than I had expected. His pictures make him look too good. He's tired and only occasionally would he trot out with enthusiasm some propaganda pitch designed to impress foreigners. His intellectual powers may be in question, but you get the impression that he believes thoroughly what he says. He doesn't kid about things he regards as important."

WHY KHRUSHCHEV WORRIES

Yet, when Khrushchev brags about pushing Soviet Russia ahead of nations of the West in evidences of industrial strength, the facts reveal that he is taking on quite a job. That may be one of his worries.

In a modern nation, transport and travel networks, as well as communication networks, are basic.

The Soviet Union covers a land area nearly three times as great as that of the United States. Within that vast Soviet area are 75,000 miles of railroads. Within the United States are 220,000 miles of railroads. The Soviet rail system is run down, powered largely by old-fashioned steam locomotives.

Or take another tack. In the whole of the Soviet Union are 131,000 miles of improved roads. Surfaced roads are largely in cities and in areas around cities. There is no superhighway system in the Soviet Union. By comparison, the United States—with one third of the area—has 2.3 million miles of hardsurfaced roads. Using the United States roads are 56 million passenger cars and 10.9 million trucks. Using the Soviet highway system are 700,000 passenger cars—half of them Government vehicles—and 2.8 million trucks.

Intercity highway travel in Russia is almost nonexistent.

WEAKNESS IN TRANSPORTATION

How about air travel? Maybe it's the answer. Actually, travel by air in the Soviet Union is estimated at about 10 percent of the travel volume in this country.

The picture up to this point is not one of great strength in transportation. What then of communications—a high-class telephone system?

With a population of 200 million to serve, the Soviet Union is reported to have 1 to 2 million telephones. In this country, people use 63 million telephones, in the United States, 127 million radios are in use, compared with 8 million receivers in the Soviet Union, plus 23 million wired speakers that insure against listening to unauthorized programs. The 2 million TV sets in the Soviet Union compare with 45 million in this country.

In the field of communications as in the field of transportation, the picture in the Soviet Union is one of great weakness, not one of strength.

STRENGTH IN STEEL

But what about those basic industries—steel and oil and power? Isn't the Soviet Union pushing ahead there?

The answer is that the Soviet Union is developing formidable strength in these fields. Steel production now is about half of the United States output. Oil production has risen to one-third the level of the United States. Electric-power production now is up to about one-third of the American level.

WHERE THE STEEL GOES

Again, those who assess Soviet strength note these points:

In the Soviet Union, a large proportion of steel and oil resources go for military purposes or for military-supporting purposes. Very little is left over for the civilian population. The Soviet Union, too, has very little steel built into its economy, because steel production has been substantial only in recent years.

In the United States, by contrast, only a small fraction of the steel and oil and power output goes for military or military-supporting purposes. The great bulk goes into the civilian economy. America, leading the world in steel production for a great many years, has a vast quantity of steel built into its cities and highways and industries. It will be generations before the economy of the Soviet Union can match that of the United States.

The strength of Soviet Russia, whatever it is, is built into a military machine, not into an economy designed to satisfy the wants of the people.

The Soviet Union's great weakness, as American appraisers see it, is in its inability to provide its people with a standard of living that will bear comparison with any other modern nation. The Soviet Union is strictly a police state, organized to exploit a captive people in order to build a military machine. The announced Soviet goal is domination of the world.

GRIPPED BY FROST

Glance again at Soviet Russia and you can understand why the outside world has attractions for this poverty-stricken nation.

Almost all of the settled areas of Russia lie north of Quebec in latitude. Moscow is at the same latitude as the lower part of Hudson Bay, Leningrad is at the same latitude as the south of Alaska. In Moscow, the capital, the number of days in the average year that are free of frost total 130, with frost on the remaining 235 days.

Of the Soviet Union's vast area, barely one-sixth is classified as arable—suitable for farming. Forests cover one-third of the expanse. There are immense areas of desert and icy wastes. Rainfall, in most areas, is inadequate.

Almost nowhere in the Soviet Union do you find all together in one place the three basic requirements for successful farming—soil fertility, enough rain, and enough warm weather. There is no area in the whole Soviet Union that can be compared in size or productivity with the fertile Corn Belt in the United States.

As a result, supplying enough food is a problem that remains unsolved in Soviet Russia today.

PRIMITIVE AGRICULTURE

It's not only nature that causes a food problem in Soviet Russia. Look at the Soviet farming methods and you see other reasons. Life on a Soviet farm is almost primitive, compared with that on an American farm. In Soviet Russia, there are only 1 million tractors, compared with 4.6 million in the United States. Much of the farm work is still done by hand—chiefly by women's hands. The life of a Russian farmer is one of backbreaking toil.

Few Soviet farms have electricity or running water. Farm families live in wooden cabins, even mud huts. They seldom get to town. Horsedrawn carts are their means of transportation.

For such hardships, there is virtually no reward. Russian farmers do not—cannot—own the land they farm. They work on collective farms or state farms. They are paid for their work, like factory hands—only less. There is little incentive to spur the peasants to more-efficient work or greater production.

It was the landowning peasant who stood in the way of those trying to communize Russia 40 years ago. Millions of peasants were liquidated before the Communists could fasten their yoke on the Soviet people. And, today, the Soviet farmer is still a foe of communism—a source of constant fear to the rulers in the Kremlin.

HOUSING: SCARCE AND CROWDED

Life in the city, for the average Russian worker, is but little better than life on the farm.

There is a serious shortage of housing in cities. People live jammed up in massive,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

but decrepit, apartment buildings. The average dwelling space allotted to a Russian is 52 square feet per person. This is less than half the area of an average living-room rug—and only about one-seventh of the 344 square feet of living space enjoyed by an average American. A Russian family is lucky if it does not have a share its 1 or 2 rooms with another family. Where bathrooms are available, they are shared by many families. Most Russians use outdoor toilets, draw their water from courtyard pumps.

The Russian diet is monotonous, at best. The average worker eats mostly coarse bread, cabbage soup, and potatoes. He may get about a pound of meat in a week. For this pound of meat—if he can get it—he must give up all the money he can earn in an hour and a half.

Here are some other revealing food prices, measured in hours of work: A pound of butter costs more than 3 hours' pay, a dozen eggs more than 2 hours' pay, a quart of milk more than half an hour's pay.

FOR SHOES, 80 HOURS' WORK

Clothing in Russia is shoddy and expensive. An average worker must work more than 300 hours—7 weeks—to earn the price of a suit. It takes more than 18 hours of work to pay for a shirt, more than 14 hours for a simple dress, and more than 80 hours for a pair of shoes. This is at average wages. For one-sixth of all Soviet workers, who get only the minimum wage fixed by law, a pair of shoes represents almost an entire month's wages.

You may get the idea, from the Soviet Union's vast size, that it is a land where people have plenty of elbow room. True, there are wide open spaces. But actually, where most of the people live, the Soviet Union is as crowded as Western Europe. This is because the bulk of the Soviet population is concentrated in the western part of the country—the only area that is fit to maintain a large population. In this area, there is no elbow room.

HOW SCHOOLING COMPARES

Now take a look at Soviet education. Here, if you would believe a lot of recent claims, is where the Soviet Union is supposed to be way out in front of the United States. Much stress is laid on statistics which show that Soviet schools are graduating more scientists and engineers than American schools, that Soviet pupils are taught more mathematics and science than American youngsters.

Yet, a closer look reveals this: The United States, with a smaller population than that of the Soviet Union, has more pupils in elementary and secondary schools—33.5 million in the United States, to 30 million in Soviet Russia. In colleges and universities, Americans outnumber Russians by 3.5 million to 2 million. This country has more than twice as many institutions of higher learning as the Soviet Union—1,886 to 767.

You also find that Soviet education, like so many other aspects of Soviet life, is pointed toward military and heavy industrial uses. The United States has more college-trained people in the fields of health, agricultural sciences, and biological sciences than Russia. Where the Soviet Union's college-trained people outnumber Americans is in engineering and physical scientists—the technicians who produce nuclear weapons, missiles, and big engineering or industrial projects.

The Kremlin claims to have more physicians than the United States, by 329,000 to 230,000. Examine the standards of medical training required, however, and you find that many physicians in the Soviet Union would not qualify to practice in this country. And the Soviet Union has only about 24,500 dentists—or about one-fourth as many as the United States.

LAG IN PRODUCTION

Productivity is the key to a nation's strength. And here, the Soviet Union, despite its huge size, is lagging far behind the United States.

The total value, estimated in current United States dollars, of all the goods and services produced in the United States in 1 year is about $433 billion. The Soviet Union's total is estimated at only about $100 billion.

Here are some contrasts: Steel, United States, 113 million tons a year; the Soviet Union, 56 million tons. Pig iron, United States, 79 million tons; Russia, 41 million tons. Coal, United States, 513 million tons; Russia, 509 million. Oil, United States, 389 million tons; Russia, 108 million tons. Electric power, United States, 716 billion kilowatt-hours; Russia, 209 billion.

Those figures are for heavy industry, which the Soviet Union pushes, and in which Khrushchev boasts that the Kremlin is overtaking the United States. The figures show that the U. S. S. R. has a long way to go.

GUNS BEFORE BUTTER

Look at consumer goods—the things that make life more pleasant—and you find the contrast between Khrushchev's Russia and the United States is even greater. Last year, the United States turned out 3.3 million refrigerators; Russia, 309,000. The United States made 3.8 million washing machines; Russia, 277,000. United States produced 15.4 million radios; Russia, 3.6 million. United States production of television sets was 6.4 million; Russia's 700,000.

These figures, once again, demonstrate how Russia plows the bulk of its wealth and energy into warmaking power at the expense of the happiness of its people.

AN AILING COLOSSUS

Add up all these facts about today's Soviet Russia, as many western officials now are doing, and the realization grows that the Soviet Union is far from the colossus among nations that it is pictured by Red propagandists.

The picture you get, instead, is one of an ailing giant, living in fear—and concentrating its national efforts on preparing for war.

Maintenance Increase for Rural Carriers

SPEECH

OF

HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week the House of Representatives passed S. 3050 with committee amendment to provide an increase in the equipment maintenance allowance paid to rural letter carriers. The Senate accepted the amended bill on Tuesday. It should become law within the next several days.

It was my privilege to serve as chairman of the subcommittee which originally considered this legislation. Hearings were opened on June 25, 1957. On that date the National Rural Letter Carriers' Association appeared and presented a well-drawn, sound, factual case which clearly demonstrated that the legislation was merited and fully justified. This association is to be commended for its valuable testimony at that time, which through the presentation of actual cost cases permitted the subcommittee to recognize the urgent need for an increased allowance. The bill introduced by Mr. PORTER, of Oregon, H. R. 6371, was unanimously approved by the subcommittee despite the opposition of the Post Office Department. It was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and subsequently unanimously reported.

H. R. 6371 provided for 10 cents per mile with a daily minimum allowance of $4, plus additional allowances, which could be authorized by administrative action for carriers serving heavily patronized routes. Unfortunately the legislation was not considered during the first session despite the recognized need for an upward adjustment in these mileage allowances, and despite the interested efforts of myself and many others to expedite consideration. The Senate therefore acted before the House and passed S. 3050 providing for 11 cents per mile and a $3.50 daily minimum.

I feel that the 11 cents per mile was unquestionably justified on some routes, just as the higher daily minimum in the House bill was justified. The administration, however, would not support enactment of a higher rate and a compromise became necessary if this deserved group of employees should not longer be denied a more realistic reimbursement for the costs of delivering United States mail.

The major costs borne by rural carriers have increased on an average as follows: automobiles, 30 percent; gas and oil, 18 percent; tires, 30 percent; repairs, 75 percent; license and taxes, 42 percent; and insurance, 27 percent. These increased costs clearly demonstrated that the present 9 cents per mile allowance set in 1951 is inadequate.

The legislation which has cleared the Congress will provide a considerable measure of relief to these carriers. It will especially aid those carriers on routes of short mileage whose fixed costs such as depreciation and insurance are closely the same as those carriers on routes of long mileage. This will be possible through a new feature in law to provide a daily minimum of $3.50 for all routes. The subcommittee and the full committee supported this feature of a daily minimum in recognition of the fact that a minimum was necessary, and we did so even though any daily minimum was originally objected to by the Post Office Department.

I know the problems of rural carriers. I know the value of the great service they render. More than 1,500 rural carriers in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania daily render a complete postal service to almost one and one-half million of our citizens. Civil servants who daily perform such an important task should not be expected to bear a portion of the cost from their salaries. That is exactly what the situation has been.

The total cost of this legislation for the fiscal year of 1959 is estimated to be $5.9 million. In these days when increased expenditures must be carefully considered and weighed, it is my pleasure to inform the House that the bill passed to increase these mileage allowances is amply justified.

The compromise on the amounts provided in the various bills was a realistic approach. I am pleased that S. 3050 was accepted by the Senate and trust that it will be speedily approved. I sin-

cerely believe that in approving this legislation we have rendered a real service to the rural carriers who are so faithfully serving their Government and the public.

Rochester, N. Y.: Citadel of World Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it is my extreme pleasure to announce to the House that my home city of Rochester, N. Y., has been selected as the winner of the first world brotherhood award for communitywide service to the cause of international understanding. This recognition follows a national survey of community programs of international action in such fields as student exchange, hospitality for foreign visitors, foreign affairs education, and various areas of international human relations. In addition to Rochester, the following cities were cited for outstanding achievement: Worthington, Minn., San Jose, Calif., Montclair, N. J., and Hagerstown, Md.

The awarding organization, World Brotherhood, is an outstanding group devoted to promoting and improving international human relations. Distinguished citizens make up its international directorate, and the judging board for its world brotherhood award.

None can doubt Rochester's worthiness for this recognition. From the tenor of the mail which I receive daily and from my contacts in the Rochester area, I can testify strongly to the city's great interest in and desire to foster international brotherhood. I am constantly amazed at the depth of understanding of the letters I receive from Rochesterians of all national origins and all faiths, expressing a genuine concern with the state of the world and with the need for greater cooperation among all the peoples of the world.

In many specific aspects the city has done much to foster the concept of brotherhood which holds such promise for the peace of the world. For example, numerous local business firms have sponsored programs involving the exchange of personnel, information, and know-how with overseas organizations. Many have far-flung plants abroad, with constant interchanges of ideas and personnel. Local educational institutions and civic groups have been particularly vigorous in promoting student exchanges. The teen-age diplomats plan has attracted wide attention in other communities.

The Rochester Association for the United Nations—4,000 members strong—has provided an unending source of information and stimulation and inspiration.

The University of Rochester has pioneered in various world study projects and courses and has maintained vigorous exchanges with overseas institutions.

Various church groups have contributed much.

Particularly outstanding has been the work of a fine citizens group working through the chamber of commerce to help those in Rochester with immigration problems. Under the patient, canny, and wise guidance of James A. Tipping, the department of citizenship provides counseling, advice, and aid to all who have any kind of questions involving our immigration or citizenship laws. As far as I know, this type of aid is a unique attribute of the city. By means of close cooperation between Mr. Tipping, the area Congressmen, and the Immigration Service, we are able to effectively help all people with these problems.

Rochester is blessed with residents of some fifty-odd foreign extractions, and it is a tribute to the community that these people from so many scattered lands have so readily and without friction been assimilated into the populace. Their rich cultural and spiritual contributions to the community are many, varied, and plentiful. We are a better city because so many fine people from so many lands have chosen Rochester as their home.

From my contacts with other Members of Congress from all over the country, I can say unhesitatingly that there is no city in the United States in which more people from more different lands live more peacefully and happily together. Rochester, in a real sense, is a melting pot—and in the finest sense that no longer is a man's nationality or religion any kind of a bar to his success and progress.

By giving and receiving personnel and material from other lands—both in educational and business exchanges—and by promoting the welfare of newcomers to its midst, as well as by widespread programs of international understanding and education, Rochester is playing its part to the hilt in the area of human relations and world brotherhood. It is fitting, therefore, that the city has been singled out to receive this award.

I want to take this opportunity to salute all those who worked so hard to make this award possible. First, of course, commendation must go to those in the churches, schools, and many organizations, locally, which have contributed mightily to building Rochester's effective programs in this area. Commendation should go also to the thousands of citizens of the city, who by word and deed have participated in Rochester's warm response to all who have chosen the community as their home or visiting place.

Special recognition should go to Mrs. Bernice Barnett Connorton, executive director of the Rochester Association for the United Nations, who has worked unceasingly to promote international understanding in the city and worked particularly on this project, and to Miss Faith Wright, whose outstanding report led directly to the award.

At this point in the RECORD, I include descriptive articles and an editorial from the Rochester Times-Union:

ROCHESTER NAMED FIRST WINNER OF WORLD BROTHERHOOD AWARD

(By Bill Pulsifer)

Because its community effort at world understanding "has few parallels in the history of peacetime international action," Rochester today was named winner of the first World Brotherhood award.

The announcement was made by Philippines Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo and educator-Nobel prize winner, Arthur H. Compton, cochairmen of the World Brotherhood organization.

The award was made for communitywide activities for promoting international understanding and friendship with communities overseas.

Two awards were made—one to a city over 100,000 population and one to a smaller city. The other winner is Worthington, Minn., which has less than 10,000 people. It was chosen for a 10-year-old program of affiliation with Crailsheim, Germany, and for its unique program of hospitality for foreign visitors.

Mayor Peter Barry will name a committee to choose a representative to receive the award from General Romulo in ceremonies June 3 in New York.

At the ceremonies, Rochester and Worthington will receive a Pan American World Airways community friendship grant enabling each city to send a community affairs leader to visit a selected overseas city, and a reciprocal visit by a community leader from abroad. A city behind the Iron Curtain or in an underdeveloped area is suggested.

World Brotherhood is a nonprofit organization devoted to human relations. Its directors include Dr. Compton; General Romulo; Paul-Henri Spaak, NATO Secretary General; Madame Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit of India, and West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer.

Judges in the competition were Mrs. Ogden Reid of the New York Herald Tribune; Edward W. Barrett, dean of the Columbia School of Journalism; John L. Loeb, banker and broker, and A. L. Cole, business manager of Reader's Digest.

Among the runnersup, San Jose, Calif. was cited for its Pacific neighbors program which includes a citywide exchange with Okayama, Japan; Hagerstown, Md., for its program with Wesel, Germany, and the work of its public schools; and Montclair, N. J., for its overseas neighbors program with Graz, Austria.

After this year the award will be given annually and will include consideration of communities in other countries.

WHY ROCHESTER WON BROTHERHOOD HONOR

This is why Rochester won the World Brotherhood Award for promoting international friendship and understanding.

According to some of the information considered by the judges, the city's:

United Nations group (Rochester Association for the United Nations) with 3,800 members is the largest in the Nation outside of metropolitan New York.

Protestant churchgoers lead the Nation, outside of New York City, in giving to the World Council of Churches.

Catholic Diocese outstrips any other diocese in numbers, per capita, of refugees resettled here.

High energy nuclear physics conferences have attracted leading East-West scientists to the University of Rochester.

Teen-age diplomats program is one of the most active American field service programs in the Nation.

Local support for the UNESCO-sponsored "Asia Month" at Rochester Museum is unmatched in any other community.

Rotaly Club's overseas student program was endorsed last year for adoption by worldwide Rotary clubs.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

New International Friendship Council supplies a "home away from home" with local families for over 400 foreign students and trainees in Rochester.

City Club continues for the 48th year to bring leading international speakers here.

Plans for twin city affiliation with Rennes, France, are underway.

University of Rochester pioneered with its "World Awareness" study programs of non-Western civilizations.

Chamber of commerce sponsors an unusual citizenship department to assist immigrants.

Business community boasts an exceptional number of international companies which send Rochester businessmen and products around the world.

Public schools attract national attention for its foreign language programs.

Also included in the city's entry were descriptions of the work of its natives such as Dr. Dexter Perkins and the Salzburg (Austria) Seminar, a kind of cultural Marshall plan to which Rochesterians contributed; Bruce M. Lansdale and the American Farm School which he helps operate in Greece and to which Rochesterians have contributed, and Mrs. Harper Sibley, for whom a graduate residence at the International Christian University in Japan is dedicated.

In considering the entry the judges paid tribute to the Rochester newspapers for coverage of the international scene.

How the Report on the City Was Prepared

This is how the city won the award:

It began with a visit last May of a representative of the World Brotherhood organization. He met with representatives of local organizations and industry.

On the basis of his recommendations, Rochester was selected as 1 of 7 cities to be considered as finalists.

World Brotherhood asked the Rochester Association for the United Nations last December 1 to furnish supporting information.

Believing that the task would require the full-time services of at least one person, RAUN hired Miss Faith Wright on December 10 to prepare Rochester's entry.

Miss Wright is a 1954 graduate of the University of Rochester, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John W. Wright of 7 Green Hill Lane, Pittsford, who had spent a year in 1956–57 studying in Geneva, Switzerland, as a recipient of a Rotary fellowship. She now works for Reader's Digest in New York.

Miss Wright was paid $270 by RAUN for 5 weeks and 2 days of work on the project.

She got information from more than 100 local individuals involved in businesses, institutions, and clubs which were involved in international projects.

The report was submitted January 26 in 2 parts—a colorful, 52-page presentation which served as a summary outline to acquaint the viewer unfamiliar with Rochester with the city's activities, and a binder more than 2 inches thick with documentary material supporting the summary. The list above is only partial; Miss Wright pointed out in reporting on her work that it would be impossible to list every group that promoted friendship and understanding.

Those outside the city who supplied supporting statements included Eleanor Roosevelt and Dr. Robert Oppenheimer.

Representative Kenneth B. Keating, of Rochester, also was asked to support the application. In announcing that Rochester won the award the judges wrote:

"We would like to give hearty endorsement to the words of (Keating) who wrote: 'The city by promoting brotherhood on a local level and through its cognizance of the need for the worldwide extension of this concept, is making a substantial and effective contribution to world peace'."

World Interest Award Causes No Surprise Here

Rochester has had a suspicion for a long while that it is a unique city in the matter of interest in world affairs. With 4,000 members in a local association for the United Nations, an extensive teen-age diplomat program, pathfinding fields of world study at the university and a score of other such activities, its preeminence in that particular was known locally very well.

So when World Brotherhood chose Rochester as winner of its first World Brotherhood Award for cities with more than 100,000 population it came less as a matter of surprise than as satisfaction in recognition.

World Brotherhood is an organization established in 1950 "by men and women who believe in a spiritual and moral interpretation of the universe to promote understanding, justice and cooperation among peoples differing in religion, race, nation, social status or culture."

The announcement of the award was made by the Philippines' Ambassador, Carlos P. Romulo and Dr. Arthur H. Compton, cochairmen.

Rochester was credited with a "community effort which in the opinion of the judges has few parallels in the history of peacetime international action." But while all the organized activities that give Rochester distinction in awareness of world affairs were reviewed in the award it was not for these that it was given.

It was because these, in the judges' opinion, only reflected the communitywide "sense of international responsibility which permeates the Rochester scene," and the "individual citizen response to the challenges of the world outside."

Among the outward manifestations of those qualities were listed the Rochester Association for the United Nations, the university's world awareness" study program, support for the World Council of Churches which, the judges said, "is matched only by that of New York City," the Rochester Museum's "Asian Month," the Industrial Management Council's foreign visitors hospitality program, the chamber of commerce work with new citizens, the Teen-Age Diplomat program, Rotary U. N. fellowships and support given to worthy international causes by corporations doing business here.

None of these, of course, is news to Rochesterians. But it's nice to be singled out as an outstanding city in the top concern of the age.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily Record at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

Appendix

Address by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California, Before Southern California United Press Editors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address I delivered before the Southern California United Press Association Editors at Ojai, Calif., on Saturday evening.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND BEFORE THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA UNITED PRESS EDITORS, OJAI, CALIF., MAY 10, 1958

Fellow members of the fourth estate and fellow Californians, it is a great privilege to be with you here tonight at Ojai for this meeting of the Southern California United Press Association Editors.

The world we live in continues to grow smaller and smaller and our vision and perspective becomes larger and larger. As members of a proud profession that seeks to mirror these changing times, our responsibility in reporting and interpreting local, State, national, and international events of public concern and interest grows correspondingly greater.

This afternoon I participated in the dedication ceremonies of the National Pacific Missile Range at Point Arguello.

Looking out over the broad expanses of the Pacific Ocean, where in the near future our expectations in the critical field of missile development will run the cycle of temporary setbacks and success, it brought back to mind the history of our golden State when admitted into the American Union with 95,000 people in 1850 and what has since developed here.

We have always sought new horizons. Our State and its people have never been wedded to the status quo or ruled by the dead hand of the past.

Each generation of Californians has desired to leave to their children an even better land than they themselves found.

This is still our challenge and our opportunity.

Californians must never lose the pioneering spirit of the Argonauts, if our State is to remain the land of opportunity and become the leading State among the 48 in the Nation.

In 5 years we will have 18 million people living and working inside our State borders. By 1970, only 12 years from now, we will have far over 20 million residents as citizens of California. And to prepare for a harmonious integration of this influx, we cannot postpone or delay our decisions indefinitely.

One statistic of growth in which Californians will not take pride is the fact that California led the Nation in major crimes last year—a total of 299,864.

The increase in crime rate from 1950 to 1957 was 77 percent. Our population during that same period increased 32 percent.

During this period the attorney general has in the Nation.

The State narcotic bureau is also under his supervision and administrative responsibility.

In the critical controversy of water development, in the field of a solvent fiscal structure, in the need for our expanding educational facilities, in business development, in sound labor conditions, in welfare programs, in highway, hospital and recreational expansion, in government efficiency and economy, in crime and narcotics control, the responsibility of the next Governor of this State is great and the people must be told that the decisions will not be easy nor will the burdens be light.

There is certainly no pat panacea for the complex, troublesome, and arduous problems that face our growing State.

During my service in the State assembly and State senate, in my experience as a newspaperman, during my 13 years in the United States Senate, and as either majority or minority leader in the 83d, 84th, and 85th Congresses, I have been intimately involved in working out programs and solutions in the areas comparable to those to which I have just referred.

I have worked with Republicans and Democrats in both the legislative and executive branches of our Government during two administrations.

California has a vital interest in national and international affairs which, to a considerable extent, affect the future of our industry, our agriculture, and our commerce.

The broad experience I have gained can be of great value to our State. It can bring to the Governor's office a broader understanding of the problems of California which is an important and integral part of the entire Union.

This understanding will contribute to the maximum development of many opportunities contributing to advancement of our State's vital interests.

As a member of the State legislature, I played an active part in preserving our constitutional guaranties for the financial support of our elementary and secondary school system, and in providing the funds that have made them effective.

In 1933, when I went to the State legislature, the State had an unbalanced budget. As a member of the economy bloc we made substantial reductions in governmental costs. As a member of the joint tax committee we recommended a revised revenue system which was approved by the people of California and met our basic requirements for the next quarter of a century.

As a member of the State senate, I was chairman of the subcommittee which drafted, and I subsequently handled on the floor, the first unemployment-insurance legislation enacted in this State.

I supported, in the State legislature and in the United States Senate, social-security legislation for old-age assistance, vocational rehabilitation, aid to the blind, and child-care assistance.

During my service in Sacramento I supported legislation which assured every worker the right to join a union of his choice. The legislation made illegal the so-called yellow-dog contract which had prevented a worker from having that free choice.

As a State assemblyman, I cosponsored the antilynching legislation now on the statute books of this State.

As Republican leader of the United States Senate, I moved to bring the civil-rights legislation before the Senate and took a lead in securing the passage of the first such bill in over 80 years.

As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I have cooperated with my Senate colleagues and House Members, without regard to partisanship, to help advance sound and constructive flood control and reclamation projects.

A partial list includes the Central Valley development, the Los Angeles flood-control projects, the Sacramento deep-water channel, Folsom Dam, the Solano project, the Corning Canal, the San Diego aqueduct, Crescent City Harbor, Cachuma Dam, Richmond Harbor, the Ventura project, San Diego Harbor and Mission Bay, Whittier Narrows Dam, the Cherry Valley Reservoir, flood control along the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and the Coachella extension to the All-American Canal.

As a Member of the Senate, I took an active part in the fight to restore to this and other coastal States the tidelands which had been taken from us under the New Deal doctrine of Federal inherent powers overriding the right of the States.

Both as a State legislator and as a Member of the United States Senate, I have been interested in the conservation of our water resources so vital to our future growth and development.

I have consistently taken the position that the Federal Government must respect the water laws of the several States and should not, contrary to the letter and spirit of the reclamation law, attempt to put itself above the laws of California.

There are a multitude of problems that will face the Governor of this State as he takes the oath of office next January.

Among the most pressing will be:

The fiscal condition of the State treasury and the budget problems for the future.

Our State budget is approximately $2 billion, the largest of any State in the Union.

The reserve funds will have been exhausted before the budget of the next governor becomes operative.

Our tax structure is one of the highest in the Nation both on a rate and per capita basis.

Any major upward movement in State taxes would discourage new capital investment in California and cause prospective industries to look elsewhere.

The executive branch of the State government is in need of reorganization. Today we have a cumbersome structure of 8 constitutional offices, 24 departments, 128 boards and commissions, and 46 independent agencies.

There is costly duplication and there is not the coordination and the effective structure our dynamic state needs to meet the problems of our time. As Governor I shall make recommendations to the legislature relative to such reorganization.

I shall give my study and consideration to tax studies of the legislature prior to recommending revisions in our State revenue system.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

My efforts shall be directed to balancing our State budget and preserving the solvency of our State so that we may meet our governmental, educational, and welfare needs within the capabilities of our people to support the same.

Yet our revenue now falls $110 million short of meeting expenditures. By 1959–60 the revenue deficiency may run to more than $200 million.

This is before we face up the priority problems of water and schools.

If the sales-income tax initiative should be approved it would cause annually a net loss of approximately $36 million to be added to the deficit.

This revenue loss would increase over the years. I was the first gubernatorial candidate to take a public position in opposition to this proposal.

While we would be justified in bonding ourselves for needed capital investment in the State water and school construction programs we could not safely go on spending more than we receive without damaging the credit of our State and the solvency of our governmental institutions.

In my judgment, no such State water bond issue will be approved without the prior approval of a State constitutional amendment guaranteeing the southern part of our State (which would assume approximately 60 percent of the obligation) that they would have a continuity of water supply comparable to their continuity of financial obligation.

In addition the counties of origin will need constitutional assurance that their own present and future water needs for agricultural, industrial, and residential purposes will be equitably provided for.

As President Grover Cleveland said: "A condition and not a theory confronts us."

I shall use my experience of 20 years as a legislator, who has worked with men of both parties, to end the stalemate and find areas of agreement between men of good will, North and South. We must press forward to the financing and building of our necessary State water projects.

We just cannot afford another legislative session of deadlock, bitterness between sections of the State, and acrimony between the executive and legislative arms of the Government.

Educational problems will be with us for the years ahead in this growing State.

The State government is spending over $575 million a year in the primary and secondary fields.

Our public school enrollment has grown from 1 million in 1940 to 2,815,000 in 1958.

By 1965 it has been estimated that it will approximate 4 million.

School district bonded indebtedness has gone from $300 million in 1947 to $1,300 million in 1956.

Since 1947 the State has authorized $635 million in school bonds. Additional State credit will be needed to assist local districts of our classroom shortage is to be overcome.

Last year 138,000 youngsters in grades 1 through 8 were on double sessions, down from 150,000 the year previous. However, there were more children in grades 1, 6, and 7 on double sessions. In 1957 22 counties reported no double sessions, 17 counties reported a decrease in the number of youngsters involved, and 19 counties reported an increase. One county eliminated double sessions but six counties reported double sessions where they had none the previous year. Last year in 4 counties there were 25,000 on double sessions in the junior high schools and high schools a drop from 31,000 in 7 counties last year.

The efforts of the local districts to finance the needed expansion in the operation and maintenance of their schools is evidenced by the fact that 750 of the approximate 1,800 districts in the State have voted to exceed their legal maximum tax rates, and 780 are at their legal maximum tax rates. The 295 districts operating at less than their legal maximum tax rates enroll less than 250,000 of the near 3 million students this year.

I believe in, and unqualifiedly support, the right of every American worker to join a union. Any attempt to restrict the opportunity of an employee to participate voluntarily in a union, or to prevent a duly elected union organization from representing such employees in collective bargaining, will be vigorously opposed by me.

I believe in the right of every union member to have a free voice in the administration and activities of his or her union, and if the union does not act in their best interests, I believe in the right to withdraw from the union without losing employment.

Legislation has been introduced by me in the Senate, and I support similar legislation in California, which will guarantee democratic control by union members over the officers and activities of their respective unions. This legislation does the following:

1. Guarantees the election of union officials by secret ballot.

2. Provides for the recall of union officials who misuse their positions of trust and responsibility.

3. Prevents conspiracies between management and union officials that work against the welfare of union members.

4. Protects union members' welfare and pension programs.

5. Requires that where unions are permitted, under law, to represent all employees in an industry or plant, all employees must be admitted into the union if they should desire union membership.

6. Provides that union members shall have a voice in the conditions, terms, and duration of strikes.

7. Prevents arbitrary control over local unions of trustees appointed by national or international unions.

8. Provides for regulation by union members of the actions of their unions on questions of excessive union fees, assessments, or arbitrary actions.

Because of the fight I made on the floor of the Senate 2 weeks ago, Congress will get an opportunity to pass some effective legislation this session.

I believe that unions, in order to grow, prosper, and function effectively, must induce employees to become members of their organizations voluntarily and not by compulsion.

No permanent progress has been achieved in our society, or in any other civilized nation, where people are compelled to belong to particular organizations in order to exist. The strength and contribution of our churches, parent-teachers associations, and fraternal, charitable, and civic organizations has been due to the free and willing participation of our citizens. I believe in the right of an individual to decide, without coercion, his intention to become a member of a union. I also believe that if an individual decides not to support a responsible union which is working for his benefit, the union would continue to advance without his membership.

In voluntary organizations, there will always be some individuals who will not participate in the activities of institutions working in their behalf. But that is the price we must willingly pay for liberty. Its alternative is compulsion without cooperation.

I therefore support the initiative proposal which will permit the people of California to vote on voluntary versus compulsory unionism.

In my studies of the application of the partnership principle to the Trinity River project, careful consideration has been given to, (a) the staggering level of the public debt; (b) the priority of expanding national security needs; (c) present and future water needs of California; and (d) the economic analysis of Federal against partnership development of the Trinity power facilities.

Development of the power facilities on other than a partnership basis would add to, not reduce, the construction and operating costs of the Trinity project. To be sure, a limited number of power consumers and Federal agencies would benefit, but the monetary advantage to them would not offset the monetary advantages provided under the partnership plan.

Partnership development would benefit the taxpayers of California and the Nation as follows: (a) $56 million in construction costs; (b) at least $165 million additional net revenue to the Central Valley project; (c) $83 million in tax revenues: Total, an estimated $304 million. Partnership development would also contribute to State, county, and local governments another $62 million in tax revenue.

Benefits of the Trinity project, whether computed on a water rate, electric rate, or on a tax revenue basis, would be enjoyed by countless more Californians under partnership development of the power facilities rather than Federal development.

There is ample precedent in California and elsewhere for private enterprise participation in the construction of power facilities at Federal projects at no cost to the Government, whereby the purchase of the use of falling water in these joint operations assists in reducing Federal expenditures.

I support the partnership plan for joint development of the Trinity project's power facilities. I shall also support an amendment which will provide for periodic review by the Federal Power Commission of the provisions regulating rate payments to the Government for use of falling water.

Government alone cannot solve the economic problems of the Nation. Our free-enterprise system is still providing over 60 million Americans with employment.

We can best get our unemployed back to work by policies that will encourage the investment of capital in industry, commerce, and agriculture.

The road to rigid economic controls or to the Federal or State government getting into business will discourage, rather than improve, the economic climate.

Detroit's Celebration of Israel's 10th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in recent days, many Members of the Senate have joined in commemorating the 10th anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel.

This is, indeed, a significant occasion. In 1948, there were many who were certain that the fledgling nation would not survive to receive honors on its 10th birthday.

There were many times during this decade when the existence of Israel was threatened, and even today there are those who would like to banish Israel from the map.

But the people of that valient country have demonstrated that determination and the desire for freedom can overcome any obstacles.

Recently Hon. Philip A. Hart, Lieutenant Governor of Michigan, spoke at Detroit's celebration of Israel's 10th anniversary. His remarks were given in his capacity as acting Governor.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE PHILIP A. HART, ACTING GOVERNOR, STATE OF MICHIGAN, AT DETROIT'S CELEBRATION OF ISRAEL'S 10TH ANNIVERSARY, APRIL 27, 1958

There are many reasons for the warm interest and affinity which millions of Americans feel for the democratic State of Israel. There are, of course, thousands of Americans who have close relatives in Israel, and millions of Jews and Christians who feel a strong religious tie with the Holy Land. But even beyond those obvious and strong links, Americans and their Israeli friends have many added sound reasons for their friendship and for the cooperation which we all hope will continue to grow between Israel and America.

(a) Both Israel and America are melting pots drawing upon the strengths of many nationalities. Like the United States, Israel has drawn the largest group of its immigrants from Europe, but others have come from throughout Asia, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere. So the internationalism which characterizes the outlook of both Israelis and Americans has its roots in personal experience with people from the far corners of the world.

(b) Both Israel and the United States were born in battle—and having fought hard for freedom and self-government, value them highly. Our common political ideals have a religious basis—the Judeo-Christian conviction that human personality is the supreme value. The Mideast conflict is between those who believe in the power of freedom and prophesy and those who don't.

(c) Third, I would mention the spirit of neighborliness and of cooperation toward great goals, which has characterized the people of Israel and the people of our own country. The present-day cooperative farms in Israel—the kibbutzim and the others—have their parallel in the barn raisings and the corn huskings and the town halls of our American tradition. I think we Americans share with the Israelis a youthful spirit, a kind of divine discontent—an impatience to move on to better things. This spirit of progress is nowhere better exemplified than in the trade-union movements of our two countries—among the most democratic and the most effective in the world, and forever seeking ways of improving the lot of the working people who have made our two countries what they are.

For all these reasons, them and many more, Americans applaud the great strides Israel has made in these first 10 years. I won't make any attempt to summarize that progress, for I know our able speaker, Yohanan Meroz will get the facts right. I simply want to say that for a country about one-seventh the size of Michigan, I think Israel's progress is—to use a misused word—amazing. More than doubling its population in a decade was certainly unprecedented, but nearly doubling the per capita income during those 10 years is an achievement of utmost significance in this 20th century of worldwide rising expectations.

All too often, I think when we Americans think or speak of our relations with other countries, we tend to concentrate on what we think we can do for them. That's necessary, of course, but in the case of Israel there's an imperative lesson we can learn. Despite the fact that Israel is in constant, immediate danger from without, the whole range of educational and social welfare programs in Israel have been receiving the unstinting support of the Israeli Government. The success of those programs contributes importantly to the willingness of the people of Israel to defend their country. Yet here in this country we hear suggestions that despite our country's unequalled wealth we somehow can't afford both an adequate defense and scientific effort and a realistic program to deal with our educational, health, and welfare needs. We should learn from Israel that what's spent on education, health, and welfare strengthens a democratic society every bit as much as what's spent on missiles and munitions.

And finally, I hope that we Americans will have the good sense to develop a working partnership with Israel in promoting rising standards of living throughout Asia and Africa. Israel is in a potentially effective position to serve as a bridge between the highly complex and developed economies of the West and the underdeveloped economies of the Asian and African countries. When Asian and African leaders visit the United States and other western nations, they're apt to find our economies too advanced and complex to have much immediate bearing on their own problems. Western progress needs translating into terms which will be meaningful in Asia and Africa, and Israel can help us do the job. It's encouraging to read that Israel is already expanding its trade and diplomatic ties with other newly independent nations in Asia and Africa, and is now running of its own point 4 program of technical aid to Burma and to Ghana, in west Africa.

Specifically, in the Middle East, I believe the United States and Israel should advocate a Middle Eastern Development Authority which might build up the possibilities of peace by combatting poverty and hopelessness. When the Israeli Foreign Minister, Mrs. Golda Meir, spoke in the United Nations last year, on the Sinai withdrawal, she turned to the Arab delegates present and asked:

"Can we, from now on—all of us—turn a new leaf, and instead of fighting with each other, can we all, united, fight poverty and disease and illiteracy? Is it possible for us to put all our efforts and all our energy into one single purpose, the betterment and progress and development of all our lands and all our peoples?"

Let us pray that Mrs. Meir's question will yet be answered in the affirmative—and let us do all we can to make it so.

Labeling of Shoes Produced in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Repairman Starts Move for Labels in Shoes," published in the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune of December 29, 1957. The article relates to the one-man campaign of Shoe Repairman Wilbur Gardner, who has a point of view very much in harmony with that expressed in the resolution of Phoenix Grange, No. 779, Jackson County Oreg., which appears in the body of the RECORD today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune of December 29, 1957]

REPAIRMAN STARTS MOVE FOR LABELS IN SHOES—GARDNER RECEIVES SUPPORT OF MANY OFFICIALS IN MOVE

(By Bob Vroman)

Wilbur Gardner, who operates Gardner's Repair Shop at 612 East Main Street, Medford, is not by nature a troublemaker. For 27 years he has been content to work in his little shop, hammering, sewing away at the job of repairing shoes for Medford's citizens.

While he has known for some time that people were not always getting their money's worth when they bought a pair of shoes, he never figured he could do anything about it—at least not until one day about 6 months ago when he suddenly got "fed up" and decided to take matters in his own hands.

Pair after pair of children's shoes that were being brought into his shop didn't have enough solid leather anywhere to make a repair. They were paper from one end to the other, which was all covered up with a veneer of leather and probably cost the buyer from $8 to $10.

PUBLIC DUPED

Gardner reasoned that if clothing, bedding, foodstuffs, and other commodities had to be labeled as to their contents or construction, why not shoes? He figured that the public is being duped by not having laws to compel manufacturers to label shoes as to what materials are used in their construction.

The first thing Gardner did was to correspond with Congressmen in Washington, D. C., to stir up interest in getting shoe label laws and to find out what he could do to help get them. Gardner has written to Government heads of other countries to find out what laws are in existence on the labeling of shoes and he has had several articles published in trade journals on the subject.

He recently received a reply from Prime Minister Robert G. Menzies of Australia, along with a copy of the laws that control shoe labeling in that country. Although the laws are not as comprehensive as Gardner would have them, Australia's regulations are the best of any country in the world, and may serve as a pattern for setting up such laws here.

MORE EXPENSIVE

Not only are they more expensive in the long run, but cheaply made shoes do not give proper support to the wearer's feet, Gardner said, and that after they have been wet once they are apt to loose their shape completely. He said this is particularly harmful to children's feet and he added that foot doctors claim that 65 percent of the shoes on the market today cannot be rebuilt for foot correction purposes because of the cheap materials used in their manufacture. He also said that one-third of the children's shoes today are not even repairable.

Paper is the most common of the cheap materials used in shoe construction and lately it is being found in even the better grades of shoes. Gardner said that 75 percent of the children's shoes made today have wooden shanks instead of steel, or else no shanks at all.

In some women's shoes, he said, a manufacturer will import expensive leather and do a fine job in styling to make a handsome shoe, but inside there will be found paper insoles, heel counters and toe caps. The customer pays a high price for the shoes, which may actually fall apart if they get wet. This is particularly true of summer shoes, Gardner said.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Gardner's complaint isn't so much the fact that paper fiber is used in shoe manufacture, but that if it is used the shoe buyer should know what he is getting for his money.

SENDS PETITIONS

Right now Gardner is in the process of sending out hundreds of petitions to cities all over the United States to aid in getting legislation passed. This was suggested by Senator WAYNE MORSE, along with other information, in a 3-page reply to Gardner's inquiry. Gardner has picked 12 cities in each State to send the petitions, which he is doing entirely on his own.

On the petition in his own shop Gardner has about 200 signatures, a good many of which are Medford doctors and shoe retailers, who recognize the trouble caused from poorly made footwear.

The petitions read: "National petition to label shoes: To state on a label what shoes are made of for your protection, due to the use of paper fiber and imitation leather in their manufacture. I believe I could buy better shoes if they were labeled. I believe I could buy better shoes by label and better foot health would result. I believe a great savings in money would result if I could buy shoes by label."

Also, at the suggestion of Senator MORSE, Gardner is collecting specific evidence of the use of paper fiber in particular brands of shoes, and on his counter for the public to see are cut-away samples of shoes made with paper that could not be repaired.

ATTACHED TO SHOES

He believes that the label should be attached to the shoes themselves and if they contain paper fiber, wood, or plastics, or any other product besides genuine leather, the label should say so in plain language and not call the material by some high-sounding name.

In this way Gardner feels that buyers will be able to judge better for themselves whether or not a particular shoe is worth the price.

Shoe retailers seem to be in accord with Gardner's ideas, too, because they often get "kickbacks" from customers who find that a pair of expensive shoes is cheaply made.

Almost every shoe repairman in the Nation is aware of the problem, Gardner said, and it's about time something was done about it.

RECEIVES COMMENDATION

Gardner has already received commendation from Parent's magazine for his investigations and he has received endorsement from various organizations locally. He also received a letter from Gino Prato, the Brooklyn shoe repairman who became known nationally after his appearance on $64,000 Question, commending him on what he has done. Prato said he would visit Gardner in Medford soon to see if he can do anything to help get a shoe label law passed.

Gardner now has the ball rolling on a nationwide scale and the time may not be far off when a person can go into a store and buy a pair of shoes and at least get what he pays for, putting an end to what Gardner calls the deceptive practice of our shoe industries.

Proposed Arctic Inspection Zone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Decisive Propaganda Victory For Our Side," published in the Glendive, Mont., Daily Ranger of May 4, 1958. The editorial is a well-thought-out and understandable analysis of the proposal made by the United States Government to establish an Arctic inspection zone, a proposal which, unfortunately, the Soviet Union has seen fit to reject.

In my opinion, and I think in the opinion of many other Americans, the most important area, in many respects, is the Arctic area. It is not a continent but a floating ice mass. It is quite different from the continent of Antarctica which has a solid land base.

So far as potential aggression is concerned, I would point out that any danger to this country would most likely, come from over the Arctic ice cap. Therefore, one can understand why this particular area can be considered as perhaps the most important in the world.

Furthermore, insofar as my own State of Montana is concerned for a good many years the residents of Montana have had some concern about this particular area. During the Second World War, 7,000 combat planes of all types were flown north from Great Falls, Mont., to Alaska, and thence to Siberia. What then was a one-way street could at a future time become a two-way street.

So, Mr. President, I express the hope that this sound proposal advanced by the Government of the United States will be reconsidered by the Soviet Union, and that it will agree to an Arctic inspection zone under rules and regulations which would be equally applicable to both sides.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Glendive (Mont.) Daily Ranger of May 4, 1958]

A DECISIVE PROPAGANDA VICTORY FOR OUR SIDE

The United States proposal to establish an Arctic inspection zone through the United Nations has demonstrated America's earnest desire for an easing of tensions at a time when it was sorely needed. Though the plan already has been rejected by the Soviet Union without good reason, the sound logic of the plan will help us for some time.

A chorus of shouts, our voice among them, has begged our leaders for some display of initiative in foreign policy. With our international reputation shaken by sputniks, summit fever and Communist abeyance of nuclear tests, and only our eternal smugness to fall back on, the United States needed a boost. President Eisenhower provided it. We pray that the administration can keep and add to this advantage.

This Arctic inspection proposal was no gimmick. It was a sound plan which if accepted by world powers might have provided the key for peaceful coexistence of the United States and Russia. The area to be inspected covered the vast Arctic wilderness across which H-bomb-armed missiles and bombers would be likely to fly in case of war. The plan included mutual radar monitoring of all flights across the area, a secure method of protection without disclosure of military secrets. It would have stopped scramble flights by both American and Russian planes when meteorites and geese give false indications of approaching danger. It would have eased the cold war on at least the northern front. It would have been a first step in a welcome direction.

That the plan was no propaganda gimmick was best proved by the unusual endorsement of United Nations Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjold. This quiet man who has studiously avoided entering into the day-to-day issues before the U. N. in order to gain the confidence of all nations, gambled his reputation and job by asking for Russian acceptance of the proposal. It was as if he had worked many years to acquire the stature for this one moment. The repercussions of his gamble still are uncertain.

At this stage, the rejected inspection plan stands only as a decisive propaganda victory for the United States. The crisp Russian "no" is certain to shatter partially the tissue paper tower the Communists have built for themselves in the minds of many of the uncommitted peoples of the world. The United States must now concentrate on keeping the Russian tension factories exposed to the view of the world.

Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the brilliant address by the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] last Monday, May 5, in which he gave the definitive argument for statehood for Alaska now, has attracted nationwide attention.

The Milwaukee Journal, a distinguished newspaper in my State of Wisconsin, summarized the analysis of the Senator from Idaho in an editorial entitled "Westward March Is Not Over." The editorial emphasizes his argument that the Nation stands unfinished so long as hundreds of thousands of our citizens are denied the full rights which go with living within a State in the Union.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Westward March Is Not Over," which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on May 7, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTWARD MARCH IS NOT OVER

One argument used against Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood is that "the Union is complete." Not so, Senator CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho, told the Senate, Monday.

"Our westward march is not over, ours is not a finished country," he said, "as long as hundreds of thousands of American citizens, in our two incorporated Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, are barred entry and wait upon the doorstep of our Union for the rights which are their legacy."

CHURCH also criticized those who argue that statehood would bring new Senators who would affect the party alinement and further dilute the voting strength of the more populous States.

"Such arguments," the Idahoan declared, "have been with us from the time of our national origin. Had we heeded them in the past, the United States would still be comprised of the thin tier of 13 States that

stretch along the Atlantic coastline of our mighty continent."

Speaking particularly of statehood for Alaska, which could come up for action shortly, CHURCH warned that "continued failure to grant it can only be regarded as a deliberate flouting of the popular will." Various polls, many newspaper editorials and action of Democratic and Republican national conventions of 1956 evidence that this is true.

Oil Imports Danger Strikes Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I want to invite the attention of the Senate to an interesting editorial which appeared in the El Dorado Times of April 25 in regard to the effect of increasing oil imports on our domestic economy.

While the editorial deals principally with the operations in the State of Kansas, which have been seriously curtailed as a result of these imports, I think it is well to remember that the United States as a whole has trimmed crude production to about 87 percent, using the base period of January to June 1956, on which to estimate the percentages.

The entire United States has made a cut of 876,000 barrels daily between the base period and March of this year.

In Kansas it can be definitely stated that this curtailment in the production of oil is effecting practically every section of the State and is one of the major factors in holding back a growing and expanding economy in our State.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL IMPORTS DANGER STRIKES HOME

The continuing swollen flood of foreign oil imports into the United States finally has brought the domestic oil industry close to a state of disaster.

The problem presented is an old one. It has been going on for the past 30 years. Much has been said about the matter in that time—and little done. Arrogant importers, sitting under the protection of a business-Government understanding and cabal, have paid no heed to cries of distress from the American oilfields. Successive administrations of Federal Government have been apprised of the existing condition time and again. But none of these has ever sponsored an effective remedy.

Today the volume of imports has arrived at a figure which seriously menaces the welfare of the domestic industry. All oil operators in the numerous oil States of the Union are feeling the severe pinch which it exerts. That pinch comes at a time when the industry is suffering from other causes as well. Here in Kansas the establishment of the severance tax as a revenue-raising principle, plus rigid and oversevere regulation in anti-pollution measures, has dealt Kansas oil producers the hardest blows they have yet sustained. Leasing and drilling development—the entire brisk pace of the industry in this State has been slowed.

When the oil tempo slows down in Kansas, the welfare of almost every other business and industry in the State is harmed. With oil money flowing in smaller streams through Kansas channels of commerce, those businesses receive less than their normal share from such source. The shortage cuts in a thousand ways.

That is what Gene Moriarty and Bob Ramsey, of Wichita, as well as others, told a large group of El Dorado business and professional people here Wednesday. They made their point clear: Any help now extended to relieve the plight of the oil industry may not be regarded simply as aiding a friend in distress, but represents a help to one's own individual enterprise.

This is an oil town—and has been in that category for 43 years. Business folk here understand and appreciate the importance of the oil industry to their personal welfare. They listened intently to what was said Wednesday. Moreover, they will act.

Within the next few days many letters will go forth from this town to Kansas Senators and Congressmen, urging support of the Ikard bill, House bill 11781, which is now before the House Ways and Means Committee in the National Congress. This bill, termed the "Mineral Resources Security Act," is designed to curb foreign imports of oil and oil products in a proper and effective manner. It needs to be passed—and that passage should take place at the present session of Congress.

The enactment of legislation of this sort will not be easy. Oil imports are governed and controlled by a group of large companies which have heavy importing interests along with their domestic activities. They work hand in hand with key politicians of both parties. Here exists an unholy combine of business and politics, intended to sacrifice the welfare of the domestic industry at large for the benefit of the few. The subject is further complicated by obligations of the Federal Government in the field of good-neighbor relationships.

Congress should hear from the grassroots. The grassroots represents those of us locally who are suffering along with our oilmen friends. Letters going now to Congressmen should be sharp and to the point. Congressmen are sensitive to sentiment back home. Moreover, none need forget that this is also an election year.

United Negro College Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the many very fine educational-fund campaigns is that conducted each year on behalf of the United Negro Colleges.

I was interested to read in last Friday's Milwaukee Journal an editorial urging adequate contributions to this important fund. While the people of Wisconsin are generous, as are the people of the United States as a whole, it is a fact that unfortunately we have not contributed nearly as much as all of us should have given to the growth of higher education for our Negro citizens.

America is strong and enlightened to the extent that all groups in her population—I emphasize, all groups—are enabled to grow to their fullest potentialities.

Who is to know how many potential George Washington Carvers there are among the Negro youngsters of this land who might never grow to their fullest stature, who might be wasted as that great scientist was almost wasted, and and would have been but for his own courage and the kind intervention of fate?

Who is to know how much this country loses in economic values alone, in economic wealth which is not created, because Negro youngsters are not able to pursue higher education in the same manner white youngsters are?

Fortunately, the United Negro College Fund has enlisted some of the finest of our American citizens in this splendid cause.

They are splendid citizens of the North and South; citizens who may disagree, incidentally, on some of the most controversial issues which confront the South. But these citizens are united on this one point, that all youngsters, regardless of race, should have adequate opportunity to grow to their fullest potentiality.

I do not refer merely to the young scientists—the future George Washington Carvers. I refer to the youngsters who can contribute to America—if they are given the right chance—in the liberal arts, in the humanities, in religion, in any area to which they feel a calling.

So I send to the desk the text of this Milwaukee Journal editorial which appeals to the generosity of the people of my State. I hope it will strike a responsive chord in arousing the wise philanthropic spirit of Americans beyond Wisconsin's borders.

Let no man anywhere think that this is just a southern problem. This is a problem of the 48 States. The South has made great progress, but we of the North must look to our own responsibilities, as well.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED NEGRO COLLEGE FUND

A few thousand dollars have been raised each year in the Wisconsin campaign for the United Negro College Fund. Last year it was about $13,000. That's a pittance considering that the joint campaign is for the support of 33 leading Negro institutions, with enrollments totaling around 24,000.

Wisconsin would be far more generous to this cause, we believe, if more of us understood what great good our dollars would do for these Negro colleges and their students and the Negro minority generally, nationwide. It is hard for us to realize that where most of these colleges operate, opportunities for the Negro boy or girl to go to college are terribly circumscribed both by economic status and "the color line."

For practical as well as altruistic reasons more Wisconsin people should wish to contribute what they can. For in failing to give Negroes equality of opportunity to train to their full capacity we not only discriminate, we are wasting great human resources which could contribute to national prosperity, security, and cultural advancement.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Only through education can Negroes generally attain the position we say they should occupy as fellow Americans. And more than half of UNCF college graduates go into teaching.

Milwaukee benefits directly from the UNCF colleges. A large number of leading Negro residents here with college degrees trained in those institutions. They are the Negroes to whom we must look for help in making difficult adjustments as more Negroes stream in from the deep south, mostly poorly educated and poorly prepared for northern city life.

The United Negro College Fund campaign in Wisconsin is now underway. The address of the Wisconsin headquarters is room 1007, 626 East Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee.

Exemption of Certain Agricultural Commodities From Interstate Commerce Commission Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent letter I have received from Mr. Edwin N. Yeary, president of the Yeary Transfer Co., of Lexington, Ky., concerning S. 3778.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YEARY TRANSFER CO., INC.,
Lexington, Ky., May 9, 1958.

Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORTON: The Senate Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, of which Senator SMATHERS is chairman, filed its report on April 30, 1958, with the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in which it recommends the freezing of the agricultural exemption at its present level with a slight rollback. The slight rollback would bring under economic regulation frozen fruits and vegetables and imported agricultural commodities.

The United States Department of Agriculture has been engaged during the past year in making a study of the effect of the agricultural exemption upon transportation costs of frozen fruits and vegetables, which study has not yet been completed, but I am informed will be available before too long. This study should contain information of great value to Congress in determining whether or not to place these commodities under economic regulation.

It would appear that to single out this agricultural commodity for regulation is rather discriminating, particularly in the light of the studies now being conducted.

Insofar as the regulation of imported agricultural commodities I believe Congress should take into consideration the fact that ICC has consistently ruled that a truck transporting both exempt and regulated commodities must be a regulated carrier. In the light of this ruling it is important to note that a great number of imported agricultural commodities, such as bananas, pineapples, and coffee, move in mixed loads with domestic agricultural commodities such as tomatoes and peaches. It follows that the effect of placing imported agricultural commodities under economic regulation would bring a portion of the domestic agricultural commodities under regulation when moving in mixed loads.

I believe it is beyond reasonable argument that regulation increases the cost of transportation with the result that the producer receives less for his commodity and the consumer pays a higher price for the commodity. There is also the result that there will be less consumption of any article upon which the price is increased.

Since the passage of the Motor Carrier Act, section 203 (b) (6), which provides for the agricultural exemption, has been the subject of much litigation and the courts have now clearly and well defined the meaning of the words in this section. To amend this section and change the words will result in another series of expensive litigations to determine just what was the congressional intent.

At the hearing before the House Subcommittee on Transportation and Communications when that committee was considering H. R. 5823, it was suggested that a resolution freezing the agricultural exemption at its present level be considered by Congress. Such a resolution would adopt ruling 107, of the ICC Bureau of Motor Carriers. This ruling designates the agricultural commodities which are exempt and those which are not exempt. This ruling was issued March 19, 1958. It would appear to me that a resolution of this character would result in freezing the exemption so that it could not be expanded from its present level and would not disturb the language of the statute and would thereby avoid extensive and expensive litigation.

I will appreciate your serious consideration of these matters.

Sincerely,

EDWIN N. YEARY,
President.

Civil Service Retirement Annuity Increases

SPEECH
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 31, 1958

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 607) to provide for increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, I should like to record at this time my fullest support of the bill H. R. 607, which upon enactment will provide for an increase of 10 percent in the retirement annuity benefits of civil service retirees who were on the annuity rolls on or before October 1, 1956.

This modest cost-of-living increase in the civil service retirement benefits of annuitants and survivors is urgently needed by some 250,000 retired Federal employees and 80,000 survivors who will be beneficially affected by this legislation.

These people are forced by circumstances to live on a rigid, fixed income. They, therefore, cannot adjust by any other means their economic status to meet the increases in our present-day cost of living.

It is with genuine pleasure, Mr. Chairman, that I lend my endorsement and support to this measure which seeks, as a matter of justice, to ease the financial burdens of retired senior civil service employees.

The Debtor Has Assets, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the great difficulties in thinking about the financial problems of the Federal Government is that there is no exact parallel to it.

If we try to reason from the analogy of the private householder we run into trouble, because the wealth of the United States is the whole dynamic productive power of its people now and in the future. If we compare it with a private business we go astray because the Government is not operated to make a profit.

Sometimes, though, it would be helpful to take into account some factors which are always part of the thinking of individuals and private concerns. When we talk about what the Government owes and whether the budget is going to balance, we ought to remember the enormously valuable physical assets that are the property of the whole people.

This is done very well in a perceptive editorial in the Madison Capital Times which appeared on May 7. The editorial points out the fallacy of talking about the liabilities of the Federal Government with never a word about its assets.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial from the Capital Times entitled "Shouldn't the Government List Its Assets With Its Liabilities?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULDN'T THE GOVERNMENT LIST ITS ASSETS WITH LIABILITIES?

When a private business makes a financial report it lists its assets along with its liabilities. But one never hears of the assets of a government in the caterwauling that goes on about the debt.

The national debt of $275 billion is not a pleasant thing to contemplate, we'll admit. But our chief objection to it is that the cost of financing it is adding further wealth to those who deplore it the most.

But while the tears are being shed about the national debt, why not take a look at the brighter side—the assets of the Government. The House Government Operations Committee recently reported that the Federal Government holds some $250 billion in assets.

That's not peanuts.

Actually, the assets are far more valuable than they appear on the Government's books. For example, the 18-acre White House grounds in the most valuable real estate section of Washington is carried on the books at a value of only $1,000.

It is estimated that the San Francisco Presidio is worth $50 million, but the Gov-

ernment lists it at $1. The same value is listed for Governor's Island in New York. The Little Rock Air Force base, consisting of 6,100 acres, which was given to the Government in 1952, is recorded as being of "no value."

Much of the property owned by the Government is listed at its original cost.

In the event that we wanted to give up the idea of keeping a Government, the whole thing could split up with each citizen receiving $1,450, assuming that it was sold at the deflated values listed.

If these assets were listed at their real value, it might well show that our assets exceeded our liabilities. That's not such a gloomy picture.

Address by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California, at Dedication Ceremonies, Point Arguello Naval Missile Facility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the dedication speech I made at ceremonies at Point Arguello Naval Missile Facility on Saturday last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND AT DEDICATION CEREMONIES, POINT ARGUELLO NAVAL MISSILE FACILITY, MAY 10, 1958

Today we are here to commission the Point Arguello Naval Missile Facility as a major part of our National Pacific Missile Range. This dedication, therefore, is a symbol of this Nation's progressive and forward-looking programs to strengthen our position in the military and in the peaceful applications of missilry and space technology.

The development and employment of missiles and rockets is an extremely volatile and rapid-moving field. I am told that the draftsman's ink was hardly dry on the first master plan layout for the development of this site when new and radically advanced vehicles were assigned here causing early modification of initial plans.

But this came easy and this is one of the great virtues of this site. That is, great flexibility and vast acreage to accommodate the most advanced vehicles our scientists can envision.

But why do we need these great missile ranges? We need them for operational sites, for development firings, for training bases. Point Arguello will serve all 3 of these objectives and will serve all 3 military services.

In fact, though such agency is yet to be established, it is expected that this Pacific Missile Range would accommodate any civilian agency interested in rocketry and space flight such as the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics or other organization that the Congress might establish.

This range is being established to fill the ever-increasing need for launching sites for the missile program.

The Pacific Missile Range is in no way a replacement for the Atlantic Missile Range at Cape Canaveral, Fla., or for the White Sands Proving Ground in New Mexico. On the contrary, those ranges will continue to grow and continue to fill the ever-increasing role that missiles and rockets play in our military defenses and civilian lives.

Each range has special capabilities—special features. For testing short-range missiles, your Government can utilize or acquire land ranges for firing trials. However, for longer range missiles and rockets, it is essential to use the vastness of the oceans, where maximum safety to human life can be achieved. This fact will become increasingly important as the state of the missile art advances to the point where the very large and very powerful rockets associated with space exploration come into use. In these cases, major land bases such as this site on the California coast must be provided as launching points, but our range is the thousands of miles of ocean ahead of us.

The skills and techniques and scientific capabilities associated with the establishment and employment of a missile-launch base of this character are of the highest order. As we plan for the next decade we must call upon and take steps to encourage the growth of our scientific and technological resources. We must keep in mind that in this field of activity, perhaps more than any other, what is new today may be obsolete tomorrow.

Neither in our more conventional defenses nor in this relatively new field must we allow our Nation to become second best. The stakes are high, for our very survival as free men is involved. The problems associated with designing a test and training center like the Pacific missile range is doubly difficult. For the range itself must be established and operating before the missiles assigned to the range can be tested.

This is to say the range designers must look far beyond today's fantastic missiles to insure that this major development tool—the range—has all the necessary capabilities the future will demand, and to provide these facilities on a timely basis.

And this points out another key factor of this operation—urgency. The pace of invention and discovery and adaptation of this knowledge to weaponry and space technology, coupled with the requirement of maintaining world leadership, requires that no major avenue of advancement go unexploited.

We are confident that the officers and scientists charged with this responsibility here at the Pacific missile range will continue to meet this challenge as their already outstanding progress has demonstrated.

The establishment of these major facilities here in California, the Pacific missile range and the closely integrated Cooke Air Force Base operational site adjoining it to the north, will have considerable impact on the California economy. The Defense Department has estimated that within the immediately foreseeable future some 5,000 to 10,000 new jobs will be provided in the area serving these activities. Though this growth, of necessity, is rapid, it will be permanent, for the goal is long term and tied to both military and civilian economy.

Likewise, the introduction and development of highly technical skills should be welcomed by the community and the area. Speaking as a Californian, we welcome this new activity to our State. The local and State authorities, industry, labor, and our general public will cooperate in this endeavor which means so much to the future of all mankind.

It was mentioned that these facilities will serve all services. This is of especial note. The President has recommended and the Congress is considering a new plan for the organization of the Defense Department. The keynote of this reorganiaztion is increased unity and economy. The operation here at Point Arguello, though basically managed by the Navy, is directed toward being a true national facility for unified use by all services. This is a proud example of service unity.

I have described the nature of this new facility. I have pointed out factors regarding its importance. But of the true long-term goals, there remains one last key point.

As our Nation grew to be the greatest world power, we—and particularly our Navy—lived under a concept the world strength depended upon "control of the seas." During this century, technological progress required us to revise and expand this concept to become "control of seas and control of the air." We are now embarking on the space age, and most assuredly we must take the next step—to make sure that the "control of space" is within the capabilities of those who would be devoted to human freedom and not to the enslavement of mankind.

We want to insure that free men can enjoy and benefit by unexplored potential of the heavens. We must continue to press back our horizons. Man's insatiable quest for knowledge and his compelling urge to explore the unknown are forces which will insure that full advantage is taken of all the potentials of space and that the opportunities for scientific exploration, observation, and experiment are cultivated so that our knowledge of the universe is constantly expanded.

Thus, this base, the Naval Missile Facility, Point Arguello, Calif., as part of the Pacific missile range, commences its journey into the future.

Each generation of Americans has measured up to the challenges confronting it. We in this atomic, missile, and space age can do no less, and we will face the future with confidence in the firm belief that we will continue to have divine guidance which has made and preserved us as a nation.

Annual Legislative Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, each year I send my annual legislative questionnaire to the people of the 22d Congressional District, consisting of Hollywood and the San Fernando Valley. This year's was my sixth questionnaire. The response to this questionnaire is always gratifying in that it shows the continuing interest of our citizens in legislation pending before Congress. This year more than 50,000 returns have been received and many of them included additional comments and letters. Insasmuch as there are thousands of citizens who have moved to this district from every State of the Union in recent years, I believe the results of the questionnaire represent a national cross-section to a large degree and would be of interest to all Members of the House.

Tabulation of the answers was done by International Business Machines Corp. and the results are as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
NATIONAL DEFENSE			
1. Do you feel that our military program has been materially harmed by the Air Force, Army, and Navy engaging in wasteful intraservice competition and unnecessary propaganda directed against a sister service?	79.8	14.0	6.2
Do you favor—			
2. The United States sharing information on atomic weapons and other nuclear material with our allies?	55.5	36.9	7.6
3. A multi-billion-dollar public defense shelter program financed by the Federal Government?	24.3	64.1	11.6
4. Meeting additional defense costs, if more money is needed, by the following actions:			
(a) Reduce expenditures on domestic projects, such as our own Los Angeles river flood control project, Federal Welfare programs, non-military power development	38.4	50.9	10.7
(b) Increase income and other taxes	16.7	73.7	9.6
(c) Eliminate nonmilitary aid to friendly foreign allies	54.5	36.1	9.4
(d) Permit an increase in the national debt	37.0	50.1	12.9
EDUCATION			
5. Do you believe the main support for education in the future still must come from State, local, and private sources?	78.7	17.1	4.2
6. Should the Federal Government, as recommended by the President, grant scholarships in mathematics, chemistry, physics, and other sciences to qualified students?	72.6	23.8	3.6
7. Should the Federal Government, as recommended by the President, grant scholarships and fellowships to qualified teachers as a practical reward?	65.5	28.6	5.9
8. Do you believe that Federal payment of all or part of our public-school teachers' salaries might lead to Federal control of our public-school system?	65.7	26.7	7.6
9. Do you think more emphasis on teaching science and mathematics in high schools would be a bigger factor in improving the education of United States youth than a Federal general education program?	72.5	19.9	7.6
FOREIGN POLICY			
10. Would you trust the present Russian Government to live up to any treaty or agreement (such as disarmament without inspection) we might make with them?	4.6	90.3	5.1
Do you favor—			
11. Postponing another summit meeting until Russia shows greater evidence of good faith toward permanent peace?	68.2	25.9	5.9
12. Recognition of Red China by the United States?	19.0	73.4	7.6
13. Foreign aid assistance to Yugoslavia?	13.4	73.5	13.1
14. Foreign aid assistance to Poland?	23.2	62.8	14.0
15. Continuation of our mutual security foreign assistance program to the following countries or areas:			
(a) Friendly Middle East countries	64.5	23.9	11.6
(b) India	46.8	38.7	14.5
(c) Other Asian countries	46.1	34.1	19.8
(d) France	44.6	41.0	14.4
(e) Other European countries	46.1	33.3	19.8
16. Extension of our policy of reciprocal trade for 5 years even though certain industries might be hurt by foreign competition (e. g., textiles, pottery, tuna, etc.)	55.5	32.7	11
17. Strengthening Israel militarily and economically, based on the argument that it is definitely allied with the United States and the West in the troubled and unpredictable Middle East?	44.8	41.3	13
LABOR			
Do you favor—			
18. Legislation requiring unions to conform to antitrust laws now applicable to private corporations and other business enterprises?	84.8	9.2	6.0
19. Federal supervision and regulation which guarantees union democracy, protecting voting rights of members, and reporting of all financial transactions made by union leaders?	91.5	5.4	3.1
20. Enactment of a State law along the lines of the right-to-work (also called voluntary unionism) amendment currently being discussed in California?	66.7	23.7	9.6
TAXATION			
Do you favor—			
21. Legislation which I have introduced, relieving individuals of certain tax inequities:			
(a) Deduction of all medical and drug expenses	86.3	10.3	3.4
(b) Deduction for working mothers up to 50 percent of income for child care expense (maximum $2,500)	89.3	23.4	7.3
(c) Credit for travel expenses to and from job (limit $300)	62.9	31.5	5.6
(d) Credit to parents for college tuition	67.5	27.0	5.5
(e) Allowing depreciation on taxpayer's residence?	73.9	21.0	5.1
22. A legal limit being placed on the amount of personal income tax the Federal Government can collect from an individual?	55.9	34.7	9.4
GENERAL SUBJECTS			
Do you favor—			
23. The granting of licenses by the Federal Communications Commission for "pay television"?	30.8	57.4	11.8
24. Increasing the rate for 1st-class mail, along with bulk mail, and other postal rates to help reduce the huge deficit in the Post Office Department?	78.5	18.1	3.4
25. Granting the postal workers a salary increase this year?	63.6	25.2	11.2
26. Granting military personnel a salary increase this year?	47.8	38.6	13.6
27. Granting Federal civil-service employees a salary increase this year?	34.1	49.7	16.2
28. Legislation liberalizing our immigration laws (allowing more people from foreign countries to enter)?	27.1	63.3	9.6
29. Returning to the States as many Federal Government activities as possible together with specific revenue sources?	72.3	15.7	12.0
30. The present Federal program of assistance, supervision, and general treatment of the American Indian?	40.8	31.5	27.7
31. Legislation presently before Congress terminating Federal supervision of American Indian Affairs in the State of California?	34.5	28.1	37.4
QUESTIONS OF LOCAL INTEREST			
(The following subjects do not require Federal action, but as a homeowner and taxpayer in our community, I am vitally interested in them and hope you will be too.)			
Do you believe—			
32. The Los Angeles Dodgers baseball team should be allowed to go ahead under the present agreement with the city of Los Angeles to build their own baseball park and other facilities in Chavez Ravine?	43.3	44.7	12.0
33. There should be a merger of the city and county governments to avoid wasteful duplication?	88.9	6.2	4.9

Hon. Emanuel Celler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on May 6 my colleagues paid tribute in the House to the dean of the New York Democratic delegation, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, on the occasion of his 70th birthday. It was not possible for me to be on the floor at the time, but I want to add my tribute to the man who for 35 years has represented the people of the 11th Congressional District of New York.

Mr. Milton Kronheim, of Washington, D. C., was host for the birthday celebration to Mr. CELLER; and among the guests were the New York delegation, and their wives, and Mr. CELLER's official staff. It was a memorable evening with all the guests paying glowing tribute to the guest of honor, but the highlight was the tribute paid by Mrs. Celler. She related the trials of being the wife of a man in public life and how she handled these problems. In acknowledging the tributes paid to him, MANNIE explained his philosophy. He learned that long hours of work were necessary and that all problems must be approached with patience.

In concluding his remarks, MANNIE left with us several quotations which I want to share with the readers of the RECORD.

We find these words in Job: "Thou shalt forget thy misery, and remember it as waters that pass away."

Count your garden by the flowers,
Never by the leaves that fall,
Count your days by golden hours,
Don't remember clouds at all.

Count your nights by stars—not shadows,
Count your life by smiles—not tears,
And with joy on this, your birthday,
Count your age by friends, not years.

Long ago, an eastern monarch plagued with misfortunes and harrassments called his wise men together. He asked them to invent a motto containing a few magic words that could help him in his time of trial. He wanted a motto small enough to be engraved on a ring. He wanted it to be endlessly enduring. The wise men thought and thought and finally came to him with the magic words "This too shall pass away." The motto has survived century after century. These words are rare wisdom and they have proved very precious to countless numbers of people.

High Quality of Oregon State Highway Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Nation has been provided an effective antirecession tool as the result of passage by Congress of an accelerated program for construction of the Federal Interstate Highway System. This was a major objective sought by myself and other Members of the Senate Public Works Committee when the bill was before us for consideration.

However, the speed with which this crash program of roadbuilding can be put to use will depend on the readiness of States to put men and machinery on the job. I am pleased to report to the Senate that the Oregon State Highway Department was ready for the challenge as soon as the Highway Act of 1958 became law. The State of Oregon will be able to meet the deadlines for putting the work under contract. This will have a salutary effect on the economy of my home State, which has been adversely affected because of declines in lumber production, because many new job opportunities will be created as the construction program progresses.

Oregon is ready to participate fully in the accelerated highway program because of the efficiency and advance planning which it has accomplished. Passage of the new law found Oregon State Highway Engineer W. C. Williams and his staff ready with a stockpile of projects, surveyed and ready to go. I might add that this type of foresight and planning in road matters is not unusual for my home State. It is the rule, rather than the exception. The efficient operation of the Oregon Highway Department is a tribute to the many persons who have given years of service in management of the Oregon road system. It is because of this dedicated public service that Oregon enjoys one of the Nation's finest highway systems. This accomplishment has been due to the work of many men, persons like R. H. Baldock, the predecessor of Mr. Williams; Tom Edwards, construction engineer; and Forrest Cooper, deputy State highway engineer.

Readiness of Oregon to take on its share of the antirecession road program is also a tribute to the effectiveness of members of the Oregon Highway Commission, the group of able private citizens who direct the activities of the professional engineering staff. The work of the Oregon State Highway Department was the subject of an article in the May 4, 1958, issue of the Oregonian. I ask consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "Highway Department Rates High With United States," which was written by Mr. Herman Edwards, a capable staff writer of the Oregonian.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregonian of May 4, 1958]

HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT RATES HIGH WITH UNITED STATES

(By Herman Edwards)

The Federal Government's antirecession crash program which made an additional $600 million available to the estates for highway construction when it was signed last month by President Eisenhower, created some problems for many State highway departments.

The law sets two deadlines which the States must meet if they qualify for the money. One provides that all projects must be under contract by December 1, 1958. The other requires that all must be completed by December 1, 1959.

How could the States qualify within such a short period? Some projects take 2 and 3 years for the surveying and location of routes. Acquisition of right-of-way also is time consuming.

It is typical of the Oregon State Highway Department that it was ready for this challenge. State Highway Engineer W. C. Williams promptly told his bosses, the three members of the Oregon State Highway Commission, that Oregon should be able to realize to the full amount the approximately $10½ million which the crash program will add to the highway construction program in Oregon this year.

OREGON FAVORED

Oregon is in a better position to meet the challenge than many States. Currently, it stands about eighth in the list of those which meet Federal requirements and provides matching money as it becomes available. There are good reasons why Oregon is in this favorable position.

The State highway department not only is an efficient business, but big business—the biggest of the State agencies by far. During this calendar year it will spend approximately $95 million in the construction of highways and bridges, the purchase of right-of-way, the maintenance of its highways and properties and the administration and operation of an establishment that numbers some 3,600 persons.

As for the details of getting projects ready to qualify under the new crash program, the department already has enough of them "on ice" to insure that Oregon will be able to participate to the limit, said Frank Hall, chief highway designer.

Hall dramatically opened his "ice box," a treasure chest of projects ready to be submitted to the commission for go-ahead. Some of them have been in the making over a number of years, their start delayed only because of lack of funds. Most of them are of the type on which the commission has ordered surveys and preliminary cost estimates but has been forced to tell visiting delegations they must wait until more money is available.

PROJECTS DUE

Some of these projects will be laid before the State Highway Commission at its May meeting Thursday and Friday in the Imperial Hotel.

The duties of highway department employes are divided among five major operating divisions. Traffic engineering is responsible for route determination and traffic control and other functions. Construction engineering is responsible for construction on all highways except bridges and structures. Bridge engineering constructs all structures.

Most numerous in personnel is the maintenance division, which employs approximately 1,700 people. The office engineering division is responsible for finances and statistics, for road designing and many other functions.

Oregon designs its own bridges, does all of its engineering. Some States contract these functions and also that of right-of-way purchases. Some States also contract their maintenance. Oregon does most of its maintenance work. Oregon extends farther into all fields of highway construction than most States.

Headquarters of the department is in its own handsome building on the Capitol Mall in Salem. Its big maintenance and repaid shop for the care and rebuilding of some 4,400 pieces of equipment is on Salem's East State Street, where also is located the engineering laboratories unit of the materials division. Maintenance shops also are located at La Grande, Bend, Klamath Falls, and Coquille.

Department personnel are located in every county of the State on geographical or project basis. The State is divided into five divisions, with a division engineer at Salem, Portland, Roseburg, Bend, and La Grande. The department's teletype system and its wave-radio network, which is shared by the State police, provide fast and efficient communications throughout the entire highway department's family.

ENGINEERS SET

Each of the 5 division engineers has 3 keymen, a resident engineer who is in immediate charge of highway construction, a resident bridge engineer who directs the building of structures, and a district maintenance superintendent. Resident construction and bridge engineers are assigned on a project basis, the district maintenance superintendent on a geographical basis.

There are a total of 19 maintenance districts over the State. In a still broader delegation of responsibilities there are 132 section foremen who are responsible for maintenance in their individual areas.

The department's activities are in many fields, some of them little publicized. One of the most spectacular but little known is the engineering laboratories unit of the materials division. Last year some 29,000 items were submitted to the laboratories for testing, some of them requiring many tests each. Since 1919 the division has conducted approximately 450,000 tests and has records of every single one to prove the claim.

The staff of approximately 35 engineers, technicians, and assistants, normally augmented by 10 or more during the summer,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

works under the direction of G. W. Harra, engineer of materials.

"We trust no one, not even ourselves," said Harra of the laboratory tests which determine whether materials that go into highways, structures, everything used by the department, are all they are claimed to be, and that they will give the State full value and service.

Sand, gravel, chemicals, paint, and many other items are tested for quality and proper proportions of ingredients. Lubricating oils are tested from 120° Fahrenheit to a point below zero where they no longer will flow. Brake fluid is subjected to temperatures 60° below zero.

Steel rods used in reinforcing concrete are pulled apart, concrete is crushed by a machine capable of exerting 300,000 pounds of pressure. These are not samples supplied by manufacturers. They are taken from the project by inspectors or engineers. To prove that their tests have been accurate and their decisions proper, laboratory technicians go back to construction projects and test materials after they have been in use for years.

TESTS VARY

The laboratory also conducts tests for other State and Federal agencies, such as the analysis of materials for the new State prison building. A test made by exerting pressure on a sample of soil will indicate its ability to withstand the weight of tons of rock fill for months or years to come.

Use of contour maps made by the photogrammetric process from aerial photographs is one of the greatest timesavers in selecting routes for new highways. On one section of the Oregon Coast highway the survey of the route was completed and it was ready for contracting within a year. The old ground survey methods would have delayed start of construction a year or 2 years.

Another timesaver which has saved money and man-hours as well as time is the data processing department's electronic computer. In estimating how much earth had to be cut and filled on a project it came up with the right answer 80 times faster than the pen and pencil method.

The computer, after engineer data had been fed into it, took 5 minutes to produce the design for a bridge. Approximate time for an engineer to produce the same answer with pencil and paper would be 40 hours.

Use of modern methods is 1 of the reasons why the Oregon Highway Department is among the top 10 in meeting Federal requirements—and it is necessary to meet such requirements on almost all projects of size. The United States Government participates in approximately 95 percent of all highway construction projects in Oregon.

BALDOCK PRAISED

Probably a more important reason why Oregon got the jump over many States in highway building is the long-range planning done by Chief Engineer Williams and his predecessor, R. H. Baldock. At a time when most States were being forced to curtail highway building, with a consequent loss of trained personnel, the Oregon department was building up a large and competent engineering staff.

This buildup was necessary to meet the impact of a gigantic construction program made possible by legislative authorization in 1951 of a $40 million bond issue and of a second authorization of a $32 million bond issue in 1953. The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 came along at just the right time to keep the Oregon department in high gear.

Oregon enjoys numerous other advantages by reason of having a competent highway department. Bridges have been largely standardized, which reduces the time and cost of designing and construction. The department maintains a cost analysis section, one purpose of which is to determine a fair contract price which will allow the contractor to make a reasonable profit.

On each project the cost analysis section comes up with an estimate of what the proper cost should be. After the job is completed cost analysis determines what was the contractor's total cost and whether he made or lost money.

Oregon has another advantage over some States in meeting Federal requirements that right-of-way must either have been purchased or be under condemnation at the time the construction contract is awarded. Oregon is able to hurry this phase of preparation by filing condemnation suits.

The business of preparing a project for its final approval by the State Highway Commission, which then orders the advertising for bids, is one which involves the concurrence of many key engineers. Because of the way the department is organized this process moves smoothly, although the finished product may incorporate many changes.

SIGNERS ADDED

A sample is the project for the Sunset interchange with the Baldock freeway. Submitted by the resident engineer, with his signature, it then acquired the signatures of the division, the traffic, and the bridge engineers. Then came the approval of the department's construction engineer, Tom Edwards. There followed those of Deputy State Highway Engineer Forrest Cooper, State Highway Engineer Williams, and C. J. Polk, division engineer for the United States Bureau of Public Roads.

Costs of highway construction in Oregon, contrary to what may be popular belief and actual experience in some States, are on the downgrade. The cost index for the first 3 months of 1958 was 157 as compared with the cost index of 100 established for the base year of 1940. This was approximately the same cost figure (157) recorded for the last quarter of 1948.

About a year ago the cost index climbed as high as 180. Other States at about the same time reported much greater acceleration in costs and much higher cost figures compared with those in Oregon.

For the Lack of a Shoe, a Horse Was Lost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, when we talk about the recession, or any other human tragedy, in terms of statistics in the aggregate, it is hard to grasp the snowballing effect that the troubles of one man or one company can have.

A good example is suggested by a news story in the financial section of the New York Times for May 9. The story states that the quarterly dividend of the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. for the second quarter this year will be half the usual amount. This is the kind of story that is common these days. It attracts little attention.

But trouble for Allis-Chalmers is trouble for thousands of workers in the Milwaukee area, where Allis-Chalmers has a great plant. It is trouble for stockholders in Wisconsin. This in turn means trouble for many businessmen who depend on those workers and stockholders as customers. And it means real trouble next year for the State of Wisconsin, which relies heavily on the personal and corporate income tax for revenue. This trouble will be sharp and immediate, because the State is forbidden to borrow by its constitution.

This is what a single news story means—and there are scores like it these days. This is why waiting for something to turn up is no way to respond to a recession.

I ask unanimous consent that the news story headed "Allis-Chalmers Halves Dividend," from the New York Times for May 9, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALLIS-CHALMERS HALVES DIVIDEND—CUTS QUARTERLY FROM 50 CENTS TO 25 CENTS—STOCK FALLS 1½ POINTS TO 23

The quarterly dividend on the common stock of the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., was cut yesterday to 25 cents from 50 cents. It will be distributed to shareholders on June 30.

The stock opened on the big board yesterday at 23¼ with a trade of 5,000 shares. Later it fell to 22¾, just short of the year's low of 22⅝. The final quotation of 23 was at a loss of 1½ points on the day.

The company explained that the board's action was considered prudent in the light of current business conditions and reflected no pessimism over the company's outlook.

Recently Allis-Chalmers reported its first-quarter net income at $2,307,199, or 27 cents a share. This was in sharp contrast to the $5,100,158, or 61 cents a share, earned in the initial 3 months last year. Net sales declined to $119,668,223 from $137,950,459.

Winona, Minn., Has Compiled an Enviable Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to a splendid record of accomplishment which has been compiled by the people of Winona, Minn.

The city of Winona has been singled out in a report, issued by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, director of the FBI, as being 1 of only 6 cities in the Nation in the over 25,000 population class which had no instance of outbreak in 5 areas of major crime in 1957.

Winona had no crimes committed in the classifications of murder, manslaughter, robbery, rape, or aggravated assault.

In addition, Winona's crime rate in other classifications—such as burglary, larceny, and auto theft—is substantially lower than the national average.

The five other cities which join with Winona in this enviable record are, Bristol, Conn.; Amsterdam, N. Y.; Melrose, Mass.; Warwick, R. I.; and Sheboygan, Wis.

This record is all the more impressive when it is pointed out that it was achieved in spite of a nationwide rise in crime. FBI statistics on national crime, reported in a well-documented news story in the Winona Daily News, shows that there has been a 9.1 percent increase in crimes in 1957 over 1956.

In all crime categories except murder, national figures show that the number of cases in 1957 have risen when compared to the previous year.

I believe this is truly a significant accomplishment in these days when crime has been making the headlines of our newspapers with ever-increasing frequency.

This record is a personal tribute to all the people of Winona who have banded together in a progressive community to create a climate of religious and civic stability which has made such a record possible.

The record of Winona springs from other causes in addition to those I have named.

I am sure the program of law enforcement in Winona has contributed in large measure to the decrease in crime.

I am certain that the educational facilities have played a major part.

I believe that the recreational leadership has exercised a great influence.

When a city establishes a record such as this, it should be studied by national law enforcement authorities for possible corporation of programs and projects into the pattern of other communities.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Winona would like to share their programs of law enforcement with national authorities and therefore I urge that such a study be made.

At this time, I would like to insert into the RECORD the complete news story from the Winona Daily News which lists comparable statistics.

WINONA 1 OF 6 CITIES WITHOUT MAJOR CRIME

The attention of police administrators and social scientists throughout the Nation has been focused on Winona following publication of an FBI report showing that this city is 1 of only 6 in the United States in which no murders, manslaughter, robberies, or aggravated assault were reported during 1957.

The annual Uniform Crime Report issued by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover revealed that Winona reported a crime rate considerably lower than the national average in each of the eight major crime categories analyzed in the report.

There were indications in Washington that intensive studies will be undertaken in Winona and the other five cities heading the listing to determine factors contributing to the low crime rate.

The other 5 cities—among 557 in the over-25,000 population classification—in which there were no murders, robbery, manslaughter, or aggravated assault during the year are Bristol, Conn., population 35,961; Amsterdam, N. Y., 32,240; Melrose, Mass., 26,988; Warwick, R. I., 43,028; and Sheboygan, Wis., 42,365.

No city in the Nation filed crime-free reports in all seven major categories listed in the survey.

Winona in 1957 reported 42 burglaries, 24 cases of larceny involving amounts over $50, 106 larceny cases under $50, and 9 auto thefts.

This is the way Winona compares with the national crime rate in eight categories. (The national average is computed on a 100,000-population basis and the Winona figures were arrived at by multiplying individual totals by 4 inasmuch as the population here is near 25,000:)

	National	Winona
Murder	5.1	0
Manslaughter	3.5	0
Rape	15.1	0
Robbery	64.3	0
Aggravated assault	90.2	0
Burglary	502.9	163
Larceny	1,317.8	520
Auto theft	254.7	36

The FBI report shows that nationwide there was a 9.1 percent increase in crimes in 1957 over the previous year.

A breakdown of the 2,796,400 crimes reported last year reveals that in the 8 major categories there were increases in all but 1 of the classifications—that, murder, in which a 0.7 percent decrease was noted.

The number of cases, with percentage changes in parentheses, follows:

Murder	6,920	(−.7)
Negligent manslaughter	5,740	(+1.6)
Rape	21,080	(+3.8)
Robbery	61,410	(+8.2)
Aggravated assault	100,110	(+3.8)
Burglary	590,020	(+12.2)
Larceny	1,721,170	(+8.4)
Auto theft	289,950	(+9.9)

The report notes that between 1950 and 1957 crime in the United States increased by 56.2, rising 4 times as fast as the total population which is up only 13 percent.

The value of stolen automobiles during 1957 was $249 million but recoveries represented a valuation of $232 million.

Winona reported recovery of all cars stolen here during the year. In addition three automobiles stolen elsewhere were recovered in Winona.

Of all arrests in 1957 in 1,473 cities of over 2,500 population, 29.8 percent were of Negroes who represent only 10 percent of the total population.

In his analysis of the crime report Hoover listed seven factors which generally influence a city's crime rate. They are:

Population. Larger cities generally have higher crime rates.

Composition of population. Crime rates usually are higher in cities with younger population groups.

Economic stability.

Religious facilities.

Recreation areas.

Educational systems.

Quality of police force and the attitude of the community toward law enforcement.

Business Is Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to place in the Appendix a thoughtful and encouraging letter which I received last Friday from an automobile dealer in my district. I hope other Members are getting similar good reports from business in their districts. The letter speaks for itself and is as follows:

PALMA MOTOR SALES & SERVICE CORP.,
STATEN ISLAND, N. Y., *May 6, 1958.*

Hon. JOHN H. RAY,
319 House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: As you know, on April 26, 1958, the Richmond County automobile dealers, in cooperation with the Staten Island Chamber of Commerce, the Staten Island Advance and local city, State, and government officials, launched a you-auto-buy-now promotion.

Speaking for my own company, I am pleased to report that during the first 6 days of this promotion we sold as many new units as we had the previous 6 weeks. I am sure you will find just as good results among the other dealers on Staten Island.

The indications are that this trend is continuing and I am convinced that there is nothing wrong with our economy that plenty of good old-fashioned American salesmanship can't correct.

For the first time in many months I can truthfully say business is good.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Very truly yours,

DAVID F. PALMA.

The Need for Social Science Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 27 of this year I proposed amending legislation to double the sum that the National Science Foundation earmarked for social science research. The amendment would not have increased the total sum proposed in the NSF budget by the Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices. It would have decreased the biological and medical sciences budget and the mathematical, physical, and engineering sciences budget.

It would have doubled the proposed $850,000 figure.

My proposal, though not adopted, drew favorable comment in this House and elsewhere. I am greatly encouraged to know that there is a growing feeling throughout this country that the most promising road to a solution to this matter of survival in today's world lies in basic research in human behavior.

The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices currently is considering legislation in this field. Strong reasons for increasing the budget figure for social science research have come from Senator WAYNE MORSE and others.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD the statement of Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., editor, Sociometry, made before the Senate subcommittee on May 9, 1958, relative to this vital topic:

STATEMENT BY LEONARD S. COTTRELL, JR., EDITOR, SOCIOMETRY, BEFORE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959, MAY 9, 1958

Mr. Chairman and members of the Senate committee: First, permit me to express my

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

appreciation for your kindness in providing me this opportunity to testify in behalf of the 1959 appropriation of the National Science Foundation, and, in particular, in behalf of its appropriation for research and training in the social sciences. I am appearing in my personal and professional capacity as a social scientist and not as a representative of any of the organizations and Government agencies with which I have the honor of being associated.

I have had the privilege of observing the social science programs of several Government agencies at firsthand. In addition to my membership on the advisory panel for the psychological and social sciences in the office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Research, and Engineering, I am currently serving as a member of the National Mental Health Council and the advisory panel for social science research of the National Science Foundation. Let me assure you, Mr. Chairman, that it has been quite painful for me to observe directly the large number of extremely significant projects in the social sciences which Government agencies have had to decline because of lack of funds. In the National Science Foundation we have received in the past year over $3 million in requests for social science projects, and have had only $600,000 to spend. The budget under consideration, as approved by the House, includes $850,000 for the social sciences next year. I am thoroughly convinced that the Foundation could well spend twice that amount. Representative CHARLES O. PORTER of Oregon quite eloquently presented this viewpoint on the floor of the House on March 27, and was advised by Representative ALBERT THOMAS of Texas, chairman of the House subcommittee which considered the National Science Foundation appropriation, that his general purpose was an admirable one.

Here are some interesting figures set forth by Congressman PORTER:

The National Science Foundation presents its summaries of obligations among the 3 major scientific areas as follows:

Biological and medical sciences. From $7.8 million in 1958 to $19.5 million in 1959, an increase of $11.7 million.

Mathematical, physical, and engineering sciences. From $7.8 million in 1958 to $19.5 million in 1959, an increase of $11.7 million.

Social sciences. From $600,000 in 1958 to $850,000, an increase of $250,000.

In short, as Mr. PORTER points out, the sciences having to do with how to improve our physical well-being and prolong life and the sciences dealing with the physical universe were increased almost three times, but the sciences having to do with the problems of human behavior were increased only about 40 percent.

If the amount available for social science research were increased to $1.7 million, and the total for research support maintained at $40 million, the result would be that all programs would be increased almost 3 times, although social science basic research would still be less than one-tenth as much in dollars as either of the other 2 programs alone, less than one-twentieth of both of the other programs together.

In his plea for additional funds for more basic research in psychology, sociology, economics, and other disciplines relating to human social behavior, Congressman PORTER points out that in 7 years the National Science Foundation has spent $27.4 million on mathematical, physical, and engineering sciences; $26.6 million on biological and medical sciences; but in this same period only $1.2 million on social sciences, its program beginning in 1954 with $57,000.

I was also very much impressed with the cogency of the arguments presented last year by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY of Minnesota in support of a greater effort by the National Science Foundation in the area of the social sciences. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I should like to present for the subcommittee's consideration Senator HUMPHREY's remarks as they appeared in the RECORD of July 9, 1957:

"I was one of the original sponsors of the National Science Foundation's program. I have always watched over it in every session of Congress, working for increased appropriations in order that its activities could be properly developed and expanded. I have paid particular attention to the Foundation's expanding social-science program and have looked forward to the time that an adequate amount of its funds would be allocated to support research grants and fellowships in the social sciences.

"I was therefore gratified to learn from the statement inserted in the RECORD on June 12, 1957, by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that he and the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], are agreed that it would be appropriate and desirable for the National Science Foundation to spend $1 million of the $40 million appropriated for fiscal year 1958, or only 2½ percent, for research grants and fellowships in the social sciences.

"I should like to express my unqualified endorsement of the views of my able colleagues and to add my own voice to theirs in support of expanding the social science programs of the National Science Foundation. There can be no question of the importance and urgency of the matter. I assume that the Director of the Foundation and the National Science Board will proceed immediately and directly to the implementation of the suggestion of my colleagues, with respect to both research grants and fellowships, and that they will prepare the groundwork for an even more extensive social science program in the years to come.

"My recent experience in the Middle East has impressed upon me more than ever the urgency of getting on in the social sciences. There is immediate and crying need for trained and knowledgable personnel to deal intelligently and rationally with a variety of social science problems. For example, the question of equitable distribution of agricultural surpluses, the need for better understanding of the obstacles and impediments to reasonable interpersonal and intergovernmental relations in the area, and insight into the mentalities and personalities of the individuals and masses with whom we have to deal. The effectiveness of our various assistance programs depends in large measure upon having reliable information about, and understanding of, the hopes, aspirations, motivations, and expectations of the peoples involved. In so many different ways there was impressed upon me the tremendous benefits which would accrue to us as a nation from having available a well-trained corps of social science technicians and experts.

"I deem it essential, therefore, that the National Science Foundation set about with dispatch to broaden its research and fellowship programs in the social sciences. The needs are considerable, but the program levels recommended by my colleagues from Oregon and Washington provide at least a reasonable minimum effort upon which a stronger and broader program can be developed in the future. As stated in the RECORD of June 3, 1957:

" 'The imperative necessities of the current social crisis suggest that excessive timidity is a luxury we cannot afford.'

"My distinguished colleague from Oregon has remarked that curtailment of funds in this area will prove not to represent economy but a very expensive reduction. I agree with him and trust that the Foundation will overcome its unwarranted reluctance to move forward in the social sciences.

"It is gratifying to note the increasing evidence of a general recognition of the importance of basic scientific studies of human social behavior. The unequivocal position of the Senate's Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary is a case in point. On several occasions the subcommittee urged the National Science Foundation to expand its work in the social sciences and in its final report the subcommittee stated:

" 'The subcommittee strongly recommends that ample funds be made available for the next fiscal year to permit the National Science Foundation to embark upon a program of social science support on a reasonable scale. The Foundation already possesses legislative authority to undertake programs in the social-science fields. The subcommittee believes that such a program would clearly be in the national interest and would provide for meeting an important national need.'

"It is inconceivable to me that the National Science Board and the staff of the Foundation will fail to give proper attention to this serious recommendation of an able group of Senators. I am confident that the Director of the Foundation and the Board, by virtue of their concern with promoting the national interest and national welfare, will not long delay in adopting and carrying out the wise suggestions of Senators MORSE and MAGNUSON, and of the members of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, regarding the development of an expanded program of research grants and fellowships in the social sciences. It seems to me that the suggested allocation of $1 million for this purpose is the very least we can spend for this important national program."

Senator HUMPHREY, it should be noted, is referring to $1 million out of a total budget for the Foundation of $40 million. The Foundation's request before you is for $140 million.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, you very graciously included in the subcommittee's record a communication I had addressed to President Eisenhower, Senator WAYNE MORSE, and others. In that statement I quoted one of the conclusions of the report on private foundations issued by the House committee headed by the late Representative Cox of Georgia. Permit me to repeat that quotation now since it presents succintly and forcefully a significant point of view:

"It is entirely possible that in a time when man's mastery over the physical sciences threatens him with possible extermination the eventual reward from the pursuit of the social sciences may prove even more important than the accomplishments in the phsical sciences."

In addition to more research funds there is an imperative urgency to train more qualified people in the social sciences. Consequently, there must be a broader and more intensive program of social science fellowships in the foundation. I understand that some $500,000 are included in the foundation's fellowship request for selected social science areas. I believe this figure should be doubled. All social scientists with whom I have consulted are agreed that the major bottleneck in the progress of the social sciences is precisely in the area of specialized and expertly trained manpower capable of performing the important tasks of research and teaching in the social sciences.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I should like to express my strong endorsement of the recommendations proposed by my fellow social scientist, Dr. Harry Alpert, vice-president-elect of the American Sociological Society. Dr. Alpert concludes an important article on the social science program of the National Science Foundation in the February 1, 1958, issue of the Saturday Review as follows:

"Next steps, in my judgment, should include, for the short range, (1) broadening of the NSF graduate and faculty fellowship programs to include the social sciences as

such; (2) inclusion of the social sciences on an equal status with other scientific disciplines in the education, register, facility support, and related programs of the Foundation; and (3) establishment, after a period of experience with present programs, of a division of the social sciences, as envisaged originally in the Magnuson-Kilgore bill 13 years ago.

"For the long run, steps must be initiated to develop among natural scientists and social scientists a sense of mutual respect and understanding and a community of interest. Today's invidious hierarchical distinctions among specialists of the various disciplines must disappear. An institutional environment must be created to encourage all scientists in intimate association to cooperate effectively toward achievement of the common goal of better understanding of the ways of nature, man, and society. Man's mastery of space, it has been appropriately said, must quickly be matched by man's mastery of himself. This is a fundamental condition of survival."

Statement by Ohio Catholic Welfare Conference on Right-To-Work Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have been furnished by one of my constituents with the text of a statement released by the Ohio Catholic Welfare Conference which expresses opposition on moral grounds to a right-to-work amendment to the Ohio constitution. I believe this statement is extremely well-worded and expresses a very logical and rational point of view about this very important current issue.

The statement points out that the right to work is a general one which cannot be denied to men; but the right to work in a specified industrial plant or business can be subject to special conditions. The statement expresses opposition to State intervention either in favor or in opposition to right-to-work laws.

Mr. President, this statement was signed by the bishops of the Six Sees in Ohio. It deserves wide attention, both because it comes from such an honorable and noteworthy source, and because it expresses a detached, convincing, and wise point of view. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT RELEASED BY CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE OF OHIO

On previous occasions attention has been called to the necessary distinction which must be made between the wisdom of enacting a law and the moral right to do so. Laws at times have been morally valid in themselves but inept and mischievous in their results. Right-to-work laws seem to fall into this category where a distinction is necessary.

Man has a right and duty to work for his livelihood. This right cannot be circumscribed to the extent that a man losses his liberty of choice of a vocation, nor to the extent that he is deprived of an opportunity to support himself and his family. It does not follow that a man has the unconditional right to work in any and every industry or business at will.

For reasons of social justice it may be desirable and often advantageous to the common good that man's right be restricted by certain specified conditions. One of these imposed conditions may require that he belong to a labor union or at least be obliged to join the union subsequently, so as to share responsibility with his fellow workmen in support of the union.

Just as a citizen of the United States is free to live in Ohio, Kentucky, or Pennsylvania, yet is obliged to observe the laws of the particular State as a condition of citizenship, so also in respect to his right to work; he is free to work in any industry of his choice, but only on condition that he abides by the rules adopted by that particular industry as a condition of employment. In other words, the right to work is a general right and cannot be denied to men in the aggregate; but the right to work in a specific industrial plant or business can be subject to special conditions.

If State statutes were to make such a condition of union maintenance mandatory, we would oppose them as unwise, if not unjust. If State statutes however were to forbid the enforcement of such a condition, when mutually accepted by management and labor through collective bargaining, then we would be equally opposed. We believe it is unwise to encourage State intervention in this matter, whether it be in favor of right-to-work laws or against them.

There are certain abuses which sometimes creep into the labor movement, but we are convinced that right-to-work laws are not the proper means to correct them. Corruption of certain labor leaders has been one of these current abuses. The denial of the democratic processes and the denial thereby of responsibility to the rank and file of union membership, whether in election to office or in the determination of union policy, are prolific causes of these abuses.

The right to strike, for instance, cannot be denied under certain definite conditions; but it is a right which must be carefully circumscribed and limited by ethical or moral considerations. It cannot be exercised willfully, that is, without just and adequate cause, and even then only in matters of grave importance, with a favorable issue reasonably secure, and, lastly but most importantly, after all other peaceful means have failed.

The right to picket is a concomitant right if a justified strike is called, but violence against persons and property is absolutely wrong and indefensible in conscience. Even the right of mass picketing is a very questionable procedure because of the physical intimidation involved and the proximate danger of overt acts of violence ensuing.

There have been other issues which cause public concern, such as jurisdictional disputes where innocent third parties are made the victims. There are questions also of secondary boycott which involve serious moral questions. All of these should be solved by an increased sense of social responsibility on the part of labor; and, if that procedure fails to correct the evils, then recourse would be had to regulatory legislation.

If we have pointed out certain abuses in the labor movement, we do so not because we think their leaders alone are at fault. There have been serious abuses also on the part of management, such as unreasonable and unjust opposition to the right of union organization, monopoly prices and profits, misrepresentation of products, and bribery and corruption not infrequently. Two wrongs, however, do not make a right; and the two evils do not cancel each other but intensify the damage done to the common good.

Much progress has been made in creating mutually satisfactory conditions in recent years in our labor-management relations. It would be socially undesirable to jeopardize the gains achieved by precipitating new causes of strife and ill will.

We think it is high time to introduce sound ethical standards into all phases of our economy. The present preoccupation with right-to-work laws may be a good occasion for all our leaders in the field of labor and in the field of management to examine their consciences as to their honest motivation, their ideals, and their practices.

As to the present issue before the electorate in Ohio, we are convinced that a right-to-work amendment would not solve our problems, but might lead to a more intensified struggle for domination and thus postpone an era of peaceful cooperation.

Most Rev. KARL J. ALTER,
Archbishop of Cincinnati.
Most Rev. EDWARD F. HOBAN,
Archbishop-Bishop of Cleveland.
Most Rev. EMMET M. WALSH,
Bishop of Youngstown.
Most Rev. GEORGE J. REHRING,
Bishop of Toledo.
Most Rev. JOHN K. MUSSIO,
Bishop of Steubenville.
Most Rev. CLARENCE G. ISSENMANN,
Bishop of Columbus.

Nonsense on Plywood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 24, 1958, I discussed the plywood problem in the Pacific Northwest in this House. At the close of my prepared remarks I said that as long as I have the honor to represent the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon I shall continue to be deeply concerned about the welfare of the plywood industry in the Pacific Northwest. But such concern, if it is to have useful results, must be based on hard facts, facts such as those I set forth at that time.

On May 9, 1958, the responsible Washington Post and Times Herald found in its editorial Nonsense on Plywood that plywood imports seem to be this year's whipping boy for the protectionists.

And in Boston, Mass., the same day, the renowned Christian Science Monitor editorially noted that a self-imposed reduction of hardwood plywood exports by Japan had idled workers in the Pacific Northwest because producers of decorative panels and doors report they have had to curtail operations because they cannot obtain enough suitable material.

This is—

Says the Monitor—

a good example of how an effort to protect one group of American producers from foreign competition damages other American producers.

Another pertinent factor cited in the Monitor is the fact that softwood ply-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

wood is used for different purposes than hardwood plywood imports.

Mr. Speaker, the full text of both editorials follows:

PROTECTIONISM RUN WILD

Workers are idle in the Pacific Northwest because Japan has reduced its exports of hardwood plywood to the United States. Producers of decorative panels and doors report they have had to curtail operations because they cannot obtain enough suitable material. At the same time Congress has before it bills seeking to cut supplies of this material—imported hardwood plywood—by imposing import quotas.

This is a good example of how an effort to protect one group of American producers from foreign competition damages other American producers. Japan reduced its exports to forestall a possible increase of the American tariff, now set at 20 percent. Such an increase was denied by the Tariff Commission after thorough investigation. But agitation for cutting imports has continued.

It is also an example of familiar protectionist tactics. For the impression is conveyed that the whole American plywood industry is in peril. Actually it has been expanding at a rapid rate. Moreover, the great part of it—softwood plywood—is used for entirely different purposes and is not touched by hardwood imports. Imports are competitive with a small fraction of the American business—domestic hardwood plywood—but in the sense that Volkswagens compete with Cadillacs.

Another too familiar feature of this protectionist drive has been scare stories. One had it that 28 plywood plants had been shut down following failure to get Tariff Commission help. A careful check showed 9 still operating, 3 destroyed by fire, 3 never existed, 4 had been consolidated with other operations and production increased; others had closed because timber supplies were depleted or because of labor trouble or lack of capital.

Yet the facts have not yet caught up with some people taken in by such stories. The plywood case may be an extreme one. But Congressmen who tend to be stampeded into opposition to the reciprocal trade program would do well to examine other protectionist pleas for similar fallacies.

NONSENSE ON PLYWOOD

Opponents of the pending renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act have resorted to almost unbelievable falsification and misrepresentation in their misguided protectionist zeal. Explanations and denials never seem quite to overtake a "big lie," but when the lie is calculated to destroy a cornerstone of American and free world strength it cannot be ignored.

One of the fictions recently circulated was that imports of hardwood plywood, principally from Japan, have resulted in the closing of some 28 American plants. Investigators for the importers ran this one down and found that 9 of the 28 had not shut down, 3 had been demolished by fire, 3 had never existed, 2 were named twice on the list, at least 1 had produced container plywood (none of which is imported), 1 was closed before there were any significant imports, 4 were consolidated with parent firms resulting in greater production, 2 failed because of under-capitalization and the other 3 were closed for such reasons as labor trouble and depletion of timber stands.

Not discouraged, the advocates of import quotas for plywood then claimed that softwood plywood plants in the Pacific Northwest had suffered from imports of hardwood plywood. As the Tariff Commission found, in unanimously rejecting escape clause relief for domestic plywood producers in 1955, the two types are not competitive. The Portland Oregonian agrees, and further declares:

"There is danger in Congress' imposing quotas on any item. Plywood quotas might be followed by similar restrictions on any number of products which could result in retaliation against American exports and the loss of jobs dependent upon exports."

The facts seem to be that the recent boom in sale of imported Japanese hardwood plywoods, used mainly for flush doors, has encouraged consumption of all types of plywood, including domestic. Yet, fearful of congressional reaction, Japan has limited her exports to this country and now American flush door plants have been closed, in some cases, or been unable to meet orders because of the lack of imported doorskins.

Plywood imports seem to be this year's whipping boy for the protectionists, and an unhappy choice they were. If the present situation of the industry discloses anything at all about trade policy, it is that imports of this kind complement and sustain the marketing of similar domestic products and, in the process, create more jobs and more business for Americans. If Congress unwisely chose to load the extension of the Trade Agreements Act with new exceptions and escape procedures, it might well end up stifling the economy it seeks to protect at a time when there is a premium on promoting new growth.

Address by Doris Fleeson Before Twin Cities Chapter of American Newspaper Guild

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the most gifted women commenting on the foibles and frailties of those of us in public life is Miss Doris Fleeson, political columnist for the United Feature Syndicate. Her astute observations are highly perceptive.

On October 24, 1957, Miss Fleeson delivered a most thoughtful and provocative address as the 11th annual memorial lecture sponsored by the Twin Cities chapter of the American Newspaper Guild on the campus of the University of Minnesota, at the school of journalism of that great educational institution, in Minneapolis.

Title of Doris Fleeson's address was An Art To Be Practiced, meaning, namely, the great art of politics, by which government is selected and operated in our country. After all, such illustrious Americans as Abraham Lincoln and Franklin D. Roosevelt were lifelong politicians.

Previous participants in the memorial lecture series of the Twin Cities Guild have been such noted writers and teachers as Thomas L. Stokes, Marquis W. Childs, Herbert L. Block, Henry Steele Commager, Alan Barth, and Elmer Davis. I believe Miss Fleeson's address is a worthy addition to this star-studded galaxy, and I ask unanimous consent, that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ART TO BE PRACTICED

(By Doris Fleeson)

All of life is, of course, an art to be practiced. But as I am only an amateur philosopher and indeed often find it difficult these days to be philosophical at all, I shall speak here of that particular area where I have claims to competence. It is politics.

My own happy breed of men and women are political reporters and the special flavor of their work arises from the fact that their identity with their subject becomes with the passage of time absolutely total.

It is fortunately possible for reporters to cover crime without acquiring the criminal mentality. They are able to make the trial of a spicy suit for divorce or a spectacular case of larceny live in deathless prose and at the same time lead blameless lives, at ease alike with their bankers and with Dorothy Dix. Not so the political reporter.

If his political coverage is to have any depth—and no other kind is worth writing or publishing—he must become saturated with his subject and intimately acquainted with the true nature of the politicians he deals with.

He must know them and the political imperatives they are bound to obey. These political imperatives take many forms, and they are different for each politician. They include geographical considerations, social and economic forces and the interests of his party, both local and national.

Such knowledge is vital because the political reporter on occasion comes very close to being judge, jury and lord high executioner of the politician. To undertake this assignment without proper information is worse than unfair, it is base.

Eventually reporter and politician grow into that relationship which is such a cross to every President and the bureaucrats around him; that is, they have no secrets from one another. Possessing as they do, a complete mutual understanding of political situations and the forces creating and operating upon them, how could it be otherwise?

I consider this relationship one of the great bulwarks of the Republic quite apart from my personal stake in it. My one real complaint about it is that reporters—and their publishers—tend to become too kind to their favorite politicians and presidents. Too often they find it difficult to maintain that detachment which combines in correct proportions understanding with critical analysis.

The pampering by the press of politicians, no matter how exalted their status; is a crime so heinous it should be forbidden by law.

When I was younger and more sanguine, I used to make certain suggestions for remedying any such bent on the part of my colleagues. I proposed, for example, that Washington correspondents should be returned to their home offices at stated intervals and made to cover police and the department of sanitation, both excellent experience for political coverage. I argued that this would reacquaint them with reality, shake them loose from connections which had grown too comfortable and generally restore their perspective.

I was fond also of quoting Parnell to the effect that the greatest enemy of Irish freedom was the English dinner napkin.

I soon learned that I was not destined to win any popularity contests at the National Press Club. I have settled long since for a column of my own, where my efforts to practice what I preach have earned me a few figs—with thistles.

I am indebted to that notable phrasemaker, Adlai Stevenson, for the title I have attached to my remarks. Mr. Stevenson's favorite definition of the difference between the two major parties of the United States is this: "For Republicans, politics is a status to be

maintained; for Democrats, it is an art to be practiced."

Mr. Stevenson, of course, gave his own party the best of it since it is always more interesting to watch a man trying to walk the length of a tight rope than to see him immobilized in the center of it.

Reporters generally will agree that the arts of politics seem to come more naturally to Democrats than to Republicans. The reasons suggested are many.

One is that throughout its long history—and it is the oldest political party in the Western World—the Democratic Party has tended to identify itself with causes affecting people. People arouse a greater and more bewildering variety of emotions than property and they do not stand still. People's causes attract reformers who are often wrong but rarely unpicturesque.

Again, Democrats make good stories because they tend to be rather more romantic about the party of their choice. Harry S. Truman actually believes that it is better to be a Democrat than a Republican; he is willing to give a Republican his civil rights, but in his view the party that will make your teeth white, your eyes shine, and you hair curl is Miss Democracy. Former Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey would probably agree with him on that last point but for different reasons.

When the late Veep, Alben Barkley, described the golden thread which ran through his party from Thomas Jefferson to Andrew Jackson to Grover Cleveland, et cetera, he almost talked poetry—for the first hour, that is, I could never seem to interest Dear Alben in my constitutional amendment forbidding speeches longer than 20 minutes.

For some curious reason Democrats also are more impervious than Republicans to the patina imparted by worldly success. I have had this put to me in various ways. My favorite comes from a disgruntled Republican who pointed to some indubitably rich Democrats, including a shirt-sleeved Averell Harriman, and said disgustedly: "Look at 'em. No matter how rich a Democrat gets he still sweats."

Will Rogers expressed the fun of watching Democrats many times. He explained that he was not a member of any organized party, he was a Democrat. A Democrat, he said, will shoot at Republicans only when he can't find another Democrat around to work on with his knife.

Republicans rather wistfully complain that their array of sterling qualities does not command the same memorable descriptions. They quite genuinely deplore the Democratic Party and with some justification regard it as the Auntie Mame of politics. What seems to baffle them is that she can be a best seller. They are quite touchingly sensitive, too, about their presumed devotion to private property, and can tell you in some detail how much of it remains in Democratic hands.

Certainly no one can take it away from Republicans that they too have had their moments—as with the Bull Moose and the sons of the wild jackass. But unquestionably theirs is a superior talent for hiding the family skeletons in the closet. It is no accident that the team emerged in January 1953, as a hallmark of the new management at the White House.

In all seriousness, and leaving the partisans to their fun and games, the objective observer descries in Mr. Stevenson's definition the dividing line between successful politicians and those whom history delights to forget. The difference is not a party matter.

Men who have come alive for the voters, including Republicans and Democrats—Theodore Roosevelt and Franklin D. Roosevelt, Al Smith and Fiorello LaGuardia—have all treated their trade as a creative art. They practiced it untiringly and they got results largely commensurate with their efforts.

Every corner of the governmental machine and the programs which these politicians directed and controlled felt what Walter Lippmann has so well described as "the brooding presence of impatient men." They were impatient because they recognized the scope of their responsibilities and knew how much depended upon them personally.

Such men communicate a sense of urgency and excitement to politics. Their creative energies release in turn the creative energies of those around them and of the Nation. Suddenly people cease to feel that to muddle through is the best that can be hoped for. It not only seems important to act; it appears possible that good will flow from it.

The command to practice politics as one of the highest arts and noblest sciences has been laid down by writers, philosophers, and rulers since recorded time. They have pronounced it necessary to the happiness of mankind and they have admitted to no limitations on its importance.

The Oxford English Dictionary defines politics as the science and art dealing with the form, organization, and administration of a state and with the regulation of its relations with other states. Note the inclusion of "the regulation of its relations with other states." Disraeli called it the art of governing mankind. Webster typically brought it down to earth. Politics, he wrote, is the theory and practice of managing or directing the affairs of public policy. The key words are "managing or directing."

To Gouverneur Morris politics was "the sublime science which embraces for its object the happiness of mankind." Morris had a right to speak, being associated with that immortal band—politicians all—who wrote the American Constitution and founded this Republic.

De Tocqueville speaks of "the agitation of mind" common at that period. It is past time for a fresh outbreak of that valuable disease.

People who denigrate politics are perverting its meaning and failing to understand its purpose. For it is through politics that man by the exercise of his will can dominate his public fate. Politics uses all the knowledge that can be assembled for man's most important function, which is to get along with other men—both within his own nation and outside its borders. It is a function noble and almost divine in its suggestion of loving fraternity.

We can elect to choose our national destiny by way of the art of politics or we can sit down and let fate overwhelm us. If we merely cling to status we shall only put ourselves at the mercy of the leaders of other states who are resolutely managing and directing their public affairs for the benefit of themselves or their nations.

The most formidable of such leaders are acting from motives we hate and for purposes we abhor. They have cynically created the problems we now are facing. We can expect them to go on creating more problems within the limits of their ability to confuse, to harass, and eventually to destroy us.

But these men are not 10 feet tall. The Russians, the Red Chinese, the Syrians, are not bigger, brighter, fiercer, or smarter than we are. They are merely men in a world of men. Contrary to a popular misconception, their police state governments are not more efficient than our democracies. What is in truth really frightening about their operations is that they are so inefficient; it is possible that the stupidities of a few men, or even of one man, may bring total destruction on us all. The Last Days of Hitler, by Trevor Roper, is recommended to anyone who doubts this—and there are companion volumes to drive the lesson home.

What is lacking here is the determined will to manage and direct the overwhelming forces at our disposal. Somwhere along the line we have been overtaken by a perverted definition of politics. We have ceased to expect the best from our politicians; we have sometimes seemed to demand the worst. We are tolerant when they abdicate their true functions and when they cater to our national faults. We have driven our best minds from politics because of the low esteem in which we hold it. We have ridiculed the intellectuals who sought to guide us by the light of reason and we have allowed them to be accused freely of treasonable purpose. Happily, the swinish climate of anti-intellectualism has moderated; but we are by no means rid of its legacies of conformity, inertia and timidity.

In our commitment to materialism which puts comfort ahead of all other considerations we have allowed our young people to forget the rewards of public service. It is an attitude which infects American life at all levels.

At the same time, the multiplicity of our society has led to the proliferation of the experts. Two kinds in particular now hold high place: The professional manager and the scientist. Yet both of these, because of their enforced specialization, have in large part removed themselves from the ordinary hopes and fear of mankind and are no longer qualified for the ultimate leadership. The worlds of science and technology are making great contributions to our well-being, but they rarely yield men capable of managing and directing mankind's affairs.

What are our principal problems today? In human terms our greatest is race relations. Inflation is a growing cancer in our economic life. The rapid growth of the population of the United States and its flight to the cities are drastically changing the whole face of the Nation. These changes have brought in their wake a whole train of enormous difficulties of which a crisis in education and the proper use of land, water, and resources are outstanding.

The avoidance of war in the face of a determined, implacable, and evangelistic enemy is and must remain the heart of our foreign policy. The task grows more difficult by the day. It bristles with such thorns as the maintenance of friendly relations among our allies and the search for an approach to colonialism in new nations which by a sad irony of fate demand freedom from outside influences while committed to feudal or authoritarian social systems.

One has only to state the problems to show that they lie in the realm of politics. The alternative to our slow destruction is to recognize this and put the national will to work.

I have not heard it suggested anywhere that this country could not have put a satellite into outer space as soon as or before the Russians did. The failure to do so was a political failure, it was the lack of vision to see what it would mean to our world leadership to be surpassed in so striking an endeavor.

The Russians used their dictatorial power over their subjects to win that triumph. Our victories must be voluntary. They always have been and they will be again when the American people are made acquainted with the facts.

The cruel embarrassment of Little Rock was well within the capabilities of wise men to foresee and to avoid. Politicians practicing their art could have mobilized forces within and without the South. The real troublemakers have never at any time represented more than 1 percent of the people—but that 1 percent had leaders.

The iron truth of today's dynamic world is that nobody can maintain status by standing still. This is a hard lesson not always learned in high places.

There will be decisions in the world—political decisions—and they will determine our fate. Whether those decisions are made

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

by us or by the Russians depends upon our ability to make our politics achieve the ends we seek.

I wish I had some magic formula to suggest. There is none. There are no wonder men or wonder women. There are only you and I and others who believe in freedom. There is only what we are able to get out of ourselves for our children, our country, and our God.

Union Racketeering: The Responsibility of the Bar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the American Bar Association Journal's current issue—May 1958—carries an article written by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], entitled "Union Racketeering: The Responsibility of the Bar." Some lawyers have lent their professional talents in aid of certain racketeering elements in the trade union movement, in ways that raise serious questions involving professional ethics, and the integrity of the bar. The bar has a grave responsibility with respect to the unethical activities of its members, and Senator KENNEDY's reminder of this responsibility in connection with union racketeering is timely and pointed.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNION RACKETEERING: THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE BAR

(By JOHN F. KENNEDY, United States Senator from Massachusetts)

Almost a quarter of a century ago, Supreme Court Justice Harlan Fiske Stone, speaking at the dedication of the University of Michigan Law Quadrangle, delivered one of the most important addresses ever made in this country to a company of lawyers. His subject was the professional responsibility of the bar, and needless to say, he did not consider the topic exhausted by a few well-chosen words on the evils of ambulance-chasing. His thrust was more far-reaching and basic—in essence an indictment of two generations of corporation lawyers.

The bar, said Justice Stone, had been the servant of the country's mushrooming corporate growth in the gaudy twenties. It had placed the skills and technical proficiency of centuries of professional development at the command of the financial community. Some of these corporate and financial operators, not unsurprisingly, some of these clients of a generation ago were unscrupulous, dishonest, operating around the fringes of the law or seeking to bend it to fit their improper objectives. A large minority of these entrepreneurs and brokers were simply unaware of the duties and responsibilities that necessarily bind those dealing in other people's money—men who were not so much dishonest as they were misguided, imprudent, ineffective, reckless or irresponsible.

Whether the businessman client knew better or not, his lawyer always did or should have. Too often, Justice Stone thought, these lawyers forgot that they were members of a profession and all that that implies. Too many of them had surrendered the function of independent and critical judgment which has been the historic pride of the legal profession—a judgment that never spared and often guided the clients to be served. And as a result, said Stone, the Nation's lawyers had to bear a large share of the responsibility for the chaos these harmful corporate activities had created by the beginning of the 1930's and for the always unwelcome effort to impose governmental regulation where private self-regulation had failed.

I have often thought of Justice Stone's appeal to the bar as I sat during the past year through the grim and sometimes shocking hearings before the Senate Committee on Improper Practices in the Labor or Management Field, the McClellan committee. Watching that parade of witnesses from the irresponsible fringe of the labor movement—some unscrupulous, some only misguided—and watching or hearing about their attorneys as well, it has seemed to me to present a striking parallel to the situation of which Justice Stone complained some 24 years ago.

For during the past 2 decades, organized labor has grown enormously in wealth, in strength, and in numbers. It has been fostered and encouraged by Federal and State laws. Its votes and support have been prizes eagerly sought by both political parties. We count on it to perform indispensable functions in the operation of our economy—to help spread the benefits of increased production among workers and their families by hard bargaining for wage increases and other benefits, to help keep the economy on an even keel by acting as a counterweight to big business.

The development of such economic power and the organization of such collective effort could not have been achieved—and was not achieved—without the active assistance of wise and skillful lawyers. In fact, since the period of major union growth coincided with large-scale Federal regulation of labor relations under the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act, high-grade legal advice and legal services were needed at every step of the way.

The legal profession as a whole has never been as thoroughly committed to the service of labor as, a generation ago, it was to business. Nevertheless, in the thirties and after, an increasing number of able law graduates were drawn to the growing labor movement by a sense of adventure and service. There was, I think, idealism and dedication in the election of many young men to go into the field of labor law—and properly so. It meant service to the many and not the few, to the cause of economic justice and a better way of life. For the overwhelming majority of those who have pursued distinguished careers in this field, this idealism has remained bright and untarnished to this day. Our committee has been greatly aided, for example, by the helpful cooperation and expert advice of the AFL–CIO's wise and honorable general counsel, Arthur Goldberg, who deserves much of the credit for that group's precedent-shattering set of ethical practices codes.

But there are others, I am afraid—too many others—to whom Justice Stone's strictures of almost a generation ago apply in full force today. "I venture to assert," he said, "that when the history of the financial era" (and for this we must substitute "era of union growth") "which has just drawn to a close comes to be written, most of its major mistakes and its major faults will be ascribed to the failure to observe the fiduciary principle, the precept as old as Holy Writ, that 'a man cannot serve two masters.' • • • There is little to suggest that the bar has yet recognized that it must bear some of the responsibility for these evils. But when we know and face the facts, we should have to acknowledge that such departures from the fiduciary principle do not usually occur without the active assistance of some member of our profession; and that their increasing recurrence would have been impossible but for the complaisance of a bar, too absorbed in the workaday care of private interests to take account of these events of profound import—or to sound the warning that the profession looks askance on these as things that 'are not done.'"

UNION RACKETEERS—A LONG LIST

In the past year, our committee has held up to public and congressional view a long list of malpractices currently characterizing the small racketeering element in our trade union movement—practices which have again been in most instances the result of serving two masters, one's union and one's self; and practices which have again been made possible by the active assistance of some members of the bar. As this sorry story unfolds, many of the lawyers appearing before our committee—as counsel or as witnesses—or whose names have otherwise been involved in the testimony, have brought shame to the name of an honorable profession.

Their ranks—those who engage in what might well be called legal racketeering—include the following:

1. Lawyers who, working for a union official, arrange, conceal, and worst of all share in the illicit profits of a variety of improper transactions that use union funds or power for private gain.

2. Lawyers paid from union funds, to which all of the union's members have contributed, who appear before our committee or a court to advise the union's suspect officers against revealing the purposes for which those members' dues have been used, or otherwise to defend those officers against charges of stealing from or defrauding these same members that pay the lawyer's salary.

3. Lawyers who represent management in the morning and so-called unions or union leaders in the afternoon, who draw up the "sweetheart" contracts and keep respectable unions out, keep wages low, and keep the profits to both the employers and the fake union leaders very high indeed.

4. Lawyers who organize paper locals, sham employer associations, so-called independent unions, and fake health and welfare plans in order to promote the kind of collusion that costs responsible management and labor—as well as the general public—dearly.

5. Lawyers who use their position with the union to promote their own financial interests, using union funds or union power to accomplish transactions and investments of benefit only to themselves.

These are but some of the examples that disturb me today—not because they reveal wrongdoing on the part of any more than a tiny minority of this honorable profession—but because of the bar's apparent indifference to these revelations. Outside of New York City, where I understand a special committee of the bar is examining the matter, I know of no bar association reorienting its codes and canons of ethics to stamp out these practices, as the AFL–CIO itself has done to stamp out labor racketeering. Where are the members of the bar who will prove their title to professional leadership by taking the lead in seeking to remove this stain on the name of their calling? Where is the Justice Stone of today who will rise up to indict this corruption and complaisance, this deceit and dishonor?

There should be no delay because the wrongfulness of any of these tactics is in doubt. The Canons of Professional Ethics promulgated by the American Bar Association, as I understand them, make it unprofessional for a lawyer to "represent conflicting interests, except by express consent of all concerned, given after a full disclosure of all the facts" (canon 6). Nor may an attorney forward his client's interest by unethical or illegal means. "The office of attorney does not permit, much less does it demand of him for any client, violation of law or any manner of fraud or chicane" (canon 15). Moreover he has an express duty to attempt to restrain and prevent his clients' improprieties, including "doing those things which the lawyer himself ought not to do" (canon 16).

A lawyer who is retained by a labor union is the union's representative. His client is not the union president or the officers or the members of the executive committee—his client is the union. He is paid with union funds, dues collected from the members, and it is to them as an organization that his true professional responsibility runs. That organization is something bigger and more important than the persons who temporarily hold office in it.

The officers, like the officers of a corporation, are themselves only the servants of the broader membership. They, too, are subject to fiduciary principles. They hold the funds of the union in trust, and must manage its affairs to serve not their private ends but the larger interests of the organization. How, then, can the union's lawyer take fees from the union treasury to defend its officers against the charge of embezzling from that same treasury?

CORPORATE LAWYERS—ANOTHER ANALOGY

The parallel here to corporate field is again perfectly plain. Officers and directors of companies are often called to account, by their shareholders, public officials or others, to defend their stewardship of the corporate funds in court. In such cases it is firmly established that the director or officer must pay for his own defense and that the same attorney that represents the company cannot, with propriety, represent the defending official. The few statutes which permit the official to reimburse himself out of corporate funds, if the suit against him proves groundless, regulate this right stringently. Certainly no less stringent conception of propriety should prevail in the union field.

I think it is thus demonstrable that the lawyer-client relationship revealed by our committee and which I have enumerated above violate the generally accepted ethical standards of the legal profession.

The question is why. What is in these two situations—involving corporate attorneys on one hand and union attorneys on the other—which demoralized these professional men, blunted their critical judgments and put them in conflict with the true interests they are supposed to represent? Watching them before the committee, I have concluded their fall from grace was not a sudden one but the result of a gradual erosion of their guidelines. I have come, I hope, to a better understand of the problems, and the temptations and the relentless pressures which peculiarly beset the legal profession.

Unlike the doctor, engineer or architect, the lawyer always appears in a representative capacity. He takes on a kind of dual personality, and the undesirable characteristics of one may be merged in the other if firm resistance is not present. The lawyer is subject, moreover, to a constant and wearing pressure which does not afflict the other professions. He operates in a field of contention. In most instances, there is an adversary, striving to defeat or neutralize his every effort. Ever present is the demoralizing influence of the client, who is interested only in results, who scoffs at a first-rate professional effort unless it is completely successful, who is often more interested in whom you know than in what you know.

Unless the lawyer is continuously mindful of the proprieties, there is always danger that the stress of the situation will blur and make indistinguishable the ground rules. There is always the inducement of the disreputable practioner who, because of alleged connections, claims he can guarantee a favorable result. This peddling of the names of reputable judges and public officials destroys public confidence in the entire judicial and executive systems and is an especially vicious form of character assassination.

There is another form of insidious infection which is peculiar to the legal profession. The lawyer exerting his best efforts on behalf of his client finds it easy to justify conduct which he would immediately recognize as improper if he were acting merely in his own behalf. This philosophy is particularly virulent because it can be made to appear as professional service and sacrifice beyond the call of duty.

There is, too, the bond of sympathy which often comes into existence between the lawyer and his client during their relationship. I suppose this is particularly true in the field of criminal law. While espousing and defending the criminal, a lawyer may unconsciously lower or lessen his abhorrence of the crime because of mitigating circumstances in the particular case.

The public also conceives of the law as a sporting proposition and extends sympathy to the unfortunate, the underdog, the man trapped in the toils of the law. This strange but disturbing reality is manifested in a number of ways. This doctrine appears to provide most criminal-case defendants with a license to perjure themselves in the effort to win acquittal. No wonder so many lawers, young and old, dream of dramatically extricating some malefactor from the death house. Few of them envision the glory of increasing the prison population.

I do not maintain, however, that the labor racketeer lawyers to whom I have referred engaged in these kinds of practices because they were not aware of the unethical character of their acts. Nonetheless, I should hope for an effort parallel to that of the AFL–CIO in drafting ethical practices codes, whereby members of the bar would turn their attention to this particular area and try to develop more specific regulations governing the practice of their profession within it. This effort to formulate more specific codes of conduct is not useful because it results in any new discoveries of what is right and wrong, but because it focuses professional attenion on the policing of the bar, properly and traditionally the bar's own professional responsibility.

The problem is not now, and it never has been, that all, or a majority, or even a very large minority, of labor lawyers have engaged in improper practices. But the fact that one has not personally profited from impropriety does not absolve him of responsibility for impropriety. For if the act of belonging to a profession is to have any special significance at all, it is at least in part that you become your brother's keeper on matters of professional conduct. The strength of our professions and, particularly the bar, has been their ability to impose high standards of conduct not on their best elements because that would be easy but on their worst.

In the final analysis, this discipline is obtained not by grievance committees and disbarment proceedings, but by the weight of professional opinion—informed, organized, focused upon the areas in which departures from fiduciary principles are becoming "increasingly recurrent" on the part of both clients and their lawyers. Such a mobilization of professional opinion cannot prevent every instance of wrongdoing on the part of members of the bar—be they labor lawyers or tax lawyers or corporation lawyers. There will always be some to whom the material rewards of wrongdoing will seem more attractive than their public reputation or the esteem of their colleagues. But professional opinion can prevent individual instances of impropriety from turning into an epidemic, the kind that Justice Stone saw in the corporate bar 25 years ago, and the kind that must be eradicated before it spreads in the labor bar today.

I leave that challenge in the hands of the legal profession to whom this article is addressed, trusting that it will never be necessary for the Congress or any other legislative body to police the ethics of the legal profession. And when the profession cleanses its ranks and restores itself to its true position of leadership in our society, then once again lawyers and nonlawyers alike will recall the eternal wisdom of Justice Stone's reminder that "the great figures of the law stir the imagination and inspire our reverence according as they have used their special training and gifts for the advancement of the public interest."

Profit by Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article dealing with the career of Teddy Roosevelt, written by W. L. Hudson and published in the April 1958 issue of Partners.

As a member of the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Commission, I take this opportunity to call the article to the attention of Members of Congress and of the country at large.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFIT BY EXAMPLE
(By W. L. Hudson)

Hero worship is as natural as breathing. It begins with children when little boys imagine themselves soldiers, policemen, cowboys, and Indians—and when little girls, with dolls, imitate their mothers. The tendency continues as we grow older, except that we then begin to select individuals often in the public eye. When we reach maturity, our selections are likely to be famous men of history.

All this is helpful in building character—provided our heroes are wholesome—as consciously or unconsciously we try to emulate them.

This brings us to a great American, the centenary of whose birth the Nation this year is celebrating.

Theodore Roosevelt, born October 27, 1858, was admired and loved by many of the country's adult population and by almost every young person during his busy lifetime—and after. And indeed there is much that we of today, as well, can learn from Teddy's career that is worthwhile in character building.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The first Roosevelt was an amazingly versatile man, having won his spurs as naturalist, sportsman, rancher, executive, orator, soldier, author, politician in the best sense of the word, and, most distinguished of all, statesman. Because of the variety of his achievements, individuals can make selections that conform to personal desires, but some are common to all.

Teddy's ability and determination to overcome handicaps must appeal to every one of us. Delicate as a child and for that reason deprived of the privilege of attending schools where he could freely mingle with other children and thereby gain an early education in democracy, Theodore Roosevelt nevertheless overcame this handicap. Through reading, thinking, and adult experience, he became a great democrat.

As is rarely the case, he decided upon his career soon after graduating from the university and stuck to his guns. Having chosen politics as his life work, he realized that his weak body would not withstand the rigors of that vocation and did something about it. He purchased a ranch in the old West, lived a rugged life there for several years and not only built a strong physique for himself but also remained throughout the balance of his career an example and advocate of what he called "the strenuous life."

Teddy held many important public offices. He had been a member of the New York State Legislature, police commissioner of the city of New York, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, colonel in the United States Army, Governor of New York, Vice President of the United States, and, finally, Chief Executive. He served with outstanding honesty, courage, and distinction in every assignment.

Here are some things we can learn from this forceful American:

1. That the cultivation of a wide variety of interests adds to the zest of life and broadens general knowledge.

2. That to appreciate the wonders and beauty of nature in her many forms, tiny insect to mammoth whale, a blade of grass to a giant tree, relaxes the tensions of prosaic life.

3. That good books provide contact with the best thinkers the world has known throughout the ages and from whom we can learn much.

4. That strict honesty of thought, purpose, and actions in the long run pays handsome dividends.

5. That we can convert timidity into courage by always doing the thing we are afraid to do.

6. That clean, wholesome, family life is the basis of true happiness.

You take it from here.

MATS: Pentagon's Air Transport Monster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appears in the May 5, 1958, issue of the magazine American Aviation:

MATS: PENTAGON'S AIR TRANSPORT MONSTER

(By Robert Burkhardt)

Cancerous is a strong word, an emotionally-charged word. But it is a most apt word to describe MATS—the Defense Department's gargantuan Military Air Transport Service.

Cancer is defined by Webster as "a malignant evil that corrodes slowly and fatally." It can also be said that two important symptoms of malignant cancer are a general loss of health caused by acute anemia, and a numbing fear of what is to come. Often there is a denial that the cancerous growth even exists, with both the victims and their friends insisting that this is no more than benign and healthy bulge.

Such is the case with MATS, whose victims are this country's common air carriers of freight and passengers. Some of these are already dead. Others are aroused and fighting back, clinging to life with every shred of their corporate being. And there are still a few remaining airlines who are trying to ignore the terrible threat of what has been publicly branded as the "world's largest free airline."

Before considering the plight of its victims, one should examine MATS itself. This organization was formed in 1948 as a merger of the Air Transport Command and the Naval ATS, and embraced a number of weather, air rescue and ground operations of the Air Force, Army, and Navy. Originally it was planned that MATS be a training organization, nucleus of a vast air fleet to supply logistical support—high-speed movement of men and materials to global battlefronts—in time of war or other national emergency.

This idea was endorsed with enthusiasm by Congress and the entire airline industry. Optimistic Congressmen hoped that a centralized MATS would be a way to eliminate costly duplication of the armed services' efforts in the air transport field, and at the same time would materially improve what was then called the United States defense posture.

At the same time, the United States air transport industry, growing by leaps and bounds as new routes were opened and larger and faster planes came into service, saw in MATS a chance to work in partnership with the armed services. Out of this, it was hoped, might come a vigorous and healthy civilian air transport industry, backed by an existing system of overseas MATS bases—including weather reporting, air traffic control, air rescue service and other support functions—all operating in conjunction with a nucleus fleet of late-model MATS aircraft.

MATS—Indexes of growth

	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958 estimates
Ton-miles flown (millions)	384	645	769	770	1,034
Cost of operations (millions of dollars)	$153	$187	$206	$224	
Aircraft assigned	1,379	1,456	1,454	1,393	
Freight tonnage	75,173	120,517	150,125	149,531	250,000
Passengers carried	440,359	617,100	700,250	748,841	800,000

Not too much is known about early MATS equipment and schedules and, for that matter, information about present operations and equipment is hard to come by even now. All told, 279 transports were taken over from Air Transport Command and the Naval ATS, mostly twin-engine Douglas-built C–47's and 4-engine C–54's. Early schedules listed few and irregular flights.

This humble beginning was no drawback to MATS planners. Right from the start MATS set out to become the biggest airline in the world by the simple expedient of offering free rides and free freight. And the number of takers has increased by leaps and bounds; today MATS traffic includes the majority of all United States military personnel moving to and from stations overseas, plus officers of NATO and other allied forces, employees of the State Department and other Government agencies, servicemen's wives and families, and everyone else who can qualify as a guest of the Government. Freight shipments and Government mail follow the same pattern.

It wasn't intended this way. To make certain that MATS was in fact a military operation, geared for a manyfold expansion in time of war, a clear policy line was laid down by the Secretary of Defense, and reemphasized by the Secretary of the Air Force: as many military passengers and as much military freight as possible was to be shipped by regular commercial aircraft.

Service to out-of-the-way points, such as Thule and Ascension Island, was the job of MATS, since no commercial airline could take this traffic. And in time of peak loads, when the regular scheduled common carriers by air were jammed up and delays expected, MATS could fly the goods and carry the GI's.

Good idea, said Congress. Sound defense policy, said the commercial airlines. And they were right, except for one small detail: MATS has never paid any attention to these policies, although repeatedly reminded of them by responsible committees of Congress.

Thus it is no wonder that MATS has grown so fast it has today become larger than all United States overseas commercial air carriers put together. The table shown here is actually an understatement of the situation, since official MATS schedules are the minimum to be flown.

MATS' Atlantic and northern schedules (March 1958 and March 1957)

	Passengers		Cargo		Total	
	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957
Europe	[1] 470	[1] 294	194	384	664	678
North Africa	80	36	166	124	246	160
Iceland	32	40	28	28	60	68
Greenland	72	62	100	96	172	158
Newfoundland			16	24	16	24
Labrador	22	18	36	50	58	68
Azores	14	14	26	14	40	28
Bermuda	12	24		10	12	34
Ascension Island	[2] 30	[2] 8			30	8
Churchill	[2] 6	[2] 4			6	4
Total	740	500	566	730	1,306	1,230

[1] Combination passenger/cargo.
[2] Some passenger/air evacuation.

NOTE.—This is an exclusive compilation by American Aviation. It is based on official MATS schedules, which understate the actual traffic movement in 2 particulars: (1) much new and larger equipment has been put into service during the past year so that freight and passenger capacity has increased more than the actual increase in schedules would indicate, and, (2) scheduled operations are on the average only half of MATS' operations, since a large number of irregular or "training" flights that also carry passengers and cargo are also flown each month.

By actual count, there are usually about twice as many flights actually flown as are scheduled. In addition, the increase in scheduled traffic is understated, since new and much larger equipment is constantly being put into service.

How have Congress and the airlines reacted to this? Repeatedly, Congress has tried to slow down the unchecked growth of MATS, only to be airily ignored. Not all congressmen are opposed to the burgeoning civilian role of MATS: Representative L. Mendel Rivers is a strong supporter of bigger and better Government air lines. And why not? He just happens to have a major MATS base located in his home district in South Carolina.

Thoughtful airline spokesmen are quick to emphasize the fact that the growth of MATS need not be malignant. MATS is a key weapon in the United States, anti-Soviet arsenal; perhaps it should be even bigger. Nobody—repeat, nobody—takes issue with the military job that is the primary responsibility of MATS.

But what is being viewed with increased fear by taxpayers, congressmen and airline officials alike, is the twisted concept now dominating the thinking of MATS' high command. This concept has now resulted in establishment of the largest State-owned airline in the world; one whose no-charge or nominal-charge policies are isolating and threatening to bankrupt its commercial competitors, and will continue to do so until either Congress or some other higher authority takes firm and corrective surgical action.

Schoeppel's Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "SCHOEPPEL's Answer," published in the Wichita Eagle of May 8, 1958.

The editorial comments upon and quotes a telegram sent by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] to a Wichita labor leader, in connection with the recent proposed labor legislation which the Senate considered. It gives his reasons for supporting the Knowland amendments. I believe it to be very useful and informative editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wichita Eagle of May 8, 1958]

SCHOEPPEL'S ANSWER

An amazing phenomenon even to the friends of organized labor is the way labor leaders are fighting all attempts to pass Federal laws to curb the excesses and downright thievery and corruption amply documented in investigations of certain labor unions.

Our own United States Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL obviously felt this way when he wired a reply to a Wichita labor leader who had protested amendments to labor legislation offered by Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, of California.

"Frankly, I am at a loss to understand why you suggest such action," Senator SCHOEPPEL telegraphed. "Not a single amendment offered by Senator KNOWLAND could in the slightest be labeled as a damaging amendment insofar as duel-paying union members are concerned. Every amendment seeks to protect the rights of the laboring man against abuses in labor relations exposed by the McClellan committee. * * *

"Are you opposed to giving every member of a labor organization the right to vote? Are you opposed to the use of secret ballots properly supervised where every member may vote without fear of reprisal? * * * What is so damaging with legislation which provides that the funds of the local union are to be used exclusively in connection with the affairs of the local union when a trusteeship has been established?"

These are the questions that not only Senator SCHOEPPEL but ordinary citizens are asking. For it is obvious that something has to be done to correct the situation.

And if honest labor leaders continue to say no to reasonable suggestions, then they only open the door to extremist enemies of labor to secure laws that would really cripple them.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my newsletter of May 10, 1958:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, FIFTH DISTRICT, TEXAS

MAY 10, 1958.

Major legislation took a back seat to political primaries in several States, the House deferring action. The fourth urgent deficiency appropriation bill ($28.7 million), and the bill increasing the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank (from $5 billion to $7 billion), plus noncontrovefsial private and public bills comprised the bulk of House floor action. Surprisingly, no opposition was expressed on a bill reducing to 60 percent of parity the long-staple cotton price support. Usually, agriculture matters end in a rhubarb.

The recession, as a political motivation, may be fizzling out. The facts are just too contrary to the political gloom peddlers' analyses. News accounts of economic statistics (Delta Airlines' analysis of the southeastern United States business increases) full-page editorial ads from scattered areas throughout the Nation (such as Kansas City Star saying Midwest is booming), CONGRESSIONAL RECORD insertions (agricultural boom, Representative ST. GEORGE; Minnesota withstanding recession, Senator MUNDT; Muskegon, hard hit but fighting back, Representative GRIFFIN) parallel the spirit of Dallas' prosperity campaign and W. A. Green ads.

However, the expensive aftermath of politically motivated antirecession legislative measures remain. The tests of constitutionality, proper parliamentary procedure, and cost to the taxpayers condemn these hastily contrived economic palliatives (most reported earlier in newsletters):

(1) Housing bill: Costs $1.8 billion, so hastily considered there was not even a printed bill.

(2) Highways: No one questions their need, but we further set aside States rights.

(3) Civil and military accelerated spending bills: A grandstand play which Government agencies can now use to justify any waste-in-haste spending.

(4) Farm price freeze: Calculated to control further the farmer and prevent his return to the workings of a free market place.

(5) Community Facilities Act: $1 billion or more to subsidize strictly local projects—"rob Peter to pay Paul, with heavy go-between deduction by Uncle Sam."

(6) Public works bill: $1.7 billion in rivers, harbors, reclamation, and other projects, including pork barrel and in no event antirecessionary in effect.

(7) Jobless benefits: $1 billion up to sky's the limit, a socialized dole, this bill substituted by Democrat leadership (without hearings or committee study) in place of President's suggestions.

The boxscore of this antirecession legislative flurry of several months is a blot on the record of Congress, an amazing conglomeration of wrong solutions following wrong interpretations of the Nation's economic facts and figures. The reason? Politics, is it not? The price we pay for this spending is (1) no tax cut; (2) inflation of the value of our money; the dollar will buy less (now 49 cents compared to 1939 $1).

The pitfalls of inflation are recognizable. It could be said that wrong antirecession measures could pave the road to ruin. Let's recall some of the component parts of antirecession legislation during early 1958:

(1) Unemployment: Far lower percent of labor force unemployed than at any time during New Deal tinkering with economy up to World War II. Also forgotten is fact there is always some unemployment;

(2) Purchasing power: Giving money away federally isn't the answer; rather, better values in merchandise will produce sales—savings are high;

(3) Tax reform: Taxes are too high and of the wrong kind, but can't be corrected for fear of lost revenue to Uncle Sam until Government slows down on spending;

(4) Labor monopoly: Increasing wages and other demands, without corresponding productivity, not within framework of market conditions (supply, demand, profit, loss) is sewing seeds of collapse. Inflexible wages and union demands are contradictory to a flexible economy.

These inflationary factors all add up to the same legislative aims—the aims of the labor leaders, the liberals, and the ADA, and when so identified, understood, and listed, spell out socialism, United States style. The dangers are clear, the remedies less clear. With reference to my earlier remarks about labor's influence in Congress, an additional study accompanies this newsletter entitled "Socialism, United States Style," a brief analysis of the ADA (Americans for Democratic Action) according to its own spokesmen.

Free enterprise stories, to contradict the politician's gloom presented this week in Congress include: (1) Stan Musial batting 509 is in a slump, since he's receded from 553; (2) the fireman (politician?) who hurries to each fire, fearful it will go out before he has a hand in it; (3) the bobby's answer to critic of soapbox speechmaker's attack on the Queen, "Wot he's sayin' ain't 'urtin 'er any and it may be doin' 'im a lot of good." (Politicians, however, can hurt our economy); (4) the deep-sea diver gets "bends" if he comes up too soon, also, business economic excesses in boom expansions can have problems of overs (overexpansion, etc.) which in free economy will correct themselves (unless prevented by Federal intervention).

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Hébert Reply to Dechert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include a letter written by the Honorable F. EDWARD HÉBERT in reply to a letter by Robert Dechert, General Counsel of the Department of Defense:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 9, 1958.

Mr. ROBERT DECHERT,
General Counsel, Department of Defense, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DECHERT: Thank you very much for sending me the copy of your letter to PAUL CUNNINGHAM in connection with the remarks which I had inserted in the RECORD following our debate on last Sunday.

I did not intend to continue the debate on a unilateral basis, but I thought it only fair to point out the difficulty confronting those of us who disagree with the dangerous language of the President's reorganization plan, as well as the gag rule on at the Pentagon for those who disagree with the proposal.

I am rather amazed at your letter, however, but I am glad you wrote as you did because it points out most vividly exactly what I have been trying to say. The language which I refer to as most inappropriate and shocking was not the language which you used on the show Sunday, but the language which you used before the Reserve Officers Association on the previous night, the text of which I note you did not include in your letter to Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Don't you think it would have been only fair to quote the article to which I had referred, and which I read on the show? In my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I attempted to correct what I understood you to accept as an unfair newspaper report in that you were quoted out of context. Now I have your letter complaining about my statement, in which you quote me out of context.

Your comments to Mr. CUNNINGHAM are adroitly phrased so as to indicate that I was describing your language on the show as "most inappropriate and shocking," when you know as a matter of fact I was referring to what you admitted you had said to the Reserve Officers Association. I have reread my remarks in the RECORD and by the farthest stretch of the imagination no other conclusion can be drawn that I considered most inappropriate and shocking your remarks about the Marines and Navy before the Reserve Officers Association. I do not appreciate but I do understand your desire to explain away your most inappropriate and shocking language against two branches of the armed services who are prohibited from defending themselves against your attack.

I note with interest you make no comment in your letter to Mr. CUNNINGHAM about these paragraphs in my statement:

"In one instance I pointed out to him that the Defense Department, through the technique of withholding appropriated funds, had reduced the fighting combat strength of the Marines from 200,000 to 188,000. He replied that the Navy Department had made the reduction. I insisted that it was the Defense Department and not the Navy.

"Following the debate I checked with the proper authorities and was informed that it was the Defense Department and not the Navy Department which had reduced the combat strength of the Marines."

Apparently it was not convenient to your purpose to admit that you had made a misstatement of fact in this instance.

Of course I do not desire to continue any debate on this subject, but I do intend to keep the record straight as consistently and as positively as I can. In this connection I have written Mr. Joseph McCaffrey asking him for a full transcript of the debate which I shall insert in the RECORD. In the event he does not have the transcript to which you refer I respectfully request that you give me the full transcript and I will put it in the RECORD without comment, and let everybody read what the facts are and what was actually said and not said.

I am, of course, sending copy of this letter to PAUL CUNNINGHAM.

With kindest personal regards.

Cordially yours,

F. EDW. HÉBERT.

The Decline of Our Domestic Fishing Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, those of us who are vitally interested in the fishing industry in the United States have become very alarmed at the recent decline and the difficulties experienced by our domestic fishing industry. The industry as a whole is declining fast. It is losing economic stature, with some segments already facing ruin because of the importation of foreign-caught fish. Likewise, our fishing fleets are being forced out of business by this kind of competition.

To give you an example of what our fishing industry faces I would like to point out that Russian fishing vessels are moving into waters off New England with a modern seagoing fleet. In fact, the United States Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has stated that Russian vessels are working an area along the eastern edge of the Grand Banks about 800 miles from Boston.

There is also evidence that the Soviets are building huge ocean trawlers, completely fitted for long journeys while the United States fishing fleet is gradually deteriorating. I understand that last year a shipyard in East Germany delivered a reported 112 smaller fishing vessels to the Soviets with 320 more scheduled for delivery in 1959 and 1960. Also a shipyard in Poland has just launched a 515-foot trawler tender especially equipped for Arctic operations.

Along this same line I should point out that Russia launched an atomic icebreaker, named the *Lenin*, last year and it is currently operating in and around the Antarctic. That is one reason why I introduced a bill calling for the construction of a nuclear-powered icebreaker for the United States Coast Guard to keep pace with Russian operations.

Mr. Speaker, the Russians want to penetrate our fishing waters for two reasons: First, they want to defeat us through peaceful economic competition. This is, of course, a part of their cold war strategy; and, second, they want to use their fishing vessels for soundings for their large submarine fleet. I realize that there is no legal means to prevent the Russians from prowling in fishing waters outside our own 3-mile coastal jurisdiction. In any event, we must remember that under no conditions can we afford to allow the Soviet Union to outdistance us, particularly in the economic field and the field of modern warfare.

While the Russian fishing fleet has grown tremendously in the last 18 years, the United States fishing fleet has declined steadily. There is no doubt that the fishing industry in this country and especially in the New England area has been fighting a losing battle against unfair competition for many years. For example, New England's trawler fleet has declined by half in the past 10 years. In 1947 there were 59 large trawlers in the region. By 1957 this number had dropped to 30. I am sure you agree with me when I say that every assistance possible is needed both in and out of Congress to prevent the collapse of this most essential industry.

As you know, some of the economic assistance we extend to our allies is used to assist their fishing industries to the detriment of ours. We must have protection for our fishing industry and see that this segment of our economy is not sold down the river in a futile attempt to buy friends abroad. Likewise, our foreign competitors like Russia are heavily subsidized by their Government, undermining the competitive position of our fishing industry even within the United States market itself.

With these facts in mind the Congress must make every effort to promote the welfare of our fishing industry. We must conserve our fishing grounds, increase production, and help our fishermen avoid the disaster that faces them.

Mr. Speaker, fishing, the oldest industry in the United States, is now threatened with extinction. This great industry must be revived before it is completely inundated by the Russian economic penetration. By reviving this industry they in turn will make an important and material contribution to our food supply, and our national defense, and well-being of our citizens.

Aid and Comfort to the Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the left-wing Fund for the Republic, for whose

tax-exempt status there is no justification, continued its assault upon pro-American agencies and institutions when it sponsored and paid for industrialist Cyrus Eaton's appearance on a nationwide television hookup a week ago Sunday night.

Canadian-born Eaton again made a tremendous contribution to the Soviet cause when he viciously attacked the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the security systems of this Nation.

Eaton is part of an epidemic of color-blindness which has affected certain segments of America. The victim cannot see the gory Red record of mass murder and subversion which the international Communist apparatus is writing daily. Eaton's scurrilous attack on the FBI and our security system climaxes a series of his public utterances which are being beamed by the Soviet propaganda machine to the four corners of the earth.

Do not think that the Fund for the Republic did not put him on this program by design. It knew of Eaton's previous pro-Russian positions.

It is more than coincidence that in December of 1955 the official Russian governmental organ Izvestia hailed Cyrus S. Eaton for his expressions on peaceful coexistence; that another organ of the Communist international apparatus, New Times, in October 1957 contained an article by Eaton in which he rapturously extols the virtues of the Soviet Union and states that he "has achieved a better firsthand understanding" by the contact he has had with Soviet representatives in the United States.

It is likewise more than coincidence that, in addition to attacking the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Eaton has repeatedly attacked what he has characterized as the anti-Russian belligerence of the United States.

Can he not see that the international Communist apparatus, now controlling one-third of the population of this earth, with a fifth column 25 million strong permeating the world, is now at war with the one nation which stands in the way of its world domination?

Can he not see that the Federal Bureau of Investigation—far from being a "Hitler-like Gestapo"—as he describes it—is the principal bulwark of our liberties and the chief weapon of the Nation against internal subversion?

In the March 1958, issue of the periodical the Progressive, Eaton states:

I am firmly convinced that the Russians want peace.

Can he not see that the only peace which the international Communist apparatus wants is a peace in which freedom is forever subdued by the forces of tyranny?

When listening to Eaton, Americans should keep in mind what Georgi Dimitrov, one of the world's top Communists and former instructor in the Lenin School of Political Warfare, taught. Dimitrov said:

We must always remember that one sympathizer is generally worth more than a dozen militant Communists. A university professor, who without being a party member lends himself to the interests of the Soviet Union, the writer, who without being a party member defends the Soviet Union, the union leader who is outside our ranks but defends Soviet international policy, is worth more than a thousand party members.

Mr. Speaker, the industrialist Cyrus Eaton, who, of course, is not a Communist, but who defends, as Dimitrov said, the Soviet Union and Soviet international policy, is worth more than a thousand party members.

Whether the Eatons understand it or admit it, we are presently engaged in a struggle—in a cold war—with an enemy the likes of which for debasement and inhumanity the world has never before experienced—an enemy whom we can ignore, appease, negotiate with, only at th expense of our survival. There are those like Eaton and his sponsors who are giving aid and comfort to the enemy in this struggle, particularly when they attempt to discredit one of the greatest Americans of our time, J. Edgar Hoover, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation which he heads—our chief bulwark against infiltration and subversion, which is the new and effective weapon of modern warfare.

At this point I would like to include in the extension of my remarks an editorial from the Cincinnati Times-Star of May 7, 1958, concerning Cyrus Eaton's television appearance:

SPIES HERE, THERE, EVERYWHERE

Cyrus S. Eaton, now 74, has made a tremendous lot of money in the United States in his life. But some of his remarks on the air the other night about current American life—he was born in Canada—do not make much sense.

The head of a huge coal, iron ore and rail network says the United States is in dire peril because of its scores of snooping and informing agencies; and it always worries him when a nation feels it is booming great because of the work of its policemen.

Does anybody besides Mr. Eaton feel that the United States has become great thanks to its policemen?

On the subject of policemen, Mr. Eaton went on to lengths worthy of Ezra Pound. "If," he said, "you were to take the police forces of the cities and the counties and the States and the governmental agencies and add them up, Hitler in his prime, through the Gestapo, never had any such spy organization."

Does anybody besides Mr. Eaton believe that the county police, the city patrolmen, etc., are spies?

If you observe this warning (put out under the aegis of the Fund for the Republic) don't take your beauty rest on that inner-spring mattress, there's a spy under every bed in the land, as in every closet, and behind every bar.

Even Hitler, a man not much disposed to laughter, would have had a chortle over this one. But nothing compared to the horse laugh to which Khrushchev is entitled.

The Solid Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the May 6, 1958, Fond du Lac Commonwealth Reporter on that great leader, Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California:

THE SOLID MAN

Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California, may or may not become the next Governor of his State, and he may or may not be a close competitor for the Presidency in 1960 and thereafter.

But few who watch him perform on the hustings in California or in the Senate in Washington can doubt that he is a man who has the courage of his convictions and is willing to follow wherever they lead him, whatever the political consequences.

A good many are saying that his championship of right-to-work laws is heavily damaging politically. Maybe this will turn out to be so. Sometimes, however, the voters are surprising. From time to time they are impressed by a man's willingness to espouse unpopular causes.

That seems to be KNOWLAND'S specialty. There are times when he appears a veritable mountain of convictions.

Not often are there any cracks in that granite. In fact, when he smiles, you sometimes get the idea that it has required a slip along the San Andreas earthquake fault.

Whatever his future, the Senate in 1959 is bound to look a little marshy and spongy without the Great Rock and California.

Golden Milestone Award to the State of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO KRUEGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly pleased to learn of the action of the National Highway Users Conference in presenting to the State of North Dakota its 1958 golden milestone award, a symbol of highway user's appreciation presented to highway departments for program reports to the public.

The golden milestone award, a miniature of the golden milestone of Rome erected by Caesar Augustus in 14 A. D., was presented during the recent National Highway Users Conference in Washington to Mr. A. W. Wentz, North Dakota State highway commissioner.

A highway department cited for the award is chosen because its program report is a clear-cut presentation of facts in which the public is interested. More than 1,900 organizations participate through the National Highway Users Conference and 48 State conferences, in making the golden milestone award. It is, in effect, an expression of gratitude from millions of highway users.

Here is the announcement made by the conference in making the award this year:

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-EIGHT GOLDEN MILESTONE AWARD TO THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

The National Highway Users Conference is honored to present to the North Dakota State Highway Department the golden milestone award for outstanding service to the citizens of its State.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

This award confers the appreciation of highway users throughout the country, who comprise the organizations affiliated with the National Highway Users Conference and the 48 State conferences.

The North Dakota State Highway Department, by means of its activity report for the 2-year period, 1955–56, has done an outstanding service in presenting to the citizens of its State an easily understandable, concise summary of progress in highway improvement during those 2 years, and of plans for the years ahead. This activity report's clear-cut treatment of a highly technical subject goes a long way toward breaking through communication barriers between the highway department and the public.

With this report, and by close and understanding cooperation with highway user groups on issues which vitally concern them, the North Dakota State Highway Department has made a substantial contribution to the overall Federal-State highway program, designed in the interests of the national economy and the national defense.

The golden milestone is a symbol of highway users' grateful appreciation.

WILLIAM S. RICHARDSON,
Chairman.
ARTHUR C. BUTLER,
Director.
JOHN V. LAWRENCE,
Chairman, NHUC Award Committee.

Rumanian National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Rumanians have a number of national holidays in their long and eventful history, but May 10 marks a great landmark in their history. On that day of 1881 Rumanians proclaimed the birth of their independent kingdom by the union of the two historic provinces, Moldavia and Wallachia. For all practical purposes Rumanians were independent and in charge of their destiny, except for the payment of a small financial tribute to the Ottoman Sultans, since 1866. But on May 10 of 1881, their national independence was officially recognized by the great powers.

Rumanians are one of the oldest inhabitants of the Balkan Peninsula, and today, even after the breakup of their historic country by the Soviet Union, they constitute the largest single ethnic element in the entire region, numbering more than 17 million. A brave and patriotic people, endowed with many native and natural talents, Rumanians have been subjected to unwanted alien regimes during most of their modern history.

In the middle of the 15th century Rumania was conquered by the Ottoman Turks, and for more than 400 years they suffered under the tyranny of callous Ottoman administrators. In the 19th century, when they succeeded in their attempt to secure independence from the Sultans, then they were under constant danger of Russian aggression. Rumanians managed to keep their country and their independence in the course of many wars. At the end of the First World War they even regained some of their lost territory, but the Second World War brought them misery and suffering. Since 1945, they have been under Moscow-oriented and Moscow-directed Communist tyranny.

It is a tragedy that such a gifted and brave people, who have sacrificed so much for the attainment and enjoyment of human freedoms, cannot even have the freedom to celebrate their great national holiday, the birth of their own independence state on May 10, 1881. But Rumanians of the free world in celebrating that day keep up the spirit of freedom even among their unfree compatriots. I am indeed glad to join them in the celebration of their national holiday.

River Development Is a Prime Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAGE BELCHER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following newspaper article which appeared in the Tulsa World, Monday, May 12, 1958, entitled "River Development Is a Prime Need":

RIVER DEVELOPMENT IS A PRIME NEED

A week ago at Cushing, Dr. Raymond Thomas, director of the State department of commerce and industry, raised a number of eyebrows in a discourse on the state of the economy in 26 eastern Oklahoma counties. Deliberately eliminating mushrooming, prosperous Tulsa County from his survey, Dr. Thomas cited the vast need for eastern county development if the area is to catch up with other sections of the State.

Dr. Thomas' remarks were revealing, to say the least. Not a few of those in attendance at the water-industry conference at Cushing were importuned to criticize his treatment of figures and statistics.

Nevertheless, we believe Dr. Thomas performed an admirable service to the 26-county eastern area by pointing out its basic frailties. In particular were we struck by Dr. Thomas' reference to sales-tax collections in the area. His point was this:

Despite the fact the area supports 21 percent of the State's total population, the per capita sales-tax income for the 1957 fiscal year was $12.12, as compared with $22.02 for the rest of the State.

What does this mean? What can be done about it?

First, the sorry sales collections record is ultimate proof, if any is needed, that too much of eastern Oklahoma is living on a welfare-type economy, is not capable of caring for its own. Second, the best answer to improvement in the economy, in providing self-support and in lifting the standard of living, lies in the development of the vast water resources of the area.

Just as certainly as there are underdeveloped areas in other parts of the world, there are also underdeveloped areas right here in the United States. And that is why the trek of the tri-State (Kansas, Oklahoma, Arkansas) basin development group to Washington this week is so important.

The three State areas located along the course of the Arkansas River are in desperate need of the economic lift water development can and will bring. If the living standards of this vast area are to ever reach their actual potential, if there are ever to be jobs provided that will lift the area out of its welfare rolls economy, the development of water resources is mandatory.

In Washington this week the tri-State group will appear before House and Senate Public Works Committee groups. The goal of the group will be the speedy development of the Keystone, Eufaula, and other Kansas-Arkansas components of the great Arkansas-Red-White Basins.

Oklahoma's economic future is irrevocably tied to the success of this 3-State presentation of the needs of the area and the facts supporting the development of these needs.

Laos Celebrates 11th Anniversary of Constitution Day, May 11, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 11, 1958, Laos celebrated her 11th anniversary of Constitution Day. In recognition of the occasion I wish to extend warm greetings to His Majesty Sisavang Vong, King of Laos, His Excellency Ourot R. Souvannavong, Ambassador of Laos, and to the Lao people.

It is not a small matter for a nation to embark upon the task of building up prosperity and happiness, of undertaking to assure peace and progress, and of assuming the responsibilities of insuring to its peoples freedom and liberty. When we look back at our own history in the fitful decade after independence, it is easier to appreciate the uncertainties that have affected Laos during her first 11 years as a free and sovereign nation. That Laos has survived and flourished and that she has managed to improve her living standards even slightly, is a tribute to the hardiness and perseverance of which the Lao people can be proud.

Believing that they must take the larger part of the responsibility in helping themselves and their nation to catch up with the rest of the world, the Laotian people are pulling themselves up by their bootstraps. But the road ahead to economic viability is long and uncertain. Because of Lao pride and real efforts at self-help, considerable attention is warranted in this country to see that she gets the public and private assistance she needs.

Apart from congratulations to Laos on her 11th anniversary of Constitution Day, what is required from the United States perhaps even more than continued help is a hard look at the long-range realities. It means appreciation of the importance of Laos to the free world and a willingness to keep this importance foremost in our thinking and planning. Although Laos has a population of only 2 million, her friendship for the

free world is valued. The weakening of this friendship not only would be a major propaganda defeat but would weaken the position of adjoining anti-Communist states in the area.

Fiftieth Anniversary of the Navy Nurse Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN YOUNG
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it is my desire to congratulate the United States Navy on this the 50th anniversary of its Nurse Corps.

Rich in history from the beginning, the Navy Nurse Corps was established by an act of Congress in May 1908. Over the years from 1908 with a nucleus of 20 nurses to 1958 with approximately 2,100 nurses, the Nurse Corps had made outstanding contributions to the men and women of the United States Navy and the world at large in both service and in the field of education.

As early as 1910 members of the Navy Nurse Corps were serving outside the United States reporting to the Philippines, Guam, Honolulu, Yokohama, Samoa, Virgin Islands, and Cuba. The Nurse Corps over the years has expanded its service activities to hospital ships, air evacuation units, military transport ships, as well as the many Navy hospitals, air stations, and dispensaries throughout the United States and the world.

During World War II, Navy nurses within the continental limits of the United States were assigned to 40 naval hospitals, 176 dispensaries, and 6 hospital corps schools. True to Navy tradition at sea, they brought nursing care to the front lines, aboard 12 hospital ships, in air evacuation of casualties, and to foreign countries where American women had never before been seen. Serving in 17 countries overseas from December 7, 1941, until the surrender was signed aboard the U. S. S. *Missouri*, Navy nurses made military history.

Thousands of young men of the Navy had to be trained during the war to be hospital corpsmen. The majority of these hospital apprentices and pharmacists' mates had never been inside a hospital before their enlistment. Their teaching and supervision were important duties of Navy nurses, many of whom were experienced instructors. Their contribution to this work was invaluable. The effectiveness and skill of these Navy hospital corpsmen who tended our naval and marine casualties aboard fighting ships and on invasion beaches is a testimonial and a tribute to the effective instruction provided by the Navy Nurse Corps.

Navy schools, staffed by members of the Navy Nurse Corps, have been established throughout the world for the purpose of teaching the native population methods of survival against diseases common to them. As early as 1913 a school of nursing was established on Samoa for native women and later similar schools were also founded in the Virgin Islands, Haiti, and the island of Guam.

Late in 1943 two Navy nurses were sent to Brazil at the request of the Brazilian Government to establish and train a nurses' corps for that country's air corps. In spite of the great handicaps encountered by these nurses because of language and social problems, the school opened September 11, 1944, and the first class completed the 8-week course in November of that year. Because of Brazil's large jungle areas and mountainous terrain, the development of a method of transporting the sick and injured by plane represents a significant contribution to health advancement in Brazil which was made possible largely through the efforts of the Navy Nurse Corps.

At home the first class of 24 flying Navy nurses completed flight indoctrination January 22, 1945. They immediately started active flying service on 24 flying teams, consisting of a nurse and pharmacists mate. After some transcontinental trips with wounded, the teams went to the Pacific to serve in the Naval Air Evacuation Service, the first arriving in Guam in early February 1945. They worked tirelessly during the Iwo Jima and Okinawa campaigns flying out the wounded. Within 30 days, approximately 4,500 injured men were flown out of Okinawa alone.

Today the training of the Navy Nurses Corps continues apace with developments in modern warfare, and in conjunction with this training, our Navy nurses are receiving the finest possible education in such advanced courses as dietetics, laboratory techniques, anesthesia, and tuberculosis nursing.

The Navy Nurses Corps' marvelous record of accomplishment over the past 50 years, together with its proven ability to adjust to the many new and varied demands made upon it, have earned for it the respect and admiration of everyone.

It therefore gives me great pleasure to add my congratulations and best wishes to the many thousands which are being sent to the Navy Nurses Corps on this golden anniversary of the founding of the corps.

Poultry Production in the State of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, United States production of broilers in 1957 totaled slightly more than 1.4 million birds, an increase since 1950 of 126 percent. This striking advance has made the broiler industry one of the spectacularly productive segments of American agriculture.

Per capita consumption of broilers reached 16.7 pounds in 1957, a gain of 3 pounds over 1954–55. Ten States produce 70 percent of the national broiler production, and Maine is one of these with a production of 50 million birds.

The following article from the May 8 issue of the Portland Press Herald presents some interesting 1957 figures on the production of and income from poultry in the State of Maine:

STATE BROILER INCOME TOPS $37.3 MILLION

AUGUSTA.—Gross farm income from broiler raising reached a record high of $37,364,000 in Maine in 1957, the State Agriculture Department said Wednesday. It was a 23.7-percent gain from 1956 while farmers nationally were increasing gross income from that source by 6 percent.

The department said preliminary figures indicate Maine's total farm income from poultry may be at or near a record $66 million. Cash receipts from eggs and from chickens were below those of 1956, however—with a drop of 9.3 and 7 percent, respectively, compared to national reductions of 10 and 28 percent.

Broiler production totaled 191,611,000 pounds of meat, up 22.4 percent from 1956.

A Bill To Permit Small Business To Compete on the Same Price Terms as Large Firms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, as every Member of this House knows, the small-business man is the foundation and backbone of our industrial system of free enterprise. Yet today the small-business men of this country are the forgotten men of this decade. It is alarming to me to see the number of small businesses that have gone out of business in a period of record prosperity.

During the past few months I have received hundreds of letters from small-business men in my district requesting that Congress do something to help them with their problems. One of the specific things they ask for was for Congress to enact a national fair trade law so as to protect them against rampant cut-price practices. Because of my intense interest in the welfare of these small-business men I introduced H. R. 11264, a fair trade bill which is designed to permit small business to compete on the same price terms as large firms. I feel sure that if this legislation is enacted into law, it will stop the present price war as exemplified by the price war that followed an announcement by General Electric. This, I believe will save the small businesses of our country from being forced into bankruptcy.

Hearings have been completed on this legislation. In order that my colleagues may have my views on this most important legislation I include my testimony

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

before the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on May 6, 1958:

STATEMENT OF HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE EIGHTH DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance, I am grateful for the opportunity extended to me by your committee to present my views on my bill, H. R. 11264, which amends the Federal Trade Commission Act, so as to equalize rights in the distribution of identified merchandise.

Throughout our history, the American people have pinned their faith on two great principles, the principle of a free competitive economic system as the mainspring of the progress of our people and the principle of fair play. Both of these find legal expression in the antitrust laws which have set the rules for healthy competition for nearly 70 years. Of course, these laws have had to be modified and expanded as economic conditions and marketing practices were changed, as new problems for manufacturers and distributors arose. We stand at such a point today. Fair trade has been undermined to such a point that it has become almost totally ineffective. We must take vigorous steps to make it function as it should as a strong weapon against unfair competition.

The fair-trade legislation of the various States, backed by the Federal fair-trade law, popularly known as the McGuire Act, was introduced in most States in the thirties. It was designed particularly to protect small retailers from the ruthless and unfair competitive practice of chainstores and other large retail outlets of using a well-known trademarked articles as a loss leader. These merchants were selling such articles often at or even below cost, in order to attract customers who then could be charged higher prices on other goods once they had been lured into the store. Under the fair-trade laws of most States, once a manufacturer had signed an agreement with a single retailers within the State not to sell at retail the trademarked product of the manufacturer below a specified price, no dealer in the State is permitted to sell this trademarked product at any lower price. The first such law was passed in California in 1931. The number of such State laws increased rapidly to the point where all States except Missouri, Texas, and Vermont (and the District of Columbia) had fair-trade laws on the statute books. However, in recent years in numerous court cases, the nonsigner clause in the fair-trade laws—which binds a retailer not to sell a trademarked item at less than stipulated price even if he did not sign a contract to this effect himself—has been challenged. In 18 States, the State supreme courts declared this nonsigner clause unconstitutional. This has naturally seriously weakened the effectiveness of fair trade even in those States where the courts have upheld State fair trade acts.

A second blow to fair trade, following these actions by State courts, was the announcement by a considerable number of manufacturers that they were abandoning fair-trade price policies. Of these, the announcement of General Electric Co., long a stalwart superior of fair trade, on February 26 of this year was the most serious, particularly since it was quickly followed by similar announcements by such varied companies as Sunbeam Corp., Schick Corp., Toastmaster division of McGraw-Edison, Inc., Ronson Corp., and Royal McBee Corp., makers of Royal typewriters. The General Electric announcement was so significant that I should like to quote two paragraphs from it:

"Court after court has expressed its lack of sympathy with fair trade, and its disagreement with the legislative judgment which led to the passage of the fair-trade laws. A total of 14 State supreme courts have also declared their statutes unconstitutional in whole or in part. These decisions, combined with Missouri, Texas, Vermont, and the District of Columbia where fair-trade acts were never passed, create a total of 18 vast and commercially important non-fair-trade areas which adjoin fair-trade States and greatly compound the difficulties of equitable enforcement at their borders. Moreover, mail-order businesses, operating from the shelter of these non-fair-trade areas, recently have been permitted to riddle the price structure of fair-trade States by advertising, offering for sale and selling products to residents of these States below fair-trade prices. Finally, in some fair-trade States it has become increasingly difficult to secure adequate penalties to enforce compliance. Not infrequently punishment for violations of an injunction is either refused, or is so mild it does not serve as a deterrent in the future.

"All these facts are clearly evidence from our study of the recent trend of the over 3,000 fair trade cases instituted by us in the past 5 years, the thousands upon thousands of investigations undertaken, tabulated and acted upon, and the hundreds of contempt proceedings brought to enforce compliance with court orders. Current experience show that despite the magnitude of these continuous efforts, we can no longer uniformly establish and effectively protect our fair trade price structure in the manner originally contemplated by the fair trade laws. As a consequence, those who have signed fair trade contracts or voluntarily observed our fair trade prices have been placed in an untenable competitive position. This is especially true when they are located adjacent to the non-fair-trade areas or in States where violators have freely flaunted court injunctions or to which they have targeted mail-order operation."

This quotation indicates very clearly, it seems to me the crucial problems involved for small companies the country over as a result of these court decisions and the consequent loss of faith in fair trade by manufacturers and dealers alike. Particularly now, in a period of recession, we must fear more than ever that many companies will become increasingly ruthless and unscrupulous merchandising their products. Small business is gravely imperiled. We have become aware that, week after week, the number of business failures has been increasing. In March of this year business failures totaled 1,495, 21 percent above February, 12 percent above March 1957, and higher than any month since 1933, except for January 1939. Over half of these failures, 750 in all, were in the retail trades. This compares to 672 retail failures in March 1956. In addition to this rise in the number of business failures should be mentioned the continued increase in the number of mergers in business, whereby small firms are swallowed up and power of large business is extended.

A crisis is at hand and prompt action is imperative if we are going to reverse these ominous trends. If my bill is enacted into law it will provide businessmen with the assurance they need that the brand merchandise which is the small-business man's bread and butter will not be used as unfair loss leaders by their giant competitors. H. R. 11264 is designed to restore fair trade to its rightful place as a protective shield for small business.

My bill makes a fresh approach to the problem of fair trade. In contrast to the earlier fair-trade legislation which has precipitated such an endless series of court controversies, the current bill does not require either a signed fair-trade contract or the operation of the nonsigner clause. Instead this bill provides specifically that the manufacturer or distributor of trademarked or trade-name merchandise, called a proprietor (i. e., one who identifies merchandise manufactured or distributed by him by the use of his trademark or trade name), may lawfully "establish and control by actual notice to his distributors stipulated or minimum resale prices of his merchandise in commerce which is in free, open competition with articles of the same general class produced by others. He may so establish schedules of resale prices differentiated with reference to any criteria not otherwise unlawful. Such schedules may be changed from time to time by actual notice to distributors having acquired his merchandise with actual notice of any established resale price." This is the heart and soul of the act.

Let us examine this a little further. Actually this act, although providing a new legal framework for fair trade, is not creating a precedent by giving manufacturers a right to establish resale prices on their own brands. This right already exists for many manufacturers who choose to adopt certain methods of distribution, such as maintaining their own retail outlets, adopting dealer franchises, or consignment selling. This bill simply extends this right to manufacturers who sell their brands primarily through the thousands and thousands of small independent retail stores throughout the length and breadth of this land.

This is, I would add, purely permissive legislation. It does not require any manufacturer to establish resale prices on his trade-marked products. Some undoubtedly will; others will not; and there will be competition between both.

I want to stress that word, "competition." You will note that this bill provides for the right to maintain specified retail prices only where such merchandise is in free open competition with articles of the same general class produced by others. Thus a manufacturer with a monopoly in a product may not establish a resale price enforceable under this law.

In short this bill merely permits manufacturers of trademarked products to establish and enforce on a national scale specified prices on such products by the simple device of providing notice to the dealer of such minimum prices. Such notice may be imparted by mail, or through advertising, or through notice attached to merchandise or its containers, or imparted orally.

If such a resale price established by the manufacturer were violated, any person suffering or reasonably anticipating damage from such violations of established resale prices could sue in any State or Federal court of competent jurisdiction. This could be a competitor of the retailer violating this law, or even the manufacturer of the trademarked article.

This legislation will, I am thoroughly convinced, help counterbalance the economic forces which are operating constantly to grind down to extinction the small, independent retailer. It will help the small-business man compete against his large competitor. It will encourage young men of initiative who want to run their own business to go into business for themselves without the fear of being crushed by overwhelming competition before they are fairly started. It would help well-run small businesses to survive and prosper by curbing the price wars that turn popular brands into profitless goods that no one wants to handle.

We have seen in the past few weeks a lot of reports that fair trade is, if not already dead and buried, at least in a very perilous state and unlikely to survive much longer. It will be a sad day, I am convinced, if fair trade is permitted to disappear. In fact, I am thoroughly persuaded that we must not merely prevent fair trade from dying, but through legislation such as I have introduced bring fair trade to the point where

it can truly operate effectively and efficiently as an integral part of our body of antitrust law designed to prevent unfair competition, stimulate our free conomy, and help this country grow. Therefore, I commend this bill to this committee and strongly urge its approval.

America's Timber Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, timber has performed as an important ingredient in the development of America, and as in the past, so will it be called upon to make further contributions to our country's expansion of the future.

A growing population is demanding more and more lumber products to satisfy its needs, but owing to certain limiting characteristics, a supply adequate to these needs will have to come from the same area of forest lands that has accommodated our past requirements.

The United States Forest Service has, as a result of an appraisal of the timber situation, presented a series of observations, and these are deserving of the attention of all having an interest in America's timber supply:

The Department of Agriculture through its Forest Service is to be commended on its excellent recent report on our country's timber situation. The Timber Resource Review, on which the report is based, is the most complete appraisal of our timber supplies and future needs ever made. Since timber will continue its big role in our economy, this report is a signal contribution to the future welfare and prosperity of the Nation. It projects our timber demands to the year 2000—just 4 decades from now—when there will be 100 million more Americans than we have now.

The report contains 700 pages of significant and useful facts. Implications from these facts are clear. With almost a doubled population by 2000, we will need to grow a lot more timber than we do now—perhaps twice as much on just about the same amount of forest land we now have. Forest land area will not increase—in fact, it may decrease somewhat.

An encouraging part of the report is this: the land we have to grow timber on is adequate—if we step up all our forestry activities over what we are now doing. We simply won't grow enough timber in the future unless we intensify forestry practices to a much greater extent.

Some highlights of the timber situation are:

1. Fifty-two million acres need planting. At the present rate of planting, it will take 50 years to put these idle acres to work.

2. Too many acres with too few trees on them—millions of acres only partially stocked.

3. Timber quality is declining. We are cutting, and have been for a long time, the better quality trees, and leaving the poorer trees.

4. More than half of the commercial forest land is in 4½ million small privately owned forests. Here is the key to a full supply of timber for the future since generally these private holdings are far less productive than the public and industry-owned forests. Moreover, the owners of these small forests are not obtaining the cash income they could obtain from these lands.

This monumental report holds significance for every American. If we heed its implications, we can be optimistic about our timber supplies in the future and our children and their children will know the timber abundance that we know. Many other public and private groups helped the Forest Service in making the survey of timber conditions. But much of the credit must go to the leadership of Dr. Richard E. McArdle, Chief of the Forest Service. The report is a fine example of his forestry statesmanship. He has made outstanding contributions in managing, protecting, and developing the Nation's forest resources. In addition, he has helped to build and strengthen Federal cooperation with the States and with private industry. He has developed and stimulated an effective forest research program. His Forest Service associates are welded into a unified action force with excellent esprit de corps. In directing the work of the Forest Service, Dr. McArdle always emphasizes the word service—service to the American people.

Farmers, Ranchers Having Boom Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, with all the unfounded talk of a farm recession, it is encouraging to learn that many great agricultural areas of our country are enjoying unprecedented prosperity. I hope the farmers themselves will start to count their blessings and quit blaming the administration and Secretary Benson for every problem from boll weevils to cloudbursts.

The Arizona Farmer Ranchman, published in Phoenix, which I understand is the third largest farm publication in America, recently featured a commendable front-page editorial pointing up the bright side of the farm picture in the great Southwest. Under unanimous consent, I include it as a portion of my remarks:

FARMERS, RANCHERS HAVING BOOM YEAR

Hey, folks, where is this depression—or recession—that everyone is crying about?

It certainly isn't visible from the cotton farms, the grainfields, the vegetable fields, the citrus groves or the cattle ranges and feedpens of Arizona.

Everybody who has any kind of a farm product to sell right now is selling on a booming market. The outlook is that demand will continue strong through the remainder of the year for everything that comes from the farms and ranches of the Copper State. No crop to be harvested later in 1958 is likely to be sold at a loss.

This promises to be a year far surpassing 1957, when the total income from Arizona crops and livestock was $398 million, a gain of $18 million over 1956. It's almost a certainty that 1958's agricultural income will be far over $400 million and it can reach a record $500 million.

Let's take a look at what happened in the first quarter of the current year and make a few prognostications as to the quarters still ahead.

Citrus, vegetables, and cattle are the principal commodities today being shipped to consumers who just can't get enough of the superior fruit, produce and beef that Arizona raises. It is true that the high vegetable and fruit prices are largely caused by Florida freezes, but Florida's tough luck had little or nothing to do with the phenomenal livestock situation.

With Valencia oranges selling as high as $4.50 a carton, this can be the most profitable citrus season in Arizona's history. We have even heard of packing house managers telling growers they can count on a return of $4.50 a field box for Valencias, up from $1.80 last season. That return would mean around $2,000 an acre just for growing the fruit and put a crimp in the aspirations of subdividers. At the same time grapefruit is selling at profitable levels and the price is improving. The other oranges are long since gone, and at good prices. Furthermore, Florida's trees are so badly damaged that citrus is almost certain to be in short supply for several years.

So, if you're looking for gloom, stay away from the citrus growers.

Almost before they had started shipping their spring crop the lettuce producers had recouped their losses from an unsatisfactory fall deal. Celery, carrots and even peas are in strong demand. A record acreage has been planted to melons and the growers will need only a little market luck to profit handsomely.

Fears that the rains and cool weather would result in heavy lettuce losses from mildew have faded away. There is no longer any great apprehension that rains and winds will cause the barley to lodge. The outlook is for the heaviest per acre yield of barley in the State's history, which is not likely to make anybody rich but should sell well if all the grain isn't rushed to market at harvest time. Our biggest wheat crop, estimated at 128,000 acres, looks even better than the barley and should be profitable even if it sells at no more than support prices.

The most sensational development in the Arizona agricultural front this spring is in beef cattle. In just a few weeks the price of finished steers shot up eight or nine cents a pound and Arizona steers have sold in Los Angeles above 30 cents. Feeders are being pressed to let their cattle go, at choice prices, weeks before they can grade as finished.

All cattlemen are holding their breath, feeling that this situation is too abnormal to last and some night will bring a sharp break. But the beef scarcity is national and any decline is unlikely to be more than moderate.

Chances are that Arizona feeders will have their best year, and there isn't a doubt that rangemen are in for their best year since 1941 for they have their best feed since 1941. The rains have made a tremendous difference in their prospects and many are now regretting the heifer calves they let go last fall when conditions were only fair. The feeders stand ready to pay them top prices for anything they can part with now, and it's predicted that they will get at least 25 cents a pound for their calves next fall. They'll be heavy calves, too.

Arizona's principal agricultural commodity is cotton, just now being planted, and the cotton farmers look forward confidently to a much better season than last. That wasn't a bad season, only a bit disappointing in grades, and that came about because of weather not likely to be repeated. There's a worldwide shortage of high-grade cotton which will be acute about the time picking starts again in Arizona, and prices should be well above the floor set by the Federal loan program. All that's worrying the cottongrowers is that they aren't allowed to raise enough quality fiber to supply their customers and may lose more of their market to synthetics.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

As for grapes, alfalfa, sorghum, and miscellaneous crops, only time will tell but at the moment there is certainly nothing on the horizon to generate despair.

Water? The Salt River project has twice as much in storage as a year ago. The San Carlos project has more than for several years. Yuma County's farm districts will again have all they need, from the Colorado. Of course we are still drawing much more water from underground than is being replaced, but even that sad story is lightened somewhat by the discovery of new supplies here and there. The general water picture is bright if not brilliant.

No, don't go looking among Arizona farmers and stockmen for pessimists, regardless of what is happening to ther industries and to the rest of the country. Don't come around Arizona Farmer, either.

This number of the big farm paper is 72 pages. In advertising volume it is almost a record.

Polish Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to echo the sentiments expressed by many of my colleagues in their salutes to the people of Poland on the occasion of Polish Independence Day, May 3.

Through long years of Russian domination—nearly two decades now—the people of Poland have retained their dreams of freedom, nourished by their memory of Poland as a free nation, the first European country to enact a democratic and progressive constitution.

It is this constitution, adopted May 3, 1791, that is recalled on this historic day. The Russian Communists, who still dominate the Polish people through armed strength, will not allow public celebrations of this event. But last year, for the first time in many years, the Polish people were allowed to mark the day in private.

It is only through their armed strength that the Soviets are able to keep the Polish people within their sphere. The Poznan revolt showed the Russians what would happen to their Communist form of government and their enforced adherence to communism if a ring of steel were not around this once-free nation.

We in America, who cherish our freedom as the Polish people do, mark this historic Polish Independence Day with renewed pledges of our friendship and encouragement to the people of Poland. Certainly the Soviets realize that armed strength and Communist-run schools are not winning the Poles to communism. And we know it also. Our people send to the people of Poland a warm and heartfelt greeting, and we join these oppressed people in their prayers that Poland will soon know freedom and independence again.

It's a Free Country, but—

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, those who stand up for the dignity of the individual are becoming fewer and farther between. When these people do assert their constitutional rights, all too often it is the Federal Government which attempts to knock them down. I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article which appeared in the Detroit Times on May 7, written by E. A. Batchelor, Jr. It is a sad story of what can happen under our present agricultural acts.

IT'S A FREE COUNTRY, BUT—
(By E. A. Batchelor, Jr.)

DOWAGIAC, May 7.—By the proud, unyielding code of Stanley Yankus, Jr. it is wrong to accept somebody else's money for nothing.

For years on his Cass County farm Yankus, 39, made sure he never had to.

His formula was simple. He grew grain on his farm, fed it to his chickens and took their eggs to market.

He never grew rich but his wife and three children did not want.

And Yankus had his independence. It was for that he left a humdrum clerk's job in Chicago 18 years ago to start life as a farmer deep in debt and willing to learn by his mistakes.

Independence is a precious heritage to Yankus. It was for freedom that his father left Lithuania. An uncle who remained behind is in a Russian concentration camp today.

But the Government that he reveres has seized the $3,403 he wrung from his farm and put in a savings bank here.

Yankus is a frightened man.

"I am not frightened for myself," he said today. "But I am frightened for this country I love.

"What happened to me is the action of a police state—the sort of life we were brought up to detest.

"And I find my friends and neighbors are afraid of the Federal Government. Don't they realize you and I and all other citizens are the Federal Government?"

This is what happened to frighten and bewilder Stanley Yankus: Four years the Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Board, Federal agency, fixed the amount of land that farmers could sow to wheat.

The move was to control wheat surpluses. By preventing wheat from reaching the market, prices are kept up artificially.

It was done in Cass County by referendum by the farmers to whom the ASC had arbitrarily granted an allotment of 15 acres of wheat. Only they are eligible to vote in this annual referendum.

Yankus said, "This is not a free election. It is a price-fixing election by special interests. The consumers who buy bread can't vote in it."

But Yankus' wheat does not reach the market. It goes to feed his chickens.

In 1954 Yankus was told he was fined $900 for growing 38 acres of wheat instead of the 12 to which the ASC quota limited him.

It was a bad year to fine Yankus. Disease had riddled his chickens. The fine came within $25 of wiping out his profit for the year.

He did not pay. He has not paid for 4 years during which he has shown a modest profit and managed to save $3,403.

That's the bank account that the Government impounded last week until Yankus pays his fines which now amount to $3,848.

Yankus said, "Yet, if I signed up with the Government to grow only 12 acres of wheat, they would buy it from me at $2.08 a bushel and put it in storage to rot."

He said many of his farmer neighbors thought the whole thing was ridiculous but had gone along, either because they don't want to stick their necks out or because they don't care where the money for their wheat comes from.

He is not an easy man to appease, this Yankus. He admits it, and adds:

"I've read enough history to know that the men who wrote the Declaration of Independence weren't easy to do business with, either. They didn't accept the British Government just because it was the government. They wanted a voice in it.

"There were plenty in those days who didn't want to stick their necks out. But we call them Tories in the history books and we look down on them."

There is a strange eloquence to Yankus as he voices his creed.

The Constitution is his bible and he points to that section which says that no citizen shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

"Who made the law that seized my savings?" asks Yankus. "I didn't vote on it and you didn't. If I had robbed a bank I would have had my day in court. But they tell me I can't get a jury trial for my crime."

Since his bank account was impounded Yankus has been forced to sell 1,000 pullets to get some ready cash.

"That hurt," he said, "but here's something that worries me even more. I learned that an FBI agent had been over asking my egg buyer in Benton Harbor a lot of questions about me.

"This awe people have of the FBI makes that very damaging to me. People get leery of doing business with a man if they think it will bring the FBI down on them. You see, they are getting afraid of their Government."

Yankus said the Cass County ASC board urged him to plant corn instead of wheat, explaining:

"They told me I could raise all I wanted and feed it to my chickens or sell it. In the first place, to raise corn I would have to buy about $2,000 worth of specialized farming equipment.

"Then if I did sell the corn, I would have to take the money and pay ridiculous high prices for the wheat my birds need.

"It's just too much like somebody telling me what I have to serve for supper each night. I can't go for it."

To try and get the Government explanation you go to the offices of the Cass County ASC board which administers the law Yankus is fighting.

The Federal Government is represented there in a remodeled old railroad depot by Office Manager Russell Leach and five women clerks.

The walls are lined with filing cabinets. They are bulging with the form B-16's and the J-11's so essential to the bureaucrat's existence.

Leach, 49, is a little man with a tiny mustache. He gets $5,400 a year for checking and reporting on men like Stanley Yankus and seeing that the girls file the multiple reports correctly. He also owns a farm nearby.

In his way, he seems just as bewildered as Yankus. The first thing he tells you is, "I'm just working here. My job is just to see that his excess wheat is reported."

Just a cog in a big Government wheel?

"Yes, that's all," says Leach.

True, he said, Yankus is the only farmer in Cass County who is violating the law by growing excess wheat solely for his own use. But the law as written didn't take that into account and "I didn't write the law."

"I don't see why he won't be reasonable and put the land into corn. I think his chickens would do better on that than wheat," said Leach.

They looked pretty healthy on their present diet, the visitor suggested.

Leach smiled wanly and offered no argument.

"I want to get along with everybody, I'm sorry this Yankus thing has caused so much trouble," he said.

"But if I'm not in this job somebody else would be."

As Stanley Yankus had said, "this Government thing has gotten so big and involved a man doesn't even know who he's fighting any more."

Soviet Arctic Veto Unmasks Mr. Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Russia's true face should be clearly known to all Americans, but her latest veto of President Eisenhower's inspection proposal once again shows her true colors. I commend to you for reading the following article which appeared in the Long Island Daily Press of Sunday, May 11, 1958:

SOVIET ARCTIC VETO UNMASKS MR. KHRUSHCHEV

(By Alexander F. Jones, executive editor, Syracuse Herald-Journal)

The Soviet Union veto of the United States proposal for Arctic inspection to avert danger of surprise attack across the North Pole is the real tipoff on Russian planning.

If there was any sincerity whatsoever in Soviet claims to peaceful intentions, the American inspection proposal for Arctic flight would have been accepted.

Of the 11 members of the Security Council of the United Nations, only the Russians opposed it.

Thus all efforts to bring about a summit conference are off, for the time being at least. There can be no discussion.

The only way the Communists can hit the United States with mass flights is over the North Pole.

So when the United States put its finger on this nerve center and proposed to make certain surprise attacks impossible from either side, Mr. Khrushchev, through his delegate, Arkady A. Sobolev, had to take his mask off. And there was not the cheerful, back-slapping advocate of a peaceful world, but a sinister gangster of as evil a stripe as Stalin.

Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, our chief delegate at the United Nations, did a masterly job in forcing Sobolev who up to this time has been a comparatively rational and reasonable representative of Moscow, to sputter incoherently in carrying out the Khrushchev decision.

Sobolev even took out after Dag Hammarskjold, executive secretary of the U. N., for expressing the hope the Soviet Union would agree to the American proposal.

All of this is very discouraging.

It reveals there has been no real change in Soviet policy. World domination is still the Communist goal. John Foster Dulles has never been fooled about this fact for one moment.

This sad development takes me back 12 years to a luncheon with the late Gen. Henry A. Arnold, commander in chief of the Air Force in World War II.

General Arnold was retiring and making a final report. He wanted to explain it and he did, at the expense of a linen table cloth.

That report detailed the danger of attack over the North Pole and the need for a gigantic radar screen to act as an alarm. It also detailed the need for Arctic bases and cooperation with Canada.

There have been many refinements in the Arctic protective screen since the Arnold report but, in general, his ideas have been carried out. Gen. Carl Spaatz, his successor, was equally alert as to the danger.

The web that has been woven has, as much as any other defensive precaution we have taken, spelled American security.

How much it means has been revealed by the Soviet wrath when the United States proposed an inspection system.

Maintenance Increase for Rural Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I regret that a short stay in the hospital prevented me from being in the Chamber when the House acted on S. 3050 last week. I was very pleased to note that not one Member spoke against this legislation, which certainly indicates the clear recognition by all concerned of the need for this very necessary adjustment in compensation of rural carriers.

A 1-cent-a-mile increase in mileage expense and an increase in the minimum compensation to $3.50 per day are only fair in view of the increased costs which rural carriers must bear. It was 7 years ago this summer when these carriers received their last adjustment, and there can be no argument about the need for at least the increase as provided in S. 3050.

I was happy to be present in our Post Office and Civil Service Committee when this legislation came before us, and to add my vote in support of this legislation. I regret that I was unable to add my voice to those speaking for this bill when it was before the House.

Our colleagues in the other body have, in their wisdom, acted speedily on this measure. It has the full support of the National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, a group which certainly knows the needs of our faithful carriers.

The United States Should Continue To Oppose Commodity Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Habana Charter for an International Trade Organization was never approved by the Congress. Chapter VI of the proposed charter dealt with commodity agreements. They are not compatible with our free-enterprise economy.

The majority report of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, better known as the Randall Committee, during the 83d Congress said:

The Commission does not believe that extensive resort to commodity agreements will solve the problem of price instability; and it believes that such agreements introduce rigidities and restraints that impair the elasticity of economic adjustment and the freedom of individual initiative, which are fundamental to economic progress. • • •

The Commission finds the same objections to the proposals for unilateral buffer stock action by the United States to stabilize world prices of raw materials and foodstuffs.

My able colleague the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and I dissented from this statement. While the majority opposed extensive resort to commodity agreements, we opposed any use of such agreements.

In 1954, the United Nations established a Commission on International Commodity Trade. The United States opposed the establishment of this new United Nations Commission, and it has refused to participate in its work. Our opposition was based on the fact that its terms of reference clearly suggested that international commodity agreements would be the instrumentality to control the price and volume of trade in basic commodities.

When the proposal to establish the Commission was before the United Nations Economic and Social Council in April, 1954, the United States representative to the Council, Mr. Preston Hotchkis, said:

The experts also believe, however, that commodity agreements, if properly drawn and operated, may be an effective means for preventing excessive price fluctuations. This they hope might be obtained if the attempt were made to cover several commodities in a single agreement, instead of relying on the inevitably slow and uncertain increase in single commodity agreements.

I must confess, Mr. President, that I find no ground to justify this hope. The difficulties experienced in negotiations relating to a single commodity would in my judgment be greatly multiplied if we attempted to deal with many commodities at the same time. Moreover, any agreement covering many commodities would involve widespread interferences with the workings of a free world economy. It would magnify the danger of diverting production, consumption and trade patterns from the channels they would be likely to assume under a

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

more healthy, competitive, and free-enterprise system. The net result of such arrangements, even if it were practicable to conclude them, would I firmly believe, be detrimental and not beneficial to economic development.

Mr. Speaker, I endorse this statement.

In view of the consistent stand this administration has taken, I am obviously distressed at reports that some State Department planners are now considering changing this position.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an article by Mr. James Reston which appeared in the New York Times on April 15 at this point:

ADMINISTRATION MAPS MOVE TO SAVE ITS TRADE PROGRAM

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, April 14.—The administration is deeply worried about the future of its foreign trade program—so much so that the State Department is now seriously considering a revision of two of this Government's pet economic doctrines.

These are its long-standing opposition to the principle of international commodity agreements, and its opposition to prolonged Government purchases of such things as domestic-produced lead and zinc.

Thus, to save the reciprocal trade agreement program in the Senate, State Department economic experts are urging a new Government-buying program of United States lead and zinc for stockpiling.

Coincidentally, these same experts are discussing the feasibility of an international coffee commodity agreement to avoid financial distress and political trouble, particularly in Brazil and Colombia.

The administration ended its zinc-buying program last month, and allocated no funds for Government purchases of lead after June 30, 1958. These decisions, coupled with the competition of foreign produced lead and zinc, have caused widespread unemployment in United States lead and zinc mines, and have greatly increased the demand in the Senate for high tariffs against lead and zinc imports.

In short, the situation is as follows:

Lead and zinc: Senators from the lead and zinc States—New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Utah, Montana, and to a lesser extent Wyoming—have served notice on the administration that they will not vote for the reciprocal trade agreements program unless the lead and zinc miners are given relief in one form or another.

This informal mining bloc, most of whose Members have previously favored the reciprocal trade agreements program, is working closely with the Senate textile bloc and oil bloc, both of which also want protection against foreign competition. And the combination has convinced the State Department economic experts that unless some concessions are made to the protectionists, the reciprocal trade agreements program will be severely crippled if not defeated.

Coffee: Brazil, Colombia and several other Latin American countries get 80 percent of their foreign exchange from the export of coffee, primarily to the United States and Europe. Their revenues from this country have been dropping steeply in the last 18 months.

COMPETITION FROM AFRICA

Meanwhile, competition from French and British African coffee has been hurting their market, particularly in Europe, and when the European common market agreements get into full operation, African coffee will enjoy a greater priority in the European market.

The question raised here, therefore, is whether to sit down with the Latin-American coffee producers and discuss the problem, knowing that such a discussion would inevitably lead to proposals for an international coffee agreement similar to the sugar agreement now in operation.

In the past, the United States Government, while feeling that the commodity agreement for sugar worked fairly well, has opposed the extension of this device to coffee. The idea here has been that the United States was the world's largest consumer of coffee and that it should buy coffee anywhere it could for the lowest possible price.

Accordingly, United States officials have refused to enter into international negotiations on a coffee-commodity agreement. Now, however, they see serious trouble ahead for the Latin-American Nations—Guatemala and Costa Rica are involved as well as Brazil and Colombia—that depend primarily on this one crop for foreign exchange.

EXPORTS FROM BRAZIL

For example, Brazil's coffee exports to the United States dropped from $604,731,000 in 1956 to $528,402,000 in 1957, a decline of $76,329,000. Colombia's dropped in this same period by $24,638,000, and the estimates for the future are even more disturbing.

This is happening when the Soviet Union is in the midst of a major trade drive in Latin America. The State Department's argument is that is would undoubtedly be cheaper and safer in the long run to revise our theory about commodity agreements than to deal with the economic and political consequences of a financial crisis in the coffee-producing countries in the South.

There is, however, serious opposition to this line of thought within the administration. Some officials think the controversy over commodities agreements and stockpiling payments for lead and zinc will be the major issue within the executive branch of the Government in the next 3 months.

A QUESTION BY OPPONENTS

The opponents of commodity agreements ask why the administration should start down the road toward more commodity agreements when it has had so much trouble with trying to fix prices and agricultural quotas at home. The free market is the best market, these officials say. Therefore, they are opposed to the arguments being heard in the State Department.

Nevertheless, political considerations in both the lead and zinc and the coffee controversies are forcing a review of economic doctrine.

Even the State Department officials who are advocating a modification of present policies do not like commodity agreements or perpetual stock-piling programs, but they are faced with harsh alternatives and feel that the time has come to talk out the differences with the administration.

It is difficult to be precise about the Government purchases of lead and zinc in the past, for these are not published. Reliable estimates, however, put the cost at about $50 million a year.

The State Department argument is that this will be very little to pay if, as it believes, the future of the Trade Agreements Act depends on the votes of the mining bloc in the Senate.

State also argues that the Latin-American market for United States automobiles and other products will seriously decline unless some way is found to avoid a financial crisis in important parts of the hemisphere.

The Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, dealt with the Latin-American commodity price problem in a speech at Pan American Day ceremonies here this afternoon.

He said that the United States Government had realized "the potential consequences of violent fluctuations in the prices of Latin America's exports and is daily searching for ways and means to contribute toward a solution."

"I can assure you," he said, "that we are truly anxious to help within the limits of what is sound and within our governmental capabilities. And we are always ready to discuss with our neighbors these mutual problems in an effort to find practical and acceptable solutions."

Mr. Speaker, if we attempt to stabilize the price of Brazil's coffee, we will immediately be asked to assist in the stabilization of other commodities, most of which we do not produce in the United States. The unlimited possibilities of our involvement are indicated by an article in the New York Journal of Commerce on April 4, which reported that the new Republic of Ghana proposed the formation of a world cocoa agency. Under unanimous consent, I include this article at this point:

WORLD COCOA AGENCY PROPOSED

(By Hy Cohen)

A proposal for a central cocoa agency, empowered to buy and sell raw stocks on world markets at favorable prices, will be set before the cocoa study group of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations.

This plan was introduced by the Ghana delegation at the recently adjourned London meeting of the group's working party. Representatives from 12 countries, including the United States, attended.

PLAN FAVORABLY RECEIVED

Sources in touch with the conference told the Journal of Commerce that this plan was more favorably received than the "orthodox buffer stock scheme," which was considered unworkable by many, and has little chance of adoption.

Also included in the Ghana plan, as presented by Sir Eric Tansley, was a maximum-minimum price range of 37½ cents to 25 cents per pound.

A counterproposal was suggested by the Nigerian delegation offering a 10-cent fluctuation, with a floor of 30 cents per pound, and a ceiling of 40 cents per pound.

CLOSING COCOA PRICES

Cocoa prices at the closing of the New York Cocoa Exchange ranged between 36.15 cents to 40.15 cents per pound.

Ghana's proposal was reported as a revision of Sir Eric's earlier antagonism to futures trading in this commodity.

As presently envisioned, the agency would operate from London and New York, buying cocoa when prices were low, and selling when they advanced. A council established for this purpose would be responsible for necessary decisions.

BRAZIL LATE AT MEETING

Brazil, a key cocoa producer, and chief mover for a world buffer stock, was only represented at the meeting during the last day.

Price stabilization of world cocoa prices has been a major concern of the study group since it was founded in 1956. Traders here have been consistently unfriendly toward any price-fixing schemes, or suggested cartel arrangements.

At this meeting, the strongest delegates for controls were the Swiss and the French. Most of the other consumer nations represented were described as not in favor of fixed prices.

COCOA IN SHORT SUPPLY

Trade sources here consider any plan for a world buffer stock in cocoa as unrealistic under present conditions when cocoa is in short supply, and prices are running at high levels.

Current high prices are detrimental to any expansion of chocolate, it was pointed out at the London meeting.

Other nations represented at the London conference were the United Kingdom, Brazil, France, Italy, Germany, Netherlands, Switzerland, Ghana, and Australia. Denmark, the Dominican Republic, and Mexico were there as observers.

The American delegation emphasized the need for increased crops, and improved, cheaper production methods, to permit producing countries to realize a greater return on this commodity.

Word has just been received from the cocoa study group committee in Rome that the results of the London meeting on price stabilization will be submitted to the group meeting scheduled to run May 16–23 in Hamburg.

COCOA CLOSES LOWER

Cocoa futures closed 7 to 22 points lower after opening with strength. The market shifted over a one-half-cent range as covering, which supplied the early buying, dried up. Turnover for the session was a light 258 lots, including 18 switches and 8 sales against actuals.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are having difficulty in maintaining the income of our farmers, miners, and ranchers, I do not believe that we should embark on any program at the expense of the American taxpayer which attempts to stabilize the world price of any raw material. Let us do first things first and protect our own producers through an adequate tariff.

Coffee, cocoa, and many other raw materials which are now receiving special consideration by the State Department are on the United States free list. We should let free markets determine the price of any commodity we are willing to import without any tariff or other trade barriers.

No Recession in Studio City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the following telegram regarding the recession sent to the President by two of my constituents:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In accordance with your recent statement the merchants of Studio City set out to prove that no such thing as a recession actually exists in our land, that there is only talk and fear of a recession. As a consequence we picked the most unlikely hour, 12 a. m. to 3 a. m., Sunday morning, April 19. We placed advertising in the press and on television station KCOP. Mr. President, at 2 a. m. Sunday morning 100,000 people jammed our business district and they were buying not sightseeing. This is a small segment of Los Angeles where 1,000 people shopping at the same time is just about normal. Studio City shopping district is about 8 blocks long. Mr. President, we in Studio City have proved that there is no such thing as a recession and we have proven it dramatically. We believe that official notice would be a stimulus for other cities and for business in general.

DE WITT MCCANN,
President, Studio City Chamber of Commerce.
EDDIE LEWIS,
Chairman, Studio City Merchants Association.

Abuse of Loss Carryover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the loss carryover provisions of the Internal Revenue Code were written into the law to help business and industry recoup their losses of poor years in years when they realized a profit. However, many smart operators take advantage of this law to save taxes. This they do by purchasing businesses which have operated at a loss and apply these losses against the profits of their own successful business and thus reduce their taxes.

If the law is not being abused, it is, at least, being used by individuals and corporations for profit and to the detriment of the working people of this country generally, and of my home State of Rhode Island in particular, because in addition to obtaining a tax reduction, these operators, as a rule, shut down the plant and sell the real estate and machinery separately, throwing workers out of jobs and at the same time remove the job potential.

I have tried, with the help of the tax experts here in the Congress, to find a way to close this loophole in our tax law, while at the same time preserving the basic purpose of the law. Some progress to that end was made a few years ago but more must be done.

I nave not given up and I am hopeful that before long the technicians on the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation will recommend a way to close this loophole against abuse while at the same time protect the legitimate taxpayer who needs this relief in his efforts to continue to provide jobs.

Under leave already granted me I include as a part of my remarks a study of loss carryover in the textile industry, entitled "Trafficking in Corporations," and a proposed remedy, prepared by Solomon Barkin and George Perkel, which illustrates the points I am trying to make. It follows:

TRAFFICKING IN LOSS CARRYOVERS

The loss carryover provisions of the Internal Revenue Code are designed to treat corporations which suffer operating losses on an equitable basis in relation to the tax treatment of other corporations. The application of this worthy purpose to corporations succeeding to the business or assets of a predecessor corporation which had incurred the loss has been fraught with much confusion and uncertainty. Prior to the enactment of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, there was no statutory provision governing the use of carryovers by successor corporations. The new code sought to remedy this situation by establishing rules under which carryovers would apply to such corporations and setting forth special limitations to prevent abuse.

The textile industry has suffered from serious economic reverses in recent years and the new rules for applying loss carryovers to successor corporations have therefore had extensive applicability to the firms in this industry. Corporate interests with no previous connection with textiles have looked upon the substantial loss positions accumulated by textile companies as an inviting inducement for acquiring such companies so as to make use of their tax advantages. In spite of the limitations imposed by the statute, many textile corporations have been acquired by other corporations and, after being milked of their tax advantages, have been liquidated. This cannibalization of textile enterprises has had serious repercussions through the industry.

PURPOSES OF LOSS CARRYOVERS

The economic consequences of the adoption of sections 381 and 382 have been just the reverse of the purposes which the loss carryover provision is designed to achieve. As noted in a Treasury Department study entitled "Business Loss Offsets," published in 1947, the principal purposes of this provision are as follows:

A. Equity considerations

In the absence of the loss offsets, the business entity whose net income becomes negative in some periods is not permitted to deduct all the expenses of earning income. To this extent, the tax on net income becomes a tax on capital. The owners of such a firm are discriminated against, because higher taxes are levied on their net income than on the income of owners of businesses with stable income.

B. Economic considerations

1. To remove impediments to risk taking: Without loss offsets, investments in assets with less risk of loss are favored over those in which the risk may be greater. Thus, the absence of loss offsets will reduce the relative investment in risky assets and ventures. Investment in such assets and ventures may be particularly desirable in the economy. Ventures may be risky because they are new firms challenging established ones or introducing new products. If successful, they may bring reduced prices in the industry they enter, or may create employment in an entirely new industry. They may be faced with a period of hard sledding and losses in their early years. If losses in this period cannot be offset against income of future periods, the prospective return from the investment is reduced relative to the return connected with a safer haven for their funds.

2. To increase the countercyclical effect of taxes: Absence of loss offsets may also contribute to cyclical instability. In years of losses, expenditures will be held to a minimum. The making of these expenditures may be unprofitable when the firm bears their full cost but must pay a tax on the additional income they would bring in. Yet they might profitably be made if the cost of the expenditure could reduce taxes through loss offsets.

Instead of preserving equity among taxpayers, removing impediments to risk taking and increasing the countercyclical effects of taxes, the application of sections 381 and 382 of the code has created windfall tax gains for certain taxpayers, discouraged enterprises from making investments necessary for their survival, and encouraged the liquidation of existing business. This per-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

version of the purposes of the loss-carryover provision has caused severe distress among the thousands of workers who have lost their jobs as a result of plant liquidations. In the textile industry, which has been suffering from the impact of several major factors tending to depress the economy of the industry, the use of section 381 of the code as an additional spur to mill liquidations has aggravated the industry's problems of adjustment and accelerated its demise. Instead of serving to stimulate constructive efforts to rehabilitate the industry, loss carryovers have been made use of by financial manipulators to the detriment of the industry and the public interest.

IMPACT OF SECTION 381

The adoption of section 381 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 injected a new and disturbing element into the textile situation. The owners of corporations which had suffered substantial losses found that they owned a valuable asset in their corporate tax-loss position. People who were operating a profitable enterprise were anxious to acquire the loss corporation's "tax shoes" so they could reduce their tax liability. Lured by the blandishments of attractive offers of tax-free exchanges of stock, complete with the advantages of obtaining stock in a listed corporation in place of securities of a closed corporation, many could not resist the opportunity of selling out. Why continue the competitive struggle with its demands for new investments for modernization when selling out yields a handsome and quick return?

In many cases the interests which acquired these loss corporations had no interest in continuing the operation of the company's facilities. Once the right to the loss carryover was achieved, the acquired plant or plants were liquidated. Frequently the funds yielded by textile mill liquidations were used by the new owners to buy up nontextile companies. Thus the resources of this depressed industry were diverted from the much-needed task of rebuilding it.

This process has operated to the benefit of those who sold their stock and to the interests which have acquired their "tax shoes." But their gains have been achieved at the expense of the workers who lost their jobs, the communities which have become distressed areas, the industry whose problems of adjustment to diversity have been aggravated, and the Federal Treasury, which has been deprived of tax revenues. In short, the windfall gains of the few have been won at the expense of the public welfare.

Information on the effects of the use of the carryover device are necessarily limited. Many of the deals are made between closely held corporations and details are not divulged. Information made available by public corporations is also limited. Nevertheless, sufficient information has been made public to yield a clear picture of some of the patterns which have developed in the exploitation of this tax loophole in the textile industry.

ACQUISITION OF LOSS CORPORATIONS AND LIQUIDATION OF THEIR PLANTS

Textile companies with loss records have been purchased by various interests, some of which had no previous experience in textiles, and within a year or two, much if not all of the facilities for producing textiles have been liquidated. In many cases, the proceeds of the liquidation have been used to acquire other corporations engaged in unrelated businesses. The corporations which incurred the losses have been used to set up a favorable tax position for corporations which are not, in essence, the same as the corporations which had suffered the losses. The following cases illustrate the manner in which the law has been manipulated for private gain and public loss:

A. Acquisition by corporations in unrelated businesses

1. The stock of the Wanskuck Co., a major producer of worsted textiles with a record of losses in prior years, was purchased by the New England Butt Co. in September 1955. The latter is engaged in the manufacture of iron castings and machinery. In May 1957, the 3 textile plants of the Wanskuck Co., located in Providence and Oakland, R. I., were liquidated, displacing 1,300 workers.

2. The stock of Boott Mills, a cotton textile company with reported losses in 1951–53, was purchased by ODC., Inc., a subsidiary of the Overseas Discount Corp. in December 1954. The latter is a holding company for various international investments. In June 1955, the Boott Mills operations were discontinued and its facilities in Lowell, Mass., liquidated. Five hundred workers lost their jobs.

3. John L. Fead & Sons, Inc.: John L. Fead & Son, Inc., a knit goods manufacturer, was purchased by the United Industrial Syndicate, Inc., in November 1954. The latter is a holding company for various manufacturing enterprises. In January 1955, the Fead plant in Port Huron, Mich., was closed, throwing 60 workers out of their jobs.

B. Acquisition by textile companies

1. The stock of A. D. Juilliard & Co., a cotton and wool textile manufacturer, was acquired through an exchange of stock by United Merchants and Manufacturers, Inc., a diversified textile corporation, in August 1953. The latter's annual report to stockholders for the year ended June 30, 1954, includes the following reference to its acquisition of Juilliard and the resulting tax position:

"During the year the corporation acquired the outstanding capital stock of a subsidiary company and, in connection with the discontinuance of certain operations of the acquired subsidiary prior to and following the time of acquisition, losses were realized from the liquidation of inventories, the closing of mills and the sale of real properties. These realized losses and additional anticipated liquidating losses were provided for either prior to or as of the time of acquisition and, therefore, are not included in the accompanying consolidated statement of income which includes the operations of the subsidiary company only from date of acquisition. The corporation esticates that the deductions of such liquidating losses (to the extent realized) and the use of carrybacks and carryovers of operating losses of subsidiary companies for purposes of computing Federal taxes on income resulted in a provision for Federal taxes for the year ended June 30, 1954, which was approximately $1,300,000 less than would have been required had such factors not entered into the tax computation.

"As at June 30, 1954, the unused loss carryovers of subsidiary companies for Federal and Canadian tax purposes approximated $14 million."

The Juilliard worsted textile plant at Providence, R. I., employing 2,200, was closed in September 1953. The Juilliard woolen mill at Stottville, N. Y., employing 800, was closed in April 1954. The Juilliard cotton mill in Brookford, N. C., employing 475 workers, was closed in December 1956.

2. The stock of Forstmann Woolen Co., a major wool textile company with losses aggregating $6,600,000 in the previous 2 years, was acquired through an exchange of stock by J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., a diversified textile company, in June 1957. In October, the liquidation of the Forstmann plant at Garfield, N. J., with 1,700 employees, was announced.

C. Acquisition and liquidation, followed by acquisition of unrelated businesses

1. Gera Mills, Inc., a wool textile company with substantial prior losses, was purchased by the Cleveland Arcade Co., a warehousing concern, in December 1953. In April 1954, the Gera woolen mill in Passaic, N. J., was liquidated, displacing 800 workers. In August 1954, the company's name was changed to Gera Corp., and its certificate of incorporation changed so as to permit it to "carry on any manufacturing, mercantile or other business whatsoever." It proceeded in November 1954 to acquire 2 corporations engaged in unrelated businesses (Chatham Electronics Corp., and Otis Terminal Warehouse Corp.) In March 1955, Gera Corp. acquired U. S. Finishing Co., a textile dyeing concern. A letter from the latter company to its stockholders dated January 28, 1955, referred to Gera's tax position as follows:

"Furthermore Gera Corp. had losses arising from other operations, which it is believed can be offset for Federal income tax purposes against earnings from the business to be acquired from the company, and from its own electronics and other divisions, which otherwise would be subject to tax."

In January 1957 the Jewett City, Conn., plant of United States Finishing was liquidated, throwing 550 workers out of their jobs. In October 1957, Gera was reported to have acquired the Triplex Corporation of America, a manufacturer of engine pistons. The bulk of the Gera Corp.'s current business is now carried on in nontextile fields.

2. An outstanding instance of the milking of a textile company by nontextile interests for tax purposes and the subsequent application of the company's tax position for the acquisition of unrelated businesses is the case of Botany Mills, Inc. The controlling stock in this wool textile company had been owned for generations by the family of Chas. F. H. Johnson. In May 1953, Bankers Securities Corp., an investment firm, and H. Daroff & Sons, Inc., a clothing manufacturer, each acquired half of the Johnson family stock. In August 1954, a syndicate headed by A. M. Sonnabend, a real estate and hotel operator, took over the controlling share of the company's stock. The company's annual report for the year ended December 31, 1955, described its carryover credits as follows:

"Based up consolidated Federal income tax returns filed and to be filed, the company has net operating loss carryovers which may be availed of to reduce the consolidated taxable income of the members of the group whose income is consolidated for income-tax purposes, during the succeeding tax years by approximately the following amounts:

"Next 5 years	$3,700,000
Next 4 years	8,100,000
Next 3 years	9,500,000
Next 2 years	14,700,000

"It is expected that approximately $3 million of estimated losses provided for in the net loss for the year ended December 31, 1955, will be taken as deductions for tax purposes subsequent to that date. Such amount is not included in the net operating carryovers shown above. All of the net operating loss carryovers set forth above are subject to those provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the regulations issued thereunder which pertain to consolidated returns."

The recognition of the role of the carryforward was described in a company letter to stockholders, dated February 2, 1956, in which the chairman of the board urged the adoption of a recapitalization plan. He noted: "Our principal asset, a tax loss carryforward of over $13 million, I fear, will be largely lost and our securities greatly depreciated in value without approval of this recapitalization plan."

In the annual report to stockholders for 1955 the board chairman notes:

"Our losses for the past 4 years and to be sustained in 1956 on account of liquidating sales of inventory and machinery will amount

to approximately $18 million. It is my confident belief that this amount can be earned by our company during the coming 6 years and, because of favorable income-tax provisions, can be retained to restore the stockholders' equity."

In 1955, the company acquired two other businesses which it operates as wholly-owned subsidiaries: Botany Cottons, Inc, cotton textiles, acquired in June 1955; Rolley, Inc., suntan lotion manufacturer, acquired in October 1955.

The Passaic, N. J., woolen mill of Botany, employing 2,000 workers, was liquidated in January 1956.

From 1956 to date, 10 additional corporations have been added as wholly-owned subsidiaries, 6 of them in nontextile fields:

Company	Date acquired	Product
Glenoit Mills, Inc	June 1956	Fur fabrics.
Baltimore Luggage Co	July 1956	Luggage.
Jos. H. Meyer Bros	Oct. 1956	Pearls.
Markson Bros	Nov. 1956	Retail clothing.
Calvine Mills, Inc	Jan. 1957	Cotton textiles.
Moss-Gordon Lint Cleaner Co	Mar. 1957	Machinery.
Premier Knitting Co	do	Sweaters.
Horsman Dolls, Inc	do	Dolls.
United Supply & Manufacturing Co	June 1957	Distributor of oil field gear.
Smartee, Inc	Nov. 1957	Knitwear.

3. Another illustration of the diversion of resources from a textile operation to an unrelated business by a new owner is afforded by the case of Powdrell & Alexander, Inc. The controlling interest in this cotton textile company was bought by George Meehan in June 1954, whereupon he became president of the company.

Following the change in management, a series of important steps took place. In November 1954, the company closed its cotton textile mill and liquidated the subsidiary Gosnold Mills Corp. in New Bedford, Mass., displacing 1,600 workers. In June 1955, it sold its dye plant at Danielson, Conn., to a new concern called Danielson Finishing Co. The various facilities and pieces of equipment at the Connecticut and New Bedford, Mass., mills were sold. The funds thus obtained were then employed to acquire the Pepsi-Cola Bottling Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio, in January 1955.

From its operations, it is apparent that the new management desires to get out of the textile business and use the loss carryover credits, not to rebuild the textile operations, but to obtain tax advantages through the acquisition of profitable nontextile enterprises. In the years 1952 through 1954, it recorded losses of $2,744,885, which it wanted to employ for tax avoidance. It acquired the bottling division as a means of earning just enough money to offset the firm's loss over credits. The speculative nature of this operation is suggested by a footnote to the annual report to the stockholders for 1955:

"On January 22, 1955, the company acquired the business and assets and assumed the liabilities of the Pepsi-Cola Bottling Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio, and has since operated that business as a division of the company. The company entered into a long-term employment contract with the manager of the bottling division which provides, among other things, that, when the bottling division shall have earned an aggregate net profit of $3 million before taxes on income, the company will sell to a new corporation, to be organized for such purpose, all of the assets of the bottling division, except cash and accounts receivable, at the book value of such assets at the date of sale. The company will own 60 percent of the stock of this new corporation and the manager and another employee will have the right to acquire 40 percent of such stock. The net profit of the bottling division for the current year, before Federal taxes on income, amounted to $599,535."

It is important to note that, for this period, 1952–54, the net operating loss before taxes was $2,744,885 and that the company has arranged to dispose of its bottling operations to a new firm after these operations yield $3 million income before taxes. While the employment agreement with the manager of bottling operation was canceled at the end of 1956 and replaced with a new arrangement giving him stock option rights in Powdrell & Alexander, Inc., the 1955 agreement casts a significant light on the motives of management.

Another interesting fact was revealed in the president's letter to stockholders, appearing in the annual report to stockholders for 1956. The letter discloses the following:

"In 1956, land was purchased in Cincinnati, Ohio, the home of the bottling division, part of which is being held as a future site for a new bottling plant. The remaining industrial property is being developed for resale."

The balance sheets for year-end 1955 and 1956 show the following items:

	1955	1956
Land	$5,165	$165,000
Land for investment		408,888

The above would seem to indicate that the company may now be entering the real-estate business. Income received thereby may possibly be offset by the carryover credit. The corporation's charter was amended in 1954, permitting engagement in any business the directors may determine.

4. The classic case of the use of mergers to erect a tax shelter, with tragic consequences to the employees and communities involved, is that of Textron, Inc. This company was formed by a merger of American Woolen Co., a wool textile firm; Robbins Mills, Inc., a synthetic textile manufacturer; and Textron, a cotton and synthetic combine, in February 1955. The American Woolen Co. notice of a special meeting to consider the merger, dated January 6, 1955, made the following reference to the subject of carryovers:

"As at the end of October 1954 the portions of the consolidated net operating losses attributable to each constituent corporation which may be succeeded to and taken into account by the merged corporation are estimated at approximately $18,750,000 for American Woolen, $10 million for Robbins, and $1,300,000 for Textron, or an aggregate of approximately $30,050,000. Such amounts will, subject to the applicable provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, be available as loss carryovers to be offset against future earnings for Federal income-tax purposes. Such loss carryovers, to the extent not utilized, will expire at the end of 1956 to the extent of $200,000, at the end of 1957 to the extent of $14,250,000, and at the end of 1958 to the extent of $15,600,000."

In his letter to stockholders of February 26, 1957, Board Chairman Royal Little boasted that "since the merger * * * (on) February 24, 1955, we have disposed of 36 textile properties and 5 textile converting divisions." These textile plants had employed approximately 20,000 workers before they got caught up in Mr. Little's taxsaving scheme.

Textron has used the resources released by the disposal of textile properties to buy up no fewer than 14 companies, 13 of which are in unrelated businesses, with products varying from storm windows to steamships. All but the textile operations are carried on as divisions of the company, which reports its income in a consolidated statement. The textile operations, which comprise only a small fraction of the company's sales, are conducted by a subsidiary, Amerotron Corp., whose accounts are also consolidated in the Textron statement.

In the year ended December 29, 1956, the company reported consolidated net profits of $6,502,592. No corporate income tax was paid.

A note on taxes in its financial statement reads as follows:

"Taxes: The Federal income and excess-profits tax liability of the company and its subsidiaries is subject to final determination by the United States Treasury Department for the years subsequent to 1945. Management is of the opinion that there is no material liability with respect to the open tax years. No provision for Federal income taxes was required on 1956 income due to losses during the year on the disposal of plant properties and equipment, which losses were charged to reserves previously provided.

"As at December 29, 1956 the company had unused Federal tax loss carryovers of approximately $45 million. Under the present tax laws these loss carryovers may be applied, subject to the applicable provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, as an offset against future earnings for Federal income-tax purposes. To the extent not utilized, approximately $14 million of the loss carryover will expire at the end of 1957 and $20,500,000 at the end of 1958."

5. Another example of the use of the merger route for the transfer of a loss carryover from one corporation to another and the subsequent liquidation of the bulk of the loss corporation's facilities, is provided by the experience of Utica Knitting Co. Controlling interest in this company was achieved by a group headed by Jerome A. Newman, a financier, in March 1952. In December 1952, the company was merged with J. T. Flagg Knitting Co. in an assets-for-stock deal and the reorganized company became Flagg-Utica Corp. The annual report of the company for the year ended December 31, 1952 stated:

"Net loss was $1,216,292, after giving effect to a Federal tax carryback of $350,000 and after giving effect to the approximately $10,000 earned by the Flagg division during December. Under the Federal tax laws, a portion of this loss may be carried forward for a period of 5 years and, to the extent that the corporation has earnings for this period, will be available for reduction of taxes payable."

Between 1953 and July 1, 1955, the company's plants (all previously operated by Utica Knitting) in Utica, Clayville, and Sherburne, N Y., were permanently closed. These mills had produced knit goods and had employed a total of 1,300 workers.

CONCLUSION

The Congress has recognized the need to restrict the carryover of losses in accordance with economic realities rather than such artificialities as the legal form of a reorganization. It has sought to insure that the benefit of the carryover shall not be exploited by persons other than those who incurred the loss. However, the limitations provided in section 382 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 have proven to be too loose to accomplish its purpose.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Abuse of the carryover privilege has become as rife under the new code as it had been under the previous statute. Loss corporations have been acquired by new interests, either through purchase or reorganization, and all or part of their businesses liquidated within a short time, without impairing the acquiring corporation's right to claim the loss carryover. The proliferation of advertisements for the sale or purchase of loss corporations is clear proof that trafficking in corporations with loss carryovers is growing rather than being retarded.

In the textile industry, the application of the carryover provisions to corporate purchases and reorganizations has accelerated the liquidation of many operating units. It has discouraged long-established enterprises from making the investments necessary for their survival. They have succumbed to the lure of a deal with outside interests intent on exploiting the loss corporation's carryover. As a result, many thousands of workers have lost their jobs and once-thriving communities have become ghost towns.

The windfall gains of the predatory manipulators of these deals run into hundreds of millions of dollars. These gains are won at the expense of the United States Treasury and the public welfare. Action is imperative to plug up the loopholes which make possible this mulcting of the Federal Government. Equity and public policy demand that the carryover be denied to any taxpayer who terminates the business which incurred the loss if he does so within 3 years of acquiring it.

Paper Machinery Firm Stakes Future in Lawrence, Mass., Research Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting article which appeared in the Boston Sunday Herald, May 11, 1958, in reference to the progress being made in the development of paper mill machinery, through a new $250,000 research center established by John W. Bolton & Sons, Inc., Lawrence, Mass.:

[From the Boston Sunday Herald of May 11, 1958]

PAPER MACHINERY FIRM STAKES FUTURE IN LAWRENCE RESEARCH CENTER—REVOLUTION DUE IN INDUSTRY UNCHANGED IN 35 YEARS

(By Juan Cameron)

LAWRENCE.—Through a new $250,000 research center, John W. Bolton & Sons, Inc. hopes to stake out its future as machinery supplier to the $10 billion pulp and paper industry.

"This entire industry is coming of age technically," said Bolton Treasurer A. LeRoy Bolton, Jr., last week at the research center's opening, "and we want to make sure we're not going to be left sitting on the sidelines."

BETTER WAYS

The new research facility, 2 years in planning and building, is a major step for the 53-year-old family owned paper machinery firm that does a $5 million-plus business annually.

The pulp and paper research center, housed in a new building near the company's Lawrence plants, will be a commercial laboratory geared to finding better ways to treat fiber; to improve machine and process design.

Even before the laboratory's official opening last week, a research project for a chemical company (Bolton would reveal no details) was underway.

Such outside work undertaken on a fee basis will be in addition to research Bolton will conduct to improve its own machinery and equipment used by paper mills through the United States and Canada.

The center, believed to be the only one of its kind in this country, underscores the revolution that Bolton feels is going to take place in its industry that sells an estimated $215 million worth of machinery a year to the pulp and paper industry.

"Our industry has seen no change in paper making machinery as it has in chemistry. Although today the machines are bigger and faster, they are the same basic designs as were being used 35 years ago," says Treasurer A. L. Roy Bolton.

IN NEXT DECADE

In the next decade, he feels, machinery will make a contribution to the industry not seen in a quarter of a century—and this contribution can only come about through intensified research.

"We're not going to see important processes—but entirely new ways of making paper be introduced," Bolton says.

Already the Nation's fourth largest industry, pulp, and paper output is expected to jump 20 million tons, or 66 percent, over the next 20 years, according to the Pulp and Paper Research Institute of Canada.

The chemical pulp mill of the future, the institute forecasts, will resemble a modern petroleum refinery with its complex of pipes and valves and completely automatic operation.

Engineers are already working on ways of processing pulp in a matter of 30 seconds through new heating methods. Accomplished through sudden and very high temperatures plus swift mechanical handling, entirely new equipment is needed.

These swift changes taking place in the paper industry, Bolton states, are pulling it out of the stage where the artisan and the rule of thumb held sway.

FORMERLY AN ART

The company's technical director George E. Soyka adds:

"Papermaking was formerly regarded as an art, with secrets closely held by practitioners. Nowadays we in the industry regard it as a science and attempt to express our findings in terms and numbers that can be easily understood and communicated."

Soyka states the basic problem as increasing the maximum yield from existing timber supplies.

In turn other problems arise: How to process pulp to produce paper and board of better quality faster and more economically; how to utilize short-fibered hardwoods and vegetable fibers like bagasse or cotton.

Then, the machinery maker like Bolton must develop grinders, pulpers, refining controls, machine knives that bring the laboratory solutions to the production stage.

When Vermonter John W. Bolton started his company in 1905 with $4,000 ($2,000 borrowed from his children), total United States paper production was less than 10 million tons. Two years later his company did an annual business of $37,623.

MATERIALS SCARCER

With paper production today around 60 million tons, Bolton sales have grown to more than $5 million, according to its officers; normal employment to around 300.

Bolton is one of the 4 or 5 leading firms in its specialized field. Others include Rice, Barton Corp., Worcester; E. D. Jones & Sons Co., Pittsfield, and Beloit Iron Works, Wis.

Roy Bolton lays the paper industry's new emphasis on research to ground work done in engineering schools like the University of North Carolina, the University of Maine, and Western Michigan University.

When professional managers begin to take over the large papermaking firms, they realized mills had been running by rule of thumb instead of on a scientific basis.

"To find the scientific whys and wherefores of papermaking, they began to seek out technically competent managers. This led to the growth of engineering schools' programs supported by the industry," Bolton comments.

Other factors leading to increased attention on research have been the growing per capita demand for products like newsprint, writing papers, tissue, and boxes, as well as new products that combine paper and plastics.

The new paper demand has made raw materials scarcer, says Bolton, as well as requiring paper producers to upgrade their materials. And as chemicals take a greater part in papermaking, the cost of recovering paper waste has become more complex and expensive.

The School Situation in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Mr. Stephen McCann, Carmichaels, Pa., before the Subcommittee on General Education of the House Education and Labor Committee. Mr. McCann is a member of the State legislature and he has served for 6 years as a member of the house education committee and in 1955 was elected chairman of that committee. He has always had a keen interest in education, and I believe he presents a comprehensive picture of the school situation in Pennsylvania. The statement follows:

Gentlemen, my name is Stephen McCann. I represent no organization. I speak as a citizen of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. My residence is at Carmichaels in Greene County.

It was my good fortune to be born in the United States of America and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania—a Commonwealth in which from its earliest beginning the schools were as much a part of the life of the Commonwealth as our churches and our homes.

I am deeply indebted to the public schools for the educational opportunities which were extended to me. I am zealous that not only in my community but throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and throughout the United States of America no child or youth shall be denied the blessings of education.

Because of this deep interest I became a member of the school board in Cumberland Township, Greene County, Pa. I served as a school board member for 4 years.

In 1952, I was elected to the House of Representatives of Pennsylvania. I have been a member of this body since that time.

As is customary in many legislative bodies newly elected members may state their preference for membership on committees. My first choice was for membership on the house education committee. My wish was granted. I served on this committee for 6 years. During the 1955 session, it was my

privilege and honor to be chairman of this important committee.

I have given this personal background solely to impress upon you my deep interest in the youth of our land and a devoted desire on my part to use every talent at my command to make available good teachers, modern facilities, and efficient instruction. It is in this capacity that I appear before you and urge favorable consideration of the legislation which has as its purpose to increase teachers' salaries and speed school construction, H. R. 10763.

Pennsylvania in recent years has provided and guaranteed from State funds unprecedented amounts to increase current school construction and has likewise mandated increased expenditures for teachers' salaries by statewide mandated salary schedules.

Since January 1955, 579 schools have been built, enlarged, altered, or approved as projects by our State school building authority. Pennsylvania has provided generously for school construction through a series of legislative acts and has approved for school districts through our school building authority $825 million as of July 1958. Of this amount the department of public instruction informs me that as of April 25, 1958, school building projects had been approved in the amount of $800,747,138.70. This leaves a balance of less than $25 million that is not committed.

As of July 1959, the ceiling on the building program through the authority will be increased to $925 million. These are new State funds available through the authority from July 1958, to July 1959, of $100 million.

The Department of Public Instruction informs me that already there are on file applications for approval of construction in total amount of $450 million, or $350 million, in excess of the amount available.

In support of these new buildings and added facilities, the general assembly at the 1957 session approved $47,033,200 as its share of annual rental or sinking fund charges on school building construction—an increase of more than $16 million over the previous biennium.

Currently, on a long-range basis, the Commonwealth is assisting local districts by accepting financial liability for 50 percent of the rental charges on approximately $1 million of new building construction.

The trouble is that when this money is spent the job will still not be finished. Again the department of public instruction informs me that the construction of approximately 8,000 classrooms in our Commonwealth is dependent upon some form of financial assistance.

They tell me further that between 75 and 80 percent of our smaller school districts have insufficient borrowing power to provide them with adequate school facilities, if the cost of such facilities must be met with general obligation bonds in which the school district itself assumes complete responsibility for payment.

Without the generous contribution by the Commonwealth in our school-building program, the situation today would indeed be chaotic. It is obvious that the Commonwealth and the local community cannot do the job alone.

To expand further as required by increased school and shifting population, to replace buildings that have become antiquated and dangerous to the security of our children, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania looks to the Federal Government for assistance.

May I comment now on teachers' salaries and the support of schools. Pennsylvania, I am happy to say, is one of the few States that has a mandated salary schedule for professional workers from the teacher to the superintendent. Its provisions are uniform throughout the State. Our mandated minimum in 1959, when this legislation is fully effective, will be $3,600. It is mandated that teachers with a baccalaureate degree advance by annual increments of $200 to a maximum of $5,400; those with a master's degree to a maximum of $5,800.

Beginning at much lower levels, practically every session of the general assembly since 1941 has seen major legislative enactment to improve our mandated schedule.

Increased financial assistance to the school districts through an equalization formula has paralleled the increased obligations to the local districts because of increased mandates in salaries. For the biennium 1951 our subsidies to public schools increased $83,700,000; for 1953, $63,800,000; 1955, $83,030,000; 1957, $135,676,804. In total amount our subsidies for the support of public schools increased from $314 million for the biennium 1951 to $564 million for the biennium 1957 an increase of $250 million.

May I emphasize that this is the effort which the State has made to maintain and advance an efficient system of public schools. In like manner, the local communities have made corresponding increases in tax revenues. A law requiring revision of assessments in our counties was enacted. A tax law was enacted that broadened the local tax base by permitting the local communities to levy many miscellaneous taxes.

Currently, however, and notwithstanding this broad effort at the State and the local levels, the situation in Pennsylvania is critical both with reference to the needs for additional school construction and for salary schedules that will give credit to the importance of teaching and recruit and maintain in the profession our able youth.

It is my belief that Pennsylvania offers a striking example of the fact that in this terrific problem of educating our youth, the States cannot go it alone. For, indeed, Pennsylvania, a relatively wealthy State, has made a great effort, but Pennsylvania is in dire need of financial assistance from a political taxing unit that has a much broader base than that which is available either to the local community or the Commonwealth or both.

There are certain features of H. R. 10763 that I like. One of them is that the assistance from the Federal Government will not be a gratuity but rather it will require reasonable State and local effort for participation.

It is desirable, also, in that it will not be unduly restrictive upon the State in determining the method of financing to be used. Moreover, it has appeal because it will be disbursed through the State educational agency with Federal controls limited to those which are necessary for adequate fiscal accounting.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this is my story. I believe that the children of America are its greatest resource; that America can continue to be great only as these human resources come to their full development through our schools; that material and military defense, no matter how effective, will fail unless bolstered and supported by citizens who through education are prepared to act well their part in maintaining the freedom and power inherent in our representative form of Government.

As stated in the bill, "It is the purpose of this act to provide Federal financial assistance on a great basis to help meet the problems of inadequate facilities and inadequate teachers' salaries."

I request with all the sincerity and power at my command that this committee report out for favorable action by the House of Representatives H. R. 10763.

National Allergy Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating the month beginning August 15 and ending September 15 as National Allergy Month. Its purpose is to urge the people of this Nation to cooperate in the fight for the prevention, treatment, and cure of allergic illness and to invite the communities of the United States to observe such month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Allergies afflict an estimated 17 million persons in the United States. Some idea of what a staggering burden this represents can be gained if we remember that this figure approximates the combined populations of our four largest cities: New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and Philadelphia. Stated another way, the number of people in this country who suffer from some form of allergy is equal to the total population of the following States: Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. Thus we see why allergies rank third in prevalence among the chronic diseases, outnumbered only by cardiovascular disease and the arthritic disorders.

The burden which the allergic diseases place on our people is heavy indeed. These disorders include such conditions as asthma, hay fever, eczema, allergic headache, abnormal reactions to drugs, and many others. In addition, allergic factors are increasingly under suspicion in connection with chronic conditions such as heart ailments, hearing loss, ulcerative colitis, kidney disorders, and connective-tissue diseases. Allergies also complicate many parasitic infestations.

One of the most striking characteristics of human allergy is the diversity of its causes. They include, for example, inhaled materials such as plant pollens and molds; ingested substances such as food and drugs; injected materials such as antitoxins made from animal serum; and contact substances ranging from metals and plastics to dyes and a wide variety of chemicals.

Industrial progress has intensified the problem of allergy. There is widespread evidence of sensitization to industrial chemical agents, including the constantly increasing number of new compounds used in our modern technology.

Investigators who are studying these problems state that allergic contact skin disease is one of the more common diseases in industry today. It is frequently seen, for example, among workers who handle dyes and dye intermediates,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

photographic developers, rubber accelerators and antioxidants, soaps, mercury solutions, plants and plant derivatives, insecticides, plastics, and antibiotics.

Many allergy sufferers periodically lose time from work, reducing our industrial productivity, and some become permanently disabled. A survey of this problem in the soap industry was recently completed by the Association of American Soap and Glycerine Producers. The study, covering 141 plants employing 429,000 persons, showed that 26 percent of the employees were exposed to potential skin irritants every day. Of this 26 percent, at least one-third picked up some form of skin disease; many of these were of allergic origin.

About 3 million persons in the United States suffer from asthma, which ranks as the most serious and important of the allergic disorders. This disease is characterized by attacks of choking, shortness of breath, coughing, and wheezing. In some it occurs only at certain seasons of the year, in others at fairly long intervals, while in many it is a daily problem. Many of these cases are in young children. The extent of the asthma problem is not fully appreciated. Few people realize, for example, that crippling lung conditions due to asthma are many times more common than crippling from poliomyelitis.

The most prevalent allergic disease is hay fever, a nasal allergy produced by seasonal substances such as pollen and molds. Hay fever can also be produced the year around by materials such as house dust and animal dandruff. Untreated, the condition often delevops into asthma.

The economic cost from loss of work by the affected individual is enormous. It has been estimated that about one-third of hay fever victims are bread winners and that the average loss from work is about 7 days. This gives us a figure of 16 million man-days lost. Stated another way, it would take over 40,000 people working for an entire year to make up the work left undone by hay fever sufferers.

The antibiotics and new drugs so essential to modern medical practice have likewise introduced additional problems of drug hypersensitivity. Those who have studied reactions following antibiotic administration are convinced that the number and severity of such reactions have been on the increase for several years.

An editorial in a recent issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association stated that about 2½ million pounds of antibiotics were produced in the United States in 1956. Of the 17 different antibiotics available to physicians, penicillin accounted for 25 percent of the total produced.

The Journal states that a study was recently made of case histories of drug reactions reported as severe by the physician or hospital involved. The results showed that penicillin was involved in 80 percent (2,517 out of 2,995 cases) of all reactions reviewed.

"The great majority of severe penicillin reactions," reports the Journal, "were of the anaphylactoid shock type, with a fatality rate of 9 percent. No deaths occurred in the cases of anaphylactoid reaction involving orally administered penicillin, while there were 63 deaths following intramuscular injection of this drug in 611 cases. Sixteen anaphylactoid reactions with two deaths were associated with other antibiotics. The incidence of anaphylactoid reactions increased during the 3 years covered by this survey: 179 cases in 1954, 231 in 1955, and 301 in 1956."

No one would question the fact that penicillin has saved many thousands of lives in the past decade, and this reduction in mortality and in complications of disease have affected the lives of millions. Nevertheless, the allergic problems posed by these widely used therapeutic agents are serious and deserve extensive study.

Many other examples might be cited of the growing importance of allergy as a major health problem. In this area, needs are varied and pressing. Most medical schools, for example, still present inadequate teaching in allergy to medical students. And many physicians could benefit from specialized training in this field. Still others should be encouraged to seek careers in allergy research.

What is being done to help the millions of Americans suffering from allergic diseases? To begin with, a new voluntary organization, the Allergy Foundation of America, has ben established under the sponsorship of the two national professional societies, the American Academy of Allergy and the American College of Allergists. This agency was formed 5 years ago and has done much to bring to the American people a deeper awareness of allergy as a major health problem.

The allergy foundation has initiated a program of student scholarships, established fellowships for training specialists and investigators, and has published a number of pamphlets on various aspects of allergic disease. This program is complemented by the additional support which the Federal Government is now supplying through an expanded program of research and training supported by the National Institutes of Health, research arm of the Public Health Service, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This year the Allergy Foundation of America plans to sponsor National Allergy Month, August 15–September 15. The purpose of this observance is to disseminate as widely as possible information concerning allergy as a growing health problem and how it can be combatted through support of basic research and the development of better methods of treatment and control. To this end the joint resolution which I have today introduced in collaboration with Senator HILL will seek to obtain presential proclamation urging Americans to back this program through voluntray gifts and services in their communities.

A Five-Point Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the five-point plan to curb the recession and bring about a wholesome, sound, prosperous, and stable economy:

A FIVE-POINT PLAN TO CURB THE RECESSION AND BRING ABOUT A WHOLESOME, SOUND, PROSPEROUS, AND STABLE ECONOMY

1. HOMEOWNERS REPAIR PROGRAM

Permit homeowners to deduct from taxable income the cost of repairing homes (for example, up to $500 or 5 percent of the original cost of the house whichever is greater), said repairs to include exterior and interior painting, plumbing, heating, air conditioning, roofing, storm windows, and other physical improvements and additions.

Beneficial results: This would encourage a nationwide home-improvement program by creating an attractive incentive to homeowners, most of whom are still gainfully employed or in business. It would not require any change in our present banking system, while providing business for the metals, hardware, paint, lumber, and kindred industries, and supplementary services. It would provide employment for skilled and unskilled workers. It would create a movement of goods benefiting transportation firms and manufacturers of transportation equipment.

Cost to the Government in lost taxes would be offset to a major extent by additional taxes derived from individuals and companies benefiting from this program.

2. PERSONAL AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR PROGRAM

Permit owners to repair their personal cars and to deduct this cost from taxable income to the extent of a small percentage of the original cost of the car. Repairs to include painting, replacement of tires, overhauls, seat covers, etc..

Beneficial results: This would provide immediate increased business for the smaller gasoline station, automobile repair shop, the producers of tools and repair parts, skilled and unskilled labor, transportation, etc. Here again the amount of tax loss involved would be offset to a major extent by the benefits that the Government would obtain from increased taxes generated by new business.

3. CAPITAL GOODS INCENTIVE PROGRAM

Permit users of machinery of all kinds to apply accelerated depreciation to all new machinery bought, received, and installed within 12 months beginning April 1, 1958. This depreciation rate could be on either of two plans: (a) 4 percent a month for 12 months and 2 percent a month for 24 months or (b) 3 percent a month for 24 months and 2 percent a month for 12 months. It will be noted that this would provide 96 percent depreciation in 3 years. The Internal Revenue Code or Regulations should be amended to provide that if any equipment subjected to this rapid writeoff should be sold, the profits, if any, resulting from such sales would become ordinary income and not capital gain.

Beneficial results: This would provide an incentive for all users of machinery—whether in mines, railroads, bakeries, chemicals, metal products, or any other type of

operation—to place orders immediately for modern equipment. Such orders would provide immediate employment in foundries, in pattern shops, in iron and steel mills, in transportation, for both skilled and unskilled labor. Again the loss of tax income would be spread over a time and would be offset in major part (if not entirely) by added income to the Government from reemployed workers and profitably operating companies.

4. COMMERCIAL AND APARTMENT BUILDING REPAIR PROGRAM

Permit operators of commercial and apartment buildings to make physical repairs and improvements, and to charge such costs to taxable income instead of capitalizing the expenditures. The expenditures could be limited to a percentage of the net depreciated cost of the building, say 5 percent or 7½ percent. Thus, on a million-dollar building the owner could spend $75,000, whether it be for air conditioning, elevators, new windows, sandblasting, painting, or other improvements.

Beneficial results: Here again a wide area of skilled and unskilled labor would receive employment, and would boost transportation, producers of machinery, paints and chemicals, etc., quickly, and with a minimum, if any, tax revenue loss.

5. EXCISE TAX REDUCTION PROGRAM

Inaugurate a program of reduced excise taxes on automobiles, automobile accessories, appliances, and other consumer durable goods. This would include such items as television and radio sets, pleasure boats, typewriters, and so forth.

Beneficial results: This point is a longer range one and will produce results at a slower rate than points 1 through 4, but will definitely provide a stimulus to the sale of new cars and appliances—and again, provide greater opportunities for employment of skilled and unskilled labor, for the production of components, for their transportation, for the employment of sales and other service people.

It should be noted that none of the above will require financial aid from the Government, easing of bank credits, or relaxing of inflationary controls.

HERBERT I. SEGAL,
President, Van Norman Industries, Inc.

Plans for 1958 Congressional Tour of New York City, May 23, 24, and 25, for Members of Congress and Their Families, Have Been Perfected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the annual congressional tour of New York City on May 23, 24, and 25 for Members of Congress and their families has been perfected. The tour includes an evening in Chinatown, a visit to the United Nations, West Point, City Hall, Staten Island, a harbor trip and a visit to the steamship *Independence*, as well as several prominent restaurants in the New York area.

A copy of the official announcement which went forth to Members of both branches of Congress early last week is as follows:

ALL EXPENSE 3-DAY CONGRESSIONAL TOUR, MAY 23, 24, 25, $37.50, CHILDREN 5–12, $32.50, FOR MEMBERS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THEIR FAMILIES AND FRIENDS

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

Friday, May 23, 9:45 a. m. daylight time, party will leave Washington via Pennsylvania Railroad. Luncheon in dining car. One forty-five p. m. arrive Penn Station. Motor coach will take party direct to City Hall for reception by the mayor, Hon. Robert F. Wagner. Thence United Nations for 2-hour tour. Arrive Paramount Hotel about 5–6:00 p. m. Members will board motor coach for a reception and dinner in Chinatown. Evening will be open to attend theaters or see the bright lights of Broadway.

Saturday, May 24, 9 a. m. motorcoach will leave for boat trip of harbor with stop and tour of Staten Island. Luncheon at Staten Island. Four to six p. m. we will have reception and tour of American Export liner steamship *Independence*. After short stop at the Paramount we will go to Toots Shor's famous New York restaurant for reception and dinner. Evening open for you to attend theaters.

Sunday, May 25, 9 a. m. motorcoach for trip up along the Hudson River to West Point for a complete tour of the Academy; parade of cadets also. Luncheon will be served during our stay at the Point. Motorcoach will return us direct to Penn Station. At 5:20 p. m., daylight time, our train will leave for Washington. Members will meet at Penn Station west gate track 18 at least 15 minutes before departure time. Dinner will be served in dining car en route home.

Make your reservations today. Dial extension 4576, room 1104, House Office Building.

Batista Backed by Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

BATISTA BACKED BY COMMUNISTS

My name is Jack A. Ossorio. My home address is 2028 Southwest 57th Court, Miami, Fla. I was born at Manzanillo, Province of Oriente, Cuba, of American and Cuban parents. I acquired American citizenship by birth abroad of an American parent (my father). I am registered at the American Embassy, Habana, Cuba.

I came to the United States in 1937 to go to school. I attended Miami Senior High School, the University of Miami, and the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Boston, where I received my master's degree. I served 3½ years in the United States Air Corps during the war and was honorably discharged.

I have worked for several Miami radio stations, the General Electric Co., International General Electric Co., the North Dakota Research Foundation, and smaller companies. In 1954 the United States Department of State sent me to Honduras for a year.

I am a specialist in inter-American affairs, a bilingual journalist, and a professor of English for foreigners. I am interested in Latin American affairs because I was born in that region, where my father is a Presbyterian missionary (in Cuba). I appear voluntarily before this committee because I have, for a long time, carried on a one-man fight against despotism in the Americas, believing that dictatorships are anachronistic and undesirable in our hemisphere. My main concern this time will be with the present regime in Cuba. I hope to convince you that aid to any dictatorship, and especially Batista's, gives us a black eye internationally.

DICTATOR BATISTA AND THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Gen. Fulgencio Batista, of Cuba, is like a chameleon: he changes color to suit his surroundings. In the year 1940 he allied himself with the Communists and was elected President of Cuba on the official Communist ticket, as the head of a coalition.

Exhibit 1 shows the hammer and sickle and the Communist Party's promise to divide the land among farmers. One of the slogans at this time was "Cuba Out of the Imperialistic War."

Exhibit 2 is a photo which shows Batista and Cuba's most famous Communists: Juan Marinello, far left, and the colored man in the back, Garcia Agüero.

Exhibit 3 shows Batista with the famous Communist leader Lombardo Toledano, and Lazaro Peña, the former secretary general of the Cuban Workers' Federation.

Exhibit 4 shows Batista with the principal Cuban Communists.

Exhibit 5 shows a picture of Communist Marinello, running for mayor of Havana, and Batista running for President. This was taken from the Communist newspaper Hoy, which Batista always allowed to circulate freely.

Exhibit 6 is the statement made once by General Batista that the Communist Party exercised a democratic function in Cuba.

Exhibit 7, dated July 1, 1953, was taken from the newspaper Prensa Libre. The news item reports that the CTC (Cuban Workers' Federation) had just made a pact with the Communists. The secretary general of the Tobacco Federation makes the statement that the pact with the Communists strengthens the workers' movement.

Exhibit 8 is a copy of the official organ of the University Students' Federation, containing photographs of some of the dramatic events which have taken place in Cuba lately.

Exhibit 9 is a publication by Cuban doctors denouncing Batista as an assassin. Included is a phostatic copy from the World Medical Convention, charging Batista with killing, torturing, and molesting doctors and patients. On the last page is a photograph of the American military mission: American Colonels Isaacson, Keller, and Stewart, and Commandants Cameron and Blackwell, when Tabernilla, Jr., received an American decoration. Tabernilla is the Cuban officer who bombed the open city of Cienfuegos with American military aid.

Exhibit 10 is a report written by Carlos Hevia, a former President of Cuba and minister of state. This is a well-documented account of the intimate connections Batista has always had with the Communists. On page 6 we read the following significant paragraphs:

"Since Batista staged his coup d'etat of March 10, 1952, the Communist newspaper Hoy has had free circulation in Cuba, and big trucks carrying the newspaper throughout the island. And he is, in an undercover way, helping the Communists to gain once more control of the labor movement of Cuba. At the same time, democratic radio commentators are silenced, broadcasting stations closed, newspaper commentators and writers jailed and brutally beaten.

"While Batista has forbidden public gatherings, yet the Communists have been permitted to have large meetings. All Communist leaders are in Cuba without the Government harassing them in the least;

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

most of them recently returned from Russia, arriving freely by plane at the airport.

"Batista has been in conversations with the Communists so that the so-called anti-Communist law that he has claimed to be preparing will finally be drafted in such a manner that it could be used against those who oppose him and favor democracy, and not against the Communists.

"When Batista organized his present party, P. A. U., about 1949, the Communists helped him; and thousands of them, including some of the best organizers, joined the new party; and these same Communists and their bosses are again gaining control of important positions in the government and in the labor movement of Cuba."

Batista finally established an organization to repress Communists, but it is interesting to note that no Communist has ever been jailed and no restrictions have been placed on Communists. The organization has been used solely, however, to silence, jail, torture and kill democratic Cubans.

To the question, Is Batista a Communist? I would answer that he is both a Communist sympathizer and a Fascist. His communistic inclinations and indoctrination have been shown in his actions as director. For example, he has not persecuted any Communist, but has placed them in important posts; he accuses his enemies of being Communists, so that in essence he is allied to communism, but poses to the contrary; he does not respect any fundamental freedom; he does not believe in freedom of the press; he discarded a democratic government and a constitution; he assumed the powers of Congress; he has made a mockery of judiciary power; he has not respected Cuban womanhood; last and most important, he has stolen millions (he probably has $200 million), exiled hundreds, tortured and killed thousands, mostly young men—the hope of Cuba.

Batista is, more than a Communist or a Fascist, a political adventurer. He would sell out to Moscow tomorrow, if he stood to gain by it. He is typical of the man who would sell his own mother to get what he wants.

FOREIGN ESPIONAGE IN MIAMI

Any assistance given to dictators hurts the people who suffer under them and hurts us also. Take the matter of espionage.

The city of Miami, Fla., is a hotbed of foreign espionage. There are any number of agents here paid by Batista, but without the knowledge of the Justice Department. Recently, when a briefcase was snatched from the Cuban consul, the names of spies were divulged. One of them is reported to have over $100,000 in the bank and, if so, probably paid no income taxes on it.

What this amounts to is that a representative of a foreign government is really the head of a large and well-organized spy system, which spends large sums of money to spy on both foreign and American nationals.

Certainly any aid given to Cuba, Santo Domingo, Nicaragua, or Paraguay is a definite contribution to the forces of tyranny in the Americas. For the great American democracy to play the dangerous game of fooling around with Fascist despots is to open the door to communism in the Americas, not to mention other similar evils.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND CUBA

As you consider aid under the Mutual Security Act of 1958, you should look into the mistaken, prototalitarian, criminal policy being followed by Secretary Dulles and Under Secretary for Latin American Affairs Roy Rubottom.

The Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement was signed between the United States and Cuba at Havana on March 7, 1952, and its original purpose was "to assist any American State subjected to an armed attack and to act together for the common defense and for the maintenance of the peace and security of the Western Hemisphere."

According to article I, paragraph 2, "the Government of Cuba undertakes to make effective use of assistance received from the Government of the United States of America pursuant to this agreement for the purpose of implementing defense plans, accepted by the 2 Governments, undre which the 2 Governments will participate in missions important to the defense of the Western Hemisphere, and will not, without the prior agreement of the Government of the United States of America, devote such assistance to purposes other than those for which it was furnished."

Now, such assistance has been used, over and over again, against the defenseless people of Cuba, and not for hemispheric defense, with the tacit consent of the United States Department of State. The worst instance to date of these violations was the inhuman attack against the open city of Cienfuegos, where tanks and airplanes put down by force the uprising of September 5, 1957. These were arms supplied to Batista by the United States Government in conformity with the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement for the defense of the Western Hemisphere. Did the Government of Cuba obtain the prior agreement of our Government?

Certainly, the agreement has not been denounced. So, as many Cubans see it, if Russia raped Hungary, then the United States State and Defense Departments are raping Cuba. Even in India people are saying so. Is this the kind of aid the Mutual Security Act encompasses?

Another sore spot is the agreement between the Government of the United States of America and Cuba, providing for the services of a United States Army mission to Cuba. Title I, article 1, declares that "the purpose of this mission is to cooperate with the chief of staff of the Army of the Republic of Cuba and the Cuban Army. Officers of the mission will act, as required by the chief of staff of the Army of the Republic of Cuba, as tactical and technical advisers to the Cuban Army."

The people of Cuba see in such a provision a perfect excuse for the United States Army to intervene in favor of Batista. Thus the United States is taking sides, in the civil war now raging in Cuba, against the people of Cuba, for Batista is opposed by over 90 percent of the Cuban people. The State Department knows that the American mission is training Cuban officers to fight the young people of Cuba, who are fighting the tyrant on unequal terms. At any rate, the mission is only beginning ill will for Americans.

Jules Dubois, writing in the Chicago Tribune, March 21, 1958, stated: "Cuban public opinion, although throttled by the most severe censorship ever exercised by Batista, is outspoken against the United States. The people, from the leaders of the civic, religious, professional, and social institutions who demanded Batista resign, to the students, accuse the United States of pursuing a policy to support a dictator and lose the friendship of a nation.

"Smith (ambassador) is being branded as worse than his predecessor, Arthur Gardner. Yet when he first arrived he was a hero to the Cuban people and managed to erase the animosity that htad been engendered by Gardner.

"Cubans, more than 90 percent of whom are trying to oust Batista, insist that the latter is being retained in office by the United States. When it is explained to them that the policy of our State Department is one of correctness and neutrality in this civil war, they reply: 'Yes, we know. You Americans are very correct and very neutral on the side of Batista.'"

By paragraph b, article 4, of the Army mission agreement, the United States Government may recall the entire mission in the public interest of the United States of America. Since the State Department has not done so, the conclusion is that it considers it a wise policy not to recall the mission.

But article 5 really shows how criminally negligent the men in the State Department are. Article 5 clearly states that "this agreement is subject to cancellation upon the initiative of either the Government of the United States of America or the Government of the Republic of Cuba at any time during a period when either government is involved in domestic or foreign hostilities."

Since Cuba is involved in a civil war and since the men at the Department of State have ignored such a provision, it can only mean that they wish to keep Batista and his Gestapo-like henchmen in power. Is this what the Mutual Security Act contemplates?

The conclusion is obvious. While we continue to send arms to Batista and training his men, we are very careful to enforce our neutrality laws, thus depriving the people of Cuba of the help they desperately need to get rid of the monster. No wonder democrats everywhere feel that we are intervening in Cuba directly, in favor of Batista and against the best interests of 6 million long-suffering Cubans, for our tanks and jets have kept Batista in power during 6 long, painful years.

We are asking for trouble. Is there not a possibility that, as a desperate reaction to so much injustice and oppression, some post-dictatorship government may accuse us, before the United Nations, of complicity in genocide or extermination of a national group as a planned move? Would that not be very embarrassing, after the rape of Hungary?

LATIN AMERICAN DICTATORSHIPS

As long as despotic regimes continue to flourish in Latin America, there will be no peace, no security, no solidarity in our continent. Democratic governments, elected by the people in honest elections, must replace the present dictatorships, which exist only through force and fraud.

All American dictators hide, behind a false front of material progress, blood, tears, poverty, and terror.

The whole world blames our Department of State for the prevalence and continuance of Fascist dictatorships in Cuba, Nicaragua, Santo Domingo, and Paraguay. The argument advanced to explain our strange behavior is that we wish to protect our interests and the most expedient way to do it is through caudillos or strong men. It is unfortunately true that our ambassadors too often have left the impression that we approve of and sympathize with unpopular regimes.

Our interests are best protected by representative governments, not by ambitious, ruthless dictators. The adulator, the servile ruler is not our best friend. On the contrary, when we help our neighbors to get rid of oppressors, we protect our interests and secure peace and happiness for our continent.

IN CONCLUSION

If I could get only one thing across to this august committee, it would be this: No aid should ever be given to any government which is not the result of popular consent, as expressed through entirely free elections. No aid should ever contribute to the strength, permanency, or encouragement of a despotic government.

We are the undisputed world leaders against totalitarianism, but we appear to have adopted a dual policy, namely, one for Communist nations and one for American despots. Democracy and freedom are inseparable, however.

Specially here in this hemisphere, where American conduct is watched closely by the whole world to test our real intentions, the wealth of Americans must not be spent on those who enslave our brothers. It is in our best interests to help those who think and act like we do. Latin Americans do not need guns. They need, however, technical aid, loans, and encouragement in their democratic aspirations.

To this effect, I would recommend, as a great contribution, the identical resolutions introduced in the Senate and the House by the distinguished legislators, Senator WAYNE MORSE, and Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, of Oregon. The resolutions make a specific reference to article 5 (d) of the O. A. S. charter, which states, in part, that "the solidarity of the American States and the high aims which are sought through it require the political organization of those states on the basis of the effective exercise of representative democracy."

United States aid, given only to democratic governments, will make us a better people and will make this a better world in which to live, that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from this earth.

ANNEX A

TORTURES UNDER BATISTA

Tortures under the ruthless, bloodthirsty dictatorship of Batista are commonplace. His Fascist, pro-Communist regime has not even respected Catholic priests, even though that is the religion professed by the majority of Cubans. Witness the torture of Rev. Father Ramon O'Farrill, now a Miami exile, who was hit with the butt of a rifle squarely on an ear and his hearing impaired.

Exhibit 11 is a clipping from the Chicago Daily Tribune, which tells of the shooting of a Catholic young man studying for the priesthood. His body was found riddled by 36 bullets (probably supplied by the Mutual Security Act). He was shot to death despite the pleas from the Roman Catholic clergy, who tried to save his life. The papal nuncio and Cardinal Arteaga had been given assurances that his life would be saved, but the word of gangsters can never be trusted.

There is a new case of torture, however. In the United States right now is a 50-year-old schoolteacher who knows what despotism means. After her unbelievable torture, her life was threatened because she dared to denounce Batista's regime of terror. Through a priest she knew, and the papal nuncio, she was able to obtain political asylum in a foreign embassy and leave Cuba. In an interview for the American Daily, a Spanish newspaper, she had this to say:

"Batista's police agents broke into my home. They were obsessed by the idea that I knew where arms were hidden. Other decent Cuban women have suffered before what I went through. That's why I told everything, in spite of the threats against my life if I spoke the truth about the terrible things that happened to me.

"I am 50 years old, and I have 2 daughters, 19 and 17, and a boy 15 years old. I am a teacher and a practicing Catholic. In the early morning of February 24, at exactly 5 o'clock, a group of men, armed with submachine guns, entered my home and made me put on my clothes in their presence. They took me to the 12th district police station. They robbed me of $25 in cash and an expensive gold watch.

"Taken before a captain by the name of Sosa, he hit me right in the face, throwing me to the floor. Nothing stopped them, not even my age or sex or the fact that I was a mother. What happened in that hell on earth for 3 long, horrible days still seems like a nightmare.

"I was savagely struck and whipped. They repeated every few minutes that they would kill me if I didn't tell them where the arms were. They pulled my hair and ears. Modesty prevents me from repeating the dirty remarks and insults that were thrown at me by young men who could have been my sons.

"Only my faith in God, my deep belief in divine grace, and my Catholic faith permitted me to endure stoically the pain and the affront. A Colombian citizen was savagely tortured in my presence and his ear torn off by blows. The image of the Saviour on the cross supplied me with spiritual light to stand the torture.

"While they were beating me, they kept shouting: 'Talk, you Communist bitch.' When I resented the remark and told them that they could only accuse me of being a Catholic, they hit me again and shouted: 'All you Catholics are worse than the Communists.'

"To hide the facts is to allow the occurrence of further crimes. If God chose me to live and denounce this infamy, I hope it will not be in vain. The whole truth must be told that everyone may know how low Cuba has sunk under Batista: They stuck a steel pipe through my vagina, while shouting: 'Talk, you old bitch, we are going to perforate you.'"

Certainly, as you consider aid to the Government of Cuba, now ruled by gangster elements, you must keep in mind how that aid will be used against the people of Cuba and against their democratic aspirations.

ANNEX B

(By Rev. Father Ramon O'Farrill, who was brutally beaten in Habana)

AGGRESSIONS AGAINST THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

On February 20 of this year a bulletin, issued by the Cuban Army, was published in all the newspapers which, like all its official dispatches, never reports the true facts on the people's struggle against the dictatorship. The said bulletin terms a good story my statements to the foreign press concerning the tortures I underwent, during 4 days, at the hands of Batista's repressive forces, and it calls rebellious propaganda the silence I kept for a year before releasing the facts.

All the people of Cuba know, and especially those in Habana, how I was unmercifully beaten by policemen under the dreadful Captain Ventura (now a commandant). After the attack, I was taken to the police station, where I remained, hurt and incommunicado, 4 days, while Batista's henchmen negotiated my release. The one condition they demanded, complete silence of the church, was the same one asked previously when his eminence, Cardinal Arteaga, was attacked by members of the police force.

On the fourth day I was delivered, by high police officers, to members of the church, Msgr. Arcadio Marina and Raul del Valle, both of whom, under police threats, promised to keep silent and to get me out of the country without letting anyone, and especially Cuban Catholics, know that a priest had been beaten up.

As a Catholic clergyman, I had to accept the discipline of my church. I was moved to an ecclesiastical residence in Canada, where I was held practically incommunicado for a year, under orders from the Batista police to the Catholic church. Later the bishop of Cienfuegos authorized my transfer to Miami, Fla.

I challenge publicly the chief of staff of the Cuban Army to deny the following aggressions committed against the Catholic church, which remain as proofs of our long calvary:

1. July 1953. Aggression to his eminence, Cardinal Arteaga, by policemen who tried to seize from him the proofs in his possession of crimes committed by the armed forces.

2. Catholic meeting at Guanajay stopped violently by the army with bullets. The leaders were insulted and taken to army headquarters.

3. The office of the Catholic youth and the university Catholic home raided repeatedly and everyone taken to police headquarters.

4. Attack on the premises of the Catholic young workers; several members beaten and imprisoned.

5. June 1956. Assault on the Arroyo Arenas church and destruction of its doors.

6. Rev. Father Leon Lemus exiled from the country after his brother was assassinated.

7. November 30, 1956. The cathedral at Santiago de Cuba machinegunned by the armed forces.

8. The archbishopric at Santiago searched and the archbishop insulted.

9. July 1957. The temporary priest at the cathedral of our holy church, Santiago, insulted.

10. The Reverend Father Maximiliano Perez of Managua taken in custody several times, and his sister mistreated by police.

11. Rev. Father Manuel Martin, of Santa Isabel de las Lajas, detained during a mass (typical case of intrusion upon freedom of worship).

12. Constant attacks against the church and priests, including defamations, scandals and profanations, from the pages of the government newspaper Time, in Cuba, owned by the Communist gangster, Rolando Masferrer, Batista's righthand man.

13. Rene Fraga, leader of Catholic Action and teacher, assassinated at Matanzas. The bishop marched at the front of the cortege until it was broken up by police bullets.

14. Mass at Vedado Parochial Church, in suffrage for the soul of murdered student leader, halted.

15. 1957. Two young fathers from Victoria de las Tunas, accused of taking in some Cubans whose lives were in danger, exiled from the country.

16. Ramon Rodriguez, member of Catholic Youth, assassinated.

17. 1957. Church at Jaguey Grande emptied to stop a mass in suffrage for the souls of students killed. The faithful then kneeled at the park outside.

18. 1957. Church of San Francisco, Santiago, assaulted and robbed by gangsters under Masferrer (Batista's righthand man).

19. Reverend Father Jorge Bez Chabebe and Father Rivas of Catholic Action, detained.

20. March 1958. Protest by the president of the diocesan council at Santiago of the disappearance of a member of the group Sacred Heart of Jesus.

As it can be seen, Batista's dictatorship, like all other American dictatorships, has engaged in aggressions and outrages against the Catholic church because she is the great defender of the human rights and the democratic principles to which all free peoples are entitled.

An Economic Danger: Clear and Present

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, former Secretary of the Army, Robert T. Stevens is not only an adopted son of Montana because he operates one of our finest ranches at Two Dot, Mont., but, as he indicates below, his grandfather's cousin, Gen. Isaac I. Stevens, was the first Territorial Governor of the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Washington Territory, when Montana was a part of that Territory.

He was still speaking for Montana when he addressed the annual meeting of the Montana Society of Engineers at Butte, Mont., on April 26, 1958.

I call your attention to his comments relative to the proposed extension of our trade agreements program.

Mr. Stevens' speech follows:

AN ECONOMIC DANGER: CLEAR AND PRESENT

Mr. Chairman, Governor Aronson, members of the Montana Society of Engineers, guests of the society and your ladies, first of all I would like to express my appreciation to the distinguished Governor of Montana for the honor he has accorded me in introducing me to this annual dinner of the Montana Society of Engineers. I count Hugo Aronson among my closest friends, value his friendship very highly and appreciate what he has just said to you.

I would also like to be among the first to congratulate the Montana Society of Professional Engineers on its forthcoming 71st anniversary, in July, and for its importance to the welfare of the professional engineers of this State. It appears that, since you joined forces with the National Society in February of last year, the Montana Society has been in the forefront nationally in the acquisition of new members. A special note of recognition is due the "baby brother" of this important group and I refer, of course, to the Helena Chapter which was "born" last August.

My information is that the Montana Society of Professional Engineers is one of the oldest, most highly respected and one of the best organized of all the State groups belonging to the National Society. I also understand that, through the efforts and aggressive leadership of President Olund and the membership of the society, you are extending your activities and expanding your sphere of usefulness. I congratulate you on the vigor and success of your programs. It is indeed a pleasure to be with you this evening.

Montana is most generous in the way it welcomes the Stevens family and makes us feel at home. When Mrs. Stevens and I visit our ranch at Two Dot, our good neighbors never fail to come by and greet us. They have a wonderful way of indicating that they like to have us in Montana—even on a part-time basis. We hope to spend more time in Montana in the future.

There are many things that have attracted us to this treasure State. The inspiration of the frontier, the vastness of Montana, the beauty of its rivers, ranges, and lakes, the friendliness of its people and the absolute certainty of its tremendous future. All these things appeal to us. And perhaps there is another factor that has unconsciously had an effect upon us. That factor goes back 105 years.

In 1853, the Congress of the United States created the Territory of Washington. That territory embraced, at that time, much of the western part of Montana. As a matter of fact, the spot at which we are now gathered was included within the boundary of that territory. Stevensville, about 80 miles northwest of here, is also within the then Terirtory of Washington. And that town was named for my grandfather's cousin, Gen. Isaac I. Stevens, who was appointed in 1853 by President Pierce as the first governor of the Territory of Washington. I am extremely proud of this early connection with our great Northwest.

General Stevens graduated from West Point in 1839. He stood number one in his class and was an engineer. He had a noteworthy record in the Mexican War and became governor of this territory at the age of 36. He headed an expedition that made the first survey for a railroad route across Montana. I am proud of that soldier-engineer-diplomat ancestor and, perhaps, I was thinking of this engineer member of the Stevens family when I accepted your cordial invitation to be with you tonight.

Since I am not an engineer, it ill behooves me to discuss with you the latest methods of mining copper, or lead, or zinc from our Montana soil. I feel even less than equal to the task of predicting the future advances in this field. However, I do feel that my deep and ceaseless interest in the education of our youth, having in mind that some of these youths will be the engineers of tomorrow, permits me to comment briefly on the educational problem that faces America today.

In preparing for my appearance here, I asked 2 of my friends in the field of education and 2 of my friends in government about the engineering needs of our country. These men are Deane Malot, president of Cornell University; Fred Hovde, president of Purdue University; the Honorable Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and James R. Killian, Jr., special assistant to the President for science and technology. They have all been good enough to write me regarding their views.

Without exception, these outstanding men in government and education are convinced that our need for educating engineers of quality is far greater today than at any other time in the history of our country. We should recognize potential scientists and engineers early in our secondary schools. By encouraging their imaginations and by nurturing their ambitions, we need actually have no fear of the future supply of men with creative minds.

Quality even more than quantity is the crying need. In order to obtain more engineers of quality, we should grant incentives to outstanding graudate engineers to encourage them to remain on the faulties of our schools in order to teach the future engineers of America. In this way, we can insure a continuous flow of qualified engineers who possess the creative and imaginative minds needed in our complex society. I was shocked to learn recently that, in New York City alone, there is a present need for almost 900 mathematics teachers to staff the junior and senior high schools. By comparing this deficiency in just one city, in just one subject, with the situation all over America, it is small wonder that the tasks we face in meeting our basic needs for qualitative factors in education are nothing short of monumental.

In addition, we should be much more careful than we have been in the past to make certain that our men of learning are not hidden under the proverbial bushel basket, where their real potential may never be utilized to the utmost. This requires topnotch personnel policies by the employer and it may be necessary for business and Government administrators to revamp these policies now wherever the need exists. There is no room today for wastage of engineering talent.

The position and importance of today's engineer was summed up by Dr. Killian in his letter to me when he said, and I quote:

"One hardly needs to emphasize the fact that engineers steadily assume greater professional responsibilities in our society. We have had a great volume of national discussion on the importance of science and on the need for training more and better scientists. This discussion has tended to overlook the important fact that we need first-rate engineers as much as we need first-rate scientists, and that if we are to have a flourishing, advancing technology we must recognize that the engineer is an essential partner in the tripartite team of scientist, engineer, and manager.

"I suggest that the engineering profession itself has a very great responsibility to make clear the important role of the engineer, and the need for engineering and engineering education to keep abreast of the accelerating scientific advance and discovery we witness today. Both from the standpoint of my experience as an educator in the field of science and technology and my brief period of public service, I am increasingly impressed with the importance of the engineering profession speaking with a more unified voice in our national councils, and with the professional status of the engineer being enhanced."

Incidentally, Dr. Killian has asked me to extend to you, the members of the Montana Society of Engineers, his very warm regards and best wishes.

The dramatic changes in our attitude with respect to higher education since the advent of the sputnik and its American counterpart, best described by the French as the Ikenik, can do nothing but good. These divining rods into the future advances of science and technology have focused the attention and concern of the American people on the importance of education and particularly higher educational pursuits. I am sure the youth of America are ready to respond to the need if only we will point the way. We can surely do something about this at the family and community level.

I surely do not know all of the answers with respect to our educational needs. However, I do know that we as a people have never liked to be second best in any competitive arena. The pioneers who settled these magnificent Western States never relinquished their competitive spirit and I have every reason to believe that that competitive drive continues today. The competition today is not over the survival of the wagon train, but over the survival of our Nation.

While we are on the subject of competition, I would like to turn now to another matter which is of great importance to the continuance of a strong and vital America. It is a subject which involves unreasonable competition. It could impair the dynamic American economy which we all agree is so essential to the security of our country.

I refer to something that could not only tear down much that you here in this room have erected but much that you dream of bettering. This subject has been described by the use of catch phrases like "trade, not aid" and, in mathematical terms it sounds like 2 plus 2 equals 4, but, in actual operation it is more like 2 minus 2, which equals nothing. I am speaking of the proposed legislation before Congress right now, known as the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. It is up for renewal for another 5 years and the plan would authorize substantial additional tariff cutting powers. Many of the top level men of our Government have spoken for the program. These are friends of mine. I differ honestly with them on this measure but that does not lessen my regard for them as public servants or as personal friends. Their voices and pens are, however, diligently at work to keep this amazing world trade anchronism intact. Free trade proponents from commerce and industry are fighting side by side with my friends in Government to extend this ill-advised legislation.

An enormous number of well-intentioned and fine people really believe that these so-called reciprocal trade agreements are actually reciprocal. Nothing could be further from the truth. This legislation was enacted originally in 1934 as an emergency measure to aid, the country during depression times and was frankly called an emergency measure for emergency conditions. It has been renewed 10 times for varying periods and the emergency never ends, in spite of the fact that since Pearl Harbor, in 1941, our country has experienced greater economic growth than ever known by any

nation since time began. Instead of being an emergency measure, today its friends now call it an antirecession measure. They move with the times and always have an opportunistic reason for renewal.

This emergency measure has kept growing like a blight; wider, more complex and more dangerous, at the expense of many American workers and many American businesses. While textiles and other soft goods were hit hard at first, today, the whirlwind of cheap imports is affecting many kinds of goods and machinery. Our people divide sharply on this subject and the Congress itself breaks up into large blocs of those who are for and those who are against, or those who lean toward or those who lean against. Many of our people have tranquilized their own convictions by repeating a little sing-song that deserves some comment. The sing-song goes something like this: "Free trade means no conflict between nations and that means no wars and that in the end means that our sons will not go forth to battle." Who among us has the courage to take issue with such sentimental reasoning? It is a strong America that will deter war, not an America with holes in its military and economic armor.

The shocking fact is that many American markets and American jobs are just as easy for foreigners to take as stealing a baby's candy. Let's consider these salient points:

1. Wages paid to workers abroad, making all kinds of goods that we buy, range from 35 cents or 40 cents an hour down to about 8 cents per hour. By comparison I'm sure it is unnecessary for me to cite the hourly rates of the average worker in the United States.

2. In 1934 when the tariff cutting spree began, the average tariff levels protecting our industries were 46.7 percent—now they are 11.7 percent. The so-called protection is three-quarters gone. And there will be more of the same if the act is renewed as proposed.

This has been mercilessly destructive to the basic foundations of American jobs. You, as engineers, know full well that no amount of technological improvement in processing can compensate for those wage differentials, in the light of what you know about present-day equipment here and abroad. As a matter of fact, many foreign countries have very modern, new equipment that was partly paid for by you and by me, as American taxpayers. How can we as a Nation give money, know-how, and lowered tariffs to our friends abroad and not have trouble at home. We can't eat our cake and have it too.

Now what about the "reciprocity" in our trade agreements? Well, in the first place, as these successive trade agreements were made with various countries, all the benefits were passed around to all the other trade-agreement countries. As you know, this is called the "most favored nation" clause. It is not surprising that the country with the lowest wages and the required skills gets the business. Obviously, again, because our wages are 5 to 10 times greater than those of other countries we didn't get the business, we got the "bizness."

The whole thing reduces itself to very understandable elements if we take a look at the facts and forget the much-touted slogans. For most items, wages are the deciding factor in measuring what country will make which product, depending upon where the necessary skills and materials can be made available. For example, England controlled the wool-goods-export market for centuries. In recent years the Italians, with lower wages and excellent skills, have chased the British woolen goods off many trade routes. And now the Japanese are invading the wool-goods-export market in a big way. Japanese goods made of wool are seriously affecting the already-stricken woolen-manufacturing industry of the United States. This is bad for the wool-growing industry in which Montana is so vitally interested, as well as being bad for the American worker.

With our generous showering of goods, services, and money upon so many lands, in addition to having cut our average tariff rates by three-quarters and with foreign wages so far below ours, what did our foreign friends do? How did they reciprocate? The facts show that the 89 trading nations, other than the United States, have developed no less than 36 different, ingenious practices, restrictive to international trade and investment. As examples: 62 countries require import licenses to get goods into the countries and skullduggery is rampant in this area; 46 require export licenses, sometimes tied up with stringent currency controls; 26 have restrictions on outgoing capital movements; 28 have restrictions on incoming capital movements; 33 have exchange licenses; 23 have multiple exchange rates; 9 have import quotas, but the import licenses operating in 62 countries are, in effect, just the same as quotas.

The problem is the same whether it be in Rhode Island, Ohio, Georgia, or Montana. Only the names of the products involved are different. The blight is on a vast variety of items; textiles, machinery, machine and hand tools, chemicals, metals, cameras, appliances, and countless others. The great State of Montana is probably first in the Nation in zinc, third in copper, and fifth in lead production in the United States. As you know, the price structure is not only disheartening but is ruinous to many American mining companies. It is tough on many Montanans who depend so greatly upon these metals for their livelihood. We get the same end result whenever low-cost imports shut down plants and mines and people are put out of jobs.

Probably one of the least understood phases of the market place, and certainly the phase misunderstood by most of the proponents of free trade, is the psychological effect of the sale of a small quantity of really cheap and unrestricted imported goods on the basic price level of the rest of the domestic supply. The result is dramatic, immediate, and destructive. The price of all the rest of the goods, no matter how high the wages, rent, heat, light, taxes, and other items of cost that went into them, will grind inexorably downward with the sureness of the pull of gravity.

Unrestricted imports encourage the disintegration of price levels based upon American costs. There may be a temporary advantage to consumers but, if uncontrolled, it will wreak havoc on employment in America. The result is decreased purchasing power, hardship, relief, and a lower standard of living. American jobs must be preserved for American workers.

What advantage is there to the American worker and his family if we permit the further liberalization of these foreign trade laws? The gains that have been made in the fields of minimum wages, overtime pay, social security, industrial safety, health and welfare could be seriously affected. Any manufacturer can now escape American labor legislation and most American taxes simply by locating his plant abroad. The laws governing interstate commerce should not discriminate against goods produced in the United States.

Why should two identical garments, one manufactured in the United States and the other manufactured in Japan, run into different rules at our State borders? If, as is true, we have legislated costs on the United States product, is it fair or reasonable that foreign goods should move in interstate commerce entirely exempt from the rules that apply to American manufacturers?

In my judgment, the American people are too fairminded to approve this type of unfair competition if they understood it. The point is that our laws should take into account the high costs of American manufacture when evaluating the entry of foreign goods into our country. Tariffs, quotas, or a combination of both are necessary if we are to preserve our American standard of living. And let us not forget that American industry has twice been the arsenal of democracy in world wars. Is it wise, in the nuclear age, to decimate, under the halo of reciprocal trade, industries which were essential to allied victories in World War I and II?

Ladies and gentlemen, it is fantastic to many American businessmen to speak of this idea of international trade as reciprocity. Almost alone, we have done all the giving and yielding and losing. It was all the American Government's idea in the first place, 24 years ago, and we sold it all over the world. The act took the tariff control out of the hands of Congress and gave it to the executive branch. The control of American international trade should go back into the hands of Congress, where it belongs. This is the point at which local conditions register promptly and accurately.

Two bills are now in the House Ways and Means Committee and will shortly be acted upon. One is the Dorn bill, H. R. 11250, and the other is the Simpson bill, H. R. 11462.

Both bills return the determination of when American industry, and thus, our country is injured to the Congress, through the medium of the Tariff Commission, by whatever name it may be called. Under these bills economists in the State Department could no longer use global politics, sputniks, or other convenient reasons to overrule the true facts when our industries and mines are actually hurt, as is now the case.

I urge all of you connected in one way or another with American free enterprise to give serious thought to this vital and current subject and to advise your Congressmen and Senators how you feel. There isn't too much time. I have opposed the encroachment upon American jobs of these misleading trade agreements since their inception and I shall continue to do so until some form of equitable relief, based upon the American standard of living, is available.

The danger is clear and present. No one can deny that we must stop being complacent about our technical educational system. By the same token, we cannot be complacent over the fact that our country has actually become the battlefield for cheaply made imported manufactured goods. The American standard of living is under attack from overseas. Many countries who are attacking us in this way are our friends. They rely on our economic strength and our aid. Personally I believe most of them would understand our problem if our representatives at the international bargaining table would present our situation effectively and fearlessly. Let us join together to remind our Government of the necessity of defending our hard won high standards of living.

I thank you.

Argus-Leader Given Public Service Award—Tops Class for Largest Newspapers

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, the largest

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

newspaper in South Dakota, has recently won a first prize award from Editor and Publisher for "a newspaper's service to the community." The South Dakota newspaper was given this splendid recognition because of a study of a local gas rate increase conducted by a utility rate specialist at the expense of the Argus-Leader, and the newspaper space given to this study.

The publisher and editor-in-chief of the Argus-Leader is Mr. John A. Kennedy. Mr. Kennedy has recently attracted nationwide attention on the basis of firsthand reporting on the advances in Soviet education which he has noted in his extensive travel and study in the Soviet Union. He and his staff are entitled to considerable public appreciation for this most recent honor that has been extended by Editor and Publisher, the leading trade publication of the Nation's newspapers. I include at this point the following news article from the May 4, 1958, issue of the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, which relates the account of the paper's service award:

ARGUS-LEADER GIVEN PUBLIC SERVICE AWARD—TOPS CLASS FOR LARGEST NEWSPAPERS

The Sioux Falls Argus-Leader has been given an Editor and Publisher first prize award for "a newspaper's service to the community," it was announced Saturday night.

A study of a local natural gas rate increase conducted by Dr. John Bauer, a nationally known utility rate specialist, at the Argus-Leader's expense and the newspaper space given the subject were the basis for the award.

The classification, one of several judged annually by the leading trade publication of the Nation's newspapers, was described by George Wilt of E. & P. as being evaluated on service to a community." The Argus-Leader gained the prized award for 1957 in the over-50,000 circulation section, including the largest newspapers in America.

Winners of the honors are announced in this weekend's edition of Editor & Publisher. Presentation of the awards is set for a Monday evening dinner at the National Newspaper Promotion Association convention at Pittsburgh. Fred Schweikher, promotion manager of the Argus-Leader who is attending the convention, will accept the award for his newspaper's entry in the judging.

Awards for services rendered by newspapers to their communities were in two classifications.

For papers with more than 50,000 circulation, the Louisville, Ky., Courier-Journal and the Shreveport, La., Times ranked next to the Argus-Leader, receiving certificates of merit.

For newspapers having less than 50,000 circulation, first prize was won by the Riverside, Calif., Enterprise, and certificates of merit by the San Angelo, Tex., Standard-Times and the Findley, Ohio, Republican-Courier.

Dr. Bauer, with a background of 40 years in the utility rate field, was employed by the Argus-Leader to review the local gas rate structure after a rate increase, which has now been in effect since August, 1957, was announced by Central Electric & Gas Co.

Dr. Bauer undertook his study earlier in the summer and submitted six recommendations to the City Commission.

He suggested that the city request of the Gas Co. "all of the information" which he deemed essential to a conclusive perusal of the gas rate question here.

On December 5, 1957 the company turned over to the commissioners facts and figures relating to its Sioux Falls operations. City officials met with representatives of the gas firm for a conference.

It was made clear, at all times, that Dr. Bauer's research was designed to ascertain whether the rate increase seemed justified.

Over a period of 6 months, the Argus-Leader published numerous articles reciting all these developments, step by step and in full detail.

Eidtorially, this newspaper didn't challenge the rate boost, but said the prime objective was a rate scale which would be fair to the company and consumers alike.

February 10 of this year Mayor Fay Wheeldon said the city would employ its own expert to continue the gas rate study.

At that time the city commission called upon South Dakota Senators and Representatives at Washington to oppose the Harris-O'Hara bill being considered by Congress.

The bill provided for the removal of certain existing Federal regulations governing prices charged by producers of natural gas. It would permit increases in the price of gas without Federal regulation.

The mayor reported yesterday that the city is still looking for an expert with combined accounting, engineering and legal background.

He said it may be necessary to employ an expert who, in turn, will gather about him a staff of consultants specializing in those fields.

"It's a fine thing for the city of Sioux Falls and all of South Dakota," commented Mayor Wheeldon, "that the Argus-Leader should be chosen from all the newspapers of the country for this high award. It focuses national attention on Sioux Falls in a way that is beneficial to the city. The Argus-Leader should be congratulated for this unusual recognition."

Seventieth Birthday of Congressman Emanuel Celler

SPEECH
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute one of our most distinguished colleagues, EMANUEL CELLER of New York, who on Tuesday last celebrated his 70th birthday. I am honored to have this great privilege not only because of my personal friendship and admiration for MANNY CELLER, but because this is a man whom all of us can regard with respect, warmth and affection.

In every generation there are men who stand out above their contemporaries in service to their fellow man, in striking achievement over a long period of time. MANNY SELLER'S public record, stretching back 35 years to the day when he first entered the House of Representatives, sets a goal of accomplishment which has few parallels. His efforts to make life a little better for the underprivileged and to provide minority groups with opportunities for productive careers on a more equitable basis testify to his unfailing sense of justice and fairness. He has constantly been working for a better society and a more advanced social order in which the civil rights of all men will be respected and no man will be made to suffer because of his color, creed, or place of birth. Over the years he has expanded the scope of his efforts to cover not only his beloved country but also the oppressed and homeless of other lands throughout the world. Certainly, his works in behalf of the Jewish people, who have been driven across the face of the earth, alone have earned for him a place on humanity's roll of honor.

I am very proud indeed to come from the same State and the same city and to serve under the same political banner as MANNY CELLER.

Anyone who has known him becomes immediately aware also of the fine human qualities which have endeared him to so many of us—his warm nature and ready friendship, has keen sense of humor, and the down-to-earth quality he imparts to every conversation.

I, in particular, have good reason to speak of this, for when I first met MANNY CELLER, I was a neophyte, fully aware of my shortcomings, and therefore fully appreciative of his kindly and considerate assistance and encouragement in any and all matters on which I consulted him.

In times such as these when the Nation faces economic recession and its fearsome consequences—consequences which will inevitably affect most seriously those in the lower income brackets—it is noteworthy that MANNY CELLER is to be found in the ranks of those working to protect the small businessman and the unemployed. But this is only one of his numerous activities. His work in regard to antitrust legislation and civil rights as well as his defense of the Supreme Court against the attacks of those who would weaken its power—all these add luster to an already star-studded record as one of the Nation's outstanding liberals.

It is in behalf of a better future, a better America, and a better world that I salute the venerable gentleman from New York having reached the ripe young age of 70 and still in possession of more physical vigor than many men half his age, he will, I hope, together with his charming wife, remember to invite me to another birthday party 10 years from now.

Idle Workers Want New Jobs, Representative Dwyer Finds in Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PERKINS BASS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article from the Elizabeth (N. J.) Daily Tribune of May 7 headlined "Idle Workers Want New Jobs, Representative DWYER Finds in Survey." The article interestingly details a survey

and conclusions made by Congresswoman FLORENCE DWYER on the unemployment problem in her district. I am sure this news item will prove valuable to many of us who have similar conditions in our areas.

IDLE WORKERS WANT NEW JOBS, REPRESENTATIVE DWYER FINDS IN SURVEY—CONGRESSWOMAN VISITS UCC OFFICES IN COUNTY, HEARS OF FINANCIAL WORRIES AMONG UNEMPLOYED—SAYS STUDY WILL HELP GUIDE HER VOTING

Distressed men and women, still proud and conscientious and ready to work, are standing, often unwillingly, in the unemployment compensation offices in her district, Representative FLORENCE P. DWYER, of Elizabeth, said today.

She discovered this, she added, in a day-long inquiry to determine the attitude of the citizens, the effects of Federal palliatives already begun, the efficacy of the system of disbursing checks, and the attitude of the people most involved.

The bulk of the unemployment compensation claims in Union County is administered through the Elizabeth and Plainfield offices.

Technical procedures have been expedited by additional Federal funds made available at the first signs of the recession, Mrs. DWYER said. The United States Government pays the administrative cost and the States issue the checks from employer-employee contributions.

Statistics in both Union County offices show that unemployment, despite the availability of numerous jobs, approximates twice that of a year ago. In conversations with citizens standing in line for checks, Representative DWYER heard stories of financial distress in homes, mortgages endangered, educations in jeopardy, instalments in arrears.

FEAR OF LOSING HOME

One wife told Mrs. DWYER her husband's unemployment compensation claim is exhausted and her own is nearing its terminus and they may lose the home acquired when both were working.

A man reported dejectedly he had purchased a car when overtime wages were sufficient to meet the payments. Now he has no job.

A widow, pinching frugally to keep her son in college, despairs of the next heavy tuition payment.

"This is my first time in a line like this," a woman shyly confessed. But she added quickly she was not accepting charity.

Women presented a universal complaint, and some urged a radical remedy—a price freeze at the grocery. Food, all said, costs too much; prices are out of proportion to income and wreck unemployment compensation claim check budgets.

The 26 weeks of payments available in New Jersey have been consumed by many families.

Representative DWYER told persons she interviewed that proposed Federal legislation contemplates aiding any State in extending by one-half the period in which it will pay jobless benefits.

Other Federal measures she described are new secondary road program to ease the situation in the construction field; drastic modification of the financing of new homes; credit relaxation, and the distribution of $6 billion in defense contracts, which will touch all phases of industry.

On that last facet, she will confer next week with the Department of Defense and the Small Business Administration.

HOPES TO SEE JOBS

"My concern," she said, "is to get people back to work. The allotment of contracts in idle and slowed down plants in this district will help."

Elizabeth's difficulties primarily are those of Detroit, the slowdown in the production of motor vehicles. Many Elizabeth factories, large and small, contributed directly to the Detroit assembly lines.

All industries are slowed, although chemicals and pharmaceuticals are the least affected, Representative DWYER learned.

This intimate study of the effects of the recession in her district will guide her, Mrs. DWYER said, in voting on remedial measures now in the Congress or to be introduced. She said it also proves the accuracy of Labor Secretary James P. Mitchell in recommendations he had made to the administration and Congress.

Depression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an article written by the news editor of the Western Nebraska Observer, Bob Pinkerton, of Kimball, Nebr.

You will note his article takes sort of a reverse slant on the thinking of the people of the East on this thing we call a repression.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, in Nebraska when you talk about a depression some people just grin; they wonder what you are talking about. Nebraska took a pretty solid whipping in 1956 when more than half of the counties went on a total drought relief program but last year and again this year things are looking up. There is a lot of moisture and good prospects for an excellent crop, good prices for cattle, hogs, and other meat products.

I have known Robert Pinkerton since he was a little boy. His thinking is sound. I recommend to my colleagues the reading of his article on the depression.

The article follows:

I am deeply concerned with the affairs in the Cornhusker State. It seems that Nebraska somehow cannot seem to get into the swing of recession like the other States. So reports the university's business research department.

Some of you, I suppose, are lulled into a false sense of security by this report, which claims retail sales are ahead of last year.

This is obviously an unhealthy condition. When the rest of the Nation is deep in the pangs of recession, here's Nebraska, enjoying prosperity. What if a group of States got to gether and did this. See the picture? Wouldn't be long before the depression would strike the recession States, and the prosperous States would become more prosperous.

Now the problem occurs: Civil War II.

I think it is the duty of every conscientious citizen of Nebraska to talk themselves into a recession. If the other States do, well, remember, "United we stand, etc."

With unity and purpose for all, I submit the following cures to prosperity.

All citizens, regardless of economic status, should not rush out and buy things they need. "Don't buy," is my slogan.

Ask your boss for a wage cut.

Talk depression; think depression; sleep depression. This is the most effective way to attain a recession, and maybe shoot for the moon—depression. Tell your neighbors you are sinking fast. Ask them to do the same.

Write your Congressman. Let him know how bad things really are in your home State. Don't let anybody tell you differently.

Wear old clothes. This gives an overall frightening picture, and others will follow suit (so to speak).

Above all, practice recession. Practice makes perfect. For the cause of patriotism, act now, before it's too late.

Address of Mr. Reid Brazell, President, Leonard Refineries, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the RECORD an address made by a distinguished citizen of the State of Michigan, Mr. Reid Brazell, on the occasion of the 12th annual testimonial dinner given by the Association Executives of Michigan for Michigan Members of Congress on April 29, 1958.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY REID BRAZELL, PRESIDENT, LEONARD REFINERIES, INC., AT THE 12TH ANNUAL TESTIMONIAL DINNER GIVEN BY THE ASSOCIATION EXECUTIVES OF MICHIGAN FOR MICHIGAN MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 29, 1958

Needless to say, I appreciate the opportunity and feel honored to have the privilege of speaking to you on this auspicious occasion—an occasion when busy folks take time to come here to Washington, to talk to, to break bread with, and to honor their Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

When Bill Palmer called and asked me to talk to this group, my first reaction was, "What do I have to say that would be of interest to such a meeting?" I asked Bill, "What do you want me to talk about?" His reply was, "Why you like Michigan." That was easy. I like Michigan because I believe in Michigan, and because I believe in Michigan I suggest to you and to the people of Michigan that we establish as an objective, as a goal, the job of putting real meaning and truth into the three words, "Michigan means business." The achievement of this goal should not be too difficult for the people of Michigan if past performance is any indication of what they can and will do if such a challenge is accepted.

Let us take a look at our State, its history, and, more importantly, its people; also a look at the present, and look to the future.

First, as personal reference, I should like to mention that it was by no accident of birth that Michigan is the State in which I make my home, in which I raise my family, and in which I earn my daily bread. I was born in Oklahoma and lived there and elsewhere for 30 years before adopting Michigan. Notwithstanding my love for Oklahoma, my native State, and my pride in it, I adopted Michigan for my home. I chose it for reasons that are reflected in its history, its geography, its climate, and, above all, in its

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

people. That faith of mine has become stronger each of the year that I have lived here. I truly believe in Michigan.

Perhaps from the vantage point of the past we can more clearly perceive why confidence in the future of our Michigan is justified—and come to a better understanding of why we all of us should believe in Michigan.

Consider for a moment: What sort of a State is Michigan? What are Michigan people like? There is no simple answer to those questions. Michigan is unlike any other State lying between the two oceans. Michigan people and the development of the State reflect circumstances most unlike those that exist elsewhere in this world.

Senators MCNAMARA and POTTER must find it a great challenge as well as great honor and responsibility to wear the mantle of United States Senator for Michigan.

If we start at Monroe in Congressman MEADER's district and go westward to the western boundaries of Congressman HOFFMAN's district, we find fertile lands where Michigan farmers plow soil as rich as can be found in our whole country.

Moving northward, we find the busy Saginaw Valley district so ably represented by my own Congressman ALVIN BENTLEY, to the east we find the great thumb area represented by Congressman MCINTOSH, moving farther north into the districts represented by Congressmen GRIFFIN, CEDERBURG and KNOX; a vast region of generally sparse soil where a few short years ago stood our vast treasures of pine and hardwood. Some people thought these treasures inexhaustible, but the trees were felled and by 1890, they were largely gone. In every frontier country there are heedless people who despoil without thought for the future. So it was with Michigan's forests. But others come to heal the wounds. Thus today, happily, there stands in that region row upon row of growing pines and hardwoods which will bless future generations.[1] At the upper part of Congressman KNOX's district are the Straits of Mackinac which so long divided Michigan, but now spanned by the world's great new bridge, to unite the people of the upper and lower peninsulas and open new horizons for us. The eastern end of the upper peninsula, also in Congressman KNOX's district, was another land of hardwood and pines which, once despoiled, is again emerging as a land of bounty. Traveling westward toward the Wisconsin border, in Congressman BENNETT's district, rock ridges emerge from the soil and there are found the iron and copper riches that for so many years sustained large segments of our population.[2][3]

I believe in Michigan because of its great natural opportunities. Michigan is a State apart. Its uniqueness lies in the varieties of its geography, climate and terrain and particularly in the uniqueness of its peoples. Its uniqueness is perhaps best exemplified by the fact that Michigan is dotted by more than 11,000 inland lakes, is traversed by 20,000 miles of streams and is framed by waters as blue as those of the Mediterranean. It has a shoreline of over 3,200 miles. Michigan is bounded by 4 of the 5 Great Lakes. There is Lake Superior, with its cold and mighty breakers smashing the rocky shores of the upper peninsula—Lake Michigan, beating at the sand dunes to the west; Lake Huron, gently touching the eastern side of Congressman MCINTOSH's district; and Lake Erie; lazily lapping the Monroe marshes.[4][5]

Michigan's climate is also unique. Our State is air conditioned by the waters of the Great Lakes. The lake waters absorb heat from air warmer than themselves and warm the colder winds. The Great Lakes regions are frequently a meeting point for high and low pressure areas, with the result that we have frequent changes of weather. Our climate is a seasonal climate. Each year we enjoy spring's rebirth of nature, summer's warmth tempered by the cooling lakes, autumn's brilliance unexcelled in beauty in any place else in the whole world, and winter's quiet snows.

Our uncommon geography and climate have produced an uncommon people. Our people vary as to types and ancestry, and because of what Michigan people have done with the land that they found, our State never developed into any common type of State.

Little more than a hundred years ago Michigan was wilderness. Its chief industry was the fur trade. As late as 1814 history records Indian massacres in Michigan. It was not until 1842 that the Indians ceded the last Michigan lands. In the space of little more than a hundred years this State was created from a wilderness land of trappers and fur traders to its present greatness. Into its development went incredible extremes of vision and stupidity and greed and generosity

Our State was born of bloodshed and dissensions so often common to frontier lands. It was born of the calamities of Indian massacres, pestilences, destructive fires, wars and unprecedented waste and greed and wisdom and folly and cupidity and integrity. Truly Michigan has had a tempestuous past.

The Michigan wilderness did not come to the forefathers easily. They fought for it. First they fought the French, then the British and then the British again, and all the while they fought the Indians. When peace came many of these frontiersmen entered upon an orgy of exploitation of the Michigan land and the treasures beneath the surface unprecedented in history. It is, however, of some comfort to recall that the pines of Michigan housed much of the Nation and produced values equal to 3 times the gold that California's earth gave up and 10 times the gold from Alaska. Many houses built of Michigan pine still stand today. And much of the money derived from this so-called "rape of the woods" found its way into our colleges and our hospitals. It might be well to consider that had these pine lands not been cut away we would not have our great and growing State and national forests that are so important to our beloved Michigan outdoors.[6]

During roughly the same period that Michigan trees were producing their fortunes, Michigan produced half the copper mined in the United States—more than 9 billion pounds of it—and millions of tons of iron ore. Into this land came Welshmen, Lithuanians, Austrians, and Finns to fell the trees and tend the mines, joining the earlier migrations of Germans, Dutch, Irish and Polish peoples, who had come to mingle with the original French and English settlers. Thus came our complex and uncommon people.

When the first great native pines came crashing down in the Michigan forest and when our iron and copper ore became much less bountiful, there were heartbreaking times in many parts of our State. The lumberjacks and the ore workers took up farming. We see today in many sections of our State tragic reminders of their vain efforts and of their dreams of establishing farms in soil inhospitable to farming. A lonely chimney against the evening sky. A rotting door stoop. A dilapidated barn. We must not assume that all of our State is thus inhospitable. Today much of that soil once unsuccessfully tilled is producing fruits, cereals and meats in great abundance. These developments have come about because Michigan men who failed once were willing to try again and try ever once again. They have come about also because, just as there were those who despoiled our land, there were in greater number those who made efforts to enrich it and to insure its future bounty. In 1957 our legislature had the wisdom to found our great Michigan State University, the first agricultural college in the entire Nation to open its doors. That institution and our great conservation department are fulfilling their destiny in securing to us the utmost bounty of our soil and the riches beneath.

I believe in Michigan because our State has been well endowed with many resources. There are the great salt deposits in the State which have placed Michigan ahead of all other States in salt production. Lest we think salt a common sort of product for table use only, we should remember that salt and derivatives from it are used in more than 14,000 different products.

Petroleum, too, is found in Michigan—enough so that in 1938 Michigan was second in the producing States east of the Mississippi. While production has been declining, it is still an important product to many of us.

In the era before the automobile, other great industries came to Michigan: furniture in Congressman FORD's district, wagons and carriages in Congressman CHAMBERLAIN's district, the great paper and pharmaceutical industries in Congressman JOHANSEN's district, and the great and growing pharmaceutical industry in Detroit. There came also a wide variety of small factories which depended upon the hardwood of the region, dotting areas to the north.

Michigan is bounded by waters that were bountifully filled with fish. Thus it became a land of fishermen. It became also a land of sailors. Our great fishing industry has declined, but with the development of the St. Lawrence seaway, our State promises to provide ports for the shipping of all the world. Michigan woods have always abounded with game. Thus we are a land of hunters and outdoorsmen.

Up until now we have considered for the most part those people of Michigan that depended upon the soil, the forests, and the treasures beneath the soil for a livelihood.

There was, and is, the Detroit industrial complex so ably represented by Congressmen MACHROWICZ, DIGGS, RABAUT, DINGELL, LESINSKI, GRIFFITHS, and BROOMFIELD. First established as Fort Pontchartrain by Cadillac in 1700, Detroit and its environs had a population of only 1,442 people in 1820 and only 21,000 people by 1850. As late as 1900 Detroit's population was only approximately 300,000 people. Today its population exceeds 2 million, and it has become one of the largest cities in the United States.[7][8]

In 1900 Detroit was a city of stability. It was a self-satisfied city. True, there had developed in Detroit the successful manufacture of stoves, drugs, machinery, and railroad equipment, which continues to be successful. But at the turn of this century the most extravagant prediction as to Detroit's future would have paled into insignificance when compared with the actual events that followed. Ford, Chalmers, Olds, Joy, Durant, Nash, Willys, Chapin were pioneers of another sort than the trappers, fur traders, and timbermen who penetrated the Michigan wilderness, but they pursued their dreams with the same tireless energy and zeal and at the same hectic pace. By 1910 the population of Detroit had grown to almost half a million people and Detroit had become the ninth largest city in the United States.[9]

Detroit did not invent or create the automobile, but Detroit did create and perfect the art of making tens of millions of them

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

through assembly line techniques and industrial practices that revolutionized not only Detroit but the world; techniques and practices which may revolutionize society itself before their influence is fully spent. Into the crucible of Detroit came armies of unlike men. From Michigan itself came the grandsons of the fur trappers, the sons of the lumberjacks and timber cruisers, the unsuccessful farmers and the sons and grandsons of the copper and iron miners. But Michigan was an insufficient reservoir of manpower to supply the virtually insatiable appetite of the assembly lines. From the Appalachians and from the deep South came other armies of men. When World War I ended, other nations poured their unneeded and unwanted sons into Detroit. These were a most uncommon people.

These diverse and unlike peoples from all parts of the world have been assimilated in the State of Michigan. The melding of their diverse skills, cultures and backgrounds has given us a citizenship unique among the States, but with many common characteristics.

Michigan peoples have many common traits. Among those common characteristics are ambition, industry, bravery, skill and a love of their State and Nation. We should not forget that Michigan gave us many supremely brave and self-sacrificing men—673,000 of them who served our Nation in World War II. Most of our peoples who were not in active service, hundreds of thousands of others, gave their skills to produce the munitions of war—more than 20 billion dollars worth by the end of World War II—far more than the production of any other State, to make Detroit and Michigan the arsenal of democracy in World War II.

Until now I have spoken most of material things. I have said little of Michigan's inanimate treasures. True, we are a people who have devoted much of our lives and resources to material things—but there is another side equally or more important. In 1817 our forebears established a great university—the University of Michigan—one of the 4 or 5 great universities in the world. At almost each crossroad we established a church and in hamlets a college, so today there are more than 20 colleges and universities. In 1785 a land ordinance was adopted setting aside section 16 in every township to be used for educational purposes. Thus today the son of a Finnish immigrant writes our Nation's songs, the son of a Polish immigrant is a judge or a Congressman. A most uncommon people we are.[10] [11]

Detroit made automobiles available to even the poorest of our country's citizens. More than 7 million of them in a single year. That availability has been largely responsible for the second greatest industry that our State now enjoys, the tourist industry. Thus there is a close kinship between Detroit and the outer regions of our State.

Our 11,000 lakes, our shorelines bathed by the waters of the Great Lakes, our thousands of miles of trout streams and our tens of thousands of reforested acres beckon to the weary to come at all seasons and enjoy peace and beauty and to return to their homes and jobs refreshed. The automobile has provided the means for them to come. And how they have come. From an occasional visitor a few years ago seeking relief perhaps from hay fever, we now have a flood of visitors who come from all parts of the world and at all seasons of the year to visit with us and to spend with us more than $600 million annually.

When Etienne Brule crossed the Straits and landed at Sault Ste. Marie in 1618 he could not imagine that a few short years hence, as history goes, a span of steel and stone more than five miles long would bridge the rushing waters of the straits. Cadillac and his small band of men and women manned the ramparts of Fort Pontchartrain on the shore of the Detroit River in 1700, and met with equal fortitude the vicissitudes of Indian attack, destructive fire, cholera and near starvation. I doubt Cadillac could envision that towering edifices of steel and stone would one short day stand on the site of and near the old fort. The timber cruiser who as late as the 1880's stood in the hushed silence of a grove of towering pines would never have believed that hundreds of thousands of people would come to these woods and lakes and streams of Michigan each year to find renewed vigor and contentment. I suspect that as Brule, Cadillac and the timber cruiser would have been unable to prophesy the future of Michigan, we now cannot successfully prophesy that future.

We do know one thing well, however, that this great State of ours, and its magnificent institutions and its people, have developed, been preserved, grown and flourished in a climate of personal, political and economic freedom. It is the hallowed function of you gentlemen whom we honor tonight, to help to continue to preserve those institutions of freedom.

It is not my purpose of province to advise you as to how you shall insure that freedom endures. There comes to my mind, however, the words of two great and honored Michigan statesmen who described their creeds when dealing with critical political problems of their day. First, there was Senator Lewis Cass, who as a Senator in 1850 enjoyed the dubious help of being required by custom to vote in accordance with instructions of the Michigan legislature, which appointed him. Differing with the instructions received from the legislature, he had this to say, "When the time comes and I am required to vote upon this meaesure, I shall know how to reconcile my duty to the legislature with my duty to myself by surrendering a trust I can no longer fill." Friend and foe alike proclaimed him for his courage and ultimately the instructions from the legislature were withdrawn and Senator Cass not only retained his integrity and independence, but he has been forever honored by his people.

More recently the late Senator Vandenberg, having changed the views he had previously held on matters of the greatest national interest, reported to the shocked constituents who had elected him and said, "What happens to me politically is of no moment to me or to the State, but what happens to the country is of vital moment to all."

What can we predict for the future of Michigan? I am reluctant to predict as to its physical characteristics, its modes of transportation or even as to the form and nature of its industry. It has been predicted by scientists that in the next 25 years worldwide transportation may become as rapid as communication is now; that nuclear developments may make energy almost as cheap as air and that climate control will permit us to have alternatively a tropical grade or an ice age. In the light of these predictions it would be presumptious for me to try to predict the rate of growth of our State or the precise forms that growth shall take.

I believe that Michigan has the greatest growth potential of any State in the union. It has great natural resources, particularly the greatest bodies of fresh water in the world; the geography and terrain that make it an outdoor paradise for its residents and tourists; and above all the most important resource. People of indomitable spirit.

How can we put action—truth—into the words, "Michigan means business."? First—we—you—each person in Michigan, should recognize it is a job for us to do ourselves. Stop expecting Washington and our Federal Congress to do the job for us. We should ask for and expect to receive the cooperation of the Federal government in those areas where joint State and Federal action is required.

Second, advise our State officials and our State legislative bodies that in the development of our land of plenty, it will be necessary to invest money, now and in the future, in many projects, such as roads, educational institutions, health institutions, harbor projects, recreational facilities, to name only a few—projects that will permit the rapid development of our Michigan, and, incidentally, a rapid return of the money invested, through taxes that would be paid. We should expect the legislature to provide the funds necessary.

Third, the organization of groups whose efforts can be directed toward the many community projects that should be undertaken, projects that will help to put action and truth into the words, "Michigan means business."

---

[1] 1857, Michigan State University was the first agricultural college in the Nation to open.

[2] Michigan is the second State in production of iron ore, first in salt, second in sand, gravel, magnesium compounds, and peat.

[3] 1919, the Soo Canal was completed and it became and remains the busiest in the world.

[4] 1887, the Nation's first game warden was appointed at Grand Rapids.

[5] 1891, the Nation's first ski club was established at Ishpeming.

[6] 1881, the first forestry school in the Nation was established at the University of Michigan.

[7] 1868, first refrigerator box car was patented in Detroit.

[8] 1875, first ice cream soda developed at Sanders in Detroit.

[9] 1893, the first woman policeman was appointed in Detroit.

[10] 1867, Michigan was the first State to support a university by direct property tax (University of Michigan).

[11] 1874, first school for underprivileged children in the world opened at Coldwater, Mich.

Increased Mileage Allowances for Rural Carriers

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the House in passing S. 3050, a bill to increase the rural carrier equipment maintenance allowance from 9 cents to 10 cents per mile or to $3.50 per day, whichever is greater, has acted to correct a financial injustice which is presently imposed on this loyal group of postal employees. This meritorious and needed legislation has been of vital concern to me. I introduced a bill (H. R. 6371) in the House on March 26, 1957, which provided essentially what is provided in the legislation that passed the House this week.

The subcommittee, of which I was privileged to be a member, carefully considered all the testimony presented on the legislation. Overwhelming evidence made it abundantly clear, even at the time of these hearings in June 1957,

Footnotes at end of speech.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

that rural carriers were being required—in effect—to subsidize the Government in the delivery of rural mail. Costs of operation had exceeded the allowance paid to such an extent that it was actually taking of their salary dollars to cover the required expenditures to provide the vehicle to do the job. Factual, substantiating data clearly established the need and justification for an increase in mileage allowances. Despite this obvious conclusion, the Post Office Department opposed this legislation last year.

Our subcommittee carefully considered the testimony and facts presented at the hearings on this legislation. The apparent need of an increased allowance resulted in my bill being favorably reported to the full committee. On July 25, 1957, the bill was unanimously approved and reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

It is unfortunate that the House did not have the opportunity to act on this legislation earlier. However, I commend the distinguished Chairman of the Committee [Mr. MURRAY] and the leadership of the House for expediting consideration at this time.

The need of higher allowances was also indicated in hearings held during the current session before a subcommittee in the Senate. The antipathy of the Post Office Department to this financial plight of the rural carriers was gone this year, and testimony presented in the Senate was an acknowledgment than an upward adjustment in these allowances was necessary. As a result of the hearings in the Senate, a bill was reported which reflected more liberal provisions than that reported by our committee last year. The Senate accepted S. 3050 as reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and in that action transferred responsibility for prompt action to the House.

Many of my colleagues in the House as well as myself favored the more liberal provisions of the Senate bill. The points of difference in the two bills had to be resolved and the only sensible solution was to seek an intermediate point of acceptable agreement. Concessions were necessary. The bill which cleared the House and was accepted by the Senate was, in my opinion, the very best that could be had at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the officers of the National Rural Letter Carriers' Association for their tireless and successful efforts to blend the differences of thinking and opinion which existed in regard to this legislation. In representing this large group of postal employees they have ably demonstrated that they are not too bigoted to accept reasonable compromise, when it becomes clearly evident that such action is necessary. They have rendered a service to the Congress by assisting in uncovering the facts so necessary to permit us to act wisely on legislation. They have further rendered a service to their membership, and have acted in their best interest by facing up squarely to the realities of the moment. Their judgment in recognizing the necessity of the compromise between the two bills should result in the rural carriers of this Nation receiving an increased mileage allowance in the near future.

It is my hope that the President will not delay signing the measure. These increased allowances are necessary to help these employees more nearly meet the present-day costs of delivering rural mail to the 35 million postal patrons of the rural free delivery.

Following passage of S. 3050 by the House on Monday of last week, I received the following telegram:

> On behalf of the rural carriers of the Nation, we wish to express our sincere appreciation for your efforts in connection with the equipment allowance bill which passed the House today. We are deeply grateful for your able assistance in the House passage of this meritorious and needed legislation.
>
> RAY L. HULICK,
> *President, the National Rural Letter Carriers' Association.*

I want the rural carriers of the Nation to know that it was a pleasure to work with their organization, with the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and with my colleagues in the House in the interest of legislation to correct their financial plight, and to relieve them from personally bearing undue expenses to perform a valuable government service.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, May 10 is celebrated by freedom-lovers all over the world as Rumanian Independence Day. This day is even deeper significance than ever this year, since the brave people of Rumania today suffer under the yoke of a foreign tyranny.

For the Rumanian people, enslaved first by the Nazis and then by the Communists, the sunlight of freedom shone all too briefly. But the will to be free, the desire for liberty, cannot forever be curbed.

Rumania today is a restive land. More and more its Communist overlords become anxious and fearful as they watch the backlash of their years of brutality and suppression take form. Perhaps even the men in the Kremlin are slowly coming to the realization that tyranny cannot survive man's urge for freedom.

I am happy today to join with all freedom-loving Rumanians in honoring their former independence. We in this country can well take this occasion to again pledge our efforts to help the courageous people behind the Iron Curtain in their determined efforts to regain their independence.

We in the United States must not, and will not, forget our friends in Rumania. We hope and pray for the day when America and Rumania will again meet on the common and hallowed ground of liberty.

Bigness Is No Sin but Bigness Certainly Does Sin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we have been told repeatedly that bigness is no sin. However, when bigness can repeal the law of supply and demand, when bigness violates every rule of reason, keeps prices up and pushes them up higher, when prices should be going down, then bigness is committing the sin which must inevitably destroy it.

Permit me, today, to call attention to a very fine article on the subject. The article is written by John L. Hess and appeared in the Reporter, May 1, 1958, issue.

The article follows:

WHAT KEEPS PRICES UP?

(By John L. Hess)

Word flew around the financial markets of the world late last fall that a meeting had been called in London to do something about the copper slump. Copper shares rallied. Smelters cautiously raised prices. United States antitrust laws being what they are, the American Big Three—Anaconda, Kennecott, and Phelps Dodge—did not attend. But the first two were represented anyway by the copper department of Chile, where they are the major producers. The meeting was behind closed doors, but the decision could hardly be kept secret, nor did the participants want it to be. World copper production was to be cut back roughly 10 percent.

In the Belgian Congo and Rhodesia, in Michigan and Montana, output slowed and some mines were closed entirely. There was a brief delay in Chile; Kennecott finally persuaded the negotiators, it was reported, that a cut in its higher-cost mines in the United States would be just as effective as one in its Chilean holdings. Layoffs rose in Arizona and Utah. In New York, the Cerro de Pasco Corp. announced it was reducing its production of copper in Peru by 11 percent. Its President said the industry had demonstrated statesmanship of a high order, and Cerro de Pasco wanted to be recorded in support of this constructive approach.

In view of the fact that the world supply of copper far exceeded demand, one can understand why a producer should welcome an orderly, across-the-board cutback. But statemanship, it seems, never calls for cutting prices. Two years ago, when copper was at an alltime high and important consumers were switching to aluminum, there were no recorded meetings of industrial statesmen to consider the problem.

The copper affair is cited here for what light it may cast on a phennomenon that, according to the New York Times, has been mystifying economists in Washington. "Experts Puzzled by Prices' Ascent," read a headline as far back as last November 4. "They Believe Slack Demand Should Be Causing Cuts."

The economists are still baffled. The administration, the Federal Reserve Board, and leaders of Congress have been nearly paralyzed by indecision ever since manufacturing began to taper off at the start of 1957. Should they act to combat a recession, or should they apply the brakes lest inflation run away with them? Indeed, with the

business statistics distorted by the rise in prices, many were unable to see the recession at all. As late as last August, the Federal Reserve System was still raising interest rates and constricting the money supply (over the opposition of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York) under the misapprehension that a boom was still on, chiefly because prices were high.

Economists agree that whatever measures are taken to restrain a boom or combat a recession, timing is of the essence. 'Applied too late, the brakes will not hold, the engine will not respond to the accelerator. But, unable to decide whether inflation, or deflation lay ahead, leaders of both parties were still reluctant early this spring, when the recession was already a year old, to plump for a tax cut or any other drastic move.

The indecision was the more agonizing because, while nobody will come right out and say he likes inflation, a decline in prices has come to be regarded with horror by all concerned.

It it still being taught in our schools that when the supply of goods is greater than the demand, prices fall to the point where they entice buyers. It's a nice theory. But in practice, whatever became of the free market? Or of the traditional American view that mass production and low prices are the path to prosperity, while cartels and other such foreign devices to shelter business against the buffeting of competition bring stagnation and poverty?

Industry after industry has abandoned the free-market concept. The prevailing doctrine now is: if sales, and hence profits, go down, raise prices. In February, the Civil Aeronautics Board granted the airlines a fare increase, with the explanation that profits and traffic had declined. It also suggested that there had been excessive scheduling of flights. In other words, the service was too good, or there was too much competition. Thus, in a mere 20 years, the airlines have come around to the defeatist outlook that it took the railroad industry more than a century to achieve.

REVERSE-ORDER DRILLS

It should be noted that the restrictive business philosophy is common both to high-wage industries such as steel, auto manufacturing, and construction, and to low-wage industries such as textiles and retailing. Nor does it take the threat of imminent bankruptcy to cause a free-enterpriser to abandon principle and curb production. The oil industry has been doing it for years.

Ostensibly for conservation, the major oil-producing States each month fix the allowable output after the refiners have reported how much they want. The theory is that any excess of supply over demand would be wasteful. It would also hurt prices. The Federal Government obliges by banning the shipment in interstate commerce of any oil produced in excess of the allowable. This amiable conspiracy against the consumer has worked almost too well. The price of a barrel of crude oil in Texas has risen from as low as 10 cents in the depth of the depression to $1.25 during the Second World War to more than $3 now. (The last big rise came during the Suez crisis, and did perhaps as much to hurt American prestige in Europe as the Marshall plan did to help it.)

But the fabulous profits to be made have inspired a worldwide oil rush. On land and under sea, drilling rigs have made rich strike after strike. Geophysics has greatly reduced the risk of dry wells. And the increasing flow of new, unregulated oil has threatened to swamp the carefully built price structure. Whereupon the rugged individualists of Texas have appealed to Washington, and not in vain, for protection against the operation of the free market.

The White House announced last year a program of voluntary quotas, limiting oil companies to the amounts they had imported in the past. This was accepted by the giants of the industry; it froze them into their dominant position. But relative newcomers to oil importing, with costly new refineries at coastal ports, defied the quotas, and it began to seem as though the free market might break through the dike. Last winter, with demand declining and imports rising, refiners began to trim the prices they pay to domestic producers, though not to the level prevailing before the Suez windfall.

At this point, a powerful force stepped into the breach. The Wall Street Journal reported on February 13:

"The oil industry should make further cuts in processing crude oil to correct the imbalance between supply and demand, M. J. Rathbone, president of Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), said.

" 'What we need right now,' Mr. Rathbone stated, 'is less refinery runs and consequently less product and the ability to work off burdensome stocks.'

"Mr. Rathbone asserted that a general cut in the price of crude oil would not accomplish anything at this time. 'I do not myself see why it should not aggravate the situation rather than alleviate it,' he said."

The Chase Manhattan Bank, in its monthly petroleum review, admonished the industry: "Clearly the time is now at hand for a drastic cutback." Price cuts would not increase demand, it asserted. (The coal industry apparently disagrees; it favors tight curbs on oil imports to keep oil prices up, lest power companies switch from coal.)

In admirable unison, oil companies cut their runs. Texas ordered the sharpest reduction in "allowables" ever, about one-fifth, and Oklahoma and Louisiana went along. As demand still lagged, inventories remained burdensome, but earlier price cuts on gasoline were rescinded. By March, Gulf Oil could announce with satisfaction that there was "no need or justification" for a reduction in petroleum prices.

"MATURITY" COMES TO THE MILLS

A valiant effort to tame the free market even without Government help may be observed in the textile industry. Except in wartime, this has been known as a depressed business for many years. Its wages have been close to the legal minimum, but cotton mills traditionally worked 6 days a week, so that employees have been able to eke out a living with overtime. Now all that has changed. On April 5 of last year the Times reported:

" 'Realistic' cutbacks in production are being planned by textile executives in an all-out effort to restore the laggard industry to a healthy condition.

"The consensus among leaders at the convention of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute is that the industry's salvation depends on the willingness of individual companies to forego immediate gains to bring about long-term well being to the industry.

"As one executive put it, 'The textile industry finally seems to be reaching maturity. Steel and automotive companies have long realized that cutbacks are necessary, and our industry is no exception.'

"Textile men of long experience say this convention is characterized by a greater desire for industry cooperation than has existed in a long time. Traditionally, the industry has suffered because leading elements in it have insisted on pursuing a course of 'rugged individualism,' which has often piled up disastrous results."

The results of this new spirit of restraint and cooperation were gratifying, for a time. The industry generally abandoned the 6-day week for 5 and even 4 days. Within 2 months, textile prices had strengthened, although demand was still slow. The textile industry appeared to be taking its place among the mature industries.

Unfortunately, the developing recession canceled out much of the gain, and in the fall it was necessary for M. Lowenstein & Sons to do for textiles what Jersey Standard was to do for oil. Lowenstein called on the industry to shut down for extended holidays at Thanksgiving and Christmastime and, not relying on the spirit of cooperation alone, it explicitly reminded all that Lowenstein was not only a textile producer but also "the largest buyer of print cloths in the industry."

Not only did the holiday shutdown take place but the curtailment spread to the previously prosperous synthetic-fabric mills. Textron, Inc., made a public pledge not to operate more than 5 days a week during 1958.

The superior maturity of the steel and auto industries, enviously referred to above, of course reflects their superior concentration of control. As Fortune magazine put it a while back, "to every major steel company, price competition means meeting U. S. Steel's prices." Exhortations are not necessary here. Yet the extraordinary discipline of the steel industry, holding the price line while furnaces are banked for lack of orders, merits further notice. Some steel firms have gone into the red, but no one has broken ranks.

Probably a sense of interdependence makes unnecessary the kind of tactics charged to nine steel companies in a little-noticed suit filed back in 1954. The Sunbury Wire Rope Manufacturing Co. complained that during the Korean war it had been warned by U. S. Steel and Youngstown Sheet & Tube that it would be wrecked if it persisted in underbidding the rest of the industry on Government contracts. It did underbid and it was wrecked, Sunbury said. According to the complaint, its customers were told that, if they dealt with Sunbury, they would get no steel and no orders from the major steel companies. The suit was settled out of court for about two-thirds of a million dollars and the idle plant was sold.

THOSE COMPETITIVE COMMUNISTS

The philosophy of lower production, higher prices has become almost unanimously accepted.

Last winter, the first closings of cement mills in twenty years were accompanied by another increase in cement prices. More mills shut down in March, and prices rose again.

The aluminum industry suddenly emerged last winter from a generation of shortages into an era of oversupply. It sold, and is selling, vast tonnages to the government under price-support guaranties made as an inducement to expand during and after the Korean War. In response to a slump in civilian demand it cut production, but it held the price line until April 1, when Aluminium, Ltd., of Canada effected the first price cut for aluminum since 1941. This forced the American industry to follow suit, and an American executive complained, as reported by the Times:

This is a good example of the havoc Russia can wreak in world markets. Although the Russians have been offering aluminum at the annual rate of only about 50,000 tons in Britain, their prices of one to two cents below the aluminum quotation apparently forced the Canadian concern to trim prices—and so we also have to cut in the much bigger United States market.

It is a curious development that Communist Russia should inject an element of price competition into a Western capitalist industry that has never experienced it.

SEMANTICS AND SECOND THOUGHTS

It is vain, probably, to quarrel with the morality of the prevailing business philosophy—or perhaps we should say reflex—on

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

prices. It is, after all, the function of management to turn in a profit to shareholders, if possible. And when business generally is raising prices, no one company or industry can halt the tide; indeed, those sectors where the free market persists to some degree are in peril of being trampled.

Retailing offers a plethora of examples. In recent years, while the auto makers have been raising their prices, dealers have been forced by sales quotas and competition to cut their margins. The dealer mortality rate has been staggering. Back in depression times, organized retailers obtained passage of price-fixing legislation blandly called "fair trade" laws. (The semantics are intriguing. Nowadays "competition" is often preceded by the word "cutthroat," and "black market" and "free market" have become interchangeable.) Under "fair trade," dealers arrange with manufacturers to fix minimum retail prices on their goods, allowing a generous markup for all. Those who cut prices are haled into court as lawbreakers.

In recent years, however, a weakness has developed: Some judges did not care for the enforcement role, and the profit margins were so ample that a whole bootleg industry grew up to exploit it. "Fair trade" goods somehow seeped into "unfair" channels—notably discount houses. This February, mighty General Electric, its warehouses filled with appliances, abandoned "fair trade." Other appliance makers hastily followed. Prices went down as much as 40 percent in department and chain stores, which, if they did not make a profit on the items, were glad to bring shoppers in. Many small dealers, including many of the discounters who had started it all, helplessly quit the field.

Little noticed in the scramble was the fact that the manufacturers had not cut factory prices at all—in fact, some manufacturers actually raised them—and they unloaded a lot of appliances.

The tendency of business to seek shelter against the harshness of competition assumes the force of a natural law. Adam Smith recorded it nearly 2 centuries ago:

"People of the same trade seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public, or in some contrivance to raise prices."

Hence, the administration's appeals to business and labor to exercise restraint have only caused raised eyebrows. For while businessmen and employees as individuals or in groups can do little about inflation, the Government can do, and is doing, a great deal. But most of its efforts have been in the direction of raising prices.

It spends billions to maintain farm prices and reduce farm production; it maintains tariffs that protect the high prices of a limited sector of United States business while depriving other United States producers of markets abroad; it buys minerals and stows them away to support the price level. In procurement, it prefers high United States bidders to low foreign bidders. Much of its enormous spending, accounting for nearly one-fifth of the Nation's consumption of goods and services, is done on a cost plus fixed fee or on a negotiated-contract basis. These methods of contracting reduce producers' cost consciousness and this tends to result in higher prices.

Private home builders, operating in a field of apparently unlimited demand and with the Government insuring them against loss, priced themselves out of the market long ago. As the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia has observed, this went unnoticed for years because the debt was stretched out. On a 30-year mortgage, the monthly payment seemed extravagant but not impossible, especially if the inflation and boom were going on forever, as some economists, many politicians, and all salesmen believed.

But easy terms reached their limit. It was conceivable that buyers could be found to sign 40-year mortgages and 4-year auto loans, but with prices and interest rates up, the monthly payments suddenly became impossible. Housing and cars slumped, gradually dragging the rest of the economy with them.

The Government's response has been not to try to reduce the cost of housing—perish the thought—but to subsidize the mortgage lenders, raise their interest rates, and seek to overcome their sense of caution. Official standards of how much house a man with a given income can afford have always been optimistic. Now the Government offers to insure mortgages at which bankers blanch.

State and Federal policy on utility and transportation rates also tends to raise prices during a recession. The principle is that where rates are regulated they should guarantee a fair return on capital. No more, no less. In time of recession, when passenger and freight traffic and power consumption decline, the regulatory agencies are more or less automatically required to raise the rates. That this discourages business is beside the point.

During the postwar era of undreamed-of prosperity, the illusion has grown that a depression is impossible because the Government would not allow it. Furthermore, the layman has often been told by the expert that the Government now plays the role of a semiautomatic stabilizer in the economy.

Actually, the Government has played a highly contradictory role but, on balance, probably a destabilizing one. It threw its money and its credit behind the postwar boom and, rather than use the occasion to reduce debt, it encouraged States and cities, business and public to emulate it in deficit spending. The burden of supporting the Government has been gradually shifted away from favored businesses (through fast write-offs, inventory gimmicks, and other loopholes) and toward the consumer (through sales and excise taxes, for example). The Government has subsidized what has proved to be an overexpansion of industrial capacity.

To list the ways in which the Government promotes inflation is to suggest some possible countermeasures: abandonment of farm price supports as such (direct relief or subsidy would seem preferable); vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws; a liberal, low-tariff trade policy; an overhaul of the philosophy of utility rate regulation; repeal of sales taxes.

One may doubt that exhorting businessmen further will serve any purpose. Apart from the fact that they are not, as individuals, able to shape the course of events, they have never been enthusiasts for the open welfare of the free market. In the words of the grim GI battlefield jest, "A feller could get hurt out there."

Democracy in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, recently the Giddings Public School in Giddings, Tex., which is located in the 10th Congressional District which I represent, sponsored an essay contest, the subject of which was Democracy in Action. In grades 5 and 6 the essay of Miss Jane Moody placed first.

Because of the nature of the subject, I feel that the Members of Congress will be interested in reading Jane's excellent essay.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I respectfully request that the following essay be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

(By Jane Moody)

To me the word democracy alone means freedom. But to see democracy in action we have to see the people going about their own ways without someone ordering them around.

Democracy is a great thing, but democracy in action is even greater. When we see people going about their own ways we see them going to the church of their choice, speaking freely, going to the school that they wish to go to, to name a few of the many examples of democracy in action.

Democracy begins in the home. The home is a very important place for democracy. The children grow up in the home. They could be taught democracy but they might not be. They could grow up to be good citizens but they might not. Therefore the home is important for democracy.

Democracy also means government of the people, by the people, and for the people. When we say government of the people we mean the Government is part of the people. When we say government by the people we mean the people make the Government. When we say government for the people we mean the Government is like the people want it. So as you see the people govern themselves. The people elect their own representatives to hold office.

We have a Government to keep and enforce laws which we, the people, make.

Then too, democracy means to me education. Each person has the right to have an education. They can go to elementary school and high school, then on to college. Then I would say they were educated.

The pledge to the flag is also a part of democracy. When we apply it, it becomes democracy in action. When we say it we are pledging that we will keep and obey the law that we the people make.

These things which I have written about are what democracy in action means to me and so in the words of Norman Wakefield let us make this freedom pledge.

"I am an American. A free American.
"Free to speak without fear.
"Free to worship God in my own way.
"Free to stand for what I think is right.
"Free to oppose what I believe is wrong.
"Free to choose those who govern my country.
"This heritage I pledge to uphold.
"For myself and all mankind."

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of the following letter sent to me by Mihail Farcasanu, president of

the League of Free Rumanians. Mr. Farcasanu writes concerning the national Independence Day of Rumania, the celebration of which is now forbidden by the Soviets:

THE LEAGUE OF THE RUMANIANS,
New York, N. Y., May 8, 1958.

The Honorable ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
Representative from Michigan.

DEAR MR. BENTLEY: As you are aware the national independence day of Rumania, the 10th of May, cannot be observed any longer in that country, where the Soviet military occupation has suppressed it, imposing, instead, on the subjugated Rumanians the anniversary of their own enslavement.

We would be deeply grateful to you if you can mention in Congress the now forbidden day of Rumanian independence.

The free Rumanian principalities which, at the time of the Ottoman invasions of Europe, contributed so valiantly to the defense of Christianity, after being for a long period a battlefield, regained their independence in the 19th century. At the conclusion of the Crimean War, the Treaty of Paris, 1856, recognized the necessity for European equilibrium, to give international support to the Rumanian lands, a Latin barrier to the imperialist inroads from the East. This recognition was strengthened at the Berlin Congress, 1878, and at subsequent international conferences.

That the freedom of Rumania, together with that of other countries of Eastern Europe, was necessary for the balance of power on the Continent, has been fully evident since the establishment of the Soviet military occupation in that part of Europe. The idea that through the recognition of the Moscow installed stooge governments in the occupied area—thus indirectly acquiescing in the Russian conquest—the expansionist ambitions of the Soviet Union would be satisfied, has been proven a tragic illusion. The reconstruction of a Europe in which the subjugated countries will be reestablished as free and independent states, appears now as an indispensable prerequisite to world peace.

The 13 years of Soviet Communist occupation have greatly impoverished the country, victimized the population through political persecution and slave labor, while subjecting it to the oppressive schemes of sovictization. But while it is in the power of the occupant to destroy the body, the soul escapes him.

The reports we receive from Rumania, show the religious and nationalist feelings of the people are stronger than ever. The Marxist-Leninist indoctrination has not succeeded in gaining a hold on the youth. On the contrary the traditional attachment to the values of western culture has retained the same force on the minds of the young generation, while the aspirations and hopes for freedom constitute their main moral sustaining force.

Such are the facts which motivate the Soviet efforts of obtaining from the West recognition of the status quo, through a host of formulas like disengagement, Rapacki plan, equation of Warsaw, and NATO pacts' powers and cultural exchanges. Moscow is still in great need to demonstrate to the subjugated peoples the cooperation and friendliness between the Kremlin and Washington, in order to convince them there is no more hope for them from the West. This should be combatted by the United States which has a vital interest to preserve this important potential on their side.

Any message of hope and encouragement for Rumania's Independence Day will serve this purpose by helping the morale of her people, now suffering under Soviet domination. With all my gratitude.

Yours respectfully,

MIHAIL FARCASANU,
President, League of Free Rumanians.

Liberation Day, Ethiopia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 5, 1958, Ethiopia observed her 17th anniversary of Liberation Day. I wish to take this opportunity to extend warm and sincere felicitations to his imperial majesty Haile Selassie I, Emperor of Ethiopia, Mr. Kebbede Abbebe, chargé d'affaires ad interim of Ethiopia, and the Ethiopian people in recognition of that event.

The sovereignty and independence which Ethiopia had enjoyed from time immemorial were wrested from her by the forces of tyranny and totalitarianism during the recent world holocaust. Alone against a towering enemy, Ethiopia fought valiantly for its life and for the first time in 3,000 years she lost her independence. Thus, a short generation ago Ethiopia was the first victim of Fascist aggression, and Emperor Haile Selassie in his great speech to the League of Nations prophetically warned of the consequences of its failure to repel and punish Mussolini's assault.

Emperor Haile Selassie returned to his country on May 5, 1941—Liberation Day. In the years since liberation, Ethiopia has tenaciously striven to reconstruct the country by means of implementation of forward-looking policies which had been interrupted by the invasion and occupation. Realizing that the old ways, including the absolute monarchy, must yield, the emperor is trying to bring about an orderly transition. In 1955, Emperor Haile Selassie proclaimed a new constitution. It called for elections to choose a chamber of deputies. This major step toward democracy—the parliamentary elections of September 1957—marked the first election in Ethiopia's proud history.

The emperor's dream is to raise his 15 million subjects out of centuries of darkness into the light of modern, healthy self-sufficiency. He knows this will be a long, difficult road. Ethiopia has achieved a remarkable degree of economic stability in a very short period of reconstruction. There is a definite pattern of development in the country and while her progress along the uphill road is slow, it is steady.

The educational system is expanding. Six teacher-training schools are operating, as against one 6 years ago. In 1955, 1,000 students graduated from the eighth grade; in 1956, 2,000; in 1957, 3,000; and an even greater number is expected to graduate this year. Ambition for education has seized the people. A new agricultural college and farm, built and operated with United States assistance, has begun to change the face of the Ethiopian countryside. This is the 2-year-old Imperial Ethiopian College of Agricultural and Mechanical Arts. The million-dollar college was designed and built by Americans under the United States technical assistance program. Operation costs are jointly shared by the United States and the Imperial Government of Ethiopia. There exists a real thirst for knowledge. In the several educational programs conducted by the United States mission of Ethiopia—public health, nursing, vocational training, teaching—more applicants have been turned away than have been accepted because of the lack of facilities.

Ancient Ethiopia is gradually moving into the modern world under the active guidance of Emperor Haile Selassie. He is anti-Communist, a believer in collective security, and a friend of the United States. When the Communists struck in Korea, the emperor, true to his principles, sent troops from his imperial bodyguard which effectively contributed to the fighting forces there. Two years ago in the Suez and Hungarian crises, as on many other key issues in the United Nations, Ethiopia supported the United States position. We have for long enjoyed close and friendly relations with the Ethiopian Government and people based on mutual esteem and respect for each other's traditions.

Professor Wood and Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, another great and notable Missourian, Prof. R. F. Wood, Central Missouri State College, is reaching an advanced milestone in his distinguished career.

It has been my pleasure and privilege to personally know Professor Wood for a number of years. In my opinion, no man in the State of Missouri stands higher in the teaching profession. The influence of Professor Wood's teachings, coupled with the example of his upright life and wonderful personality, will extend through many decades yet to come.

In his love of God and unswerving faith, his love of country and his outstanding patriotism, he has no superior. He has not only taught his pupils but has led them in their preparation for the battle of life. The example of his life extending over his long term of service at Missouri State Teachers College will ever remind me of the words of Oliver Goldsmith:

"And, as a bird each fond endearment tries
To tempt its new-fledged offspring to the skies,
He tried each art, reproved each dull delay,
Allured to brighter worlds, and led the way.

* * * * * *

"As some tall cliff that lifts its awful form,
Swells from the vale, and midway leaves the storm.
Though round its breast the rolling clouds are spread,
Eternal sunshine settles on its head."

Such a man is Professor Wood—may God lengthen his days and minimize his sorrows.

In connection with Professor Wood's retirement, Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr.,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Holden, Mo., has written the following article which I take pleasure in extending in the RECORD, and also in commending it to my colleagues, especially those from Missouri:

PROFESSOR WOOD AND MISSOURI

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr.)

Last year Dr. A. G. Capps of the University of Missouri reached retirement age and much was said concerning his years of service to Missouri. Once again a situation arises in which all Missouri is interested. Yes, and people and institutions throughout America feel a keen concern. The reason this year is the forthcoming retirement of Rolla Franklin Wood, professor of history and international relations at Central Missouri State College for the last 31 years.

Professor Wood is to Missouri what the late Dr. William Bell Riley was to Minnesota. The First Baptist Church of Minneapolis was organized March 5, 1853, and it became the largest Baptist church in the Northern Baptist Convention under the leadership of Dr. Riley.

Mr. Wood, who resides at 121 West North Street, Warrensburg, Mo., was born April 20, 1888, at Curtis, Nebr. He was the son of James M. and Laura Bell (Rader) Wood. He received his bachelor's degree in 1920 from Central Missouri State College and his master's degree in 1925 from George Peabody College for Teachers. He did additional graduate work at the University of Virginia, Peabody, and Columbia University.

He married Miss Minnie Edwards of Winston, Mo., who passed away during the last year. They were parents of two fine children, Janet Sue Wood and Don Edwards Wood. He was superintendent of schools of Pattonsburg, Mo., from 1920 to 1923, principal of the high school at Bessemer, Ala., 1923–27, and a member of the faculty at Central Missouri State College since 1927.

Professor Wood is a deeply religious man and has often preached in the Methodist church. Recently, Dr. Wilton Marion Krogman of the department of anthropology of the University of Pennsylvania, issued "A Decalog of Race," often referred to as "The Ten Commandments." Professor Wood ascribes to this point of view as do all broad-minded Americans. It is as follows:

"1. Thou shalt not bow down before the false god of racial superiority.

"2. Thou shalt not boast that only thy race is pure.

"3. Thou shalt not preach that whole races are at different levels of physical development.

"4. Thou shalt not attach importance to color of skin, or other racial traits.

"5. Thou shalt not establish racial groups as fixed and unchangeable.

"6. Thou shalt not, to the detriment of thy neighbor, assert that cultural achievements are based on racial traits.

"7. Thou shalt not hold that there are racial personality traits that are inborn, or inherited.

"8. Thou shalt not look down upon they brother because his appearance differs from thine.

"9. Thou shalt not because of a man's different religion or nationality, say that he belongs to a different race.

"10. Thou shalt faithfully and sincerely act on the foregoing admonitions and then, indeed, thou wilt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Mr. Wood has been active in promoting international goodwill by instilling in the hearts of his students a deep concern for a sound foreign policy. He has been able to demonstrate some of the principles he believes by being a three-time member of the city council of Warrensburg, Mo., and a member of the Missouri State Constitutional Convention of 1943–44.

One of the most delightful trips the writer ever took was to a Phi Sigma Pi meeting in Atlantic City in February 1941, which was under the direction of Mr. Wood. Mr. Wood was president of this national organization in 1928, and has been active in Phi Delta Kappa, the Masonic Lodge, Knights Templar, Rotary International, NEA, Missouri State Teachers Association, Mississippi Valley Historical Society, National Council of Social Studies, Warrensburg Chamber of Commerce, and American Academy of Political and Social Science.

It is doubtful that any Missourian has traveled more in the name of historical travel than he has. Quite often he tells the members of his class the direct positions the various armies took in the battles of the Civil War, data that could only be understood by him after visiting these battlefields many times.

In some respects Professor Wood reminds me of Dr. John R. Rice. Both are in agreement as to the desirability for a sound Christian faith. Both would oppose the concept of a professional man without adequate morals and proper ethics. Dr. Rice is termed the preacher's preacher and Professor Wood could also be termed the teacher's teacher.

Recently in one of his excellent TV programs entitled "Listen to Youth," Mr. Charles S. Wehrer, Jr., associate professor of elementary education at the State Teachers College, Minot, N. Dak., gave "A Teacher's Prayer." Professor Wood is nearing the end of his teaching career and fits in very nicely to the basic concepts of this prayer which is as follows:

"Oh, God, make me a better teacher. Help me to understand my pupils, to listen patiently to what they have to say and to answer all their questions kindly. Keep me from interrupting them, talking back to them, and contradicting them. Make me as courteous to them as I would have them be to me. Give me the courage to confess my sins against my children and to ask of them forgiveness, when I know that I have done them wrong.

"May I not hurt the feelings of my children. Forbid that I should laugh at their mistakes or resort to shame and ridicule as punishment. Let me not tempt a child to lie and steal. So guide me hour by hour that I may demonstrate by all I say and do that honesty produces happiness.

"Reduce, I pray, the meanness in me. May I cease to nag; and when I am out of sorts, help me, oh Lord, to hold my tongue.

"Blind me to the little errors of my children and help me to see the good things that they do. Give me a ready word for honest praise.

"Help me to treat my pupils as those of their own age, but let me not exact of them the judgments and conventions of adults. Allow me not to rob them of the opportunity to wait upon themselves, to think, to choose, and to make decisions.

"Forbid that I should ever punish them for my selfish satisfaction. May I grant them all of their wishes that are reasonable and have the courage always to withhold a privilege which I know will do them harm.

"Make me so fair and just, so considerate and companionable to my children that they will have a genuine esteem for me. Fit me to be loved and imitated by my children.

"With all thy gifts, oh God, do give me calm and poise and self-control."

Professor Wood and Missouri stand side by side. My only regret is that all America and the nations of the world are not completely acquainted with this dedicated person. Professor Wood has given so much that all mankind should arise and say together, "Thank you, sir, for doing so much."

Guns to Butter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Wichita, Kans., Eagle, on April 19, 1958, an editorial which I consider worthy of the attention of the membership of this body; agricultural and industrial representatives alike.

The editorial points to current speculation that Russia is preparing to cut back its defense expenditures in an effort to bolster its reportedly lagging food and fiber production.

Statistically, we learn from the article that although some 52 million Russians are employed at cultivating 480 million acres of land, food shortages are prevalent in the U. S. S. R. While, on the other hand, here in the United States where only 6 million farmers are cultivating about half the number of acres being worked in Russia, or about 260 million, we have enormous agricultural production surpluses.

Whether one considers the story these statistics tell a blessing or a curse, I think they paint a picture highly complimentary to our American farm economy. The American farmer today is producing on the basis of agricultural scientific advances more food for consumption and fiber for clothing than our closest world competitor, and thereby contributing greatly to our higher living standards.

The editorial follows:

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Eagle of April 19, 1958]

GUNS TO BUTTER

If ever a tribute was paid to the farmers of America, it came in current speculation that Russian Dictator Khrushchev is prepared to cut his defense budget in an effort to match United States farm and ranch production.

This might even be a reason he is pressing so hard for summit conferences and other tension reducers.

The great disgrace in the Communist enterprise is its lagging farm segment. Although 52 million Russian peasants are employed cultivating 480 million acres, food shortages continue.

This is particularly embarrassing for the Communists because it matches abysmally with the United States where 6 million farmers cultivating 260 million acres have us knee-deep in enormous surpluses of grain, butter and other products.

In fact, if Russia hadn't been able to rob the farms of its east European satellites the past 13 years, there is no telling how serious their food shortage would be.

Khrushchev boasted recently that soon Russians will be better fed and clothed than Americans. But the amazing fact is that Russian meat herds are not much larger than they were when the last czar was killed more than 40 years ago. And an estimated 10 million Russians died of starvation during World War II.

Here is one of the greatest paradoxes of our times:

A backward country industrially, Russia has caught up with us in some lines, as the sputniks showed. Yet we, the industrial giant, have continually outstripped her in the very field of agriculture that was supposedly her base for growth.

Agriculture at Its Highest Level in Oskaloosa, Iowa, Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, all of us are familiar with the old adage that prosperity on the farm insures prosperity throughout the whole country, and the best encouragement we have today that the present lag in industrial economy will be of short duration is the fact that agriculture in the midwest is showing strength. This was exceptionally well illustrated in the May 12, 1958 issue of Time magazine, which selected Oskaloosa, Iowa, in the district I have the honor to represent in Congress, as typical of the comeback being made by towns and cities in the farming areas of our Nation.

Oskaloosa sometime ago was designated as the typical midwest city. In this area agriculture is at its highest level. There is adequate industry affording considerable employment within the city and Oskaloosa has very fine educational facilities, with two privately endowed colleges—William Penn College at the north edge of Oskaloosa and Chicago Evangelistic Institute in a little municipality of its own known as University Park, adjacent to Oskaloosa. The city has not made spectacular growth, but through the years has held its own and kept pace with developments along all lines.

As cities go, Oskaloosa is rather small, but the opportunities offered here are very large.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to include Time's article on Oskaloosa.

The article follows:

BOOM TIMES

The best economic news in the United States last week, bar none, was the boom in United States agriculture. From all over the country reports trickled into Washington showing that the farmer, after being the lowest man on the economic totem pole since 1955, is making an astonishing comeback. Agriculture Department experts scarcely dared believe some of their own figures. As of mid-April, the prices that farmers get are up 9.8 percent over the same time last year. The prices they pay are up, too—some 3 percent. But the net improvement is pushing their annual income to $13 billion versus $11.5 billion last year.

Moreover, the picture in individual farm commodities is even brighter. Items:

Thanks to a brisk competition between steak-hungry consumers and farmers trying to rebuild their drought-depleted cattle herds by holding back or buying up heifers, beef prices were running 30 percent above last year, spreading joy from Texas to the feed lots of Kansas City.

Hogs were up 20 percent above last year and holding long after most farm economists expected a seasonal price break; many counties in the corn belt reported the most favorable corn-hog ratio in history—up to 25–1. (Usual make-money point for hog raisers is when 1 cwt. of live hog sells for 12 bushel of corn.)

Even the egg—a big thing from California to Delaware—was selling for 25 percent above last year, so high that many poultrymen feared consumers might rebel.

Partly because of the Florida freeze, but also because of continued high food demand from city folks, fresh vegetables were selling 40 percent higher than last year.

And the once heavily subsidized potato was selling, unaided, more than 150 percent higher, carrying the new farm prosperity all the way up to Maine's Aroostook County.

MAIN STREET EVIDENCE

But as far as the general United States economy was concerned, the best evidence of farm recovery was on the main streets of farm towns. In Oskaloosa, Iowa, a typical Midwestern farm market town (population 11,000), where farmers long were sullen and resentful over drought and low farm prices, Time correspondent Jonathan Rinehart found cash registers jingle-jangling more merrily than in years. Manager Ernest Dilley of the Thriftway Supermarket reported that farm wives, in a delicate shift in buying habits, suddenly had taken to buying cake mixes, scorning the economies of blending their own. Manager John Liley of the local J. C. Penny store gloated: "We had the best April we've ever had." Predicted Mrs. Gilbert Howarth of Howarth Sales & Service: "Last year we sold 15 air conditioners. This year we expect to sell 20. And that's not bad when you consider there are eight other stores in town where you can buy them."

Chevrolet Dealer Robert Knoepfler sold 15 new cars and trucks in April, cleared out 25 used ones. At first he figured that he had simply cut into his competitors' business. Then Clay Carriker, manager of Greene's Ford, said that his new-car sales for the past 60 days were 20 percent ahead of 1957, used cars 30 percent; high-priced new trucks were slow, but lower priced used trucks were hot. Another major beneficiary of the farmer's new-found prosperity was the farm-machinery business. Owner Don Berkemeir of the Lytle Implement Co. reported that he sold 25 new tractors so far this year, drew groups of up to 25 farmers at a time to his showroom to view the latest in mechanical hay balers. "Business," said Berkemeir, "is within a few dollars of double last year." Used tractors taken back as trade-ins scarcely stay in the shop long enough to be oiled and repainted. Fresh from selling off 160 head of feeder cattle, Farmer Bill Hynick, 45, dropped by recently, plunked down $1,950 for a 2-year-old model. "I've been thinking of buying for a couple of years," said Hynick. "Until now, I couldn't do it."

Not only has returning farm prosperity benefited virtually every Oskaloosa business (lumber dealer Jim Mathew figures his sales are up 50 percent, due largely to farmers fixing up the old home place or repairing the the barn), but it has brought a flock of new civic improvements in progress, for example, 3 new schools, a $200,000 bowling alley and and amusement center. Two years ago Oskaloosa, hungry for an industry payroll to offset the setbacks to farming, almost landed an American Chain & Cable Co. plant, but at the last minute lost out. Putting its finger on the reason, the Iowa Development Commission said: "Poor community attitude." Last week a commission pulse feeler passed through, asked a workman in overalls what he now thought of Oskaloosa. "Best damned town in Iowa," the workman roared.

BACK ON HIS FEET

Oskaloosa's good fortune was not unique. The Central Iowa Farm Business Association completed its annual report on 153 representative farms, reported net income in 1957 averaged $11,200, or 32 percent over 1956's $8,467 and more than 2½ times 1955's low of $4,235. For a national view, the Farm Journal polled its regional correspondents, found business noticeably better in every section except the Southeast, where rowcrop farmers have been hit by weather and acreage cuts, but livestock and poultry farmers are prospering.

Having recently been through the mill, most farmers were being prudent with their new prosperity. In Fresno, Calif., heart of the San Joaquin Valley machine-farming area, Julius Neilsen, Bank of America farm-loan representative, said: "I never saw so many farmers come in ahead of time and pay off their loans." The Iowa Life Insurance Co. reported its sales to farmers through April were up 78 percent over last year. And, said Red Oak Agent Stanley Fagerland: "When the farmer gets around to buying life insurance, you know he is getting back on his feet."

Congressmen Get Public's Own Ideas of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Monday, May 5, by Roscoe Drummond, entitled "Congressmen Get Public's Own Ideas of Foreign Aid." In his column Mr. Drummond refers to the efforts of two distinguished members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Representative A. S. J. CARNAHAN, Democrat of Missouri, and Representative CHESTER E. MORROW, Republican of New Hampshire, to disseminate the facts concerning the foreign-aid program. In so doing, they traveled some 15,000 miles to 36 cities in 25 States. During the recent hearings on the Mutual Security bill, they repeated their presentation to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The committee took the unprecedented step of adopting the following resolution of commendation:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs hereby expresses its thanks and deep sense of appreciation for the outstanding work and efforts of two valued colleagues, A. S. J. CARNAHAN of Missouri and CHESTER E. MORROW of New Hampshire, who have given unstintingly of their time in disseminating factual information concerning United States foreign policy and the mutual security program to the American people; and be it further

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs commends Representatives CARNAHAN and MORROW for the excellence of their factual presentation of information concerning the mutual security program and requests that their presentation be repeated in the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

House of Representatives during the forthcoming debate on the Mutual Security Act of 1958.

The text of Mr. Drummond's column follows:

CONGRESSMEN GET PUBLIC'S OWN IDEAS OF FOREIGN AID

WASHINGTON.—Very soon now, Congress is going to hear from the grass roots as to what a large cross section of people really think about the mutual security program and economic aid.

It will be a rather surprising report. It will be delivered in person on the floor of the House by two highly respected members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Representative A. S. J. CARNAHAN, Democrat, Missouri, and Representative CHESTER E. MERROW, Republican, New Hampshire.

Congressmen CARNAHAN and MERROW have earned their credentials. They know what they are talking about and they didn't learn it from a Government handout or by reading public opinion polls or by sitting behind their desks in the House Office Building.

Over several 2-week periods since the opening of Congress they have been traveling and tromping across the whole country talking with people, listening to people, asking questions, answering questions, and providing facts about the foreign-aid program in order that their audiences could make up their minds on the basis of the facts.

During this period they have traveled 15,000 miles to 36 cities in 25 States, made 90 platform appearances, appeared on 33 TV shows, delivered 31 broadcasts and held 28 press conferences.

And shortly, when the mutual-aid bill comes to the floor, they are going to tell Congress what they heard and what they found. They will do it at the request of the Foreign Affairs Committee. It will be an unusual procedure in that Mr. MERROW and Mr. CARNAHAN will reenact for the whole House one of their typical question-and-answer sessions with a typical grass-roots audience.

Anyone talking with Congressmen CARNAHAN and MERROW can see why their audiences liked to question them and listen to their answers. Neither is a Bryan or a Dale Carnegie. They are as unpretentious and solid and authentically American as doughnuts and a sharp single through shortstop. Both are former schoolteachers, one in the social sciences and the other in physical sciences. They are accustomed to offering facts in answer to questions, so that the questioner can better think for himself. One night they went on a disc jockey show for 30 minutes and ended up answering telephoned questions for 3 hours.

What they found was this:

That the foreign-aid program is just about the most misunderstood thing in the whole United States—more misunderstood than the sack, the dismal showing of the Los Angeles Dodgers, or Enstein's $E=MC^2$.

That when the people get the facts in their hands about the real results of the program—the way it strengthens the defenses of the United States and helps our own economy as well as other economies, they favor it overwhelmingsly and want to see it carried forward.

That many critics of mutual security are absolutely flabbergasted to learn that the United States never did build showerbaths for Egyptian camel drivers, or send striped pants to Greek undertakers, or penguins to the king of Saudi Arabia—that these are simply tall tales made up by those who try to show that economic aid is a senseless giveaway.

That while their audiences wanted hard, factual answers to practical questions—and got them—Congressmen MERROW and CARNAHAN were impressed by the number of people who, quite apart from self-interest, believed it was morally right for America to help others help themselves.

That after the facts of the foreign-aid program had been set forth, they never found more than 5 percent in any of their many audiences who were against continuing the program.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee has just approved this year's mutual-security legislation with a cut of $339 million in the appropriations ceiling. But the real test is still ahead in the appropriaitons committees, and in the Senate.

The judgment of Representatives CARNAHAN and MERROW is that Congress will do what the American people want if they make their voices heard.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

This Is My Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, an old friend of mine, Mrs. Roy E. Dealy, a teacher in the Charles H. Milby Senior High School, has sent me a copy of an inspiring essay written by one of her students, Carol Couch.

Carol is 16 years old and a junior in high school. She chose as her subject the heritage that is hers as an American.

Of this essay, Mrs. Dealy wrote me:

I thought you might be interested to know that our national and local spirit in America are still very high.

I am indeed glad to have such evidence of this as the essay by Carol Couch. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS MY HERITAGE

(By Carol Couch)

My life began when the lives of so many others were ending so horribly. The world that I came into was resounding in frightful screams. Unlike the crying of a helpless baby, the screams and cries were those of nations—equally as helpless. The time I speak of is World War II. As a tiny baby, I knew nothing of the strife and anxiety which existed around me. Slowly, relentlessly the enemy swallowed up the helpless nations that stood in its path; and with each step it took, it became more and more a threat to my own America. Husbands, fathers, sons—the men and strength of our Nation passed in a never-ending stream across the waters of our world. The world trembled with the clash of metal and cries of agony. Then abruptly it was over.

Quiet enveloped the earth. It was the quiet of a tomb, the quiet of a home where the tennis racket of a teen-age son stood in the corner—never to feel the touch of his hand again. It was the quiet of a clouded day when no sweetheart's laughter would bring sunlight into the gloom. The stream had begun again—this time in reverse, and much slower. Some returned unharmed, some on crutches or stretchers. There were those who returned in flag-draped coffins, and those who returned not at all. Wounds of the flesh heal quickly, but those of the heart and soul are much slower. After living in fear and hate for so many years, we had to learn the ways of peace.

Slowly we began our task. As war had changed the land, it had changed the people too. We began, by degrees, to return our land to what it had been. Our industries boomed. Our inventions and discoveries raised our standard of living. The luxuries we produce have made our homes more and more comfortable. We are a nation of prosperity, but not one of neglect. We have not forgotten war. Each year we spend billions to insure that if another war comes, we will be prepared.

This is my heritage. This Nation, to which I was born when its life was threatened, is mine. Its hills and valleys are mine. The sunlight shining on its rippling waters and its fields of waving wheat are mine. The dainty wildflowers that make a rainbow across the green of its meadows are mine. They have been watered with the blood of our soldiers and the tears of our women. They too are mine. I pray to our Heavenly Father that I shall never forget what price was paid for my heritage. It is my responsibility to remember—to remember my privilege and my heritage.

Address by Col. William McIntyre, President-Elect of the Society of the American Legion Founders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the address delivered by Col. William H. McIntyre, president-elect of the Society of the American Legion Founders, at the 39th anniversary of the St. Louis caucus, on May 10, 1958, at St. Louis, Mo.

As a commentary on the American Legion's past role and the challenge with which it is faced in the future, this address is well worth consideration by every veteran regardless of whether he belongs to the American Legion.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS MADE BY COL. WILLIAM H. MCINTYRE, PRESIDENT-ELECT, SOCIETY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION FOUNDERS, AT THE 39TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ST. LOUIS CAUCUS, ST. LOUIS, MO., MAY 10, 1958

My fellow Americans, once more we are observing a day of remembrance. Two months ago a birthday of the American Legion was celebrated. Today we are gathered here to commemorate a caucus which was the cradle of this great veteran organization, the American Legion. We, of the society, have kept alive the spirit which prompted its foundation. As we enter our 40th year, have we followed out the precepts as outlined in the preamble to the constitution of the American Legion?

The work of the American Legion is a beautiful story from the founding days in 1919. Looking at the record the Society of American Legion Founders has given freely of its time and funds and it can point with pride to its contributions to the many activities of the Legion. But is that enough?

In our society, the membership shows ambassadors to foreign countries, Governors of States, Members of both Houses of the Congress, judges in high courts, captains of industry, railroad and bank presidents, and insurance executives. I could go on but you all know that an unusually large percentage of our members have held positions of trust.

The American Legion is a household word throughout our great country. It is the community center of patriotic, civic, and in many cases, social activity. It uses its strength to promote the interest of the defenders of America. It has put a high premium on patriotic service in the military forces during the time of war. It has championed adequate care of disabled veterans and the protection of war widows, orphans and dependent parents. Another monumental contribution to the national welfare of our country was it sponsorship of the GI bill of rights for World War II and Korean war veterans. More than 10 million veterans went to college under these bills.

Child welfare, youth training, Boy Scouts, baseball, oratorical contests, national preparedness, and community service are some of its many interests. It has been a foremost and militant opponent to communism.

Many in our society are members of national commissions and committees. Ours is the responsibility of continued leadership.

My presence here as a speaker is but incidental. You are here, not as observers or listeners, but as participants in a ritual of personal and national remembrance. My task has been to place in words some of the thoughts and feelings which I hope are common to all of us. I salute each one who has been impelled through his own inner convictions to be here to commemorate this memorial day in a way which seems most proper and fitting.

From about 500 who attended the Paris caucus and 1,100 who attended the caucus in this city, our membership has dwindled to about 200. This we realize is due to time. We are all going along in years and traditions send our thoughts down memory lane of history accomplished.

It is my opinion that even a greater chapter in American Legion history remains to be written, since, after all, the organization is only 39 years old. The American Legion has grown into a three-war organization of such dimensions in manpower, influence, and grassroots stability, that its future contributions to community, State, and Nation will dwarf its record of service since 1919.

But the great future destiny of the American Legion does not lie in nationwide concepts. It rests upon the vision of Legionaires everywhere and what they do locally as enthusiastic individuals and as work groups for their own communities.

The key to this vision is the spirit of community service. For building good, and constantly improving, local neighborhoods is the most solid foundation for strong States and an invincible Nation.

In the spirit of community service lies the great promise of tomorrow for the American Legion. In fulfilling that promise, the American Legion can make its proud boast of a grand prelude to an immeasurable great future.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Today we are living with an H-bomb literally suspended over our heads. An H-bomb that bears the symbol of the hammer and sickle of world-conquest bent communism. At the same time we are confronted at home with a galvanized Red fifth column that has gained a new lease on life because of recent court decisions through technical rather than logical interpretations of the law. These aggressive forces within our midst are day by day raising the cost of setting up and defending America. Few citizens today have the intestinal fortitude to speak up for what they believe is right because it is easier and much less painful to remain silent. This is the challenge that faces every dedicated and patriotic American today.

The salvation of our Nation depends upon a great new rebirth of a dynamic conviction of Americanism. We must translate that conviction into positive steps whatever personal sacrifices this might entail.

Our goal should be to bring up a new generation of Americans whose word again will be as good as a gold bond, whose national pride is based on the knowledge and preservation of our very institutions, who understand the need for safeguarding and preserving every cherished American freedom and right, and who will be young men and women with the moral courage to speak up and defend their personal beliefs and national heritage.

This is a special day, a rallying day to rededicate ourselves to keep alive the memories of those who participated in the founding of our great American Legion.

Therefore, we shall build American strength, because in that direction alone lies the perpetuation of our liberty and the last best hope of freedom for all mankind.

The Inner World of Space—Importance of Action on the MURA Acceleration at Madison

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, mankind is today engaged in a historic adventure into space. This adventure is twofold: (a) An adventure into outer space; and (b) an adventure into inner space.

As a member of the Senate's Special Committee on Outer Space, I have previously pointed to some of the implications of our earth satellite and related programs. But today I refer to a race which is just as important, indeed, perhaps infinitely more so. I refer to man's unlocking the mysteries of inner space through high-speed accelerators—the new and more powerful versions of the old atom smashers which first proved, more than two decades ago, that enormous amounts of energy might be released when atoms are split.

High-speed accelerators are big news, not simply to the physicists and other scientists, but to the world as a whole. For who knows what secrets they may reveal which will utterly change our concept of matter, and which may utterly break through present barriers fronting men's minds?

In the New York Times of this morning, May 12, there is a front-page story about the high-speed accelerators. This article, however difficult it may be for us laymen to comprehend, points to as significant an adventure as any which is now occurring anywhere in this land.

RUSSIA HAS BIGGEST ACCELERATOR

A few highlights of this article are:

First. The world's biggest accelerator is, unfortunately, not in the United States; it is in the Soviet Union.

Second. The biggest accelerator in the United States is the Bevatron, of the University of California, in Berkeley.

Third. But the most promising of all proposed American projects, one which will dwarf the bevatron of California, is the famous MURA project sponsored by the Midwest Universities Research Association, for this MURA project will provide the equivalent of 540 billion electron volts in collision.

TWO NOTED MURA LEADERS

Fourth. The designer of the proposed MURA accelerator is Dr. Keith Symon, a physics professor at the University of Wisconsin, who is technical director of MURA. I was pleased to have Dr. Symon in my office recently, and to have him give me the latest account of the progress toward the realization of the MURA project. Accompanying him was another distinguished leader, Dr. R. O. Rollefson, director of MURA, and also a professor of physics at Madison.

Fifth. In my judgment, no finer home for the accelerator could be established than in the Midwest universities, and in one university particularly, I may say with pride which I feel is pardonable, the University of Wisconsin, a real home of free inquiry. It is, in my judgment, far preferable to a Government laboratory, as such; that is, a laboratory staffed and controlled entirely by Government personnel answering to higher Government personnel and carrying out perhaps an overly rigid, not flexible, Government program.

Sixth. A further fact developed in this article is that so far MURA programs have almost been starved for lack of funds.

The office of MURA is on the second floor of a 40-year-old converted garage on University Avenue in Madison. There is no window, only a skylight, but here the brilliant minds of dedicated men of the Midwest and from elsewhere are marshaling for this great adventure into inner space.

Seventh. I wish I could indicate that all of the Federal Government agencies with appropriations available have displayed a sympathetic, encouraging attitude toward the 540-bev accelerator, as it is known.

A great many Federal Government officials have been most enthusiastic and cooperative. Others, I say frankly, rather less so.

These latter seem to prefer tightly controlled Government laboratories, exclusively, rather than university laboratories' greater freedom of action. But the past is past; it is the future that counts.

WORLD SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION ON ATOMS FOR PEACE

Eighth. A further fact that I should like to point out is that the scientists of many nations are now at work on parallel paths in this probing of what are now estimated as the 30 elementary particles of the atom. For example, a Japanese physicist, working with MURA, as pointed out in the Times article, has made most interesting comment with regard to the project.

I earnestly hope that from the universities of other countries—from the genius of France, England, Italy and other lands—will come the essential cooperation with our university and other laboratories that will make it possible for man to proceed with maximum efficiency in this adventure to inner space.

This is part and parcel of the International Science for Peace Program to which I have previously referred. Let us welcome the free flow of data for peaceful uses, among the scientists of the free world.

FRENCH ATOM CHIEF HEADS 1958 ATOMIC CONFERENCE AT GENEVA

Apropos of such cooperation, from September 1 to 13, there will be held in Geneva the second Atoms for Peace Conference. Already 2,300 abstracts have been submitted.

President of the conference will be Dr. Francis Perrin, French High Commissioner for Atomic Energy. Secretary-General will be Dr. Sigvard Eklund, head of the Swedish Atomic Energy Commission. An interesting interview with Dr. Eklund may be found in this months' issue of Forum Memo, published by the Atomic Industrial Forum.

I may say that back in 1955, I had been pleased to edit a Senate document, entitled "Atoms for Peace Manual" which was well received at the first Geneva Atoms Conference, and by the United States State Department and United States Information Agency.

I salute now the scientists of MURA and wish them well in their great undertaking.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief listing of my earlier statements in the RECORD on the MURA project and the Times biographical notes on Dr. Symon, be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY'S PREVIOUS CONGRESSIONAL RECORD STATEMENTS REGARDING MURA PROJECT

February 28, 1957, pages A1594–A1597.
August 23, 1957, page A6991.
January 13, 1958, pages A172–A173.
February 19, 1958, pages 2039–2041.

[From the New York Times of May 12, 1958]

A SOUND ATOM SMASHER

(Keith Randolph Symon)

MADISON, WIS., May 11.—Dr. Keith Randolph Symon, whose dream is to build the world's largest atom smasher, is a sound man.

The term, a colleague explained, means that when he comes up with an idea, chances are that it will be right. "And that," his colleague remarked, "is mighty important when you are dealing with hundreds of millions of dollars." At the age of 38, Dr.

Symon is a physics professor at the University of Wisconsin and technical director of the Midwestern Universities Research Association, known as MURA.

He is relaxed to the point of seeming diffidence. His coworkers describe him as the acme of level-headedness and reasonableness, and a theorist with an unusual amount of experimental experience.

Dr. Symon, a square-jawed, husky man, is a former Sea Scout skipper (equivalent of a land scoutmaster). He has built an 8-foot Eskimo-type kayak with room for himself and the smaller of his 4 children (2 boys, 2 girls). He paddles the kayak on Lake Mendota, 1 of Madison's 4 lakes.

AN OUTDOOR FAMILY

The Symons are an outdoor family, and often swim and picnic together.

Dr. Symon possesses a green thumb and, despite heavy shade, has raised a brilliantly green lawn that is the envy of the neighbors.

He is a moderate devotee of the home workshop, hi-fi (traditional classical music) and home movies. His home reading is mostly of scientific material. He wishes he had kept up with his tennis.

He's, however, a star on the physics department baseball team and can pilot a plane.

A current project is teaching himself Russian at home.

His manner is impassive until he warms up. Then he displays a quick sense of humor. He can explain his field to a layman in simple language without patronizing the listener.

His MURA office is on the second floor of a 40-year-old converted garage on University Avenue. The first floor is a jungle of equipment and machine shop tools. His office is closet-sized. The floor slants. There is no window, only a skylight. But there is the trademark of the atomic scientists, a blackboard covered with cryptic equations.

Dr. Symon ranks high among the designers of giant accelerators. But his reputation will not be firmly established until the MURA machine has been built—the Atomic Energy Commission and Congress willing.

However, there can be no question so far that this young scientist has moved steadily forward in an exacting field.

He was born in Fort Wayne, Ind., the son of a printing company owner, and grew up in Terre Haute, Ind.

He went to Harvard to become a lawyer, but turned to science after taking a sophomore physics course under Profs. Wendell H. Furry and Jabez C. Street. He is a Phi Beta Kappa.

Dr. Symon's A. B. degree was in mathematics and philosophy (chiefly logic). But he had studied enough physics credits to be a physics major, too.

TWO HARVARD DEGREES

He won his master of arts and doctor of philosophy in theoretical physics at Harvard in 1943 and 1948 respectively.

He married the former Mary Louise Reinhardt of Wheaton, Ill., a biology major at Radcliffe in 1943.

During World War II he was in the Naval Research Laboratory in Washington, first as a civilian and then as an ensign.

While teaching at Wayne University in Detroit in 1954 he conceived the design for the $100 million atom smasher. He came to Wisconsin in 1956.

Dr. Symon would like to see interuniversity scientific cooperation developed further. His ideal is a small permanent staff connected with the university and in close touch with graduate students. He would supplement this by a larger rotating staff of scientists who would be detached for a year or two from their regular academic duties at Wisconsin and other MURA universities.

Viewpoints on Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, it is good for the Nation that the people are taking an interest in the reorganization of our Armed Forces. Regardless of our personal feelings, we should encourage consideration of that important subject.

The Pittsburgh Press of May 7 contained an able editorial entitled "Viewpoints on Defense." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIEWPOINTS ON DEFENSE

Today we have the exhilarating example of two important and patriotic Americans who seldom think alike, yet here they act toward the same end. That end is unity and adequacy of our Nation's defense.

One is Representative CLARENCE CANNON, a Democratic lawmaker from Missouri who, as chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House, has responsibility for the billions of dollars spent each year on defense. The other is President Eisenhower, an old soldier from Kansas, now President and leader of the Republican Party.

Says the President, with no dulcet tones: "From these changes (his Army, Navy, Air Force reorganization plan), I expect very specific results: A stronger, more efficient defense, and every spring, come appropriation time, a more rational, less noisy defense."

And says Mr. CANNON:

"It is high time we put an end to this insane bickering between the services, and eliminated billions of wastage, and begin to develop sufficient military strength to keep us out of war."

Speaking to the House, Mr. CANNON challenged to battle another influential man in Congress—CARL VINSON, Democratic chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. Mr. VINSON has accused the President of trying to set up a "Prussian-type General Staff."

Mr. CANNON has long been a critic of the Navy—Mr. VINSON's pet service. He blamed Pearl Harbor on the perpetual rivalry between the Army and Navy.

Mr. CANNON spoke disdainfully of "the obtuse admirals who never forget how the last war was fought and never learn how to fight the next war."

But his most effective attack on the opponents of the President's plan came with his charge that the Navy has "deliberately duplicated other military facilities at a waste of billions of tax dollars."

Since all the appropriations for the Armed Services go through Mr. CANNON's committee, he should know. And for the doubters he gave the following example of wasted billions:

"On the Potomac River in sight of the Capitol is the Army's Bolling Field. And right beside it, with only a line between, the Navy has the Anacostia Naval Air Station. Each has its own fire department with its firemen and equipment. Only one is needed. Each has its own ambulance service and its own hospital staff. Only one is needed. Each has its own chaplain, its own recreation facilities, and its own mess service. Army libraries and Navy libraries, Army officers' clubs and Navy officers' clubs, Army steam baths and Navy steam baths, Army post offices and Navy post offices, and other duplications too numerous to mention.

"There is a control tower for each field, a weather staff at each field, a communications staff at each field, and each field maintains its own ready crews and repair and maintenance organization.

"The cost of maintaining this unnecessary duplication in this one instance alone runs into the millions. And there are similar instances all over the country."

The Pentagon is a complex organization, and we don't profess to know all the answers. But, for our money, Mr. VINSON has got to talk a lot faster—and with more logic—to convince us that President Eisenhower and Mr. CANNON aren't talking commonsense.

Peace and the American Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the questions which troubles us all, though we try to shunt it to the back part of our minds, is what would happen to the American economy if we really brought an end to the cold war.

No one knows the answer to the question, but it is too important to ignore. The Milwaukee Journal, a great and responsible newspaper, raised this question in a challenging editorial in its edition of Sunday, May 11. It is a disturbing editorial, and it ought to be read.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Can We Afford Real Peace?" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN WE AFFORD REAL PEACE?

There is a haunting worry about our strange, unnatural economy that goes deeper than recession. In cold-blooded terms: Can we afford real peace?

James Marlow, the Associated Press news analyst, has detected this question relentlessly staring at us from between the lines of recent remarks by President Eisenhower—though the President does not seem to have meant it to be there or seen it there.

His remarks were a plea, to both Congress and the Nation, for the whole $4 billion of foreign-aid money that he seeks. He departed from arguing the vital demands of our own security through strengthening of the non-Communist world, and put the plea on this basis also:

"I remind everyone that 80 cents out of every dollar that we spend for mutual aid does not go to foreign lands. It goes to work right here at home. That means hundreds of thousands of jobs for American workers. It means large outlays for American machinery, iron and steel, farm goods, chemicals, and motor vehicles."

See how pregnant this is with the unasked question, the awful one? If we dare not cut even part of the $4 billion lest thousands lose their jobs, how about the rest of the $40 billion that the cold war is costing us every year? How would our economy stand

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the shock if, say, a major disarmament agreement should cut off much of that support?

The desperate fact is that the economy is not at all a normal peacetime one. It is a war economy in almost every sense except the lack of fighting. And it has come to depend, to a frightening degree, on the colossal stream of military spending that is poured into it. And it is from even this kind of unsound, unconstructive basis that the economy has disturbingly receded.

It is vital, of course, for the Nation to get quickly over the recession and restore at least the 1956 type of full economy, to keep itself girded in the world struggle. It is at present inescapable, too, to continue a maximum defense effort, of which foreign aid is a key part.

Yet our right and only ultimate goal is real peace, and either it or annihilation must come. And with peace, what then? It is too easy to talk about all the other, better things the Government might do with $40 billion a year, to keep it underpinning the economy. But could it happen? Could the dreamiest dreamer turn any big part of the $40 billion into civil benefits without creating an all-embracing paternalistic state beyond all dreams? (Eisenhower couldn't get even a few hundred million to build schools.)

In the alternative, with 10 or 20 or 30 billions suddenly taken out of it, could the economy possibly escape grinding to a halt in the most racking depression ever? Some will say wishfully that it can and somehow would escape, but we ought to be doing a lot more worrying about how.

Proctor Dam Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it was my privilege last week to appear before the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee to urge an appropriation to complete planning and to initiate construction of an important flood control and water conservation project in Comanche County, Tex.—the Proctor Dam project, on the Leon River.

I have now received the text of a resolution passed by the Comanche County Chamber of Commerce in support of this project. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY'S CERTIFICATE

I, O. O. Brightman, secretary of the Comanche Chamber of Commerce, hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of a resolution passed at a special meeting of the board of directors May 2, 1958:

"Whereas the Comanche Chamber of Commerce has repeatedly endorsed the Proctor Dam project on the Leon River; and

"Whereas appropriations for continued planning are now under study by the appropriate committee of Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the Board of Directors of the Comanche Chamber of Commerce, do hereby request the continued support of our Representative and Senators for the construction of the Proctor Dam on the Leon River."

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the chamber this 2d day of May 1958.

O. O. BRIGHTMAN, *Secretary*.

Free Enterprise in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOS. E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, American agriculture is free enterprise at its best. Our farmers present a sharp contrast to the highly centralized agricultural production in Soviet Russia. We not only preserve the human values of individual initiative, but we also attain a much higher level of agricultural production.

I was most interested in the remarks made by the new Russian Ambassador, Mikhail A. Menshikov, before the Economic Club of New York on Tuesday evening, April 15, 1958. His statement shows that the Russians now realize that to achieve maximum agricultural production they must abandon their centralized bureaucratic control over agriculture. He stated that Soviet agriculture will now largely be patterned after our own type of farming in which tractors and other farm equipment are owned by the farmers themselves. While the Russians extol the virtues of communism, they use capitalist incentives to increase production. There is an obvious lesson in these remarks for our people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of Ambassador Menshikov's remarks to the Economic Club of New York dealing with agriculture may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Now we turn to the progress of agriculture in the U. S. S. R.

The nature of this progress is shown by the fact that grain production in the U. S. S. R. now is 3 times above that of Russia in 1913. In the same period the production of cotton and vegetables increased sixfold. We had a threefold boost in sugar beet and that hardy staple, the potato.

In the course of our 40 years we have advanced from a primitive, backward agriculture with its ancient hand tools and wooden plows to a highly mechanized and scientific agriculture. Millions of tractors, combines, and other machines are at work today on the fields of our country. In the past 4 years we have carried out a sharp increase in agricultural production. It has witnessed great increases in the total yield of grain; much more livestock has come to market and the output of meat and dairy products is far heavier. We gained hundreds of millions of bushels of grain through the cultivation of about 90 million acres of virgin and long-fallow lands.

Our farmers are now working on the problem of rapidly increasing the volume of livestock products.

We are aware that American farmers have scored great advances in this field. Soviet farmers, backed by the entire nation, have made it their job to catch up with the United States in the per capita production of meat, milk, and butter within the next few years. Our population is somewhat larger than yours, so per capita production means more in the way of total volume of production.

We hope to succeed in this job we've cut out for ourselves. But we most earnestly trust that you won't hold it against us for trying. We like to think of it as a sort of friendly competition. And after all, it's for the benefit, for the good of men, women, and children.

Of course we'll be glad when other countries, including the United States, improve their own standards of living. This is how we understand the meaning of peaceful coexistence. This is how we want to get along together—by racing to improve the well-being of the people—by scoring progress in education, in science, in the arts. Who could argue about that?

The decision to reorganize the machine-and-tractor stations which was adopted at last month's session of the Soviet Parliament, the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R., will undoubtedly make a real contribution to the further development of Soviet agriculture. Up to now, all agricultural machinery, tractors, and combines were concentrated at these stations. But this form of serving the nation's collective farms no longer met their needs in the face of the need to make greater and more rapid increases in production.

So, after a nationwide discussion with millions of the Nation's working farmers and urban dwellers taking part, the Soviet Parliament decided on a reorganization program under which the agricultural machinery will be sold to the collective farms.

This step will permit the more effective use of the machines, tractors and so on. It will give greater initiative to the collective farmers. It will help put agricultural production to higher levels.

I suppose that at this point, you as business people and economists, will be asking yourselves, "That's all right, but how can these peasants on the collective farms buy all that machinery?" Well, I have news for you. They have spot cash in thousands of cases. They have productive acreage in the rest and they'll do all right.

The decision to sell agricultural machines to the collective farms became possible because these farms are now economically strong. The annual income of an average collective farm in 1957 amounted to 1,250,000 rubles. That's only the average, and it's not hay.

At the present time, our collective farms have qualified workers and are able to make productive use of varied and complicated equipment supplied by our industry.

So there's no doubt that the reorganization of the machine-and-tractor stations, like that of industry's management, will soon show an even higher rate of economic development in the people's interest.

American Industry Must Be Protected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the letter written by Hon. Donald Comer, chairman of the executive board of

Avondale Mills, Inc., to the editor of Fortune Magazine in reply to that publication's May issue editorial, National Interest Versus Tariff.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AVONDALE MILLS,
Birmingham, Ala., May 5, 1958.

EDITOR, FORTUNE MAGAZINE,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I have just read in your May issue your editorial National Interest Versus Tariff. In this you suggest the elimination of the escape clause and liquidation of the Tariff Commission features in the reciprocal trade program.

Surely you remember that when President Eisenhower wrote to Congressman MARTIN asking his support of this measure, he promised that no American industry would be injured and mentioned as a guaranty of this the fact that the legislation carried these escape clauses with promised review by the Tariff Commission by any industry being hurt.

As I understand it, your philosophy is that there should be no tariff and that the consumer in America should buy wherever in the world he could buy the cheapest. We might disagree on why America today is so outstanding among nations but I would like to argue that the basic reasons is because of the protective tariff. We have paid high wages and have developed an industrial empire over here because the people who make what America makes have been paid wages high enough to buy the product their labor produced. The American wage is the highest in the world but we can claim no superiority in skill to Europe, or today even to Asia. During the early years, with the help of the machine, we were free from the threat of handmade things from Asia and the tariff protected us from Europe.

This letter is primarily concerned for the protection of our textile interest, though the threat today is very much broader. The Japanese have the same textile machinery that we have. As a matter of fact, a Japanese company has just offered to build for Avondale Mills a cotton mill in California and even lend the Japanese employees to start the mill off in case we were not quite familiar with their machinery. Of course, their argument was that they could build the mill so much cheaper than American textile people could build it.

If we should follow your philosophy, Japan and other Asian countries would quickly capture the American market and after our industry had been expended, I wonder who would guarantee the continuation of their low prices in our market.

We may never have another war, but we are spending $40 billion a year in our budget, just in case. Do you remember that the late Secretary Knox said that the textile industry was second only to steel in our country's defense needs?

I notice that you are critical of Mr. Phillip Reed, head of General Electric Co., for urging some tariff protection for his industry. In looking through your magazine, I see that General Electric carried, I think, nine pages of advertising. I am not arguing that an advertiser should control the editorial policy of a paper, but I am arguing that if you take his money and then pursue an editorial policy that he thinks is not for his best interest, but indeed threatens his very life, you should at least give your readers a chance to hear his side of the case—expressed by him or someone selected by him.

Among your list of advertisers, I notice Daniel Construction Co. and J. E. Sirrine Co., both of Greenville, S. C. Both of these companies have been very largely occupied in the past years in building and owning cotton mills. You carry an advertisement from the Southern Co., the company that controls all the power companies of the Southeast and supplies the power that runs our mills. You carry an advertisement duPont Co., from whom we buy our dyes, paints and chemicals of one kind or another. You carry an advertisement from Wellington-Sears Co., a part of the West Point Manufacturing Co.—one of the largest textile companies in Alabama. You carry an advertisement from the Tennessee Industrial and Agricultural Development Co. and from the West Virginia and Arkansas Development Co. These agencies are seeking for expanding industry in their respective States, but under your philosophy, they might as well close up because they would lose the industries they have already. I was interested that you had an advertisement from Excelo Shirts from New York. They wouldn't last long with the increased imports from Hong Kong.

For another side of this question, I would like to refer you to the May issue of American Mercury Magazine in which is reprinted a guest editorial from the Nashville Banner and an article by Senator GEORGE W. MALONE and others.

Don't you think that your advertisers who surely disagree with your free-trade policy are entitled to some consideration and should be invited to express their different opinions? This is not with any thought that this would change your editorial policy but only in the interest of fair play.

Yours very truly,

DONALD COMER,
Chairman, Executive Board.

The Role of the Soil Conservation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the role of the Soil Conservation Service in a myriad of contributions to the individual western farmer has often gone unmentioned. Where great expanses of the desert have become fertile and productive through reclamation, accompanying problems of soil preservation and management have required expert and technical solution. These answers have been competently provided by the Soil Conservation Service through a corps of dedicated soil scientists.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a feature article from the Boise (Idaho) Statesman of May 5, 1958, the story of an enterprising farmer-homesteader on the Black Canyon reclamation project in Idaho. It graphically portrays the outstanding work being done by the Idaho farmer through our excellent soil conservation districts, and the superb assistance being afforded by soil conservation specialists. It also emphasizes the ability of the American farmer to learn and apply the practices which will assure the fertility of the soil for the generations ahead.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLACK CANYON FARMER CHANGES DESERT LAND TO BLOOMING FARM

(By Denton Brewerton)

CALDWELL.—John W. Brown, farmer-homesteader in the Black Canyon reclamation project, first saw the 90 acres of land that later was to become the Brown home 7 years ago. It had never felt a plow and the native sod was broken only by scattered patches of sagebrush extending the length and breadth of the land. Today, the land tells a different story.

"Soil building is fun," he said, "but it takes patience and determination to enjoy the fruits of your labor."

He said it was a big thrill for the Browns when the first land-leveling equipment moved onto the farm.

"The high places were cut as much as 6 feet in depth, while fills in the low areas were made up to 9 feet deep in some places. It seemed like there was nothing left on the farm but bright colored subsoil," he added.

SOIL BIGGEST PROBLEM

From the start, Brown said he recognized the soil as his biggest problem. It was a burned-out desert soil nearly devoid of organic matter. Slick spots also were present throughout the farm. He said such spots are common in the Black Canyon and are characterized by adobe conditions with chemical problems to really make it tough for a farmer.

The water intake rate of the soil posed a problem.

"We turned from 4 to 5 gallons of water per minute down each corrugate," he explained. "And it seemed like every drop was wasted off the lower end of the field. We set the water on 700-foot runs for 72 hours and sometimes longer before enough water was taken into the soil to last until the next irrigation."

The Browns had taken nearly all of their cash reserve for a house, some livestock and the leveling and now had enough for seed and fertilizer. They had to beat the soil problem and make it pay.

FIRST CROPS PLANNED

The first crops were planned to provide green manure over as much of the farm as possible during the first season. In every grain crop, the homesteader included a generous seeding of white-blossom sweet clover, which was turned under in the early fall.

Orchard grass was seeded with alfalfa as a hay mixture to provide the soil-building qualities of the grass roots. Enough straw was baled to furnish bedding for the livestock during the winter and the rest was worked into the soil.

Brown had started his farm on the road to workability and a good harvest, but he still needed more and better management. He was inside the canyon soil-conservation district and requested assistance on the farm.

Technicians from the soil-conservation service studied the problems and helped Brown organize his plans. A soil survey was taken to show the different types of soil on his farm. The technicians helped him prepare a complete farm plan based on the ability of his soils to produce and to be used in the cropping program of the farm.

He started on a rotation plan for his farm, including alfalfa-grass hay for 2 years (the third crop of hay was plowed under for green manure on the second year) and row crops for 1 year.

On another type of soil on his farm he used a plan to include alfalfa-grass hay for 3 years, grain with red clover seeded in for green manure for 1 year, followed with grain and new seeding of alfalfa-grass hay the fifth year.

PLOW DISCONTINUED

Brown worked and talked soil building for the next several years. He discontinued

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

using the plow except for plowing green-manure crops and located a chisel-type tillage tool that he worked from 12 to 14 inches deep to mix the crop residue with the soil instead of turning it under.

Soil-building practices are beginning to pay off for Brown, who also is chairman of the board of supervisors of the canyon soil-conservation district.

The time required for each irrigation has been reduced by two-thirds, while the interval between irrigations has been more than doubled.

Along with that, man-hour demands on the farm have been reduced, while the overall farm production has more than doubled since he started his soil-building work and long-range planning for the future.

Trade: A Weapon in a Real War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New Orleans Item of May 7, 1958:

TRADE: A WEAPON IN A REAL WAR

Without trade we stagnate.

Simply and bluntly, that is the way Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN of Texas summed up the necessity for extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act by Congress.

"Mr. SAM," addressing the inauguration banquet for Mayor Morrison and the city council members here Monday night, laid some facts of economic life on the line:

Only $3 billion worth of United States imports last year could be considered in competition with United States-produced goods—this to be contrasted with the $19.5 billion worth of agricultural products and manufactured goods exported by the United States.

As opposition mounts to the importation of Japanese cotton goods, it must be remembered that Nippon textiles account for only 1.4 percent of the textiles sold in this country, and for this bagatelle we risk losing our greatest friend in the Far East.

Foreign markets buy up 20 to 40 percent of the United States cotton and rice crops.

Yet, even with the backing of such a powerful political figure as Speaker RAYBURN, everyone in Washington is willing to agree that the reciprocal trade program, due to expire June 30, is in more trouble than it has been at any time since its conception by Cordell Hull in 1934.

Paradoxically, the source of most of its trouble is to be found among the southerners in Congress, the men who represent the region that for 150 years was the citadel of free trade.

The President has asked for a 5-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which allows the United States to enter into freer trade agreements with foreign nations.

Congressional veterans who in the past decade have fought in the seven legislative battles to repeatedly extend the 1934 act, believe the President will be lucky to get a 1-year extension, and that, even then, the act is likely to be riddled with weakening amendments.

Rising unemployment and slowed production have thrown a scare into many Members of Congress who in the past have given support to the reciprocal trade program.

But the biggest single bloc of opposition today comes from certain areas in the South. According to David Koonce of the North American Newspaper Alliance, as many as 85 southerners in the House—20 percent of that body—and 16 southern Senators may be marshaled against extension of the act.

Back in 1934, not a single southerner in Congress voted against the original act. Why the change?

The answer lies in the great changes that have been talking place over the South, especially since World War II. What was once the cotton South is today the textile South.

Thirty-five years ago, North and South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama grew about one-third of the Nation's cotton. In 1957, these States produced only about 2 million bales—the same amount grown last year in California alone.

On the other hand, the Carolinas, Georgia, and Alabama today spin, weave, and finish almost three-fourths of the Nation's textile goods.

Mr. SAM, after serving the cotton-producing State of Texas for 45 years in Congress, takes the longer range, worldwide view of the matter. Monday night he said:

"We must trade with Japan. If we lose Japan we lose the East. We must trade with Western Europe because if we don't, Russia will."

Russia has openly declared war on the West in the field of trade.

It is a war we cannot win if each segment of our great industrial potential runs to Congress for special protection—no more than we could have hoped to win the last two great world wars if each able-bodied man had attempted the same course of action.

And, the textile industry cannot be singled out in this matter. It only happens to be the latest to take up self-defensive arms—and at a crucial moment in the life of the reciprocal trade program.

In this economic war with international communism the West's most effective weapon will be free trade. If we do not forge such a weapon—well, let us quote Speaker RAYBURN once more:

"Russia may win the world without firing a shot."

Federal Assistance in Pollution Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, within the next few weeks we will have the opportunity to discuss the appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal year 1959. This appropriation bill contains, among many other vital funds, a $45 million allotment for the necessary continuation of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. I urge that all Members of the Senate give this expenditure favorable consideration.

As we all know, with urbanization and industrialization expanding more every day, pollution of our Nation's streams and rivers becomes a problem of rising importance. The United States Public Health Service, in cooperation with State and local authorities and with private groups, has been doing a yeoman anti-pollution job; but infinitely more must still be done, and it takes funds to do it.

Pollution of course endangers the physical well-being of citizens who use water from these streams for drinking, recreation, and other purposes. However, polluted water can be exceedingly harmful to the economic health of many areas of our Nation, as well. The areas to which I refer are those which are especially dependent on recreational activities for their livelihood. Fishing, boating, swimming, and many other out-of-doors recreational pursuits are dependent on pure water, free from pollution.

In my own State of Wisconsin, as in many other States of the Union, this latter type of water utilization plays a vitally important part in the economy. People from all parts of our great Nation have rightly made it a habit to come to Wisconsin in order that they may enjoy nature at its very best.

In keeping with Wisconsin's fine tradition of preserving her natural advantages, many communities have wisely taken first steps toward assuring continued pure water in their areas. Many communities have antipollution projects in blueprint stages, and lack only adequate financing to put the plans for sewerage-treatment plants into operation.

It is this type of financing which has made the Federal Water Pollution Control Act one of the most beneficial Government grant-in-aid programs.

I am in receipt of a letter and petition from Mr. James E. Spendler, secretary of the Wisconsin Division of the Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., the fine organization which has done so much to preserve and conserve our Nation's outdoor recreational areas. This petition is rightly in support of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. I request that the petition be printed with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 3, ADOPTED ON APRIL 19, 1958, BY THE WISCONSIN DIVISION, IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC. IN STATE CONVENTION ASSEMBLED IN DELAFIELD, WIS.

Whereas the major rivers in Wisconsin can no longer bear their intolerable burden of industrial waste and human filth; and

Whereas pollution of the State waters is a growing peril to industry, agriculture and to the welfare of thousands; and

Whereas the Federal Government wants to stimulate immediate employment; and

Whereas Wisconsin communities have $7 million of critically needed construction blueprinted and approved by the State pollution committee for sewers, sanitary plants, and improvements of existing plants to protect Wisconsin precious water supplies from pollution; and

Whereas if the Government is going to spur public employment, the cleaning up of the public waters would help in protecting public welfare, and aid industry and agriculture; and

Whereas the construction of such sanitary plants and sewers would result in employment in the State for unskilled labor, construction trades and stimulate employment in manufacturing plants of pollution abatement equipment: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Wisconsin Division of Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., in

State convention assembled this 19th day of April 1958, in Delafield, Wis., That the President and the Congress grant sufficient funds to enable this critically needed construction in Wisconsin and elsewhere; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators Wiley, Proxmire, and Theodore Wisniewski and all other persons and groups important to affirmative action upon its provisions.

Corporate Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOS. E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, America's capitalism is a people's capitalism. It draws its strength from the voluntary participation of free citizens. Consumers exercising their right to buy or not to buy determine what shall be produced and in what quantity. Workers select the jobs which seem most attractive and which give them the maximum opportunity for self-expression.

More than 10 million Americans from all walks of life have invested directly in America's business enterprises. Another 100 million citizens indirectly participate in the ownership of our industry through insurance policies, mutual savings bank accounts, pension plans, mutual funds, or other forms of investment.

Not so many years ago the annual reports of most corporate enterprises were confined to financial and operating details. Today, management is well aware that corporate citizenship is a responsibility which is just as important as research, engineering, or marketing.

The 1957 annual report of the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana contains a most illuminating statement that outlines the manner in which this important industrial enterprise has discharged its responsibilities in the communities in which it operates.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement on corporate citizenship may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORPORATE CITIZENSHIP

Every corporation is, by law, a person in the courts. It can sue and be sued. But a corporation ought to be a person in a sense much broader and more meaningful than that. It should be a person in the sense of being a good citizen of the community, alert to its responsibilities.

Our company accepts as a guiding principle that it should be an upstanding person in that second and deeper meaning.

We recognize that we have a duty, along with all other citizens, to help, through organized agencies, in relieving the distress of the unfortunate. So it is that our companies and foundations created by them have contributed to community funds and the Red Cross.

We have been concerned that we should help in erasing or at least alleviating disease. So it is that we have given unrestricted grants to assist in various areas of basic medical research.

We have accepted it as our duty to help forward the education that is a mainstay of a dynamic democracy. We have underwritten generously the cause of education. In part we have done this by awarding scholarships and graduate fellowships. In part we have done it by contributing to the National Merit Scholarship Fund, through it giving scholarships for undergraduate study to the outstanding children of our employees. In largest part we have done it by making gifts without strings to the State and regional associations of private, 4-year, liberal arts colleges.

We have recognized an obligation to help train and inspire the youth of today, who are the leaders of tomorrow, to the ways of a good life. We have contributed both money and technical skills to the support of youth organizations—the 4-H Club, the Future Farmers of America, Junior Achievement.

We have acknowledged that we should share in the giving of time and effort, as well as of money, to movements for civic betterment. All who work for Standard have been encouraged to participate actively in such movements—church groups, the scouts, school boards, on down a long list. Thousands of our people, from directors to beginning junior clerks, have participated and are doing so now.

Basic as these responsibilities are, however, a corporation has obligations even more basic. To its customers, it must furnish good products at fair prices. To its employees, it must provide the conditions, opportunities, and rewards that promote and recognize loyal and efficient service. To its stockholders, it owes a fair return on their investment and a constant endeavor to protect and enlarge their property. To suppliers and all others with whom it has business relations, it has a responsibility for considerate and ethical dealings. Finally, to society as a whole it owes a fair accounting of its activities, and the articulate expression of its views and philosophy with the end in view of making available an adequate basis for evaluative judgment.

It is within this framework of good citizenship that we seek to function.

The Irish Cause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter concerning Ireland by a student of Irish history, Mr. William J. Conlon, 23 Breed Street, Lynn, Mass.:

Democracy cannot operate in secrecy. Dictators and would-be dictators and little men with totalitarian leanings know this well. They do their utmost to control the press, stifle public opinion, develop spinelessness, and buy off opposition. All the better to work out their scheming in the dark where the people will have no chance of checking on them. We are perilously close to that situation in Ireland today. It was an American statesman who said "You can't be crooked in the light." It's high time the Irish people understood this. It is time they made up their minds to end the crookedness in the dark. They still have the power. For how long we would not care to guess. We think if the truth were known about what is happening in Ireland today there would be an outraged cry from the Irish people all over the world, but the truth is not known. It is buried or else labeled propaganda.

Let us remove Nelson's Pillar from O'Connell Street in Dublin, and let's prove to the world our sincere desire to be a free sovereign state.

Consider these things: Our people in the north are being persecuted and crucified, whole areas are being turned into terror zones, prisoners are being tortured, and young men are in arms against tyranny. How much of this story is known? We would hazard a guess that Americans and others know more about what is happening in the north (albeit from biased sources) than the average citizen in the south.

Do the citizens of the south and 26 counties know what is happening in the 6 counties with the approval of the Dublin Dail? Among our tourist attractions we can now boast of a concentration camp at the Curragh, County Kildare, which comes under the supervision of the Dublin Government. We may not have a plan to end unemployment or emigration but we have a concentration camp at the Curragh, County Kildare, and we have semisecret trials. Indeed that is not the end of the list. We have a secret police force working in conjunction with Britain's security forces in occupied Ireland (namely, the six stolen counties of Ireland).

We have given the power to some minor police official to seize newspapers and to haul men off to jail, for the crime of putting up posters, demanding the release of Irish prisoners (Irish Republicans), and we have the shameless hypocrisy of men who pay tribute to our republican dead, while they jail and hound our republican living. There are men in this country with influence in high places who know these things, but who haven't the moral backbone to stand up and condemn them. There are men who march in processions under banners proclaiming their part in the struggle against the infamous Black and Tan regime almost 40 years ago. Have they spoken out for the youth of this generation who have taken over where they left off? Some perhaps have, but too many who march in processions to honor the dead of 40 years ago appear to have closed their eyes and stuffed their ears to the sights and sounds in occupied Ireland that was illegally stolen by England.

Colonel Topping, a successor of Sir Edward Carson, in the stolen 6 counties of Ireland, said, and is proud to boast that his R. U. C. commandos are a "Black and Tan terror force."

The London Times can open an article on occupied Ireland with the startling assertion: "The Irish border owes its existence entirely to the determination of the Sinn Fein movement to break the link with Britain." And yet politicians get away with the lie that it is the young men of Ireland today who are responsible for the present situation.

The Irish Times, hardly an organ of Republican opinion, was closer to reality on December 10 when it remarked editorially while commenting on the London Times article: "Throughout the free world is there a solitary country in which a third of the electorate is solidly opposed to the regime? Not merely as in normal democracies to the government but to the whole conception of the state as it stands?"

And again, after quoting the London Times sermon on the 26 counties resolution to remain under the Crown and to keep the Union Jack flying the editorial noted: "Something similar might be said of Algerian resolution to remain part of metropolitan France, but who would dare to say it?"

And is there outside Algeria a case comparable to that of Northern Ireland on this side of the Iron Curtain?

Is there, indeed? Isn't it time, the people of the 26 counties woke up to this fact?

Isn't it time they told their political leaders to stop being England's policemen in Ireland?

WM. JAS. CONLON.

LYNN, MASS.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Talmadge Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial entitled, "A Significant Plan," from the May 8, 1958, issue of the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal; the editorial entitled, "Talmadge's Farm Plan," from the May 7, 1958, issue of the Griffin (Ga.) Daily News as written by its editor, Hon. Quimby Melton, Jr.; and the column entitled "Talmadge's Farm Plan" written by Hon. Turner Rockwell, editor of the Valdosta (Ga.) Daily Times in a recent issue of that publication.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SIGNIFICANT PLAN

Senator HERMAN TALMADGE of Georgia may be quite junior in Washington, but as Doris Fleeson pointed out in her Journal column recently, he's mighty smart.

Miss Fleeson was writing of Senator TALMADGE's plan for farm price supports which combines the virtues of free enterprise with Government protection.

It would do away with the redtape and irritants of acreage controls and Government loans and let the farmer plant as much as he wants of any crop he prefers.

Here is where the protection factor enters. Each farmer would have a domestic production quota expressed in bushels, bales, etc. This quota would be worked out on the basis of national consumption of the commodity in question.

The farmer would do his own selling in the open market. This makes him a businessman again, rather than a Government ward. It also should reopen world markets to United States farm products.

If the price he gets is less than 100 percent of parity, the Government would pay him the difference on that part of his crop raised under the domestic quota. But only on that part raised under quota.

The farmer then, can stick to the quota and the Government umbrella. Or if he pleases he can exceed this quota as much as he wants at his own risk.

Here is another good feature. Payments would be limited to $25,000 on the amount of price support any farmer could receive. Shades of Soil Bank abuses.

The plan sounds good and looks simple. It restores the farmer's independence, but leaves enough in the way of Government props to save him in emergency. It's a completely moral double standard.

Georgia and the South will like it. And as Miss Fleeson points out, other sections may like it enough to restore the old South and West agricultural alliance that once ran things in Washington.

TALMADGE'S FARM PLAN

(By Quimby Melton, Jr.)

Every person in the United States is vitally concerned with the agriculture of this Nation. If it weren't for the farmer, where would the rest of the country be?

He raises our food and our fiber. He keeps the soil in trust for future generations. The trees which make the lumber which make the buildings which house us grow on his land. Without him, we'd be sunk.

Because of this vital interest of every American in the farmer, we particularly invite your attention to Senator TALMADGE's column which appears in the Griffin Daily News today, as it does every Wednesday.

Today the Georgia Senator has outlined his bold new farm plan for the United States. He particularly invites Georgia farmers to write and tell him what they think of it. We join in urging them to do so, because we know that the Senator will be guided by the wishes of the people of Georgia.

The Talmadge plan calls for letting the farmers farm. Anyone wo hever tilled the soil knows the wisdom of this. Farmers constitute one of the last bulwarks of independence in this Nation. But they are so tied up now with redtape and Government dictation that it almost takes a lawyer to plant a home garden in the country.

Senator TALMADGE has offered what seems to us a vast improvement over the present situation. We hope that you will read his column then write and tell him what you think of his plan.

TALMADGE'S FARM PLAN

(By Turner Rockwell)

Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, in a Senate speech a few days ago, offered a farm program which he feels will help solve many of the ills that beset American farmers and will remove the restrictions as to acreage planted to basic crops and others that have been major factors in the farm program under which our farmers have been operating for a number of years.

Senator TALMADGE feels that a farmer should be permitted to plant what he wants to plant and sell his crop for the best price he can get in the open market and then have the Federal Government pay him the difference between the prices he receives for commodities sold for domestic consumption and 100 percent of parity.

The way Senator TALMADGE outlines his proposed plan is this:

1. Eliminate all acreage controls and Government loans.

2. Assign each farmer growing basic commodities a domestic production quota to be expressed in terms of unit measurements (pounds, bushels, bales, etc.) which would be the same percentage of the national consumption of basic commodities that the farmer's historic acreage base bears to the total national acreage base.

3. Guarantee and pay to each farmer a sales price support of the difference between the price he receives for his domestic production quota and 100 percent of parity.

4. Require each farmer to submit a bill of sale with his application for sales price support payments.

5. Impose a maximum of $25,000 on the amount of sales price support payments which any individual farmer could receive.

Senator TALMADGE believes that such a program would tend to eliminate redtape and the accumulation of farm surpluses and let the farmer handle his operations as he sees fit.

The Senator feels that, since it is geared to domestic production, it would amount to no more than giving the farmer the same protection which labor gets with the minimum wage and industry with the tariff.

It is generally agreed by those who have studied the farm problem that any program to be workable must permit the farmer to farm and provide some way of guaranteeing to him a fair share of the national income for his efforts. However, there is no general agreement as to how this is to be accomplished.

It can be said for the Talmadge proposal that it is different from that which has been tried. Doubtless it has bugs in it and would not do the complete job, but it is worthy of study. Certainly, the answer to the farm problem has not yet been found.

Death of Maj. Gen. Hanson E. Ely

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOS. E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, on April 28, 1958, one of this Nation's most brilliant generals and one of the State of Iowa's most illustrious sons, died at the age of 90. He was Maj. Gen. Hanson E. Ely, whose heroic and unexcelled leadership of the 2d Brigade and later of the 5th Division in France during World War I, earned him an enviable reputation that will last long in military annals. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the New York Herald Tribune for April 30, 1958, telling of General Ely's outstanding career.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL HANSON ELY DIES: WAR I LEADER WAS 90

ATLANTIC BEACH, Fla., April 28.—Maj. Gen. Hanson E. Ely, 90, who emerged from World War I with a reputation as one of this country's most brilliant generals, died here Monday. General Ely, who retired in 1931, had lived here for many years.

The general won the first of five awards of the French Croix de Guerre for his achievements as commander of the 38th Infantry Regiment, leading his troops in the first and one of the most famous American assaults of World War I, the Battle of Cantigny.

The citation described him as a "brilliant soldier who * * * executed with great success an operation which netted numerous prisoners and gained important ground. He maintained the conquered ground despite several enemy counterattacks."

WON HEROISM AWARD

For his accomplishments in that battle, which occurred on May 28, 1918, he was promoted from colonel to brigadier general and placed in command of the 2d Brigade of the 2d Division. With this command General Ely won the Distinguished Service Cross for extraordinary heroism under fire during the capture of Viersey, near Soissons.

General Ely also led the 2d Brigade in the Aisne-Marne, St. Mihiel, and Mont Blanc offensives. He was promoted to major general in October, 1918, and given command of the 5th Division.

He won high praise from the late Gen. John J. Pershing for the esprit de corps of his division, which was under machine-gun, rifle, and shell fire through 27 of the final 30 days of the war.

HEADED WAR COLLEGE

Relegated after the war to his permanent rank of colonel, General Ely won his permanent star in 1921 and his 2 stars 9 years later. He was appointed commandant of the Command and General Staff School at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and later served as president of the Army War College.

General Ely assumed command at Governors Island in December 1927, and served there until his retirement 4 years later.

General Ely was born in Independence, Iowa, November 23, 1867, and was graduated from West Point. He first served on the western frontier, then was teaching military science and tactics at the University of Iowa when he was recalled to line duty for the

Spanish-American War, serving in the Philippines.

He was one of the first officers sent abroad after the United States entered World War I, assigned to study Allied trench warfare methods.

Surviving General Ely are his wife, Mrs. Eleanor B. Ely; three sons, Col. Louis B. Ely, United States Army, retired; Col. Eugene B. Ely, United States Army, retired, and Maj. John A. Ely, United States Army, stationed at Fort Benning, Ga., and a daughter, Mrs. Julia Clocker.

General Ely will be buried in Arlington National Cemetery, Wednesday after services at 9 a. m. at the chapel at Fort Myer, Va.

Rise in the Status of Women Throughout the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the great social revolutions which has occurred in this second half of the 20th century is the welcome rise in the status of women throughout the world; particularly in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

The United States has contributed significantly to the progress which women are making in all fields of endeavor throughout the globe.

We, and our friends, welcome the increasing number of women who are entering into public life in many countries—in both elective and appointive offices.

We welcome the coming onto the statute books of many lands of provisions which, for the first time in history, have begun the move toward equalizing the status of men and women under the law.

We know full well, of course, that the most basic responsibility of women continues to be the maintenance of the home and of children. But we know from our own United States experience that there is no good reason why women should not likewise play an increasing role in the decisions which shape the future of mankind.

Perhaps Madame Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit of India best illustrates what a tremendous contribution women can make and have made for the betterment of their own lands and for the advancement of peace and good will.

Age-old discriminatory custom, age-old superstition, age-old unfairness of law against womankind's full role, must be revised if one-half the human race is to help meet the problems of the whole human race.

One of the important instruments of the United Nations in seeking these goals is the 18-member United Nations Commission on the Status of Women.

I send to the desk now an article which appeared in the May 1 issue of the Christian Science Monitor describing both the progress and the problems in women's status as faced by this important Commission.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. N. COMMISSION STUDIES STATUS OF WOMEN
(By Paul Cremona)

GENEVA.—Major questions, affecting the status of women, including such matters as political rights, minimum age for marriage, access to women of education and economic opportunities, were considered by the 18-member United Nations Commission on the Status of Women, which for the third time held its yearly session in Geneva.

Its most important achievement was the adoption of a resolution calling for an international convention forbidding the marriage of girls below the age of 16. A report prepared for the Commission by the U. N. Secretariat shows that, while in a number of countries no minimum age is prescribed by law, in no fewer than 31 countries and territories girls may marry on reaching the age of 12.

In its review on the progress achieved toward recognition of political rights for women, the Commission noted with satisfaction that great advances had been made in this field during the last few years. Women had won equal political rights in 70 countries, and there was an increasing participation by women in public affairs.

For instance, Canada had appointed a woman as Secretary of State; in Denmark a woman was nominated Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs; Egypt had elected 2 women to Parliament; West Germany elected 48 women to the lower house; India had elected 27 women and appointed 2 women as undersecretaries; the Netherlands had a woman plenipotentiary in the Council of Europe; and in the Soviet Union a woman had been appointed as chairman of the Presidium of the Communist Party.

POLITICAL RIGHTS DENIED

However, in some 11 countries no political rights had yet been granted to women and in a number of other countries where these rights were the law there existed major obstacles in the way of the actual exercise of these rights. There was still much prejudice against women in public life, even in many very advanced countries, Miss Minerva Bernardino of the Dominican Republic told the Commission.

Only 1 woman so far had presided over the U. N. General Assembly and only 2 women had been elected presiding officers of U. N. General Assembly committees.

Even some delegates to the United Nations did not recognize the equality of women, Miss Bernardino said, adding that only a few women were appointed by their governments as members of delegations to the United Nations.

INTERNATIONAL DUTY STRESSED

She insisted that there should be greater participation of women not only in national life but also in international organization.

In many countries women were not sufficiently educated in the use of their political rights. Only by accepting duties of citizenship and by participating actively in public affairs, the commission stressed in its report to the U. N. Economic and Social Council, "could women make full use of the right of suffrage in the countries where this right has already been accorded to them. By refusing to join the political parties in their respective countries, women were foregoing opportunities for political education and experience, renouncing their political responsibilities, and so failing to assume the active part which they ought to play."

PUBLIC SERVICE RENDERED

The most important aspect of political rights examined by the commission at its last session was the access of women to public offices and functions as well as the conditions under which they were exercising them. As long as women were relegated to secondary posts in the Governments and administrations, it was stated, there would be no equality in their participation in the Government of their countries.

With a view to making appropriate recommendations on this subject U. N. Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjold was requested to submit a full report on the access of women to and the exercise by them of public services and functions. The report will be examined by the commission at one of its next sessions.

The commission studied for the first time the important question of marriage age. In certain countries girls still are married very young, frequently without their consent and often without the formality of registration.

AGREEMENT REACHED

All representatives agreed that such practices ought to be abolished. However, during the discussion they failed to agree.

The French representative, however, thought that revolutionary stand should be taken without delay on so serious a problem and that laws should be imposed really giving women protection. If such laws existed, she added, they would help to alter customs.

The commission finally adopted a resolution requesting the U. N. Secretary-General to prepare a draft convention on the matter forbidding marriages of girls below the age of 16.

Health Conditions Among Refugee Orphans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, legislation which I cosponsored and which has been enacted into law provides for the admission to our country of orphan children adopted by American families and also provides for admission, under strict safeguards, of persons, including orphan children, who are suffering with tuberculosis.

There has been some criticism of the law which provides for the entrance into our country of people with tuberculosis. The fear has been expressed that the admittance of adopted orphan children with tuberculosis constitutes a serious health menace.

Mr. President, Mr. and Mrs. Harry Holt of Creswell, Oreg., have performed outstanding humanitarian service in helping many hundreds of mixed-blood Korean orphans find good homes in the United States. They have freely expended of their time, health and funds in behalf of this worthy project. Since the enactment of the immigration law of 1957, a small number of adopted Korean orphan children have entered our country who are suffering, or are suspected of suffering, from tuberculosis. Many of these children have been treated at the National Jewish Hospital at Denver, Colo.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Dr. Sidney H. Dressler, medical director of the National Jewish Hospital, and a nationally known authority on tuberculosis and chest diseases, has effectively answered the criticism leveled at the Holts with respect to the admission of tubercular and suspected tubercular orphan children.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the letter from Dr. Sidney H. Dressler which appeared in the May 6, 1958 issue of the Oregonian newspaper in Portland, Oreg.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT ALL TUBERCULOUS

TO THE EDITOR: I have learned that there has been considerable criticism of Harry Holt, of Creswell, Oreg., for bringing Korean-American orphans suffering from tuberculosis to our country for adoption. National Jewish Hospital is interested in this criticism because it has admitted 15 of these children for treatment.

As a specialist in chest diseases, it is my conviction that this criticism of Mr. Holt is not warranted. I believe the tuberculous children are being handled under such safeguards that they constitute no danger to anyone.

Under our laws, aliens suffering from tuberculosis must remain under hospital treatment until clinical reports and X-rays have been submitted to and approved by the public health authorities. The patient therefore is not discharged until he is no longer a source of infection.

Another important consideration is that most of the children are merely suspected victims of tuberculosis. Out of 12 admitted to National Jewish Hospital on February 1, only 5 actually had active disease. These 5 are responding well to treatment. The others need not have been hospitalized at all. They have been discharged.

The real danger of tuberculosis today lies in the unknown cases. It is estimated that there is at least one unknown case for every known one. We should concentrate our efforts on the menace of people who unknowingly spew their germs on family, friends and others.

Mr. Holt is doing a great humanitarian service by bringing abandoned offspring of American GI's and Korean girls to this country, thus giving them a chance at life. He should be encouraged.

SIDNEY H. DRESSLER, M. D.,
Medical Director, National Jewish Hospital, Denver, Colo.

Community Spirit Helps Teacher Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, at this time when we are all concerned about the effectiveness of our school systems and efforts to strengthen them, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues here to a simple but effective program of aid to secondary schoolteachers which is being carried on at LeRoy, N. Y., in the 39th District which I have the privilege to represent.

I speak of this program here because of the very worthy attitudes and philosophy it reflects and the meaning it could hold for all our school districts. It illustrates a way in which local industries and civic organizations can do something today to help their own education systems by improving the quality of teaching in their secondary schools and giving more incentive to teachers to remain in their profession.

This is the program:

In each of the past 2 years, Mr. Lester A. Pridgeon, manager of the Jell-O plant in LeRoy, has presented a $1,000 grant to the LeRoy school district to enable one or more of the local high-school teachers to take advanced courses of study during the summer to improve their professional knowledge. The aim is to strengthen the school system by increasing teaching skills where most needed.

The school system administers the program, establishes its own standards, and selects the teachers according to the needs of the school system. Two teachers have been selected each year and two more will be chosen again this year by the school district.

To date, the program has enabled teachers to gain special training in science, guidance, retarded reading, and administration at universities of their choosing. But the benefits of the program have been evident throughout the entire school system.

Dr. Donald Horr, superintendent of the LeRoy schools, enthusiastically acknowledges that the program has paid dividends far in excess of its monetary worth. He explains that the program not only has enabled teachers to increase their knowledge and improve their skills in areas of need, but it also has demonstrated community appreciation for teachers and has benefitted considerably the morale of the entire school ssytem. Dr. Horr points out, too, that the program has particular impact because it is a local, personal award and not one endowed by a "Great White Father." It meets educational, financial, and psychological needs, he says.

Now, on the basis of this local success, the parent company, General Foods, has decided to expand this program to other plant communities. So this year 12 more plants in 12 more States are instituting this program in their local communities. It is a source of great satisfaction to me that this simple, direct, and effective program which originated in the town of LeRoy, N. Y., is now spreading to other communities across the country.

It does not require a vivid imagination to see the potential of this program if it were adopted by other industries or organizations. In my opinion it is this type of local, self-help program, operating with many variations throughout the communities of the Nation, which could have a very significant and immediate favorable effect on the secondary education of our Nation.

I wish to commend the leaders of industry and education in LeRoy who recognized this need and took steps to meet it. I commend also the General Foods Corp. for expanding this valuable program to its many other plants across the country. This is not a profound program, neither is it spectacular or costly, but it represents a commendable, straightforward solution to an immediate problem. Our Nation is stronger and better every time our people act directly and responsibly to solve such problems.

Summer Fellowship Program for Secondary Schoolteachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely interested in the remarks of my fellow colleague and neighbor, Representative OSTERTAG, from the 39th District of my State, when he referred to a high school teacher fellowship grant program which the Jell-O company originated and is sponsoring in LeRoy, N. Y.

I am interested, and also agree that this type of teacher aid is something which should be noted by us and by other industries and civic groups, as I feel any program to help high school teachers obtain advanced studies during the summer strikes directly at an area in education which needs to be helped the most.

I would like also to bring to your attention and to the Members that this same program, "The Summer Fellowship Program for Secondary Schoolteachers," is being initiated this summer in my own district at Fulton, N. Y., by the Birdseye Division of the same General Foods Corp.

I think that Claude Webb, the plant manager of Birdseye in Fulton, and his parent organization, General Foods, are to be commended in offering such a practical teacher-aid program to the profession at this critical time. I also commend this program to the attention of other industry and community civic organizations.

I know that this summer Fulton high school teachers will be able to take advantage of these grants for further study, and they will certainly be appreciated.

I join with Representative OSTERTAG in congratulating the Jell-O and Birdseye companies in New York for initiating such a fine and constructive program.

Necessity for Construction of Civil Defense Shelters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to make an appropriation of $250 million out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to be expended by the Administrator of Civil Defense in making contributions to States for the construction of bomb shelters and other protective facilities.

For some time I have been very much concerned over the lack of action on the part of the Government to provide shelter facilities for our citizens in the event of an atomic attack. I have been exploring this problem thoroughly with local and Federal officials and believe that some immediate action is called for.

Although the top-secret Gaither report has not yet been released, that document is reported as portraying the United States in the gravest danger in its history. Faced with growing Soviet might and a powerful, ever-increasing Soviet economy and technology, the United States is daily becoming more and more exposed to political, propaganda, and psychological assauts on all sides. We do not know when actual armed attack might also come; we must therefore be prepared for it, as we must for the other assaults.

The Gaither report, in addition to recommending a rapid increase in spending for the military, has recommended that $5 billion a year for several years be spent for a civil defense shelter program. While the appropriation I recommend is not that high, I believe it would provide a good start on the program.

It is regrettable that the administration, in spite of repeated requests from the Civil Defense Administration and in the light of the Gaither report has not seen fit to include in its budget presentations a request for funds for such a project.

I am cognizant of the fact that such shelters may never be used; perhaps that may explain the reluctance of the administration to embark on the program. As a result of my study of the situation, I believe that structures can be built which would serve dual purposes—with appropriate modifications they could be used for civil defense purposes and for everyday community services. With the wonderful cooperation of the city officials of Detroit, Mich. I have explored, for example, the possibility of underground tunnels being utilized as shelters. A series of tunnels, approximately 15 feet in diameter, about 20 or more feet underground could be constructed with appropriate entrances and exits, air filtration plants, facilities for storing food, water, and other necessities, to be in standby condition until such time as it was determined that there would be no need for them. They would then be converted for use as sewers. The same principle could be applied to underground garages and other facilities; they could be constructed with appropriate modifications for civil-defense purposes and still serve other needs of the community.

Cost of constructing these facilities would be shared on a matching basis by the Federal Government and local governments. Authority for such participation already exists under the Federal Civil Defense Act; the only thing lacking is the money to go ahead on the projects. This I am proposing to take care of partially with the bill I am introducing.

The extreme necessity for the project at this time, not disregarding the employment opportunities it would create, is the fact that these shelters cannot be built overnight. It will take time to complete them and I am fearful that there may not be sufficient time. Neither I nor anyone else is convinced that we will not in the future be attacked. If, as we have been informed, from 50 percent to 90 percent of the enemy bombers penetrate our defenses, there will not be enough time to evacuate our cities and only a very small percentage of the population would escape. These shelters should be considered an integral part of our defense system, for by providing shelters to protect our people in main industrial areas, our Nation will preserve retaliatory power.

I am hopeful that both Congress and the administration will see the wisdom of immediate action in this field and will provide the necessary funds, as I have in part recommended, to commence work on shelter projects.

Tangle in Woolens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, as consideration of a renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act draws near, it seems appropriate to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in Fortune Magazine in January of this year. This editorial describes a situation in the woolen industry which would appear to need corrective action. I ask unanimous consent for its inclusion in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

TANGLE IN WOOLENS

The next few months will see a decisive battle between the forces of United States protection and trade liberalization over the administration's proposal to renew the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. All kinds of minor skirmishes are already going on, and one of the more intriguing and illuminating is the case of woolens and worsteds. For it indicates that the trouble with the United States tariff system is not just that in many cases rates are still too high. An equally big trouble is the system's arbitrary nature, which prevents importers from knowing where they stand. As one British trade organization recently argued: "No one wants to abolish the duty * * * just stabilize it* * * make it definite, predictable, workable."

The outcry in the case of woolens and worsteds is more than justified. Back in 1947 the United States ad valorem duty on these commodities was set at 25 percent under the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade worked out at Geneva. But the United States at that time reserved the right to raise this duty up to 45 percent if annual imports exceeded 5 percent by weight of the average United States production over the 3 preceding years. At the time output of domestic woolens and worsteds was running at about 450 million yards per year so that importers in effect had a quota of some 21 million pounds, which seemed to give them a reasonable market in this country. Since 1947, however, domestic production of woolens and worsteds has drastically fallen, and in May of 1957 President Eisenhower felt impelled to invoke the Geneva reservation and to fix the United States import quota at 14 million pounds. By July the quota was filled and further imports had to pay not a 25 percent but a 45 percent duty.

The President may conceivably reverse his decision, which is not mandatory, but already it has tended to disrupt the whole woolen and worsted trade. Foreign manufacturers of cheap woolens rushed to get in under the quota. Importers of high-priced, less competitive woolens, which take time to produce, slashed their orders. Hence the United States woolen industry has gained little by its protectionist device while the United States consumer is sure to suffer. But more than this, the whole quota system is obviously an anachronism and does nothing whatever to cure the real troubles of the United States woolen industry. Those troubles arise from the fact that despite a huge rise in United States population in the past 10 years the industry has been unable to hold its own against domestic synthetic fibers. The cause of its grief is the United States chemical industry, and protectionist tariffs on raw wool imports. Woolen textiles are 1 more example of how easy it is to make foreign trade the whipping boy of failure to meet the iron law of American capitalism—namely, competition.

Community Facilities Act Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have heard from Mr. John Bolgert, mayor of the city of Sheboygan, and Mr. John M. Katzban, village manager of the village of Whitefish Bay, in answer to my inquiry addressed to city officials in Wisconsin about the usefulness to their communities of the Community Facilities Act.

Both of these officials say that their communities can take good advantage of the act in financing much needed projects.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letters from these two officials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

CITY OF SHEBOYGAN, WIS.,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
April 22, 1958.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: I was indeed pleased to receive your letter in which you state that you were cosponsoring legislation in the Senate to make low-interest loans available to local government. Please accept my sincere apology for not answering at an earlier date but we have been going through an extensive survey on capital expenditures which has just been completed.

I have noticed that the Senate has passed your bill and has sent it to the House. I sincerely hope our Wisconsin Representatives in the House support it unanimously. The following are lists of projects that are facing us in the future: Storm sewer, $125,000; incinerator, $567,500; garage, $899,200; storage building, $46,800; total, $1,638,500. We recently passed an ordinance to float a bond issue in the sum of $3,600,000, for the construction of a high school in the south end of our city. According to our plan we wish to make available equal additional facilities for all our students, consequently a new high school at the north side at about the same approximate cost will have to be built.

Of course, the only method a municipality can use to finance a project as large as I have set forth above, at the present time, is through a bond issue. With your proposed legislation it would be possible for a municipality to receive a loan from the Federal Government at a reasonable rate of interest. I feel that this type of legislation would not only be of value to the city of Sheboygan but to every municipality in our State.

I express to you our gratitude in cosponsoring this legislation.

Very truly yours,
JOHN BOLGERT, *Mayor.*

VILLAGE OF WHITEFISH BAY,
OFFICE OF VILLAGE MANAGER,
May 6, 1958.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: I have been directed by the village board to reply to your letter relative to our interest in a legislation you are sponsoring for public work projects.

Please be advised that we are interested in this legislation to the extent that we are preparing plans for the construction of a joint water system which will be shared with the neighboring communities of Fox Point and Glendale.

Thank you for your inquiry in this matter.

Very truly yours,
JOHN M. KATZBAN,
Village Manager.

Simple Solution of a Serious Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I repeat a radio speech recently made by me in favor of my bill, H. R. 4835:

This is Congressman EUGENE SILER of the Eighth District of Kentucky speaking to you on the subject of the liquor evil and the desirability of having an effective law enacted by the Congress of the United States to ban the advertising of all alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce or through any medium that crosses the boundaries of our different States of the Union.

Congress can only take jurisdiction of this alcoholic advertising and banish it by law upon the theory that such interstate advertising does constitute interstate commerce within the meaning of our Federal Constitution. And, of course, the Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly held that almost every kind of transaction or any transmission of anything between two or more States is in fact a form of interstate commerce. Therefore, my own bill, H. R. 4835, introduced by me in Congress on February 14, 1957, would make it an unlawful offense, within constitutional authority, to transport any alcoholic advertising, whether by publication or radio broadcasting or television transmission, across State lines and would provide a fine of $100 to $1,000 or a prison sentence of 6 months to a year, or both the fine and prison sentence, for offenders against such a law if it should become enacted by Congress.

It is a rather tragic and ironic situation when the great majority of citizens and homeowners in some areas of the country, for instance in my home county down in southeastern Kentucky, have voted themselves entirely dry and wish always to keep their areas and their homes dry like hickory chips, yet have to encounter alcoholic advertising wet like the Atlantic Ocean in their very homes and at their family hearthstones, morning, noon and night and at most of the periods in between.

A great many people all over America are interested in this subject. Several hundred persons have written or informed me of their support of this bill, and I am sure that thousands of others would have so informed me, except for the fact that it is generally known and very well publicized that I am for this bill with my whole heart and soul, and, therefore, it is adequately realized that it would be a pointless gesture to write me in support of my own legislative proposal, namely, H. R. 4835. All of these good people well understand that only through enactment of my bill can their home towns and home counties and their places of abode be truly free from this continuing liquor evil. For without this enactment, the slithering, slimy reptile of deceit that is called alcoholic advertising will constantly, consistently, and conveniently come right into their homes and whisper lies and misrepresentations into the tender ears of their children. "This is a man of distinction," says the bright-colored liquor ad, but genuine truth would say, "A man on skid row drank this liquor, and he now has delirium tremens and a chronic case of cirrhosis of the liver, and he won't be around here much longer." Also, the liquor advertising says, "This is Manhattan melody," but the unvarnished fact is that it should really say, "This is a funeral dirge of hell." Why do the liquor advertisers always tell so many lies and half-truths and send them into your homes? Well, the answer is that they worship that god known as mammon to such extent that the advertisers are willing to say anything or do anything to promote that pagan worship. But if my bill should become the law of the land by action of Congress, these untruths and misrepresentations would cease to transgress within the precincts of our American homes and among all of our growing families.

We are always quick to affirm our interest in crime prevention. But how interested are we in this great problem? I notice J. Edgar Hoover, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation estimated some time ago that our annual crime bill is $20 billion, and he further stated that about half of the arrests made each year were for drunkenness, drunken driving, and for other liquor-law violations. In Chicago, a police liaison officer stated that 80 percent of the disturbances that police were required to handle were traceable to alcohol causation. What a price the American people pay for alcohol products. And yet we continue to allow promotion of them daily through publications and radio broadcasting and television transmission. All of this could be prevented and stopped by a very simple law at the hands of the United States Congress. And yet we just go ahead year after year and permit a promotion of our own destruction and a wastage of our own resources—financial, physical, spiritual, and moral. When will the American people dry their tears and bind up their wounds long enough to demand that this evil, lying, injurious advertising of harmful products be stopped by act of Congress? Even after the advertising is stopped, the evil will still continue to be among us, but at least it will no longer be encouraged in a public manner, and it will not burglarize your homes with its criminality and all of its evil designs.

Many eminent physicians and well-known scientists have gone on record placing alcohol in the same category with narcotic poison. Now, of course, all of us would be truly shocked and repulsed if any kind of advertising of narcotics for daily consumption should come into our homes. Yet we constantly face this devastating alcoholic advertising of the different harmful forms of alcohol that comes into our family circles, and most of us do nothing about it whatsoever. Even though we know that alcohol is truly the handmaiden of narcotic poisons, yet hundreds of earnest, well meaning people will merely yawn and tolerantly thumb through the liquor ads in their magazines or they will smile complacently at the silly jingles of the beer advertisers as they flow into their family sitting rooms through television channels or by radio broadcasting.

Juvenile delinquency has become a tremendous problem here in America. It is said to have increased 28 percent in the last 6 years. Youthful gangs roam the streets of large cities like New York, and Detroit, and Chicago, and even in a number of smaller towns, and cities of our country. These gangs sometimes wear peculiar clothes, have strange haircuts, call themselves by fearful names, do the rock and roll throughout the night. Frequently they commit murder, rape, and robbery. Often they drive their teachers to distraction and some of them seem to take pride in presenting themselves as daily problems wherever they may chance to roam. Now, a prominent juvenile court justice in Boston made a statement in recent years that liquor was the greatest single factor in juvenile delinquency and that this liquor evil had led the youth of our land down the wide-open road to narcotics, immodesty and immorality. I am sure that the justice knew what he was talking about and I am equally confident that the banning of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce would go a long way toward helping to restore normal sanity and a wholesome outlook among our young people all over our country. Why should we wait or hesitate to use a good water bucket when the house is burning down? Likewise, why should we hesitate to promote and enact good legislation to help correct juvenile delinquency through banning the liquor evil from in front of youthful faces all over our land? Only this week a news item told of a group of boys that broke into a place and stole about $70 in order to have money to attend a movie. Then they attended the movie, but afterward they went back and reentered that same place of their theft and they replaced about $65 of the remaining stolen money. The movie they saw was The Ten Commandments. This incident is a forceful argument for our belief that young people are influenced and persuaded in a power-

ful way by what they see before their very eyes. It also means that constant alcoholic advertising will succeed in persuading young, impressionable minds that it is truly smart and desirable and entirely in good order to take up the alcohol habit. But if we should legally ban this form of advertising there would then be just that much less persuasion upon the American boy and girl towards adopting a social custom that first becomes an occasional habit and then changes from occasional habit to constant curse in a very subtle manner and in a short period of time.

By way of illustrating the foolishness of permitting legalized advertising of alcoholic products, some writer said: "Suppose there were 170 million cows in America. Then suppose there was a big industry selling Old Scarecrow hay made of locoweed, but described as soothing and mellow, resulting in the cows turning from their sober alfalfa to begin eating Old Scarecrow. And suppose this made the cows do silly things like running into fences or automobiles so that 500,000 were killed or injured every year. And suppose milk production was cut down because the Old Scarecrow users lost 50 million cow-days yearly. And suppose the cows' life expectancy was reduced 10 percent and that it made over 4 million so sick that they were useless much of the time and that for every one that was cured, the industry made 10 new addicts for Old Scarecrow. And suppose caring for all these sick cows required 80 percent of the farmers' time. And suppose, in spite of all of this, sellers of Old Scarecrow were allowed to advertise in every cow pasture proclaiming that cows of distinction use their stuff. How would you expect farmers to react? Don't you think all the farmers of the country would try to protect their cows by banning this false and harmful advertising? And now just suppose we cared as much about our children and our fellow men as we would expect the farmers to care about their cows. Would we not leave no stone unturned to help our children, our families, our neighbors through using our influence to persuade the Congress of the United States to pass a reasonable, simple, helpful law that would ban all alcoholic advertising in interstate commerce. How about it?"

We may not be farmers with cows, but we are supposed to be citizens with conscience and we should be willing constantly and consistently to fight for the right. And we do know that this is right.

Is There a Panacea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the La Grange Citizen, La Grange, Ill., entitled "Is There a Panacea?" Much mail comes to each Congressman on this subject, and many bills have been introduced into the Congress in an effort to alleviate the effects of the recession. It is refreshing to read an editorial of the type appearing in the La Grange Citizen. It reads as follows:

IS THERE A PANACEA?

A lot of brainpower is being devoted to development of ideas recommended to put United States economy back on the track.

The Halls of Congress are not the only places that resound with oratory favoring this or that scheme to put men and women back on payrolls, and to reduce buyer reluctance.

Unfortunately for all of us, the Members of Congress, especially those up for election in the fall, cannot ignore the fact that what they do and say might determine their fate at the polls. Tax reduction being the most popular panacea it can be expected to draw the greatest volume of oratory, if not the greatest legislative voting support in the final showdown.

"This recession or whatever you want to call it is not going to be leveled off by legislators. Sooner or later we will have to get out of our heads the notion that the law manipulators can solve all our problems by passing a bill or two.

"Or that the bureaucrats can wave a magic wand and shower blessings on all of us" is a bit of sense uttered by one suburbanite who retains the old-fashioned notion that individuals can better work out their salvation than the Great White Father in Washington can.

Not concurring completely with the individual salvation contention, another suburbanite argued:

"Individuality is a fine thing in theory. But we have all become so mass minded and so imbued with conformity that not many of us are individuals when it come to fitting in the economics jig-saw puzzle.

"We buy when everyone else buys. We stop buying when others do. Everyone buys the same thing and keeps boosting the price of it. We have a science and technique for everything but we do not have a science to teach us self control and personal opinion courage."

Interview of Herbert Lehman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on May 4 I had the pleasure of hearing one of America's greatest liberal statesmen discuss his philosophy of government in a television interview with one of our outstanding young television and radio journalists. This was an interview with the Honorable Herbert Lehman, formerly a Member of the Senate, by Martin Agronsky, of NBC Television, on the program Look Here.

Mr. Lehman gave his definition, or as he described it, his characterization of what "liberal" or "liberalism" means, in reply to a question by Mr. Agronsky. This is one of the finest and truist statements of what the great humanitarian spirit called liberalism is. Mr. Lehman cited four distinctive points which characterize a liberal. He said that a liberal is—

One who loves freedom and equality, exact equality;

One who has concern with the problems of the underprivileged;

One who has a passionate respect for justice; and, finally,

One who believes strongly in the universal brotherhood of man.

Mr. President, Mr. Agronsky and Mr. Lehman bring out in brilliant fashion the philosophical guidelines of the liberal spirit in politics and government. This interview makes a real contribution, in my opinion, to the art of government. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that others who did not hear Mr. Lehman may have an opportunity to read his remarks.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. AGRONSKY. Good afternoon; I'm Martin Agronsky. Welcome to Look Here. This is the Manhattan office of a man who has served his State of New York as Lieutenant Governor when Franklin D. Roosevelt was Governor; as a four-term Governor himself in the thirties; and more recently as Senator. And for his conduct of these offices the Honorable Herbert Lehman is regarded by New Yorkers as one of the great public servants of their State's history. And for his many good works he is one of their cherished citizens. Governor Lehman.

Mr. LEHMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Agronsky; I'm very glad to be here with you today.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Well, thank you, sir. Governor, I can't help noticing all these boxers; are they related in any way to your public service?

Mr. LEHMAN. No, not a bit; but Mrs. Lehman and I were the first people to introduce the boxer breed to this country. We brought the first boxers over for breeding purposes 46 years ago and made the first American champion. I'm devoted to the breed and we've had a lot of fun in raising them.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Do you consider that a contribution, sir, in public service?

Mr. LEHMAN. I think it was a contribution to the happiness of a great many people.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Governor, you've just observed your 80th birthday. Now such a milestone I would imagine would give a man pause. Would it give one pause to reflect as much as when you turned 30 as a young man?

Mr. LEHMAN. Well, I did have an 80th birthday celebration. It was a very happy one. I was honored by my family and my friends and my associates. Mr. Agronsky, I've been asked whether I miss my work in the Senate. I want to say that I, of course, miss my work and I particularly miss my friends and associates from Washington, but I've kept just about as busy since I retired as I ever was before; and it has been a great source of satisfaction to me to know that I still can make some kind of a contribution to the welfare of the people of my State and Nation.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Do you find that over the years, sir, from the time you first entered political life and public service that your views and your philosophy have changed as much as the world has changed?

Mr. LEHMAN. Well, I know that the views and philosophy of many people have changed. As far as I'm concerned I was surprised when my wife in emptying our attic when we moved from the country to New York a year or two ago found some compositions which I had written 60 years ago in college in which I dealt with many of the questions now of interest—civil rights, immigration, and other questions.

Mr. AGRONSKY. When?

Mr. LEHMAN. When I was at college. And I found my views had not changed very greatly from that time to this.

Mr. AGRONSKY. That's a remarkable statement, Governor; how do you account for that? Were you so prescient?

Mr. LEHMAN. No, I don't think so, except I was brought up in a liberal atmosphere, and it had its great impact on me. My par-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ents were liberals. My father was an immigrant, my mother was. They came over from Germany to find their new life here and to some extent to escape from the rigors of restrictions in their native country; so I heard continuously as a boy liberal points of view. And then later I of course became very much interested in liberal issues, questions and problems because my parents encouraged me to do so. So I don't think it's so difficult to understand why I have remained a strong liberal ever since. And there are other factors of course.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Governor, I wonder if we could talk about another of your interests and your obligations aside from liberalism and politics that you've assumed since you've retired as a Senator. You're now heading the American Committee for the 10th Anniversary of Israel. Do you think that Israel's problems are greater or less than they were 5 years ago or 2 years ago?

Mr. LEHMAN. Well let me speak to you about that for a minute. I think Israel has made almost miraculous progress in the past 10 years. It has become a strong industrial nation, the only industrial nation in the Middle East. It has developed its agriculture and its social consciousness to a marked degree. It has admitted twelve hundred thousand new immigrants, party people, devoted people, dedicated people, to Israel, who have been a great asset to Israel. There's no doubt at all about it that from the material aspect, physical aspect, and the social aspect Israel has made very great progress. But I don't want to give you the impression that I do not believe that Israel is in a very critical condition; it is, very critical.

Mr. AGRONSKY. And do you think that Israel can survive, considering the critical conditions?

Mr. LEHMAN. I think it's going to survive under any circumstances. But I believe that its difficulties will be tremendously reduced and the security of the world will be served without question if our country and the other great powers make it crystal clear to the world that Israel is there to stay under all the circumstances. And that they should take measures to assure the security of Israel within its present boundaries. If that is done I think there will be no grave danger there.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Well, by raising that point, sir, you, of course, indicate that there is some prospect that this will not be done. Do you think that is so?

Mr. LEHMAN. I don't know. I'm always an optimist and I hope that our Government will redeem the assurances which they have given time and time again to Israel. When I say our Government, I include other countries like Great Britain and France.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Well, what do you consider is the major threat to Israel's survival today? The Arabs?

Mr. LEHMAN. Well, I think obviously the major threat to Israel is the Arabs, but a new factor has entered into the situation, and that is the injection of itself by Russia into the Middle Eastern situation. Russia has encouraged almost fanatical nationalism among the Arab leaders and among the Arab people. And by doing so I think it has strengthened the intransigence of the Arabs to be willing we work together, live together, prosper together with Israel; and I think that if Israel prospers, I believe the entire Middle East will prosper; and I want to emphasize the fact that I believe the Middle East should be developed on a regional basis not only for the benefit of Israel but for the benefit of the entire Middle East, and if that is done I think our chances of maintaining security in the world and lasting peace will be greatly enhanced.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Governor, I wonder if you'd permit me to put a question—perhaps in the role of Devil's advocate. There are, after all, millions of Arabs in the area, more than 40 million; I believe it's 44 million, and so few Jews, just a little over 2 million. Wouldn't it be in the best interests of American policy, considering that particular ratio, that the United States should support Arab interests?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; I emphatically deny that.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Why do you think that, sir?

Mr. LEHMAN. Well, because in the first place, I don't think you're going to placate the Arabs by making concessions. In the second place, I've never known a country permanently for any great length of time to prosper unless they maintain principles. I believe that if we continue to yield and yield and yield to the demands and to the representations of Nasser and some of the Arab leaders we may very well find ourselves in the same situation that we did when we placated and yielded in every degree to Hitler. If the great powers of Europe had stood up firmly for principle, for agreements, for understandings in 1935 and 1936, I doubt if we ever would have had a Second World War.

Mr. AGRONSKY. You think then, Governor, that in the situation that Israel is in today in relation to the United States that the issue is one between principle and expediency again?

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the issue is between principle and security in the first place, but in the second place—and I think that that must be taken very greatly into consideration and I hope it will be by our Government—is that the security of Israel is directly connected with the security of the United States and of the entire free world. If you have an explosion in Israel—and it's the most explosive and critical situation in the entire world, the Middle East—it will inevitably, in my opinion, affect the security of the entire peace-loving world.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Governor, can we return again to your own career? You entered public life, sir, under rather unusual auspices for a middle-aged Wall Street banker, under the Democratic-Liberal banner. I wonder if we could look back a minute? How did it all begin? What brought you into public life under those auspices?

Mr. LEHMAN. Well as I said before, Mr. Agronsky, of course, my parents were liberals. I grew up in that liberal atmosphere. I had a teacher at school, Frank Irwin, who was very much interested and for whom I had a very high regard and who was very kind to me; and he and my father used to take me down to the slum areas and I saw how the people down there lived and it was terrible. I saw the work shops, the sweat shops in which all decent conditions were completely disregarded. I saw men and women working for 12 and 14 hours a day for miserable pittances. You can't even call them wages.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Let's set a date on that, Governor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Well that was about 1892 or 1893, one of those years. And then I also was very much influenced by a great settlement worker and I think the settlement houses had great influence on the entire liberal movement in this country. Lillian Wald who was head of Henry Street and who I knew for a long time, and as a matter of fact I later became very closely associated with her. For many years up to the present time I'm still a director of Henry Street. I became connected with many other settlement houses. Then I became acquainted, and in some cases made strong friends of some of the liberal legislators such as Al Smith and Robert F. Wagner and Jim Farley and others of like views. That affected me very much.

Mr. AGRONSKY. And they brought you into politics?

Mr. LEHMAN. Then I became acquainted with a great many of the social and labor leaders of the State and of the country as a matter of fact; all those things strengthened my determination and my inclination to take as strong a part in the liberal movement as I possibly could. It's an amazing thing how I was able through their eyes possibly under their guidance to see the real conditions with which the average young man did not have an opportunity to become acquainted with.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Governor, you raised the name of Al Smith. It has been 30 years since Al Smith was defeated in his effort to become President of the United States. Do you think, Governor, that our country has matured in the intervening period to a point where such a man—when I say, such a man I mean a man of Catholic religion—could run without jeopardizing his party's chances?

Mr. LEHMAN. Well I think the situation has very greatly improved. At that time it was a tragic period. I was very active in that campaign. At headquarters we had a room and on the wall of the room we pinned up, pasted up many of the cartoons and editorials attacking Al Smith because of his religion, and it was a terrible, terrible tragic situation which affected me very deeply. I think a great deal of that has disappeared and I think a great deal of the opposition to a Catholic candidate would be lessened today.

Mr. AGRONSKY. You do. Do you think that the country then has become more tolerant?

Mr. LEHMAN. I think it has become more tolerant, very definitely.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Governor let me ask you perhaps a mean question. Suppose you lived in Mississippi or Alabama—and at one point in your life I believe you did live in Alabama—what would you do at election time? Would you vote Republican as a protest vote or would you vote Democrat in the hopes of getting a little accomplished through your own party, or would you not vote at all these days?

Mr. LEHMAN. Well let me put it this way. I'm going to be very frank. If I were a politician, an officeholder whose whole life depended on his holding office I'm not sure that I would have courage enough to vote against the views of my constitutents. But if I were a citizen I'm certain that I would have no hesitation in voting on the liberal line; in other words, to do away with all disabilities and all civil deprivations that have been exercised for so many years against Negroes.

Mr. AGRONSKY. You would leave your party on that?

Mr. LEHMAN. I would if necessary leave my party. At least I hope I would have courage enough to do it. I've never lived in Mississippi; I've never lived in Alabama, although my parents lived there for many years. I hope I would have courage enough to do it and I believe I would. But I want to say this in justice to some men in the Senate who are liberals in every other way except on civil rights. They do realize that an adverse vote against their constitutents would mean their complete annihilation from the political field, and it takes a tremendous amount of courage to do that.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Are you prepared to justify their political schizophrenia on these grounds?

Mr. LEHMAN. I'm not prepared to excuse it but I believe I'm realistic enough to know that it must have a great effect on them. You're talking now about people whose career, whose life depends on their political careers. It's not a noble thing to do but I believe that some of them probably are affected by that.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Well Governor, perhaps it helps to have independent means then when you're in politics?

Mr. LEHMAN. I think it does to some extent help. On the other hand I think it's sometimes a handicap. It's a help because any

man of independent means can be much more independent of his own job——

Mr. AGRONSKY. As you've indicated.

Mr. LEHMAN (continuing). Than otherwise. It's a handicap to the extent that I think many times men of means have to vote or are confronted with the problem of voting against their own interests in order to uphold their own principles. I can say that from a matter of experience.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Yes. Governor, you've just laid down very vigorously a policy of independence and liberalism. Now you are a 4-term Governor of your State as a Democrat, and former Senator as a Democrat. You're an elder statesman. Now you said, too, you'd be prepared to leave the Democratic Party on this particular issue of principle, on this issue of racism in effect. Now does that mean, sir, that you are a liberal first, and a Democrat second?

Mr. LEHMAN. I would say so, although I've been a very loyal Democrat. I have voted for—I did vote for—Theodore Roosevelt because I thought the principles which he espoused and for which he fought—and they were important principles—were just and right and in the interests of the country. I believe if I had to face that issue I would say, "Well, I'm a liberal first and a Democrat second." And I say that not because of differentiation between liberalism and party affiliation but because I believe that the liberal faith is the right faith. I believe we have to have it in this country. I think that liberals have to stand firm. I think that the things that they have espoused are sound and right and will help the country. I would rather put it on the ground that I'm going to vote for what I think, and stand by what I think, is of the interests of the country than the interests of any differences between one particular point of view and philosophy.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Governor, I think you'd probably accept that that's a rather unique way for any man in political life to talk. I wonder if you'd give your definition of a liberal?

LEHMAN. Mr. Agronsky, it's awfully hard to give a specific definition of a liberal or of liberalism because there's neither dogma nor doctrine in liberalism. So I would rather characterize it than try to define it. I believe that the liberal movement is a great humanitarian spirit. It differs—the interpretation of that humanitarian spirit of liberalism of course differs among different people. But, so far as I'm concerned, I interpret a liberal as one who loves freedom and equality, exact equality, one who has concern with the problems of the underprivileged; one who has a passionate respect for justice; and, finally, one who believes strongly in the universal brotherhood of man.

AGRONSKY. Well, I think that's a very stirring definition, Governor. I wonder, looking now at contemporary political life, who in public life today do you think would best reflect such qualities as you speak of?

LEHMAN. Well, I can't answer that question because I believe there are a great many people who would fit that description; and I wouldn't want to mention a few particular individuals, for fear of omitting others who deserve that characterization as much as any.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Well, I accept that, Governor. I won't press you on that. I wonder if we can return then to liberalism in the general sense. Wouldn't you say that liberals are really a marginal force, though, in our national politics today?

Mr. LEHMAN. I think they're absolutely necessary.

Mr. AGRONSKY. But marginal, sir? Certainly in the great minority.

Mr. LEHMAN. Oh, very great minority. There's no doubt about it. Well, the militant liberals are in a great minority. I believe that the great mass of the American people are liberal. I wouldn't have been elected as often as I have been elected to office if that wasn't the case, because I wasn't elected exclusively by Democratic votes. Of course, they helped, but I was helped by a great army of independents, Republicans of liberal point of view, and of members of the Liberal Party. I believe that the great majority of the American people are liberal at heart and in mind, and so far as they have an opportunity in expressing themselves.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Governor, let's take your own experience in the Senate as a liberal and as a Democrat. Invariably when issues came up, various legislative measures arose that required that you compromise in order to be on the winning side or to get the legislation passed, invariably you refused to compromise, and I've often wondered, didn't this reduce your own effectiveness as a Senator?

Mr. LEHMAN. I don't think it lessened my effectiveness as a Senator and as a leader—political leader. I use the world "political" in the broadest sense. I think probably it lessened my chances of getting legislation through very frequently. I took that chance. I had to make the choice when I went to the Senate of going out for the whole loaf or only a slice, and I decided to go for the whole loaf. Now, I think there may be instances where a legislator should compromise to some degree, but I think he should do so only after the case has been completely presented to the people of the country.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Then what is the function of the liberal, to get the whole case presented? Is that it?

Mr. LEHMAN. Well, yes. I think this, my feeling is this, that I think the liberals should not concern themselves nearly so much or exclusively at least with exerting power as with upholding principle. I think that's the important thing. I think somebody has got to uphold principle unless this country is going to revert to a situation which now exists, would have existed unless we had had some liberal leaders and which does exist now in many countries of the world. I believe he has to uphold principle. I think that has been one of the great difficulties of our country both in their domestic and in their foreign policies. We haven't sought to uphold, we haven't fought to uphold principles.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Governor, can you cite an occasion along these very lines in which insistence on a whole loaf won the day in legislation?

Mr. LEHMAN. Oh, I could if I had time, cite many examples. I'll cite one in my own experience. This happened in 1935 and 1936. When I was Governor I recommended the enactment of a social security act by the Legislature of the State of New York. The Republicans strenuously opposed that. I fought for it in 1935 and again throughout 1936. I appeared before joint sessions of the legislature three times. I sent many messages to the legislature; I appeared on the radio—it was before television—and I didn't win; but I made it a main issue in the campaign that year. I was elected by a vote so large that people considered it a mandate and the bill went through after 2 years struggle almost by unanimous vote. That is why I say no problem is beyond hope of redemption.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Good for you, Governor Lehman. Thank you, Governor Lehman. Since last September it has been my privilege to conduct Look Here at this time, and this is the last program in the current Look Here series. I would like to express my thanks to all of you now who found these interviews worthy of your time and your interest. Good afternoon.

A Tribute to the Boston Globe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it is a pleasure to join in the tribute to an outstanding newspaper, and include herein congratulatory statements by leaders in the Boston area.

REMARKS BY SIDNEY W. DAVIDSON OF THE LAW FIRM OF DAVIDSON, DAWSON & CLARK

The Boston Globe has been a partnership for over 85 years between members of two families—the Taylor family and the Jordan family.

The original partners were Gen. Charles H. Taylor and Eben D. Jordan. Each of them had a rich inheritance of New England ancestry running back to early colonial days. Each of them had to start at scratch without the benefit either of education or of capital.

General Taylor was a city boy, born in Charlestown on July 14, 1846.

Eben D. Jordan was a country boy, born on October 13, 1822, on the farm of his father in the town of Danville in the State of Maine. Danville is in Androscoggin County and once rejoiced in the name of Pegypscot.

Mr. Jordan was descended from the Reverend Robert Jordan, a clergyman of the Church of England who was born in England and who settled about 1641 on Richmond's Island, opposite Cape Elizabeth, Maine.

At the age of 7, Eben Jordan was fatherless and penniless. He worked for a while on a neighbor's farm in Danville, and came to Boston in 1836 at the age of 14. He was the first of his line to start his career outside of Maine.

Five years later in 1841 when he was 19 years old, he established his own dry goods store on Hanover Street, not far from the present entrance of Sumner Tunnel.

He advertised that he sold dry goods cheap for cash. That slogan had a special meaning. Ships from the State of Maine docked at the foot of Hanover Street near his store and brought potatoes and other produce which the captains of the ships were accustomed to barter. Mr. Jordan's advertisement demonstrated that he would not barter, but would sell for cash only.

The firm of Jordan, Marsh & Co. was founded in 1851, and grew out of Mr. Jordan's first store on Hanover Street. Mr. Jordan became the foremost merchant of his day. He accumulated the capital which enabled him to finance General Taylor, who was 24 years his junior, in the operation of the Globe which had started on March 4, 1872.

Mr. Jordan died on November 15, 1895, at the age of 73. He owned 80 percent of the stock of the Globe. He arranged that upon his death, General Taylor would have the right to buy enough of his stock to make the general an equal owner in the Globe. The general bought that stock and since 1895 the Taylors and the Jordans have divided equally between them the ownership of the Globe.

One half of the stock is now held by trustees for the benefit of descendants of the general, and the other half is held by trustees under Mr. Jordan's will for the benefit of his descendants.

NOW SENIOR TRUSTEE

In years of service I now have the honor to be the senior trustee under Mr. Jordan's will and the senior director of the Globe.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

My cotrustees of the Jordan trust are Ralph Lowell and William Davis Taylor. Davis is also a trustee of the Taylor trust. He is the son of the late William O. Taylor and a grandson of the general.

Ralph Lowell and I had the great privilege of serving with William O. Taylor as trustees of the Jordan trust and as fellow directors of the Globe.

Mr. Jordan's investment in the Globe would today be called a use of venture capital. At the outset, Mr. Jordan furnished the capital and General Taylor furnished knowledge of the newspaper business.

This partnership between the Jordans and the Taylors has already continued for a period of 86 years. In the annals of American business it is extraordinary if not unique. It is destined to continue indefinitely—and happily.

Each director of the Globe is proud of his heritage. Under the direction of the Taylors, the Globe has abundantly discharged its duty to the public of Boston and of New England.

It still carries out the ideal of its founder to enter the home as a kindly, helpful friend of the family and to help men, women, and children to get some of the sunshine of life, to be a little better and happier because of the Globe.

Ralph Lowell and I, as trustees of the trust under the will of Eben D. Jordan, now wish to pay tribute to the descendants of General Taylor who are now on the Globe. Three of them, grandsons of the general, are cousins and are in the third generation: Charles H. Taylor, namesake of the general; John I. Taylor; and William Davis Taylor. Finally, we have the first representative of the fourth generation, William O. Taylor II.

REMARKS BY MOST REVEREND RICHARD J. CUSHING, D. D., ARCHBISHOP OF BOSTON

It was almost 90 years ago that a group of local businessmen established the Globe. From many points of view those days were very different from the days in which we are living. The Civil War was over and the enormous work of reconstructing the Union was in progress. In our own city the newer immigrants were discovering the special responsibilities of their new citizenship.

Boston, itself, was expanding with the addition of Dorchester, West Roxbury, Brighton and the rest. They were certainly interesting times and all of us have been pleased to read about them in the recent series of Globe articles by Willard De Lue. He has vividly described the happenings of yesteryears as well as the vicissitudes of the Globe beginnings.

People, however, do not change very much from generation to generation and as I have been reading the stories of Maturin Ballou, the first editor, and even more especially the story of Charles Taylor, the real founder of the Globe, I cannot help feeling that the paper as we know it today is really the product of one man and one man's family.

This is not to suggest that many gifted personalities and many impressive human characters have not in times past, and in times present, made their contribution to the present success of this great newspaper. What I intend to say is that with all its varied excellence it carries the stamp or, if you prefer, the spirit of a great name and a great family.

General Taylor was a many-sided man, gifted with political acumen, literary judgment, and a keen sense of business. But, above all of this, he had a remarkable sense of public responsibility, he realized what it meant to be invited each day into the homes of the community by way of his newspaper and to become, in fact, part of the family conversations. His own credo was well known and it has become a kind of guidebook for the later generations of Globe publishers.

"My aim," General Taylor declared, "has been to make the Globe a cheerful, attractive, and useful newspaper that would enter the homes as a kindly, helpful friend of the family. My temperament has always led me to dwell on the virtues of men and institutions rather than upon their faults and limitations. My disposition has always been to build up rather than to join in tearing down. My ideal for the Globe has always been that it should help men, women, and children to get some of the sunshine of life, to be better and happier because of the Globe."

No one, I suppose, has ever expressed in more human terms the aim, the temperament, the disposition, the ideal that makes a great paper.

When I speak of the Globe family I refer, of course, to Davis and his cousins, Charles and John I. Taylor, who now bear this great name and are intimately associated with its present success. However, I mean also the Globe employees who make up what we must also call a family. Like members of a family they are all bound together in a common ideal, they all work for a common cause, they all share a common spirit and, however large or small their contribution may be, they feel themselves part of a great common effort.

To be sure, we can say that there are many Globe families; people who have been with the paper for several generations. This itself is a sign of strength and stability. But everyone who is associated in the making of this paper from the oldest worker to the newest office boy is part of the Boston Globe family.

Perhaps this is another reason why the Globe has always recommended itself to us as a family paper. We have many good papers in our city and each one has its own distinctive flavor.

The quality that is first associated with the Globe is this one of family reading. It is a wholesome as well as a handsome paper; it forms the character while informing the mind; it edifies even while it enlightens and it relaxes while it enriches daily life. Calm in reporting the news, conservative in interpreting the times, constructive in the presentation of progress, it is a welcome visitor to the New England home.

Some people may feel badly that the paper is leaving the downtown area. All of them are gone now from old newspaper row. Gone, also, are the news bulletins and the newsboys' cries of "Extra—Extra." Gone, too, are the sidewalk editors and the news commentators and the occasional appearance of pressmen with their unique newspaper hats.

There is a kind of nostalgia in changes like this, but we cannot allow sentimentality to strangle the course of legitimate progress. A great newspaper like this one must move with the times. The years have changed, and we must change with them.

At the same time it is not inappropriate to mention, as you move into this extraordinary new plant with its latest equipment and conveniences, that the success of the days ahead will be measured by your fidelity to the great traditions of the years that are now past. Keep your confidence in the family newspaper because the strength of the family stands, and must stand, at the heart of America.

May God bless what you begin today, and may your efforts redound always to His glory, to your happiness and to the welfare of your countless readers, for we also are proud to belong to the family of the Boston Globe.

INVOCATION BY RABBI MEYER J. STRASSFELD OF CONGREGATION AGUDATH ISRAEL, DORCHESTER

Omnipotent God, Father of all mankind.

At this solemn and joyous moment of the dedication of the new home of the Boston Globe, we raise our voices in prayer and thanksgiving unto Thee.

We thank Thee for enabling us to reach this great moment of happiness and progress. We look back with pride upon the years of our past that witnessed the growth and expansion of our paper—years that accomplished the ideals, dreams, and principles as enumerated by Gen. Charles H. Taylor in his famous cornerstone of the Globe:

"My aim has been to make the Globe a cheerful attraction and useful newspaper that would enter the homes as a kindly, helpful friend of the family.

"My temperament has always let me to dwell on the virtues of men and institutions, rather than upon their faults and limitations.

"My disposition has always been to build up, rather than to join in tearing down. My ideal for the Globe has always been that it should help men, women and children to get some of the sunshine of life, to be better and happier because of the Globe."

At this glorious moment, we look ahead with hope and confidence, and with faith in Thee that Thou wilt guide us to emulate and strengthen these principles.

Grant us therefore, O Lord, we pray Thee, to serve our people in all times; to fight courageously for the ideals of democracy, decency, and human dignity through an honest truth-seeking, dedicated press.

May we be permitted to serve as a beacon of light, illuminating the paths of righteousness, justice and brotherly love. May our progress for universal peace and tranquility be fulfilled in our days.

Amen.

REMARKS BY REV. JOHN JOSEPH ALBERT, RECTOR OF ALL SAINTS' CHURCH, WYNNEWOOD, PA.

I will ask you to remain seated and unite your hearts and thoughts in our common hope and prayer that the one God whom we all worship, may bless and prosper this newspaper. That as it begins this era of wider service to the people of Boston, this commonwealth, and our beloved Nation, it may ever be sustained and guided by that divine assistance which is the source of man's freedom and his knowledge of truth.

Eternal God, who alone at the fountain of wisdom and understanding, and without Whom there can be unity of purpose, brotherhood or peace in the councils of men; we ask Thy blessing upon this newspaper, and all who labor in its far-reaching industry. So lock their labor and actions in the deepest bonds of friendship and loyalty, that the work of their hands and minds may ever set forth a right understanding of the events that touch the lives of men.

Grant to them pure purposes, soundness of speech, and such clarity in the written word of truth that men will be enabled to form their own opinions freely, uncluttered by the distortions of blind partisanship or personal aims, ambitions, and enmities.

Save them from false judgment, the carelessness which takes no heed of great issues, and from the fear that will not grapple with problems that may be too hard for them.

Keep alive and fresh the wonderful spirit that has made this paper great and has brought it to such a position of responsibility and public trust, the courage not to hide from controversy and the care never to print a piece of news that would injure an innocent person. The freedom not to be so encumbered with hindsight as to fail to do the unusual, not to be bound to traditions so tightly as to lose the daring to do what has not been done before, to be a messenger of fact to the great events, issues and affairs of the world of men, yet never to lose sight of the interests and experiences of people next door. In controversy an adviser rather than a dictator; an interpreter of news than an advocate. So may this paper grow and prosper and be an instrument of ever-wid-

ening service to Thee and all Thy children. Amen.

Emerson once said, "Every human institution is lengthened by the shadow of a man." This phrase was used by the biographer of Charles H. Taylor in describing his contribution to the Boston Globe. I am sure General Taylor would be the first to agree that in respect to the Globe these words could be voiced in the plural, the shadow of men.

I will now ask you to stand for a moment of silent tribute to those loyal men (and women) whose labor and service have lengthened the Boston Globe, especially remembering Gen. Charles H. Taylor, Charles H. Taylor, Sr., William Osgood Taylor, and Eben Jordan and will you remain standing for the closing prayer in their memory:

O God, who bindest us to life by holy and tender ties; we recall all those who have gone before us in this enterprise and all that they stood for. May we live even more constantly in the spirit which they imparted, and carry out, in the old spheres in which we together moved, so much of their purposes as we can. May we be kind to the friends and families they loved; devoted to the community in which they lived; loyal to the causes they served. Thus in our lives, and in the spirit of this newspaper, may they still live on, to our own strengthening, and the welfare of the world; and this we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Natchez Trace Parkway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 150 of the Mississippi State Legislature:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 150

Senate concurrent resolution memorializing the United States Department of Interior to expedite and do all things necessary toward the further programing and planning leading to ultimate construction and completion of the Natchez Trace Parkway, and for related purposes

Whereas the Natchez Trace Parkway, as planned and laid out, extends through the State of Mississippi in such regions and areas so as to expedite and accelerate tourist travel through various scenic and historical spots and has now become an attraction to all motorists who visit our State; and

Whereas the United States Department of Interior has endeavored to make the Natchez Trace Parkway inviting to all who visit our State and has done much in the construction of said parkway; and,

Whereas the State of Mississippi has already acquired about 50 percent of rights-of-way mileage and has implemented legislation for the acquisition of all right-of-way incident to the completion of said Natchez Trace Parkway; and

Whereas it is felt that the United States Department of Interior should now do all things necessary, within its authority, toward programing leading to the completion of said parkway: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Mississippi State Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the United States Department of Interior be memorialized to expedite the programing, constructing, and doing all other things necessary leading toward the completion of the Natchez Trace Parkway; Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be properly engrossed and forwarded to the United States Department of Interior, Washington, D. C., and copies be furnished to the Mississippi delegation in the National Congress.

Adopted by the senate, April 24, 1958.

CARROLL GARTIN,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house of representatives, April 30, 1958.

WALTER SILLERS,
Speaker of the house of representatives.

The Shackled Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like permission to insert a few remarks relative to the plight of the railroad industry today as well as a splendid editorial appearing in the Chicago Tribune of yesterday, May 12. A friend of mine, Joseph Ator, has been doing a series of articles about railroads recently and I commend him for bringing the serious situation of the railroads to the attention of the public.

Today I am introducing a bill which I believe is a big step in an effort to give this industry help.

It is time that we recall the brilliant and inestimable contribution the railroads have made to America. Every possible endeavor must be made to put into effect fair policies needed for the railroads to continue to play the important role they have long had in our Nation's history.

Eleven railroads serve my district and I believe an industry who has done so much is deserving of a fair deal. Let us take off the shackles.

THE SHACKLED RAILROADS

Last Thursday the Tribune published the last of 18 daily articles by Joseph Ator on the plight of United States railroads. The series was intended to interest especially the limited number of readers who are concerned with railroads and with Chicago's future. As the Nation's railroad center, this city is vitally affected by the health of the railroad industry.

As Mr. Ator reported, the railroads' health has been none too good for more than 40 years. Their illness is explained largely by errors of the past—mistakes of policy and public relations which today's management is doing its best to correct, but which can be corrected only slowly and at great expense. As evidence of the railroads' good intentions, Mr. Ator reported, they have shifted almost entirely from the old steam engine to the more efficient diesel; they have mechanized their upkeep where possible, and have put electronics to work in such fields as safety and research. They spent more than $1 billion last year on equipment, compared with a 1926–40 annual average of $170 million.

In their defense against competitors, however, the railroads have been hampered by outmoded union rules and Government regulations. Neither can be cured as long as people persist in the 19th century notion that railroads are a gigantic monopoly. This is the theory of the Interstate Commerce Act, passed way back in 1887.

The fact is that the railroad monopoly began to wane after World War I. Less than half of cross-country freight now goes by rail, the rest being carried by truck, pipeline, or barge. The railroads' share of commercial passenger traffic has dropped to less than one-third because of competition from buses and airlines. If private automobiles are considered, the railroads would show even a sharper drop. This can hardly be called a monopoly.

But while its competitors are relatively free of Federal regulation, the railroads are required to maintain costly facilities, schedules, and rates. Changes in rates are often denied simply because they would upset the balance between railroads and a competitor.

The rate of return on the railroads' investment last year was only 3.3 percent, Mr. Ator found, compared to the Interstate Commerce Commission's own yardstick of 5¾ percent as a fair rate. In other businesses a rate of 10 percent is common. Railroad taxes have tripled since 1929, and public funds are being used to build highways, airports, and canal and harbor improvements. This puts the railroads in the position of paying taxes to finance their competitors.

Many railroad men, Mr. Ator found, are willing to keep some degree of Federal regulation in order to prevent suicidal rate wars among themselves. But at present they are often denied even sensible rate reductions.

An essential step toward curing this ill is the Smathers committee's recommendation that the ICC be forbidden, when weighing a requested rate change, to consider how it would affect other modes of transportation. A railroad's great asset is its ability to carry a large volume of most commodities over long distances at less cost than other land transportation. The fact that the railroad can expand its services rapidly is of the greatest value in time of emergency. Preventing it from taking advantage of these assets is no more sensible than telling a trucker that he can't go any place not equally accessible to a railroad. And the sufferers are not only the railroads, but their customers as well.

Known But to God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, there appears in the May issue of 1958 of the Reader's Digest, a timely article by Don Wharton entitled "Known But to God." It is well for every American citizen to review the facts presented in this article before Memorial Day. I extend this as part of my remarks.

The article follows:

KNOWN BUT TO GOD

(By Don Wharton)

In the impressive ceremony honoring our Unknown Soldiers of World War II and Korea our Nation will once more pay homage to the heroes who have preserved its freedom and honor.

On Memorial Day the eyes and hearts of all America will be centered on our national cemetery at Arlington. There in the after-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

noon the Nation will honor two unknown servicemen, who will be buried in new crypts close to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier of World War I.

The two hallowed dead, one from World War II and one from the Korean war, cannot properly be called Unknown Soldiers, since it is not known which branch of the Armed Forces they represented. Actually, the Unknown Soldier himself may not have been a member of the United States Army. But in the years following the impressive burial ceremony at Arlington in 1921 the phrase gained acceptance by the American public, and the tomb was completed with its beautifully worded inscription: "Here Rests In Honored Glory An American Soldier Known But To God."

All wars produce unknown soldiers. At Arlington you can see a massive monument erected in 1866 over the common grave of 2,111 bodies gathered from the fields of Bull Run and the route to the Rappahannock. But graves such as this are simply burials of unidentified dead; there is no symbolism. In contrast, the idea of the Unknown Soldier was that any mother who had lost a son, any wife who had lost a husband whose body had not been identified, could stand at the tomb and think his body might be there.

Whence came this noble idea? It all goes back to a printer in the French town of Rennes. In the dark days of 1916 Francois Simon lost a son in battle. Another son was gravely wounded, and on several occasions Simon organized honorary escorts for the burial of bodies brought back to Rennes from the front. He got to thinking of soldiers whose bodies were not recovered and of recovered bodies which could not be identified.

That November, when his city had a ceremony honoring its war dead, Simon asked, "Why doesn't France open the doors of the Panthéon to one of her unknown warriors who died in the defense of his country? The grave should bear only two words, 'A Soldier,' and two dates, '1914–19—.'" The idea was taken up by a French Deputy, pushed by the press, and in 1919 given its first official approval in the French Parliament. Such was the beginning of a concept so exquisitely right that it swept halfway round the world.

A few days before the ceremony on November 11, 1920, the French decided not to bury their soldier in the Panthéon, but to give him a shrine apart—beneath the Arc de Triomphe, a place of honor which even a Napoleon could envy.

The scheme whereby the unknown poilu was selected established a pattern which has been followed elsewhere ever since. Unmarked coffins containing unidentified bodies selected from the major battle sectors were shipped to Verdun, shifted several times after arrival to prevent identification with any one area. The honor of making the final choice was given to a young infantryman, Pvt. Auguste Thin, chosen because his father was among France's unidentified war dead. Private Thin was handed a spray of red and white carnations picked on the fields of Verdun. High Government officials watched and soldiers stood at attention as he walked down the flag-draped row of caskets, stopped before one, placed the flowers on it.

While a train carried this coffin to Paris to be invested with glory never before accorded a "plain soldier," a British destroyer, H. M. S. *Verdun*, was bearing another body across the channel to England. No one knew whether he was soldier, sailor, or airman, whether he was British or from the Dominions. He had died in France and been buried in an unmarked grave. In a solemn ceremony at Westminster Abbey, he was reburied in French soil—100 bags filled with earth from the battlefields around Ypres. Similarly, a year later, when America's Unknown Soldier was brought home, his tomb at Arlington was constructed so that the casket rests on a 2-inch layer of French soil.

No President, no national hero ever went to his final rest with the honors given our Unknown Soldier at Arlington on Armistice Day, 1921. To him went the Congressional Medal of Honor and Distinguished Service Cross, plus the highest military decorations of Britain, France, Belgium, Italy, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. Three Presidents did him honor: Harding, Taft, and Wilson—the latter a dying man. Gen. John J. Pershing, commander in chief of the American Expeditionary Force, walked behind the gun carriage which bore the casket; Marshal Foch, Allied Supreme Commander, was there, and Admiral Beatty, the British sea lord.

Today, of all the 95,000 warriors' graves at Arlington, only the tomb of the nameless one has a sentry. It has been said that it is easier to get into West Point than to become a member of the Honor Guard that performs this 24-hour-a-day duty. First a soldier must be accepted in the 1st Battle Group, 3d Infantry (the Old Guard)—the crack regiment and oldest outfit of the United States Army—stationed at nearby Fort Myer. Then he must survive two selection processes to become a member of the Honor Company. Finally he must gain assignment as sentinel at the Chief of Staff's quarters and handle that duty well before he is even considered for the Honor Guard itself.

He must be 5 feet 11 inches to 6 feet 2 inches tall, of commensurate weight and build, and have no physical eccentricity that detracts from his appearance. No man with any disciplinary action on his record may walk this post.

Each sentinel patrols an hour at a time in the daytime, 2 hours at night. During each hour he walks his post, at strict attention, exactly 42 times. Every move is precisely timed: exactly 27 steps from one end of the post to the other; exactly 20 seconds facing the city of Washington; exactly 20 seconds facing the tomb. The guard carries a highly polished rifle with fixed bayonet, keeping it always on the shoulder away from the tomb—symbolizing that he has placed his body between the tomb and all danger.

Millions of tourists have seen the change of guard—a precise military ceremony performed every hour on the hour during the day. At night, when Arlington's gates are closed, the operation is equally exact. Suddenly in the dark the voice of the sentinel rings out: "Halt. Who is there?" Back comes the reply, "A relief commander and one sentinel." Then the first sentinel's voice rolls again: "Advance, relief commander only, to be recognized."

The two new crypts will necessitate only one minor change: moving the sentinel's post a few yards to the west. After World War II there were proposals to place a second body in the tomb, and even to rephrase its lovely inscription. In 1949 the Commission of Fine Arts actually recommended the construction of a second tomb. Happily, such elaborate undertakings were abandoned in favor of simplicity. The World War II body will rest in a crypt marked simply "1941–1945," and that from Korea, "1950–1953." The dates "1917–1818" will be cut in a stone at the base of the present tomb, and its inscription will serve to speak for them all.

Since all of the unidentified dead from Korea were buried in Hawaii, the task of selecting one is not complicated. On May 15 the choice will be made by an enlisted man with a distinguished battle record in a ceremony at the National Memorial Cemetery at Honolulu.

But the unidentified dead of World War II are buried in more than 400 cemeteries on 5 continents and scores of islands. Under the plan developed by the Quartermaster General 4 bodies will be disinterred from the United States cemetery at Manila, airlifted to Hawaii, and at Hickam Air Force Base will join 2 more World War II bodies from our cemetery in Hawaii. From these 6 identical caskets an enlisted man will, on May 16, choose one. Meanwhile, from each of the 13 American cemeteries in Europe and north Africa, an unidentified body will be sent to Epinal, France, where in 1944 the Allied forces from the landing in the south joined the troops driving eastward from Normandy. One of the 13 will be chosen, and 2 weeks later this casket and the one from the Pacific, identical and indistinguishable, will be resting beneath flags on the deck of the cruiser *Canberra*, which will be proceeding northward from a naval rendezvous at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Off the Virginia capes a Navy man wearing the Medal of Honor will march up to the caskets and make the final decision. One body will be given the time-honored burial at sea. The other will be transferred, together with that from the Korean war, to a destroyer for the run up the Potomac.

Then will come the reception at the Washington dock, the escort to the Capitol, the 48 hours of lying in state, the procession to Arlington, the continuous salute of minute guns, the award of military decorations, the address by the President, the volley by the riflemen, the mournful sound of taps. And then, surely, before the sentinels resume their perpetual march, the Nation's grief will give way to prayers that this will never be necessary again.

This Web of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the other day I met a remarkable lady who was once a pioneering citizen of the Southwest, and who recently celebrated her 91st birthday by writing the moving poem reprinted below.

In This Web of Life, Mrs. Ida Miller Bradford has eloquently expressed the thoughts and the feelings of one who has keenly observed the events of more than nine decades, and who retains the same keen interest in current events today.

THIS WEB OF LIFE

This web of life, long since begun,
Is incomplete at 91.
The visions wrought through many days
Have brightly burned, and still they blaze.

The slender threads, though worn and thin,
Still hold the strength of life within;
The sweep of time does not efface
Its patterned dreams, nor mar its grace.

And yet they grow, as round on round
New visions form, new thoughts, new sound:
The world in turmoil—even space
Included in man's frenzied race.
Must we discard the quiet scene
That youth once pictured on life's screen,
And watch through age the fast decline
Of principles we hold divine?

Within this web the woven past
Holds memories that ever last.
Awhile they fade from out our ken
But, like the tides, return again.

And so we watch them come and go
Upon life's vast, unbroken flow—
The good and evil, side by side,
Converging on the moving tide.

The years slip by; the web begun
So long ago, is almost spun,
As round on round with shaking hands
We gather up the broken strands.

But place them how or as we may,
Our patterned form is yesterday;
And to the ever-present past
The golden strands are woven fast.

—*Ida Miller Bradford.*

The Illogical Argument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial entitled, "The Illogical Argument," from the May 12, 1958, issue of the Wall Street Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ILLOGICAL ARGUMENT

The House Foreign Affairs Committee has reported out a foreign-aid bill for fiscal 1959 totaling $3.6 billion. In doing so, the majority warned that any serious reduction from this precise figure would inevitably mean that we would lose the cold war.

This figure, though, is $339 million less than the administration requested. And when the administration made its request, it also warned that if the Congress did not give as much as it asked the Nation would be in danger of losing the cold war.

So the same argument is made that we will all be in danger if the dollar amount is reduced, though the administration's danger dollar is not the same as the committee's danger dollar.

But it seems to us that if the House committee thinks the administration was wrong in its estimate of how much is needed to prevent a loss of the cold war, Congress may reasonably question the sum that the House committee reports is necessary to spend in order to save us. For the committee may be just as wrong as the administration was wrong in its guess. And guesswork, actually, is all any such figure can possibly represent—as four members of the House committee took the trouble to point out in a minority report asking even deeper cuts.

Aside from this very unconvincing argument that X amount of dollars will save the world but X minus 1 amount of dollars will lose it, there is another argument that certainly warrants a long, hard look at the whole proposition of foreign aid.

This argument, joined in by both the administration and the House Foreign Affairs Committee, runs like this: Foreign aid money provides business for American firms and jobs for some 600,000 Americans. If foreign aid is cut substantially, an unestimated number of these 600,000 jobs will be endangered.

What the adherents of big giveaways are saying here is that foreign aid is a make-work project for Americans. They argue on the one hand that the Nation must be unselfish enough to help overseas countries overcome their troubles, and on the other that we must use foreign aid for the selfish purpose of keeping the domestic economy on a less unstable keel.

The trouble with those two arguments is that, so far as the altruistic one goes, we've already poured some $60 billion into uplift with hardly notable success. And so far as the other is concerned, it would anchor into the economy a policy that is nothing but an international W. P. A. That countries can be induced to stand on their own feet when they are told the United States economy itself rests on their continuing inability to do so, is something logic cannot accept.

And inasmuch as nobody yet has offered any acceptable facts to prove that either the world or America will go to pot unless we annually ship billions of dollars overseas, we hope Congress will not accept the arguments, either.

Pugwash Pollyanna

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice to that of our colleagues who have expressed righteous indignation at the scurrilous attack which the Ohio industrialist, Cyrus Eaton, made upon the Federal Bureau of Investigation during a nationally televised program last weekend. Mr. Eaton, of course, is entitled to his opinions. Anyone who makes public utterances, however, has a responsibility to be certain his facts are accurate. Herein lies a great and oft-recurring weakness of Mr. Eaton.

Those of us who know the FBI as a highly efficient and impartial investigative agency find it impossible to fit J. Edgar Hoover and his associates into the picture which Cyrus Eaton has attempted to paint of them. This, however, is a common experience with persons familiar with Mr. Eaton's strange proclamations.

In recent years, Cyrus Eaton has won an eager following of Iron Curtain officials. He has entertained Soviet representatives at his country estate and has provided quotations for the Communist propaganda mills. Not only has he ingratiated himself to the Soviets by echoing and reechoing their hollow slogan of peaceful coexistence, but he also has accused the United States of baiting the Russians and being primarily responsible for the tension which exists between our two countries.

Mr. Eaton's blindness to the true nature of the international Communist conspiracy prompted the Cleveland Plain Dealer to publish the following excellent editorial on May 6, 1958:

PUGWASH POLLYANNA

We wish we could live in that best of all possible dream worlds, the one Cyrus Eaton, the sage of Pugwash, lives in.

What a happy world that must be, as Eaton described it on television when interviewed by Mike Wallace Sunday evening. There communism is not a threat to anyone, and everyone lives in peace. Korea never happened. Budapest is just a town where some misguided freedom fighters happened to get in the line of fire of some Russian tank guns. When Lenin said that communism and capitalism could never exist peaceably side by side, that one must conquer the other, he didn't really mean it.

In this Eaton dream world it is folly to believe that there is anything frightening about communism, or to oppose it, for Communists are harmless. When they infiltrated the Government they were merely seeking to strengthen it. When they infiltrated the labor unions, all they wanted was to improve the lot of the workingman. When they nearly succeeded in stampeding the Democratic convention into nominating Henry Wallace for Vice President in 1944, they were just exercising their democratic rights.

In Eaton's dream world there would be no trouble with Communists at all if we, ourselves, didn't make it. It was preposterous, for instance, for John Foster Dulles to use the words "massive retaliation" because that implies we would fight back if the Communists attacked us.

But, alas, there are some annoyances in the world Eaton lives in, and one of them is the FBI. Hitler in his prime never had anything like it.

Well, now, we never knew things were as bad as all that. We've heard of the midnight knock on the door, the arrest without warrant, the torture chamber, the forced confession, the trial without jury, the bullet in the head and so on, but we always attributed that kind of stuff to the Gestapo and the MVD. However, we must remember that Eaton was talking about his own special world, and that world bears no relation to reality.

Last week Cleveland's American Lithuanian Council mailed to Eaton a copy of J. Edgar Hoover's book, "Masters of Deceit." We recommend to Eaton that he read it, and that he should also study what happened to the people of Lithuania, Latvia and Esthonia after their governments entered into treaties of friendship with the Soviet Union.

We also suggest that Eaton should read a study of Communist postwar strategy by Prof. Robert Strausz-Hupe in Orbis—A quarterly journal of world affairs, wherein he will find this statement:

"Our society does not subordinate all its aspirations to considerations of power; Communist-dominated societies do. And the struggle being what it is, namely, a revolutionary one, communism presses all men and all things into the service of one cause: The overthrow of the existing social order and the establishment of a Communist society."

Mother

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include a most inspiring poem dedicated to mother, written by Henry Gillen, which appeared in the Boston Sunday Globe on May 11, 1958:

MOTHER
(By Henry Gillen)

Oh, she's more than just a woman
Cooking, sewing, smoothing beds,
Getting breakfast for the broodies,
Tucking in the sleepyheads;
She's the sunrise of their morning
And the sunset of their day,
And the preacher slowly teaching
Little hands to fold and pray;

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

She's the doctor working wonders
With a cure in every kiss,
And the haven for the harried
When there's anything amiss;
She's the voice of angels singing
Olden, golden lullabies,
And the magic storyteller
Who can close a baby's eyes;

She's a Merlin, she's a Mary
With a lot of Nancy Hanks,
Who is paid in arms that capture
With a tiny bit of thanks;
She a nursery Clara Barton
And a kitchen door Jeanne d'Arc,
And a backyard garden Burbank,
And the starlight after dark,

She's a headrest for the weary
And a patience for the plaint,
And a planner and a doer,
And a soldier and a saint,
She's the moonlight on the mountain
And the lighthouse by the sea,
And a confessor and comfort,
And faith, hope and charity;

Though no subject of the headlines
In the capitols or marts,
And she wears no crown of diamonds,
She's the lovely queen of hearts.

The Staff Horror

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Joseph Alsop, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 4, 1958, is worthy of the attention of our colleagues:

THE STAFF HORROR
(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—The President himself has now described one of the main causes of his administration's curious inability to take rapid and decisive action on great and urgent matters.

"I do not believe," he said at his press conference, "that any individual * * * can do the best job by just sitting at a desk and putting his face in a bunch of papers."

"Actually the job when you come right down to it, when you think of the interlocking staffs and associates that have to take and analyze all the details of every question that comes to the Presidency, he ought to be trying to keep his mind free of inconsequential details * * * so that he can make clearer and better judgments."

Through the tangled thicket of Eisenhower syntax, one can dimly discern the fearful shape of the Eisenhower staff system. This vast machine has been developed to relieve the President of the burden of inconsequential detail and the bother of putting his face in a bunch of papers. In these respects, it certainly works to perfection. But consider its effect on America's policy and posture, and you cannot conclude that the famous staff system works very well, if indeed it can be said to work at all. At this moment, for example, there are a whole series of moves the American government could make, in order to capture the initiative in the miserable maneuvering toward a summit meeting. The simplest would be a one-sentence letter from the President, declaring his readiness to discuss disarmament at the summit, anywhere and on any terms, within two weeks after the Soviets have given solid proof of their willingness to accept serious inspection and control of disarmament. That would be a real blockbuster.

Because of the staff system, however, no such letter can be written, and presummit initiatives must always be left to the Soviets. You cannot recapture the initiative, as Secretary of State Dulles once boasted he had done, if you do not know your own mind. And the plain and awful truth is that even today, the American government does not know its own mind on disarmament.

Our positions have not been firmed up yet, is the official way of putting it. Without giving any positive guidance about the positions he would like to have outlined, the President has turned the whole gigantic complex question over to a gaggle of high officials—Secretary Dulles, Admiral Strauss, Secretary of Defense McElroy, and Dr. Killian are the chief interested parties.

The high officials have, in turn, passed on the poisoned chalice to subordinate officials, who, of course, fully reflect the bitter disagreements of their chiefs. In meeting after meeting, the areas of disagreement are being pinned down in reams of highly classified documents. But no decisions are being taken except on the issue of suspension of nuclear tests. And on this issue, John Foster Dulles has contemptuously bypassed the staff system. He has made his own decision in favor of eventual test suspension. And he is boldly preparing to implement it.

Very little gets done, in truth, except under the absolutely irresistible pressure of events, or when a single member of the Cabinet simply forges ahead on his own. Even the defense reorganization bill, universally described as "the President's own baby," does not really constitute an exception to the rule.

In this case, the President merely indicated he wanted a plan of defense reorganization which would eliminate the evil influences of interservice rivalries. His Secretary of Defense was brand new at his job. The President had spent all his prepolitical working life in the war and Defense Department. But when Neil McElroy and his working group, headed by Charles Coolidge, tackled the problem of defense reorganization, they received no detailed specifications of any sort from the White House. As a result, the defense reorganization plan is really a McElroy-Coolidge baby, and not the President's baby in any normal sense of the phrase.

In this case, the result was good. But in the vast majority of cases, the result is something close to paralysis. Ours is a Presidential government. It puts an appalling burden on the occupant of the White House. But this kind of government does not and cannot function when the man in the White House delegates nine-tenths of the vital process of decisionmaking to a Rube Goldberg machine called a staff system.

More Ford Money Misspent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Tablet:

MORE FORD MONEY MISSPENT

Americans are proud of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Year after year it apprehends murderers, robbers, kidnappers, counterfeiters, dope fiends and other criminals who break our laws and threaten the safety of our people. It also has successfully exposed and been a help in convicting hundreds of plotters, agents of foreign governments intent on destroying our liberty and threatening our Republic.

The head of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover, has won the plaudits of the American people and the approbation of each succeeding administration. He has been an effective power in law enforcement, a strong guardian of our Nation's freedom. Only recently Archbishop Cushing of Boston, in the name of many Americans, saluted Mr. Hoover's work and recommended his most recent book, Masters of Deceit, as a must for this generation to read and spread as a service to our Nation against the Communist menace.

Last Sunday evening Cyrus S. Eaton, of Cleveland, who appears to have given leadership to what some call Russia First, appeared on the Mike Wallace radio program and, following what might be best described as the party line, bitterly assailed Mr. Hoover and the FBI. He charged science had been retarded by the FBI—perhaps the Red science of stealing United States information—and, he added, there were no Communists in the United States to speak of, except in the minds of those on the payroll of the FBI.

The industrialist declared the FBI had sold itself in a marvelous way. He said its importance was enormously exaggerated. "They make no contribution to the upbuilding of this country and its respect abroad," he asserted.

Mr. Eaton contended in the filmed interview that the FBI was just one of scores of agencies in the United States investigating citizens. If you were to take the police forces of the cities and of the counties and of the State and governmental agencies and add them up, Hitler in his prime, through the Gestapo, never had any such spy organization as we in this country today.

There was much more of this material which sounded like a Daily Worker editorial and included the frequent Red boast; namely, that the Soviet Union and Communist China were pleased with the anti-Christian dictatorship and it's there to stay.

That this amazing performance should come from Eaton is not too surprising, for he has been a critic of the anti-Communist attitude of our Government and probably despises our Armed Forces as well as the FBI. The key to the disgraceful performance are those who pay for such a broadcast. The 74-year-old industrialist was a guest in a new series of interviews by Mr. Wallace on the overall theme of survival and freedom. It is being produced in association with the Fund for the Republic, which was established by a $15 million grant from the Ford Foundation.

Labor Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Newark News, N. J., of May 8, 1958, entitled "Labor Reform":

LABOR REFORM

Having defeated Senator KNOWLAND's efforts to write labor reforms on the Senate

floor, the Senate leadership has begun what it calls an orderly approach to the problem. A Senate subcommittee headed by Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, is conducting hearings on legislative proposals by Senator MCCLELLAN'S investigating committee, the Eisenhower administration, organized labor and Senator KNOWLAND'S rejected program.

The first witnesses, Messrs MCCLELLAN and KNOWLAND, emphasized the need for assuring the union members control over their organizations and protecting union funds from embezzlement by union bosses.

Documented disclosures of widespread abuses have forced national leaders of labor to abandon the arbitrary stand that no restrictive legislation is needed. On behalf of the AFL–CIO its president, George Meany, has submitted a list of remedies it would approved.

They deal almost entirely with halting thefts of union funds. They fall far short of what the McClellan committee, the administration and Senator KNOWLAND have demanded. They ignore one of the major needs, the establishment of democratic procedures.

Of this omission Mr. Meany says:

"We have secret ballots. The idea of Congress writing constitutional provisions and compelling voluntary organizations to put them in their constitutions is repugnant in itself."

The idea may be repugnant, but that doesn't mean it isn't necessary. Banks and railroads and other public utilities also found the idea of public regulation repugnant, but they had to accept it because abuses had developed in their operations.

Mr. Meany says that "we have secret ballots," but he doesn't say that all unions use them all the time. Besides, more than secret ballots is required to insure periodical elections and guard against trusteeship abuses and collusive contracts obtained through bribery.

In an election year labor leaders undoubtedly will be able to block a comprehensive reform program. But even if Congress at this session goes no further than Mr. Meany is willing to go, that would be a substantial victory for union members who have been robbed by their leaders.

Judge John J. Parker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the all-time great jurists of our country was the late Judge John J. Parker, of Charlotte, N. C. His long service to the Federal judiciary as chief judge of the fourth circuit was outstanding and earned for Judge Parker not only the respect but the admiration of lawyers and litigants alike. At ceremonies in Richmond recently memorializing the late Judge Parker, his long-time friend and neighbor from Charlotte, Dr. Frank Porter Graham, former president of the University of North Carolina, later United States Senator and presently United Nations mediator, delivered the principal address. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from that address as quoted in the Charlotte Observer:

(Here are excerpts from a talk made by Dr. Frank P. Graham at ceremonies in Richmond memorializing the late Judge John J. Parker. Dr. Graham, United Nations mediator and former president of the University of North Carolina, entered the university as a freshman to find Parker, a junior, already a distinguished student leader. It was, for the two, the start of a lifelong friendship.)

(By Frank P. Graham)

In this brief compass of his life and within my own limitations, I am not adequate to do more than suggest the origin, the quality, and the range of the life and services of John J. Parker.

Starting with little money and no pull, by sheer integrity of character and mind, steadfast work and relentless will, he climbed the judicial heights of his time but never lost the common touch and remained loyal to old friends and appreciative of their meaning in their common life.

John Parker, by personal sympathy and by the unpretentious life of his father, a highly respected merchant in the small historic town of Monroe, N. C., was proudly a man of the people in the full dignity of our North Carolina democracy.

Characteristic of many North Carolina families who triumphed over their small incomes in a resurgent State on the way up from post bellum poverty into a more general well-being through education and industry, he seldom spoke either of poverty or lineage.

Through his mother and his descent from colonial Albemarle he had either direct or collateral heritage from a professor of oriental languages at the University of Glasgow, a colonial governor who served the longest period of any governor in the history of North Carolina, and a postrevolutionary governor who was one of the leading Federalists of his day.

The Associate Justice of the Supreme Court from North Carolina appointed by George Washington is still the only North Carolinian who has sat on that Court, which his descendant, John J. Parker, missed by one vote in the Senate of the United States. He was the grandson of the rector of historic Saint Paul in Edenton, N. C., in whose beautiful shades many of Parker's forebears lie buried in sacred memory. * * *

Parker was one of those student leaders who helped to build in Chapel Hill a campus climate of opinion and attitudes in which excellence in scholarship, literature, debate, and leadership were no less renowned among students than triumphs in intercollegiate athletics.

Foremost leader of the insurgent nonfraternity student democracy of the University of North Carolina, he was throughout life a champion of the equal freedom and dignity of the individual person.

He was essentially a progressive conservative who would conserve the best of our heritage and advance the fairest of our hopes.

For him progressive measures were not to be the exhibitions of superficial novelty and passing popularity but in their deeper meaning were to be the revelation of enduring values of equal freedom and justice under law for all. * * *

For John Parker the transitions of leadership were a natural evolution from high responsibility in a campus democracy to leadership in one of the original historic States to eminent influence in the Federal Union of States and in the international affairs of the free concert of nations.

As a Republican in a dominantly Democratic State, his defeats in strenuous high-level political campaigns for Congress, for State attorney general and for governor, never embittered but rather schooled him for later victories of the spirit over disappointments and sorrows which might have undermined the character of a man without his high faith in the democratic process, generous understanding and dauntless courage.

With wisdom tempered by experience, preeminent became his services on the court of the fourth circuit in which he served as the chief judge, the senior Federal judge and the judicial peer under four of the 14 Chief Justices of the Supreme Court.

He wrote some 1,500 opinions, unsurpassed in numbers and epochal in basic cases for civil liberties, religious freedom, the right of the national Government and the local community to cooperate in the use of public money for public power, and for the right of a member of a labor union to sue the union for damages on account of discrimination because of race.

It was a part of his loyalty to the Constitution, the courts, and the law of the land that he, as a circuit judge, supported the position of the Supreme Court as it stood before and then as it stood after the epoch-making decision of 1954.

It is notable that following the decision of the Supreme Court, in the hot southern area of civil rights, the chief judge for the fourth circuit, second only to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, wrote the basic opinions which provided the clear-cut interpretations and feasible implementation of the historic decision which did not compel integration but did prohibit legal segregation in the public schools on account of race or color.

Almost unanimous has been the judgment of Federal and State judges and lawyers, that, in the improvement of the procedures and administration of justice in the Federal courts, Judge Parker stands preeminent in the history of American jurisprudence.

It is recalled that an eminent English jurist, who sat with Judge Parker, the alternate American judge on the International Tribunal for the trial of the Nazi leaders charged with war crimes against humanity, himself visited the United States in tribute to the quiet but profound character of the eminently judicial services of Judge Parker on that tribunal.

Three Presidents of the United States in succession turned to him for light and judgment in difficult situations.

Roosevelt asked him to make a judicial recommendation in a controversy of rights between the Office of the Comptroller General and the War Shipping Administration.

Truman appointed him as the alternate American jurist in the postwar international tribunal.

To the side of President Eisenhower he valiantly rallied in resistance to a constitutional amendment which would have tragically limited the initiative and responsibility of the President in the conduct of foreign policy as an accepted part of the structure of the United States since the founding of the Republic.

His speeches in strategic places and his testimony before the Senate committees were among the decisive forces in preserving the meaning of the American presidency in its responsibility and opportunity for international leadership in the modern world.

The life and service of John Parker today add to the democratic meaning of the homes and public schools of Monroe, N. C., the rock walls and ivied halls of the University of North Carolina, the Federal Building and Queens Road of Charlotte, and to the court of the fourth circuit in this capital on the James River in old Virginia, whose flag of responsible representative government under law must ever fly free and high in the modern world.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Constitution Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, by Presidential proclamation dated August 30, 1956, the week beginning September 17 of each year was set aside as Constitution Week, a time for the contemplation and commemoration of the historic acts which resulted in the formation of our Constitution. This proclamation urges the people of the United States to observe that week with appropriate ceremonies and activities in their schools and churches and in other appropriate places.

The entire text of the proclamation is as follows:

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION

Whereas on September 17, 1787, after 4 months of debate, highlighted by sharp differences of view and by wise compromises, the outstanding leaders of our Republic, who were meeting in Convention at Philadelphia, signed the Constitution of the United States of America; and

Whereas the story of the framing, signing, and adoption of that epochal document constitutes one of the most significant chapters in the history of our country; and

Whereas it is fitting that every American should reflect upon the vision and fortitude of our forebears in creating a charter designed "to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty" for themselves and for the fortunate millions who were to follow them as citizens of this Nation; and

Whereas the Congress, by a joint resolution approved August 2, 1956, has requested the President to set aside the week beginning September 17 of each year as Constitution Week, a time for the contemplation and commemoration of the historic acts which resulted in the formation of our Constitution:

Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the period beginning September 17 and ending September 23, 1956, as Constitution Week; and I urge the people of the United States to observe that week with appropriate ceremonies and activities in their schools and churches, and in other suitable places. I also urge them at that time to give solemn and grateful thought to that eventful week in September 1787 when our Constitution was signed, delivered to the Continental Congress, and made known to the people of the country, thus laying the foundation for the birth of a new Nation.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 29th day of August in the year of our Lord 1956, and of the independence of the United States of America the 181st.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

By the President:

JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State.

My purpose at this time is to remind the Nation and particularly our schools and colleges, of this significant and patriotic event. Since it occurs shortly after the fall term commences in September, such institutions may find it expedient to begin preparation before summer vacation begins.

No Bombings in Charlotte

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, on May 5, 1958, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], in an extension of remarks at page A4106 in the Appendix of the RECORD, included a statement issued by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith which contained a compilation of alleged bombings of religious institutions, schools and other property. Incidents numbered 24 and 25 were listed in that statement as follows:

24. November 11, 1957, Charlotte, N. C.: Bombing attempt at Temple Beth-El failed.

25. November 5, 1957, Charlotte, N. C.: Police investigating three dynamiting incidents in Negro section since October 27; latest explosion in vacant house practically destroyed.

These statements were called to the attention of the Police Department of Charlotte by a staff writer of the Charlotte Observer who interviewed police officials and prepared the following article which appeared in the May 7 issue of the Charlotte Observer:

Local police Tuesday challenged a statement by the B'nai B'rith that three race-inspired dynamite explosions occurred in Charlotte during October and November of 1957.

The controversy arose Monday when Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of bombings as compiled by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, a Jewish fraternal organization. Included was this statement:

"November 5, 1957, Charlotte, N. C.: Police investigating three dynamiting incidents in Negro section since October 27; latest explosion in vacant house practically destroyed."

City and county police said flatly that this was not true.

"No bombs have gone off in the city of Charlotte," said Assistant Chief John S. Hord of city police. He was backed up by Detective Capt. W. A. McCall.

"If these bombings had happened, I would have been there," McCall said.

County Police Capt. G. A. Stephens said his department had no knowledge of any bombings in the county at that time.

CELLER also mentioned the attempted bombing of Temple Beth El in Charlotte November 11, 1957; the attempt at Temple Emanuel in Gastonia February 9, 1958, and one at Woodland School in the county February 15.

Police pointed out the explosions did not occur at any of these places.

At Temple Beth El, six sticks of dynamite were found in an outside corner of the building. The fuse had been lighted but burned out.

The situation was about the same at Temple Emmanuel. Police discovered an overnight bag sitting beside the church at 4 a. m. This fuse also had gone out.

At the Woodland School incident, county police had been tipped off about the try and were waiting when the men arrived. Five were arrested and three were later convicted. All admitted being Ku Klux Klansmen.

I have received a letter from the Police Department of Charlotte requesting that the RECORD be corrected. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] was informed of my intention to insert the foregoing newspaper article and the following letter in the RECORD and he assured me that he would be glad to have me do so. I am sure the gentleman from New York desires to have the RECORD factually correct. Following is the letter I received from the police department:

CITY OF CHARLOTTE, N. C.,
OFFICE OF POLICE DEPARTMENT,
May 9, 1958.

Hon. CHARLES RAPER JONAS,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JONAS: Monday, May 5, 1958, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, had the following statement inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A4106 under the heading of "Bombings" as follows:

"November 11, 1957, Charlotte, N. C.: Bombing attempt at Temple Beth-El failed.

"November 5, 1957, Charlotte, N. C.: Police investigating three dynamiting incidents in Negro section since October 27; latest explosion in vacant house practically destroyed."

The attempt bombing at Temple Beth-El is correct. However, Congressman CELLER has evidently been misinformed as to the three dynamiting incidents having been investigated by the police in this city on November 5, 1957, as this is incorrect. We had no bombings in the city of Charlotte in a number of years.

I hope the statement made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be corrected and we would appreciate it very much if you will see that this is done as we feel it is doing the city of Charlotte and its citizens a grave injustice.

With kindest regards, I am

Cordially yours,

F. N. LITTLEJOHN,
Chief of Police.
JOHN S. HORD,
Assistant Chief of Police.

The good people of Charlotte do not condone bombings or other acts of terrorism or violence. The police department of that city is alert and efficient in its efforts to maintain law and order, and in these efforts it has the support of the overwhelming majority of the people in the city.

Vital Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the United States Tobacco Journal of May 5, 1958, on the

vital subject of the proposed extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act:

VITAL LEGISLATION

The recent decline in foreign purchases of American-grown tobacco, arising from overseas competition and the necessary price structure for this country's leaf, can reach serious proportions unless immediate action is taken to insure the maintenance of these diminishing markets.

One of the problems involved, of course, is the cost of production of tobacco in the United States. Since the cultivation of a leaf crop requires a high proportion of hand labor, there is no way of reducing costs without simultaneously reducing the quality of the product. The latter alternative is unthinkable, for it is the quality of American leaf which has given it supreme standing in the world market.

It would be convenient if there were some readily available method of subsidizing leaf exports in order to retain this country's share of the international tobacco trade, but other than the so-called Public Law 480 shipments—whose extent is severely limited by the supply of Federal funds for foreign aid—no such quick answer to this question exists.

Actually, it appears that the only fruitful avenue of approach to the problem of retaining foreign markets for American tobacco growers is the direct converse of a direct subsidy to the domestic producers: A further development of the process of helping overseas buyers to help themselves.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, whose proposed 5-year extension now is being argued in Congress, represents the only means of stimulating foreign purchases of American commodities, unless the distasteful and costly system of subsidies is accepted as a workable alternative.

The trade act, as long experience has demonstrated, makes it possible by mutual reduction in import duties here and in the customer countries, to maintain a constant flow of goods in both directions. Just as an automobile factory can expect to sell more cars when its own and its competitors' labor forces are working overtime, so can American tobacco growers expect to find broader markets for their leaf when foreign countries can sell their goods here at reasonably competitive prices.

A full 5-year extension of the act is needed to keep the free world economically healthy. It is in the best interests of the United States to renew the act.

Major Health Organizations Announce Program for Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 8, 1958, I directed the attention of our colleagues to the announcement of an award for research on the medical and biological aspects of the aging. I am pleased to note the news release of four of the major national health organizations announcing a comprehensive program to improve the health care of our aged citizens.

The release, dated May 8, 1958, follows:

MAJOR HEALTH ORGANIZATIONS ANNOUNCE PROGRAM FOR AGED

Better health care for the Nation's 14 to 15 million aged is the goal of a comprehensive program announced today by the Joint Council To Improve the Health Care of the Aged.

The council's attack on the more knotty problems of health care for the aged is designed to: (1) increase opportunities for older people to obtain voluntary health-insurance coverage, (2) expand health-care facilities tailored to the needs of the aged regardless of economic status, and (3) develop more community-health services for the aged.

The program will be implemented through the active and aggressive leadership of the council's four sponsoring organizations—the American Dental Association, American Hospital Association, American Medical Association, and the American Nursing Home Association.

"Member organizations of the Joint Council," said Dr. Edwin L. Crosby, director of the American Hospital Association and interim secretary of the council, "have already undertaken studies and work projects aimed at improving the health care of the aged." Among the many activities which these groups have undertaken or in which they have cooperated he listed the following:

(1) The American Hospital Association, in cooperation with the Public Health Service, is conducting a conference on the care of patients with long-term illness.

(2) An American Medical Association committee is working with the American Nursing Home Association in preparing upgraded standards for nursing homes which will result in improved nursing home care for the aged.

(3) A National Conference on Homemaker Services is being arranged under the joint auspices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and 26 national voluntary organizations including the American Medical Association. This project is aimed at reducing the financial expense of disabling illness among the elderly by performing the necessary household tasks to enable them to remain at home among their family and friends, with qualified nursing and medical attendance in the home.

(4) Six regional conferences have been held under the auspices of the American Medical Association to help doctors cope with problems of the aged, and a national conference will be held in September.

The joint council will appraise the success of these programs and seek their application through united effort.

"The long-range aim of the council is better health for all the aged," Dr. Crosby asserted. "This can be achieved by helping everyone to prepare throughout his life for the later years. Our more immediate concern is better care for the aged who are chronically ill, and better ways to meet the financial and social problems that accompany such illness."

He said, "The joint council has found that sufficient up-to-date information concerning the problem is not available. A series of research projects has been launched to pinpoint the problems that require the most urgent attention."

"In addition," he continued, "the joint council will seek the expansion and improvement of health care facilities by encouraging legislative action to accelerate construction and remodeling of hospital and nursing home facilities for the aging."

To better meet the problems of the financial expense of prolonged hospitalization for chronic illnesses, the joint council is working with the voluntary health insurance industry, including Blue Cross and Blue Shield prepayment plans, to accelerate and broaden their programs that have already resulted in some degree of coverage of 6 million persons over 65 in a few short years.

The joint council has emphasized the need for State and local governments to assume their proper responsibility to indigent patients, by providing realistic financial support for medical, dental, hospital, and nursing home care for the aging who are unable to pay.

Dr. Crosby said, "The broad health care plan of the joint council includes an educational program at the national, State, and local levels. Its purpose is to make all citizens aware of the growing health problems of the aging and what can be done by the individual to assist in this field. The council plans to enlist the continued aid and support of America's voluntary community organizations."

G. H. Alford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on April 20, 1958, the State of Mississippi and the Nation lost a valuable and distinguished citizen in the passing of Hon. George H. Alford.

Widely known as a leader in agricultural, political, journalistic, civic, and church circles, Mr. Alford devoted his long and fruitful life to serving the cause of human advancement. His good works—and they are many—will be long remembered by the people of Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I speak for all of my colleagues from Mississippi in expressing sorrow over the passing of Mr. Alford, and in extending to his fine family our deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herewith a copy of the press account of Mr. Alford's passing, along with an editorial which appeared concurrently in the April 21, 1958 issue of the McComb (Miss.) Enterprise-Journal. The editorial was written by one of Mr. Alford's long-time friends, Hon. Oliver Emmerich, and is a fine tribute to a great and good man:

[From the McComb (Miss.) Enterprise-Journal of April 21, 1958]

NOTED FARM LEADER, G. H. ALFORD, DIES

Services for George Howard Alford, 83, prominent Pike County farmer, writer and community leader who died Sunday, were held at 2 p. m. today at Progress Baptist Church.

Mr. Alford died at 2:35 a. m. at St. Dominic Hospital at Jackson following a trip to Mississippi State College where he attended an alumni meeting.

He was a veteran farm leader, editor and former Pike representative.

EXCELLED IN FARM WORK

He excelled in all these fields, and he was Pike County's first county agent and was the first Federal field agent of agriculture in the United States.

He was a Baptist, deacon, and Mason.

Mr. Alford was born January 28, 1875, at Progress community in southern Pike

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

County—the eldest of 10 children of J. Dock and Laminda Fortenberry Alford.

At the time of his death, he lived within 200 yards of his birth place in Progress.

He was graduated from Mississippi State College in 1899 and later was graduated from George Washington University, Washington, D. C.

COLLEGE ATHLETE

At Mississippi State, he played center on the college's first football team. He was captain of that team and also was editor of the college yearbook, Reflector.

His one ambition in life was to help develop the agriculture and rural life of Mississippi and the South.

This was evidenced in legislation which he supported when he served as a legislative representative from Pike County.

He championed a bill to provide county departments of agriculture, a bill to authorize the establishment of agricultural high school and legislation to eradicate ticks.

FIRST PIKE AGENT

With the inauguration of farm demonstration work, Mr. Alford became Pike County's first county agent.

He also served as agent in Claiborne and Forrest Counties and later was district agent for south Mississippi.

He served as State agent in charge of agricultural work in Maryland and also was Federal field agent for Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, and Kentucky.

He also was secretary-manager of the Texas Farm Bureau and superintendent of Magnolia Electric Association.

In the field of farm journalism, Mr. Alford was editor of the Southern Farm Gazette, the Progressive Farmer, and the Progress Enterprise.

HONORARY POSITIONS

As a civic leader, he held the following honorary positions:

President of the Pike County Farm Bureau, president of the Mississippi Farm Bureau, president of the Pike County Development Board, president of the Southwest Mississippi Livestock Association.

Member of the Pike County Board of Education; trustee of the Progress Consolidated High School; president of the Pike County Baptist Sunday School Convention.

Included among the books and pamphlets Mr. Alford wrote were:

Southwest Mississippi Livestock Association, How To Prosper in Boll Weevil Territory, Southern International Harvester Co. Demonstration Farms, Talks to Farmers, Twenty-eight Selected Addresses.

Health Bulletin, Diversified Farming in the Cotton Belt, Getting a Start With Alfalfa in the Cotton Belt, How To Grow Cotton in Spite of the Boll Weevil.

How To Live a Long and Happy Life, Autobiography of G. H. Alford, and Prayer Changes Things.

SURVIVORS LISTED

In 1902, Mr. Alford married Mayme Simmons, daughter of Dr. Willis Fleet and Annie Hall Simmons. They had five children.

Survivors of Mr. Alford include 2 sons, Percy K. Alford, Washington, and George H. Alford, Jr., Jackson; 3 daughters, Miss Ruth Alford, Houston, Tex.,—Mrs. Clyde E. Day, McComb, and Mrs. Lura W. Alford, Roseville, Calif.; 4 brothers, Delis C., Washington, Yarbor and Claud, both of Progress, and Dr. T. C. Alford, Mashulaville, Miss.

Three sisters, Mrs. J. H. Elizey, Progress, Mrs. Ethel A. Byrne, Los Angeles, and Mrs. Effie A. Ball, Columbia; and 11 grandchildren and 4 great-grandchildren.

The Reverend Joe Hinton, pastor of Progress Baptist Church, and the Reverend Dr. Wyatt Hunter, pastor of First Baptist Church, McComb, officiated at the service.

Masonic graveside rites were conducted. Burial was in the church cemetery.

Hartman Funeral Home was in charge of funeral arrangements.

A TRULY GREAT MISSISSIPPIAN PASSES

(By Oliver Emmerich)

G. H. Alford, native Pike Countian, who is being buried in Progress community today, was among the outstanding men to live in this or any part of Mississippi. His claim for this distinction is not being based upon his accumulation of money. Though he was successful in his own business affairs his chief claim for recognition is the fact that consistently throughout his life he sought to make the world a better place in which to live. It is better because he lived in it.

G. H. Alford was a progressive-minded individual. He was born at a time when agriculture was backward in many ways. As editor of the Progressive Farmer, as director of agricultural extension service in the State of Maryland, as the first county agent in Pike County and as district agent in South Mississippi, he sought earnestly to improve the methods of agriculture.

He was an ardent believer in good schools. As a legislator he voted for the creation of a State department of agriculture and the eradication of cattle ticks. He advocated consolidation of schools, fought for improved rural schools, sought rural telephones and devoted his years to improving rural life in Mississippi.

He was a devoutly religious man. Even after becoming an octogenarian his alert interest in human problems continued. This editorial is being written because the editor of this newspaper feels that a humble but great man has lived and died in this county.

His memory is rightly honored. His philosophy of life, his zeal for progress, his devotion to community improvement, his years of unselfish service to Mississippi and mankind have helped all of the people of Pike County and Mississippi. His memory should be cherished by our people.

The New Benson Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, there is growing evidence in the country of increased support for the farm program of Secretary Benson. The Secretary of Agriculture is a man of strong conviction in his belief that the less the Federal Government meddles in the management and control of the affairs of our farmers, the better off our farmers will be in their economy.

The soundness of Secretary Benson's policies are reflected in the current price picture on a number of farm commodities.

Certainly we need more men in government of the courage and conviction typified by Secretary Benson.

The Washington Daily News on May 5, 1958, presented a splendid news picture of the situation in an article by Columnist Lyle C. Wilson entitled "The New Benson Look."

The article follows:

THE NEW BENSON LOOK

The possibility that Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson is becoming moderately acceptable in the farm belt seems incredible although it may be true and, even, reasonable.

There is some evidence in support of it, not the least of which is that the well-informed Secretary, himself, believes it to be true.

A United Press lead on the first farm price report for April revealed why Mr. Benson believes he is emerging from the farmers' doghouse and, moreover, why the Secretary is planning this year to take an active part in the Republican congressional campaign.

The United Press lead went like this:

"Farm prices bounded upward in April, bringing improvement in farmers' purchasing power for the sixth consecutive month.

"The Agriculture Department reported that farm production costs kept pace with prices received, rising to a new all-time high for the seventh consecutive month. The parity ratio—the relationship between prices received and prices paid—remained at 87 percent, the same as in March."

The Wall Street Journal found this to be editorially interesting and commented:

"There are a number of groups in the population that aren't doing as well as a year ago, but one of the largest groups of all is doing quite a bit better—the farmers."

The Journal calculates that farm prices as of last April 15 were about 10 percent above April 1957, while farm costs rose only 3 percent in the same period.

Farmers will not accept Wall Street's yardstick to measure Mr. Benson, but in this instance it is a matter of mathematics rather than a matter of sentiment.

Whether Republican politicians will be persuaded by the new Benson look remains to be seen. Republicans must contest this year's election against Democrats who would rely more on the taxpayers to hike farm prices. Some Republicans have been demanding that Mr. Benson be fired.

They passed the word to the White House that Mr. Benson must go if Republican candidates are to have a reasonable chance to win. President Eisenhower has supported Mr. Benson consistently with a determination which has dismayed the congressional politicos. They have acknowledged that Mr. Benson's departure would not much, if any, change administration farm policies.

What they want is to get rid of the man, regardless of future policies, on the theory that the farmers just don't like him, mistrust him, and believe that Mr. Benson's sympathies lie elsewhere.

Improvements in net farm income, however, may change all of that. Mr. Benson believes that it will do so. He notes accumulating invitations to campaign this year in congressional districts and in States where the farm vote is decisive.

Mr. Benson is a conservative who believes in less, rather than more, Government control and regimentation. He advocates the law of supply and demand as both sane and safe. He has a high regard for the taxpayers' dollars and would be among the last to be freehanded with other people's money.

Since American conservatives are leaderless and lost in the political wilderness, perhaps they should take a second look at Mr. Benson as a man who might lead them to the promised land.

Retirement of Hon. Ralph E. Flanders, of Vermont

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, two edi-

torials which relate to the prospective retirement of my colleague, the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

One of the editorials is entitled "FLANDERS TO LEAVE SENATE," and was published in the Rutland Daily Herald of May 1. The other editorial is entitled "In the American Grain," and was published in the Boston Herald of May 4, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rutland (Vt.) Daily Herald of May 1, 1958]

FLANDERS TO LEAVE SENATE

While it is true that Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS' announcement that he will not seek reelection this year comes as no surprise, it will undoubtedly help to crystallize the plans of a number of other candidates for State or Federal office.

However sure they have been that the Senator would not run again, the slight uncertainty remaining while his announcement was held off has acted as a deterrent to definite commitments by these other candidates while it has also helped strengthen the Senator's influence in Washington. As he said in his statement, his support of certain measures has been more effective while he was presumed to be a candidate for reelection.

The praise for Senator FLANDERS voiced by State officials, party leaders, and his colleagues in Congress reflects, we believe, the sentiments of a majority of Vermonters, who twice gave him substantial majorities—in the Senatorial elections of 1946 and 1952.

As a member of Vermont's team in Washington he has helped to maintain and extend the State's reputation for sound but forward-looking ideas—conservative, if you will, in the proper sense of that often-misused word.

FLANDERS' is still the junior Senator from Vermont—and will be through 1958. But as his announcement clears the air for the choosing of a successor it also becomes the occasion for the expression of deserved thanks for his service that covered two terms during some very critical times. It also provides opportunity to offer best wishes for the years of retirement, with the certainty that his energies will continue to be devoted to the development and progress of his native State.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald of May 4, 1958]

IN THE AMERICAN GRAIN

Vermont Senator RALPH FLANDERS' decision to retire from public life removes one of the most colorful and independent of legislators from the national political scene. His motto might well be modeled after the legendary one of Davy Crockett: Be sure you're right, then go ahead.

In the 12 years that FLANDERS spent in the Senate, he revealed a dauntless aspect. No foe was apparently too large for him when he thought he was right. He was among the first to join battle against his fellow Republican, Joseph McCarthy. He took on the labor unions, who had supported him, by voting for the Taft-Hartley Act and increased excise taxes. He upset the elders of his party in 1947–48 by flouting the tradition that first-termers should be seen but not heard.

A Senator who has taken a definite stand on so many controversial issues, who has been so outspoken, who has followed the eccentric way of the maverick, might well expect to draw fire from many quarters. It is proof of Senator FLANDERS' popularity—and political sagacity—that the people of his State returned him to the Senate at an age when many men his juniors were in retirement. He was a freshman Senator at 67 after a half century of spectacular success as an industrialist and, in Boston, 2 years as president of the Federal Reserve bank from May 1944.

RALPH FLANDERS brought to the Senate a clear social philosophy. "My social objective," he said, "is a good living for everyone willing to work." His voting record was conditioned by that philosophy, but more often by his own unfettered conclusions. It was only on very rare occasions that he voted for the sake of party regularity.

For RALPH FLANDERS also has brought to the Senate a whiff of frontier individualism. One can take issue with him. But there is in his presence something of the salty, enduring, cantankerous proud rural character of his State. He is very much in the American grain.

Troops Departing—The Lesson to Uncle Sam: Never Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include an editorial which appeared in the Nashville Banner, a great southern newspaper, on May 8. The editorial is entitled "Troops Departing—The Lesson to Uncle Sam: Never Again."

The editorial concerns the mistake made when the order was given to send Federal troops into Little Rock last fall and expresses the hope that such a tragic blunder will not be repeated. I commend it to your reading.

TROOPS DEPARTING—THE LESSON TO UNCLE SAM: NEVER AGAIN

With the ordered withdrawal of all Federal troops from Little Rock's Central High School, a stupid, tragic blunder will wend its way into history. A Nation of conscience, concerned for the fundamentals of constitutional law, trusts it never will be repeated.

By that affront, Little Rock became an occupied city—in violation of bedrock principle. The Federal Government was in an untenable position, unrelieved by the obvious fact that it was on a spot of its own making, and unredeemed by repentance at leisure of a bungle contrived in haste.

Unquestionably the President was pushed into that insufferable action by advisory forces of reckless irresponsibility. That is no excuse for military invasion of a sovereign State, remindful of reconstruction and prejudicial to the very cause of orderly government and balanced authority, American style.

That this withdrawal coincides with the end of the school year is, of course, significant. It at least indicates, however, that the Army does not intend to chaperone these eight or so children through the vacation periods.

It is a safe wager that Federal authorities have had an ample lesson in this experience, dissuading them from notions of armed encroachment—or bayonet rule—in the future. The difficulty of graceful extrication speaks for itself. The high dive of dudgeon busted several necks, including that of the erstwhile Attorney General, Herbert Brownell, Jr., who nudged Uncle Sam out onto that tricky limb.

Wounds can heal—whatever the scar they leave—if treated intelligently. The Little Rock blunder inflicted that wound. It provides a perpetual lesson of how not to treat a case or an issue which is, under the law, for local or State amelioration.

It is an inglorious chapter thus concluded.

The departure of these troops will be 9 months late.

They should never have been sent.

Let this be the end of an experience that affronted decency and could have erupted into major tragedy for the Nation.

TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, Sunday, May 18, is the 25th anniversary of the Tennessee Valley Authority. My colleague, the able senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is one of the few still in Congress who had an active part in establishing TVA. As a Member of the House he joined with Senator George Norris, of Nebraska, in sponsoring and in pushing through Congress the act setting up TVA.

No one can speak of TVA with greater authority and better understanding than Senator HILL.

On May 7, Senator HILL delivered a speech on TVA before the American Public Power Association in New Orleans, La. It is a fine presentation. I commend its reading by every one.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TVA: ENGINE FOR DEMOCRACY

(Address of United States Senator LISTER HILL commemorating the 25th anniversary of TVA, before the American Public Power Association, New Orleans, La., May 7, 1958)

Mr. Chairman, delegates to the American Public Power Association convention, guests and friends, I am honored and happy to be with you today and to join with you in commemorating the silver anniversary of one of the greatest victories ever won for the people of America—the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Twenty-five years have passed since the enactment of the legislation creating the TVA and a new generation of Americans has grown to maturity. A generation is time enough to test the strength of an idea and the truth of a concept. It is likewise time enough for people to forget what life was like before that idea was placed in action and that concept built into our Nation's life.

I am specially proud to have this opportunity to remind you of TVA's beginning, for I was one of the sponsors of the legislation which created TVA. Of all the members of the conference committee appointed to adjust the differences between the two Houses in 1933, I am the only who is today a Member of Congress. I am the only who has had the privilege of participating year by year in legislation affecting TVA, first from my seat as a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House which used to handle legislation concerning TVA and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

in these later years as a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. Alone of all the group gathered to witness when the President signed the act in 1933, I have seen the dreams, the hope and the faith that we wrote into the statute become a reality.

Those of us who have worked and fought through the years to make TVA a reality know that it can never be taken for granted. We recall that there was a great river, its tributaries rising in the mountains of North Carolina, of Tennessee, and of Virginia, flowing southward through the foothills of Tennessee, then west to meander across the sun-baked fields of Alabama and of Mississippi, northward to meet the Ohio River in Kentucky, and finally to join the mighty Mississippi on its southward course to the gulf. It was a moody and inconstant river, changing from season to season, an angry flood in spring and winter, a sluggish trickle in summer and autumn, when shoals and sandbars held it almost useless for navigation. In flood and in drought, racing or heavy with summer's langor, in every season the river was dark with the precious cargo it carried, the fertile soil of the valley, to be wasted in the sea.

For generations that soil, the priceless heritage of the people, had washed away. This was an agricultural area, one of the oldest in the Nation, an area of small farms, growing the cash crops for which the climate was ideal but which left no cover on the ground to proect it as it lay, bare and helpless against the pelting winter rains. Once majestic forests had been devastated, a sacrifice to avarice, to ignorance, and to hunger. So the rains were unimpeded. They took the soil to the river, and the river carried it to the sea, and every year the brown scars of eosion grew wider and deeper over the landscape. Every year more farms were abandoned. Every year fewer jobs became available, and the youth of the land was exported along with the soil and the timber. Every year the people had less hope and less faith in the future.

This was the Tennessee River and its valley before the establishment of TVA. On this anniversary, this occasion for remembrance, for recognition, and for reappraisal, let us remember that the dream of the unified development of all the resources of a great river basin for the people's benefit was not born of sectional interest nor parochial concern. From the beginning TVA has been a national project. It was born because statesment from the Great Plains, from the mountain West and the industrial East saw this Nation as a whole, and knew that it would be strong only as each region grew in strength. It was the great and indomitable Norris of Nebraska who was the first to envision that the Government-owned properties at Muscle Shoals might be the beginning of a comprehensive program of resource development in the Southeast. I recall his tireless efforts to educate his colleagues, to arouse the public conscience that the dam and the chemical plants built in north Alabama, a heritage of World War I, should be held for public use.

The fight, first to keep those properties in the hands of the Government, and then to devise a method to promote their effective use, went on for over a decade. Twice bills to provide for Government operation of the properties at Muscle Shoals were adopted by the Congress, only to be vetoed by Presidents Coolidge and Hoover. Each time the fight was renewed, and in 1933, after years of struggle, President Franklin D. Roosevelt added his vision to the concept, and his support and moral leadership to the valiant bipartisan group in Congress. Then the statute creating TVA was finally approved, the properties at Muscle Shoals were turned over to the new agency, and a great concept started the road to realization—the concept that makes TVA unique in America's history, the concept that has made TVA the admiration and awe of millions of visitors, the model in 20 countries for resource development.

As we worked to set out the concept in legislative language, we had doubts; we were uncertain about a great many points. We were creating a new kind of Federal instrumentality. The tasks to be undertaken were not all new; the problems were not novel; only the kind of agency was different. Reluctant rivers had been improved for navigation from the beginning of the Nation. The problem of vanishing resources had been with us for a long time. But always rivers and resources, problems and opportunities had been considered piecemeal. In TVA we tried something new and bold. The heart of the concept lies in the fact that for the first time in the history of Federal legislation Congress accepted the unity of Nature. For this one river basin the interrelationship of land and water, of trees and pastures, of men and nature, was recognized in a Federal statute. This was a more startling innovation than it sounds. For then and now the traditional organization of the Federal Establishment divides responsibility for the resources of a river and its basin among a dozen bureaus and departments, each with a single purpose, a different head, working under separate statutes. When we created TVA we abandoned the familiar pattern. We gave one agency responsibility to inaugurate a total program committed to the full development of all Nature's resources for all the people.

At the same time we tried as we drafted the statute to build a bulwark against the steady tide of centralization. We knew then as we know now that too many decisions were made in Washington on the basis of papers and reports; too much was decided by remote control. The experts were too far from the problems, the administrators too far from the people. So we told the Board of TVA to make its headquarters in the region, close to the work to be undertaken. We authorized it to work with State and local governments and groups of citizens. We made it an independent agency, corporate in form, removed from centralized control in Washington. We gave the power of decision to the men in the field.

We wanted TVA to be efficient, and we accepted the basic principle of modern management, still too often not recognized in government. We gave authority commensurate with responsibility and we determined to judge by results. By law we freed the agency from rigidities of the classified civil service. We told the Board to select its own employees, but absolutely barred political considerations in appointments. We authorized the Board to buy or condemn the land and the equipment required in its program, and to sell whatever proved to be surplus. They could enter into contracts, and sue and be sued in the courts.

All these characteristics have proved to be essential—the unified approach, the location in the region and the encouragement to management to develop a decentralized administration, the accountability which is the counterpart of independence, the stern rejection of political interference. All have been vital to TVA's success. All of them have required defense against attack over the years, but to this date each one has been preserved. But TVA achievements, its matchless spirit, rest I think on something greater than all of these together. It is rooted in the fact that the overriding purpose of the statute was clear on every page.

The administrative innovations were not to be ends in themselves, nor were the projects and the programs they would facilitate to be objectives in themselves. Every undertaking was to be seen as a means to widen the economic opportunity and promote the well-being of the people. That is assumed to be the ultimate objective of every government program, but the purpose for which projects are undertaken is too often obscured by the projects themselves. Dams and plants and projects are judged as engineering achievements. Construction becomes an end in itself. Somehow, in some way, some ingredient in the formula we devised for TVA has so far kept the overriding purpose sharp and clear. TVA still knows that what happens to the river, the land, and the forests is not the final test. It is still aware that its success must be judged by what happens to the people when the resource base is strengthened, when energy is made abundantly available for their use.

Because of this bold and imaginative and unique concept and the magnificent TVA management that has given the concept such rich meaning, today the river is no longer a menace and a problem. It has been put to work for the people. A series of majestic dams has transformed it. Now a chain of lovely lakes, its bars and shoals have vanished, and commerce moves in stately sequence over a modern water highway. Last year over 2 billion ton-miles of freight was carried on the river, in contrast to less than 33 million ton-miles which moved, mostly in short hauls, in 1933. Grain comes down from the upper Mississippi, oil and sulfur move up from the gulf, automobiles, trucks, and steel and coal are carried for unloading at thriving river ports on the Tennessee. From the Great Lakes to the gulf the products of other regions come to new markets in this valley, and the river serves the people.

Today the people know that when the rains come and the water rushes down in angry torrents the same massive dams which create the navigation channel will stand watch through all the days and all the nights of peril, silent guardians of their safety.

This is the only river so controlled, the only river in the world where, under a single management, a whole system of dams and reservoirs is mobilized in harmonious unison to protect the people and their property.

Today transmission towers rise high from the valleys and the hills, supporting over 11,000 miles of lines which carry to the people power generated at these multipurpose dams and the gigantic modern steam plants built by TVA. Through the efficient and dedicated management of TVA, 20 dams have been built and 8 great steam plants have been constructed, along with chemical plants and other facilities. In 1933 the TVA service area had only a little over 800,000 kilowatts to meet all its power requirements. Today the area has over 10 million kilowatts of capacity. In 1933 there were only 225,000 residential electricity consumers. Today TVA reaches more than 1,300,000 domestic consumers through more than 150 municipal and cooperative distribution systems. These systems have a total plant investment of their own of almost $600 million and are partners with their Government in the great enterprise. In 1933 TVA consumers used an average of 600 kilowatt-hours in their homes every year. Today their average anual use has increased more than tenfold. In 1933 only 3 percent of the farms, just a few near towns and cotton gins, were connected to lines for electric service, and all over the region the countryside was dark at twilight. Today more than 95 percent of the farms use electricity in their homes and in their barns. Every year the farms of this area use as much power as all the region used, in all its towns and cities, in all its business enterprises, before TVA.

The river is only one resource which is providing more abundantly for the people because of TVA. Since 1934, 328 million seedlings have gone from TVA nurseries to stimulate forestation programs. The forests and the soil are in the process of rebuilding

and the cycle of devastation has been reversed. Slowly the scars of erosion are healing. Where acres were brown and barren in 1933, trees stand tall and pastures lie green beneath the sun. The landscape is more beautiful, the land is more productive, and the region has started the long road back to robust strength and full productivity.

The Tennessee Valley is no longer the heart of what was once called America's economic problem No. 1. Within a generation, average annual income has increased eightfold. Agricultural income has nearly tripled and the index of family living—the measure of the comforts of modern living—has improved 130 percent. This is double the national rate. With diversification as the watchword, the number of industrial establishments has increased about twice the national rate of increase. Manufacturing income increased more than 10 times during the first 20 years of TVA's existence, from $127 million to $1.4 billion. Progress toward more finished products has meant higher wages and greater return to valley industry. With its greater earnings the region provides a better market for the goods and services of other areas.

Improved land use with TVA's concentrated fertilizers was demonstrated on some 3,500 farms in 28 States during 1957. Through the years some 72,000 farms in 35 States have taken part in farm demonstration programs.

Recreation and fishing, waterfowl and deer conservation, and other activities add to the benefits and satisfactions of living in the valley.

TVA was not conceived as a military project. But today TVA is in the forefront in the development of atomic weapons, missiles, vital light metals, and new chemicals. Almost three-fourths of TVA's power output goes to defense and defense-related industries. More than half—a staggering 30 billion kilowatt-hours in 1957—goes to the Atomic Energy Commission plants at Oak Ridge and Paducah. These plants alone use twice as much electricity as New York City, and more than is used by all the homes, businesses, and industries in each of 41 States.

Large amounts of power go to the Army's guided-missile center at Redstone Arsenal, Ala., where the two successful Explorer satellites were produced; to the Air Force wind-tunnel center at Tullahoma, Tenn., where missiles and supersonic aircraft are tested; to the defense-related industries throughout the valley—titanium, aluminum, ferroalloys, chemicals, and others.

I am proud when I survey the financial record of TVA. My colleagues of 1933 would be proud if they could know that from the beginning revenues from power sales have covered all the costs of operation, including depreciation, and in addition have provided for the Government, the owner, a return which has averaged 4 percent on the investment. I am proud to say that over $400 million from proceeds has been reinvested in the system, enhancing the Government's investment without requiring appropriation, and that $240 million has been paid to the United States Treasury in cash.

TVA has demonstrated the ancient democratic principle that participation in their Government stimulates and releases the initiative and resourcefulness, the creative energies of a people. TVA began as an experiment in grassroots democracy and it has proved to be a matchless example of democracy functioning at its best. TVA works with and through local and State governments, businessmen, farmers, labor, colleges, and public and private groups of the Tennessee Valley, and thus it has given new life and meaning to Thomas Jefferson's dream that every citizen be a sharer in the direction of his Government. This partnership with the people is the hallmark of TVA. It has enriched the lives and the welfare of the people, it has made stronger State and local governments, and it has made our America stronger.

In the quarter of a century since TVA was established we have had time to forget some of the myths slain by TVA, myths that were advanced as truth when we were fighting to establish this new instrumentality of Government. There was the myth that Government activities could not be competently managed, but were bound to be wasteful and inefficient. You would be surprised to know how stubbornly that dogma was imbedded in our national folklore. Today it has been vanquished by the record. TVA projects have not been let out to contract, as the custom is. These projects have been designed and built by TVA itself. World records in construction time have been broken, new standards for safety in hazardous employment have been established. Costs have been held within estimates, as men working for their Government have turned in a record of performance to destroy a myth forever.

There was another myth. As we wrestled with the legislation the private power companies tried to frighten us with tales of the vast surplus of electric energy which they said would be wastefully created if multipurpose dams were built by TVA. I find, for example, that when one official testified before our committee in 1935, he said in a colloquy in which I engaged him, as we were considering the first amendments to the TVA statute:

"There is not the slightest present economic justification for the building of any of the hydro plants now being built by the Tennessee Valley Authority, nor for the building of any of those planned."

The building of dams continued in spite of his advice, and just a few years later the hydro resources of the region were approaching exhaustion as the people found more uses for electricity every year, and TVA turned from dam building to the construction of modern steam plants. Then coal, another resource of the region, was put to work for the people, and another myth had disappeared.

The myth of surplus capacity rested on some other legendary notions. It rested, for example, on the dogma that electric energy could not be made available to rural areas. We remember how firmly that conviction was rooted in the creed of America's private power suppliers a quarter century ago. In the printed transcript of the hearings I just quoted I find the same witness benignly advising the committee that we were in error if we expected TVA to find a market for power on the farms of the area. He said:

"The records of the Bureau of the Census indicate that only about 33⅓ percent of farms have an annual income in excess of $1,000. We do not consider any farm customer a prospect unless his income is in excess of $1,000."

With that complacement formula hope of obtaining electric service was denied to two-thirds of the farms of the region. This myth died too. It died because the statute creating TVA rejected the approach and the advice of the private power companies, and adopted a new standard for TVA to follow.

In the TVA Act we specified that municipal and cooperative agencies should be given preference in the sale of power. This is a common provision in Federal legislation. But in the TVA statute we did much more than that. We required the resale rates to be established by TVA to be such as would encourage use, particularly in the homes and on the farms in the area. These were the consumers neglected by the private companies. And the communities which voted and groups of farmers that organized to exercise the prefeernce rights to power which the statute made available to them on their part accepted a responsibility beyond the responsibility of providing the capital to finance the facilities of distribution. They joined wholeheartedly in carrying out the program envisaged by the act creating TVA. This is a point too often missed when TVA is discussed. We made clear that this Government investment wa snot made in order that towns and cities, or even rural cooperatives, should purchase power at low rates for resale to consumers at high prices. Nor was it to be made to transfer to the electric ratepayers of any community burdens which should be borne by the local taxpayers. This public investment in power facilities was made that a demonstration might be provided of the results achieved when power is made available to consumers at lowest possible costs.

In contracts with TVA the distributors agree to charge the rates established to promote abundant use and to dispose of revenues in such a way as to achieve the objectives we set out in the statute. In the beginning they took a risk, for when TVA's resale rates were announced in 1933 no one knew what revenues those rates would provide. We know now. The high-use, low-rate pricing policies which the private-power companies had been too timid to try turned out to be sound from the point of view of earnings. At low rates, the volume of sales rose as we had hoped, and increased revenues resulted. In spite of the rise in costs over the years, TVA's wholesale rate has been little changed and the resale rates to the consumer, considered low in 1933, have already proved for almost half of the present distributors to be too high to carry out the statute's injunction and they have been reduced. The trend of rates is downward in the TVA area and another myth has died. Sometimes an overriding concern for the public interest can accomplish miracles. This is the lesson of TVA.

The preservation of TVA as a strong, adaptable, responsive agency is just as necessary in 1958 as its establishment was in 1933. I know of no other agency of our Government which has met so well the problems of public responsibility. It is vital to our democratic processes to have government which can stand up under the hardest public scrutiny—even unjustifiable vilification and abuse—yet reply, not with guilt, but patiently with candor, as TVA has done. We must have government which can build strength for defense while concentrating on the arts and needs of peace, as TVA has done. We must preserve in the example of TVA our national determination to act for all our people, giving them always something more than second sitting at the table of special interests.

The new generation of Americans may well ask, "If TVA has been so triumphantly successful, why is its example not more readily followed?" Why, after 25 years of proof, do we yet behold the spectacle of those who would undermine and destroy TVA?

The answer is a story of the never-ending struggle between special privilege and democracy. After the First World War, private interests blocked the use of Wilson Dam and the nitrate plants and the development of the river. When Congress twice enacted legislation for navigation, power, and flood control on the Tennessee, the bills were vetoed.

For years after the creation of TVA, private power companies dragged out court injunctions and vexatious litigation. They built spite lines. Through false propaganda they sought to turn the farmers and municipalities against TVA. They tried every strategem to make TVA a failure.

Year after year, in virtually every session of Congress, we have had to fight off attacks on TVA—curtailed appropriations and crippling amendments that among other things would even deny TVA its authority to use its power proceeds for plant expansion and that would hamstring TVA's ability to grow and to meet the expanding needs of municipalities, industries, farmer cooperatives, and the national defense.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

In recent years new impetus has been added to the threat against TVA.

First came the Dixon-Yate's deal. Under this secret scheme, the Atomic Energy Commission opened negotiations with private companies for plant construction and power in the TVA service area, at high costs. The power would not have gone into atomic plants but to TVA customers. Another Government agency was to be the instrumentality for violating the TVA Act, boosting power costs, destroying TVA's yardstick rates, and opening all public power investments to similar private exploitation. Public exposure in the Senate caused even its proponents to turn against this blatant conspiracy.

A straightforward, self-financing plan, under which TVA will finance future capital expansion through the sale of revenue bonds to be paid off from TVA power revenues, is now before Congress. The private utilities, which a few years ago urged revenue-bond financing for TVA when they thought it was impractical, now cry out against this plan. They have publicly announced lobbying plans to defeat the proposal. They continue to carry on their nationwide campaign of false and misleading propaganda against TVA.

Why the unceasing fight against TVA?

The private utilities hate TVA because TVA is a yardstick against which the people in all the States can measure excessive rates and monopolistic practices. TVA stands as a perpetual challenge to the utilities. It is an argument they cannot answer. Consequently they would destroy it. They will never cease their attacks. This generation and the next and the next must stand mobilized and alert. We can never take for granted this great engine for democracy.

In evaluating and reappraising this magnificent experiment of 25 years duration, let us always remember that the triumph of TVA is recorded in the homes and the farms of the valley—in installation of stoves and washing machines, refrigerators and freezers, milking machines, pumps, water systems, and hay driers. It is recorded in the increased use of electricity by the people, not only in the region it serves but all over the Nation. It is recorded in the contributions of the great REA, which was born in this valley, of the faith and courage of the people. The symbol of our TVA is revealed when the lights go on at nightfall all over the region. They shine out at dusk from barns, from kitchens, and from parlors, deep in the coves and high on the hillsides.

This is the realization of the dream, the dream of energy made abundantly available to lighten the hours of the people's toil, to brighten the time of their leisure, to nourish their aspirations for the future, and to strengthen the Nation and the Nation's defense.

This is TVA on its 25th anniversary. This is indeed a time for remembrance, for recognition and for reappraisal of TVA, our great engine for democracy. With the faith of our fathers in the future generations, with calm confidence in the material and spiritual resources and vital strength of our America and her people, and with the firm resolution to defend and protect our heritage, we shall go forward to the glorious achievements and the rich rewards that on this historic and memorable occasion await the new generation of Americans.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the 10th day of May is celebrated throughout the world as a Rumanian national holiday. Toward the end of 1944, when the Soviet troops occupied Rumania, that country lost its freedom and independence. Its enslavement is so complete that even the 10th day of May, a national holiday, celebrating the unity and independence of the Rumanian nation, has been forbidden by the occupying power, which has forced instead upon the subjugated people the celebration of their invasion under the guise of liberation.

The Rumanians reestablished their independence during the 19th century, after the Crimean War. They had played a significant role in the history of Europe, at the time of the Crusades, through their heroic stand against the Ottoman invasions. The Rumanians, a Latin nation, have always constituted an obstacle in the path of Muscovite imperialism. Since the time of Peter the Great, they have been invaded more than 10 times by their insatiable neighbors and are now again suffering the blight of Moscow's military aggression in Europe on the Russian expansionist route toward the Mediterranean and the Middle East.

Never, during the last 13 years, since the end of the war, have the Russian tanks left Rumania. The country has been bled white by Soviet exploitation and tens of thousands have perished through deportation and slave-labor camps. It was in vain that a peace treaty was concluded with the Moscow puppet government of occupied Rumania and that afterwards this stooge government was accepted in the United Nations. Neither were the provisions of that treaty or of the United Nations' Charter implemented.

All reports coming from Rumania indicate that, despite the frantic Communist efforts to sovietize Rumanian life, the people have remained deeply attached to the West and have preserved their unshakable faith in America's ultimate will that they should regain the freedom they have lost. It is in the interest of the free world's policy, in its efforts to promote a secure peace, to support these legitimate hopes and ideals of these silent, waiting allies behind the Iron Curtain.

On this anniversary of Rumanian independence, I wish to add my voice with those of many in the free world today, in sending a message of encouragement in the hope that it will contribute in sustaining the spirit of resistance of the Rumanian people to Communist tyranny, the importance of which is more and more felt in the free world.

A Statement on the Economic Situation in Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks, the House Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am a member, has been holding extensive hearings on various antirecession measures now pending before the committee. In my opinion one of the most outstanding witnesses to come before the committee was my own mayor, the Honorable Louis C. Miriani of Detroit. At this time, I wish to insert in the RECORD his statement as it succinctly gives the economic situation now existent in Detroit, a situation not far removed from every area in our country.

STATEMENT BY LOUIS C. MIRIANI, MAYOR, CITY OF DETROIT, MICH., REPRESENTING THE AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION AND THE DETROIT METROPOLITAN CONFERENCE OF MAYORS, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES HEARINGS ON SURPLUS LABOR AREAS AND DEPRESSED AREAS, MAY 8, 1958

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: Realizing that the welfare of our Nation and that of millions of its people depends upon the legislation now pending before your honorable body, I am most grateful for this opportunity to submit for your consideration such information as I have at my command.

I am appearing before you in a dual capacity. First, as a member of the executive committee of the American Municipal Association. Secondly, as mayor of the city of Detroit, and in behalf of the metropolitan Detroit area.

Last Friday, the Detroit Metropolitan Area Conference of Mayors, representing 91 communities in southeastern Michigan, unanimously passed a resolution supporting this plea that legislative relief be given quickly to their stricken area.

With more than 5 million Americans now unemployed it has become obvious that the first order of business, as far as the proposed legislative program under consideration is concerned, is for an immediate program to ease the shock caused by the present unemployment crisis.

The second phase, which also will have an immediate stimulating effect through restoration of public confidence, is the long-range legislative program designed to strengthen the Nation's economy by correcting inherent evils which have added to present conditions.

I know that this committee and other Members of Congress are aware that the restoration of jobs depends upon the restoration of consumer buying to more normal levels.

I know, too, that you have been presented with much testimony and are giving thorough consideration to the numerous proposals which already have been included in a variety of bills.

In speaking in behalf of the mayors of the Nation, I wish to thank this committee for the expeditiousness with which it is handling its tremendous responsibility.

I am in entire agreement with the idea that the creation of jobs is of prime importance. I cannot stress too strongly the dire need for immediacy of action in that direction.

The conflagration which threatens to consume us must be extinguished first. The problem of repairing and rebuilding the structure of our economy should follow.

I cannot understand the thinking of those who advocate a wait-and-see policy while debating the cause of the blaze and the relatively minute differences between the various available techniques and methods.

Surely, it must be recognized that even a wet blanket can be more effective at fighting a starting fire than if directed at every proposal on how to put the fire out.

There is no substitute for a steady, weekly paycheck in restoring a man's confidence or his buying power.

The hopes of the unemployed lie in such important efforts as are being made by this and other congressional committees who have had the foresight and the public interest to delve deeply into factfinding in preparation for remedial action.

Nowhere is this more appreciated than in Detroit metropolitan area, where 275,000 persons, 18 percent of the normal working force, are now out of work and thousands of others suffering under the inadequate income from part-time jobs.

I dislike statistics when discussing people. These are husbands and fathers who are unable to provide for their families. These include thousands of workers who never before have been out of work and are workers with 10, 20 and even more years of seniority. These are men who want jobs, not charity. Thousands are older men who have many years of productive life ahead of them, but for whom there are no jobs to go back to. These are the wage earners who have been hit by the evolution of manufacturing methods, of which automation is but a small part.

It was particularly heartwarming to learn, from the invitational letter from your chairman, that this committee also is concerned about the problems facing so-called depressed areas.

Detroit has been particularly hard hit by this industrial revolution. But it is not a problem unique to Detroit, but one that has been experienced by all large industrial centers where previously bustling plants now stand idle because of the obsolescence of multistoried structures, the lack of elbowroom for expansion, and other factors caused by abnormal population growth.

Detroit believes it has an answer to this problem, and I will discuss this in detail later.

Your committee has asked me specifically for information as to the situation in Detroit.

On March 31, I reported to the House Ways and Means Committee that unemployment in the Detroit area numbered 230,000, 15 percent of the labor force.

Two weeks ago, that figure already had increased to upward of 265,000, or 17½ percent of the labor force. Today it stands at 275,000, and almost 1 out of every 5 workmen is idle. This makes the Detroit metropolitan area the hardest hit in the Nation.

Of the total number of unemployed, 45 percent comprise those in the automotive industry; 28 percent from other manufacturing plants, and 12 percent from the construction industry.

I realize that many Members of Congress come from areas where the phrases, "temporary business slump" and "slight recession" are applicable in the present situation.

I realize, too, that some areas are even better off than that.

But none are too far removed to smell the smoke.

I am bringing you a firsthand report from the section of our Nation where the fire is out of control.

I'm old enough to remember back 3 decades when the same cries of fire were scoffed at, fallaciously waved aside with slogans, and with inadequate programs, and ignored up to the very point when those who had sneered the most also started jumping out of windows.

I am not talking about a slight business slump.

I am not talking about a slight recession.

I am talking about a depression.

I am talking about long lines at the unemployment benefit windows, many for their last check.

I am talking about long lines of welfare applicants now being processed in Detroit at the rate of 300 a day with the present backlog nearing 5,000 cases awaiting processing.

I am talking about more than 11,000 families, averaging 4 persons to a family, who are depending upon welfare aid for food and other bare necessities of life, 70 percent of them seeking welfare for the first time.

I am talking about block-long lines of those still worse off—those who cannot even qualify for welfare aid—getting their meager meals in soup lines.

I will not bore you more with statistics.

What I do want to point out is that while individual communities have in some measure been able to handle the situation, the financial breaking point has been reached.

Detroit has set up its budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1. In it we have financed a deficit of almost $8 million borrowed to offset the current welfare deficit.

In it we have included some $16 million to meet welfare costs for the 1958–59 period. A figure, by the way, which will be wholly inadequate if present trends continue.

We instituted drastic economies, including a savings of $2,800,000 in the current and $6 million for 1958–59 budget. All city employees have been denied cost-of-living adjustments to which they are entitled.

We have refunded a substantial portion of the debt service requirements. We have bonded and taxed up to our statutory limits.

In other words, we have reached our financial ability to cope with the situation. We are not alone in this plight. It is shared by countless other communities. It is shared by State governmental units as well.

Some time ago our department heads prepared a public works program totaling $45 million and which would provide almost 13 million man-hours of labor.

These are worthwhile and needed capital improvement projects which have been delayed and which we would have authorized if we had the funds. These projects are over and above the total authorized capital improvement program of $134 million already financed by normal local and State and Federal matching funds. I have attached the list hereto as exhibit A.

This program can be launched at once.

This program will put men to work at once.

Similar programs are available throughout Michigan as our Governor, G. Mennen Williams, testified recently before your committee. They are, no doubt, available in every hard-hit area.

You have before you several measures which would provide the necessary funds for the creation of jobs immediately through such programs.

Federal relief offers the only available solution.

Such relief must come as quickly as possible. It must come in a realistic form and tailored to the varied abilities of local governments to participate.

Many communities will require outright grants-in-aid, not only for works programs but to meet welfare obligations. Others will require long-term loans with a few years of moratoriums on repayment and/or interest charges.

I recommend a ceiling on the interest rate at 2 percent, in order to avoid future crippling effects upon local municipal economies.

There have been several bills submitted to Congress that recognize the need for making available useful employment opportunities to all those able, willing and desiring to work. I have had the opportunity to review bill S. 3231 submitted on February 5 and referred to the Senate Public Works Committee. This type of bill, in my opinion, hits directly at the problem and provides for a program that could be initiated quickly and gives the administrator authority enough to allocate funds for worthwhile public improvements in those areas where the unemployment is recognized as serious.

I have supported the proposal to remove the excise tax upon automobiles being firmly convinced that this would stimulate the sales of this product.

But whatever decision is to be made by Congress in this matter, it should be made at once because the mere fact that such action is under study has caused the withdrawal of countless prospective purchasers from the market.

I make this plea, not only in behalf of Detroit, but in behalf of communities in 19 States in which automobile manufacturing is being done. Only one-third of all automobile manufacturing is being conducted in the State of Michigan and, despite the popular conception, only 23 percent in Detroit.

I urge that proposed Federal projects for construction, flood control, and so forth, scheduled for areas of labor surpluses be put into immediate programing.

Tax relief measures should be evaluated as to their effectiveness in providing employment most quickly.

More effort should be given toward the channeling of defense contracts into surplus labor areas.

These suggestions I submit as my own humble opinion. I cannot qualify as an expert economist.

I am merely one of the thousands of chief executives of local units of government who seek desperately for jobs for our unfortunate fellow men.

I would like to submit for the official record of this committee a copy of the National Municipal Policy of the American Municipal Association for 1958 which was adopted at our last meeting.

You will note that on page 16, section 25 on urban renewal, we recommend to Congress that the Housing Act be amended to recognize the need for a broadened approach to permit a greater share of the Federal programs resources to be devoted to redevelopment for commercial and industrial purposes. This particular recommendation is given consideration in bill H. R. 6215 (introduced by Congressman SPENCE) and bill H. R. 5471 (introduced by Congresswoman GRIFFITHS). Other suggested amendments are also proposed in this section of our national policy which I would like you to give consideration to. Section 25–9 is of particular importance to our particular area.

Other sections of the national policy statement, which I refer to you for your consideration, are No. 26 and No. 27 which express the feeling of the cities of the United States on mutual assistance on Federal-aid public works programs, which you are considering in bills H. R. 11474 and H. R. 11272.

Mr. Chairman, I was most encouraged to note that your invitation expressed the committee's concern, not only for the critical employment situation caused by current business conditions, but for the chronic unemployment caused by physical factors in depressed areas.

I know you are all aware of the critical problems caused by the current trends of shifting populations from rural to urban areas and particularly the problems of large core cities of metropolitan areas.

Detroit provides a typical example of how this choking process has produced slums and its resultant deterioration of a city's tax base.

The fact that the assessed valuation of our downtown area declined by $100 million in 20 years, I cite as only 1 example.

Fortunately Congress provided the means of attacking slum housing conditions through slum clearance and rehabilitation legislation. Detroit has gained a national reputation in its application of this type of legislation and is successfully meeting and combating the problems arising from housing blight.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

However, another problem has arisen that has had a serious effect upon employment and one that cannot be met entirely under existing legislation—and that is in the area of industrial blight.

The rehabilitation of obsolescent industrial areas has become a vital issue to many of our older cities. The problem arises primarily because of a change from the old multistoried factory buildings to the new concept of structures that lend themselves to a more efficient operation.

The need for more parking space for the automobiles owned by employees and for more adequate streets to handle growing truck traffic are two more of the phases that have made the old style buildings inefficient and too costly to maintain in this highly competitive age.

While Federal assistance is available to such projects under the 1954 Federal Housing Act, providing that the areas can qualify under the slum housing provisions of the act, aid is still needed by cities who desire to rehabilitate areas composed solely of blighted industrial buildings.

Detroit is now in the process of tackling one such neighborhood at its own expense, and by so doing, has demonstrated the basic soundness of the concept of rehabilitating older deteriorated industrial areas.

I have attached hereto 2 exhibits, 1 an aerial view of this pilot site and the other, the site plan for its eventual rehabilitation as an industrial park offering modern facilities to meet the present day needs of small industries.

It is significant to point out that employment in this area had dropped off by one-third within the past 4 years and that this pilot area already has been assured of occupancy by firms that will provide hundreds of additional jobs as well as adding to the tax base.

We in Detroit have employed an industrial coordinator and created a hard-hitting industrial coordinating committee.

They are in the process of setting up programs for the rehabilitation of a number of industrial blighted areas.

Detroit has completed a number of detailed studies which clearly have indicated the nature and magnitude of the problem of industrial obsolescence and blight. These studies have set the framework for a coordinated attack on this serious problem.

This industrial renewal study measured the quality of industrial buildings and environment in each block of the city's industrial corridors.

It was found that of the 7,109 acres within the industrial corridors that are presently being used for industrial purposes, 840 or 11.8 percent, had an extreme degree of obsolescence and deterioration, and 1,700 acres or 23.8 percent had a considerable degree.

The industrial study determined that 40.6 percent of the city's industry is in need of room for expansion or rehabilitation. A significant proportion of these industries are threatening to move out of Detroit despite the availability of skilled labor within the city. The loss of these plants would mean a reduction of 60,000 manufacturing jobs and the loss of the purchasing power represented by these jobs.

Detroit, because of these background studies, is now in a position to undertake a large scale industrial renewal program which will have a great effect in reducing unemployment and thus help strengthen its economy.

The city has analyzed the Area Redevelopment Act as set forth in H. R. 5471 and H. R. 6215 and feels that such legislation would aid materially in speeding up the industrial renewal program if sufficient funds are made available to us.

In closing, I also would like to express my views concerning the financial problems of small businesses.

From our investigations in Detroit concerning the well-being of small business in our city, we have from time to time talked with officials of our banking community, our investment people, and the small business administration. We have found that it is the usual, rather than the unusual, that a well managed small business has not had any difficult in securing short term operating and capital loans. We, however, do not know of any facility within our State which provides long range equity capital or working funds to small business concerns. We believe that any added legislation which will assist in maintaining a good stable small business establishment, whether it be in Detroit or anywhere else in the country, is not only good but necessary so that small businesses can continue to grow even during times when available loan funds become tightened.

In order to avoid administrative restrictions that might be of such nature as to be contrary to the intent of relief legislation, perhaps some system should be included wherein capital loans could be insured by the Government like those now presently in force in housing and farming.

This would help liberalize the necessary conservatism that is required of our banking institutions under existing laws. There has been a great deal of effort made in Michigan for legislation which would enable the organization of a credit development corporation to assist small business, but it has not been formalized because the State is not able to finance such a plan.

Our recently appointed 27-man industrial and commercial development committee's primary purpose is to maintain and expand our existing business establishments and to bring into Detroit new industries.

We are much interested in securing diversified industries, which you would term small business, those with 250 or less employes.

We have no problem in getting businesses relocated that have large capital accounts, but have considerably difficuty in finding working or investment capital for small industries of good reputation but who have been in business only for the past several years. These businesses have not had sufficient time to establish a long credit rating, and as a result, are unable to secure loans for expansion or loans for necessary working capital in these times.

We have had insufficient time to review the previous testimony given before the committee, but we do know that there certainly are areas where funds should be made available to small business where equity and long term capital is not available from existing private sources.

Let me again thank you for the bpportunity of appearing before your honorable body. I hope I have been of some help.

I have tried to stress the impact of the present crisis, particularly upon the industrial communities of the Nation.

The picture, without a doubt, is a gloomy one at the moment, but it is not a hopeless one. This is still the strongest Nation on earth. Our economy is basically sound and all that is needed is quick action to keep it so.

We, the mayors, of the Nation, join in the prayers for prompt action on your part, to keep it so.

Truth and the Democratic Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Truth and the Democratic Tradition." These excellent remarks were delivered by my good friend and most able colleague, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], on the occasion of Delaware's annual Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner, last Thursday evening, May 8.

This gathering, Mr. President, brought together the greatest number of Delawareans ever assembled for such a meeting in our State. Senator SYMINGTON's address was so well received that I feel it will be of interest and value to Members of the Senate and to many other persons throughout the Nation. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUTH AND THE DEMOCRATIC TRADITION

(Address by Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat of Missouri, at Jefferson-Jackson Day Banquet, Wilmington, Del., May 8, 1958)

Mr. Chairman, Senator Frear, General Craven, Chairman Lyons, Speaker Mahew, Senator Steen, and distinguished Democrats, it is always a privilege to address an audience of Democratic workers, those who furnish the backbone of our great party.

And it is a special privilege to gather with the friends and neighbors and supporters of one of America's great Senators—a man whose name in Washington is synonymous with ability and integrity, the two most priceless assets which can be possessed by any public servant.

All Senators of both parties are proud to be serving with the statesman I am referring to, the able gentleman from Delaware, ALLEN FREAR.

Much of my youth was spent in your neighboring State of Maryland; but my ancestors were closer to you than that.

When JAMES SYMINGTON first came to this country from Scotland, he started a flour mill in Brandywine, a town which is now a part of this great city of Wilmington.

His son Thomas, my great grandfather, was born right here in 1793, 6 years before the death of George Washington.

Later Thomas moved from Wilmington to Baltimore. An article in the Baltimore Sun, Two Generations That Span United States History, features his son, my Great-Uncle John, who lives in Baltimore today.

For these and many other reasons, I am especially proud to be visiting with you in Delaware tonight.

We Democrats have gathered here in Wilmington to reaffirm our faith in the Democratic Party, and in the principles for which that party stands.

We know that the United States has become the greatest country in world history primarily because of the philosophy and convictions of the two men we honor tonight.

Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson believed in government for all the people, not just the few.

They passed that mandate on to us; and we as a party have been faithful to it over the years.

That is why in our country today there is normally so much purchasing power at the base; and why millions of Americans have achieved a standard of living never before equaled in history.

The physical base of any modern industrial complex is the production of steel. Our atuomobile industry is the greatest user of that steel.

In this connection, the more expensive cars are fine, but the true extent of our prosperity can be measured by the utilization of steel

production in such products as Fords and Plymouths and Chevrolets.

Until recently, nearly all Americans had good food, adequate medical care for themselves and their loved ones, the right to an education, and the blessing of those labor saving devices in the home which have contributed so much to a better life.

Thanks to Democratic policies, we now have had more time to enjoy life, with radios and television sets, and stimulating vacations.

And at least as important, we have the leisure to explore and appreciate the arts and humanities.

That is what the Democratic Party's policy of purchasing power at the base has done for the American people.

Once again, however, the Republicans, now that they have obtained control of the Federal Government, are taking the short-range view—disregarding what is best for the many in favor of what is best for the few.

In the past, Republican policies have always ended up by weakening that base of our prosperity described as "mass purchasing power"; and that is exactly what is going on today.

After 5½ years of Republican rule, business is down. In some instances—example, steel—production has now been curtailed over 50 percent.

Unemployment is up. Between five and six million men and women are now out of work, with unemployment benefits running out for many.

Because of decreased hours of work, take-home pay is also down for those who still have jobs.

Such are the statistical highlights of the current recession.

But they reveal only part of an involved economic picture.

Declining production and increased unemployment would normally result in lower wholesale and lower retail prices; and this would be particularly true when, as in the present case, there has been an actual decrease in the amount of wages and salaries paid to workers.

But the most recent price indexes show that both wholesale and retail prices are at alltime highs.

And so it is now clear that, if there was any true price competition in the market place, prices would now be lower, not higher, than they were a year ago.

Despite much rumor to the contrary, wage and salary payments have actually been declining for months. Week before last, for example, manufacturing workers received $1.36 per week less than they did a year ago; and less people are working.

Decreased employment and decreased hours per worker have resulted in the March annual rate of payment to labor being $4 billion lower than the annual rate just 12 months ago.

Last year the agriculture policies of this administration squeezed nearly 2 million more people off the land.

Many, if not most, of these displaced farmworkers are now in the cities, competing against urban workers for jobs, adding to the lack of purchasing power, to unemployment, and, therefore, to the general recession.

The Secretary of Agriculture advises the farmers squeezed out to go to the city to get a job.

At the same time the Secretary of Labor is advising unemployed city workers to go back to the farm.

How mixed up can you get?

This is just another illustration that the Republican Party does not have a good policy for combating this recession; nor does it have a poor policy. It has no policy at all.

The Republican Party's idea of leadership is to continue to sit on its hands, the same old story, hoping things will cure themselves, a policy which not only brings distress to millions, but also actually endangers our security.

In the last recession, which started in the fall of 1953, this administration promptly announced planned tax cuts of more than $7 billion.

But in the present recession, which is much deeper than the one of 1953–54, no tax cut, or any other positive action, has been announced to date.

In recent weeks the Democratically controlled Congress passed two bills which would have added purchasing power to the economy. One was to support the prices of agriculture; the other to provide more employment by means of a rivers and harbors bill.

Both bills were promptly vetoed by the President, however.

And so we stumble on, with little leadership at a time when leadership is becoming absolutely vital.

As this recession continues to dry up our income and profits, where are we going to get the money to pay for adequate defenses against communism?

Because in our way of life, defense strength can only come from economic strength, and the taxes which supply that defense strength can in turn come only from one source—income, including, of course, profits.

Private profits are essential to any economy operating under a system of free enterprise.

That is not true of a State-controlled economy, where the coin of the realm is the order of the dictator—and therein lies the economic danger which may be just as serious as any military danger.

As illustration, probably the best gage of a modern industrial complex is the production of steel.

Steel is the physical base of any modern economy.

Fifteen years ago, the Soviet Union had been laid waste for a thousand miles inside its borders. The Nazi armies were at the gates of Stalingrad.

Last week Director Allen Dulles of the Central Intelligence Agency made a shocking announcement; namely, in the first quarter of this year the Russian Communists produced more steel than the United States.

What more warning do we need about how necessary it is to get our own production back on the rails—now?

For years this administration has justified passing over quantitative military superiority to the service on the grounds we were retaining qualitative supremacy.

That premise, however, was blasted last October, when the American people saw the world's first satellite orbiting in the cool autumn sky.

The Russian sputniks required all of us to consider problems of national value and survival which did not exist before.

As a result of these launchings, President Eisenhower promptly promised the American people "a critical examination of our entire defense position."

Over 7 months have now passed, however; and very, very little has been done.

It is ironic that tens of thousands of our unemployed could be working on needed national defense items, which are being held back by the administration's self-imposed fiscal ceilings.

Yes, the iron hand of budget control of expenditures is back in control.

In my hometown, heavily hit by unemployment, the leading employer could double his employment if the rigid fiscal restrictions now in force were taken off his Government orders.

Six months after the Soviets launched their first Sputnik I, the United States has again fallen back into its former ostrich-like state of complacency.

As the beep of the Communist satellites fades into silence, inaction, delays, and expenditure ceilings have popped back into view.

The truth of the matter is they never really left. They were just temporarily unnoticed, as our attention was diverted by public statements of promised actions—and also by growing economic problems at home.

After sputnik, the President assured that the American people would not "sacrifice security worshipping a balanced budget."

Many of us were thereupon willing to overlook the Government's record during the previous years—a record of disgraceful disregard for our declining strength vis-a-vis that of the Soviets.

We were eager to cooperate to do everything possible to recover lost ground, and build up our defenses to the point where we could negotiate for peace from a position of relative strength.

Last November the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee started hearings; and received expert testimony from both civilians and military leaders.

On January 23, the subcommittee issued a unanimous report, signed by all Republican members as well as Democrats.

This report contained 17 specific recommendations for action.

Those recommendations—nonpartisan in origin and constructive in content—presented a framework for positive action on the part of the administration.

The Congress was ready and eager to do its part—and to this end, the subcommittee had the Secretary of Defense appear on February 26, and again on April 3.

We found then, and know now, that little or nothing has been done to translate most of these recommendations into action.

On the contrary, and solely to save money, SAC aircraft, defense missile facilities, and other important military equipment have actually been further concentrated on vulnerable bases, instead of being dispersed as recommended.

This action, or rather lack of action, can only please Mr. Khrushchev, the gentleman who has announced that he intends to bury us.

Let's take just one illustration of how little is being done.

Despite sputnik, almost every major expenditure item in the 1959 budget for the Army shows a cutback over expenditures for the fiscal year 1958.

There has been no modification of the program to further cut down to 14 the number of divisions in the Army (Russia alone has 175).

This continued reduction of Army divisions is being taken in the face of sworn testimony before our committee that 28 modern divisions is the absolute minimum required to meet our worldwide commitments.

Sworn testimony was also received that today the United States cannot lift and properly support overseas a single division.

Only 4 days ago a brilliant and dedicated officer, Lt. Gen. James Gavin, whose battle record equals that of any American, made the following statement on a public telecast:

"We have the Army today deployed overseas, facing an opponent it can't defend itself against and can't shoot back against."

Five of our divisions with families are today stationed in Germany, directly facing the vastly superior Communist forces.

What has happened to the President's promised "critical reexamination of our entire defense position"?

Adequate defense effort is being retarded and shackled by lack of decisive leadership.

Our position in the world, our very freedom, are being undermined by this continuing policy of placing fiscal objectives ahead of security.

It has been well said that the strength of a nation depends upon the will of the people—and that in a democratic form of gov-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ernment that will can only function if the people are informed.

The people cannot participate in the great decisions which now face this democratic country unless they are given the facts.

The other day a great Democrat said, "We have now become a Nation of slogans, at the expense of the truth."

Whereas we Democrats regard the people as responsible partners, the Republicans consider them merely customers, to be sold a bill of goods regardless of logic or accuracy.

You know the promises that were made about agriculture.

What has been done to keep those promises?

You know the promises that were made to reduce Government costs.

What has been done about those costs?

You know the promises about education, and the building of more schools, and measures to reduce unemployment.

What has been done about those promises?

In their place, we have such slogans as Liberating Eastern Europe, Unleashing the Formosa Chinese, Rolling Back Communism.

Candor has apparently left our Government.

Month after month the Senate Armed Services Committee heard in closed session about Russian long-range missile firings, before this Nation was test firing any such missiles.

But at the same time, the American people were being told by a member of the President's Cabinet that this country was ahead in the missile race.

My friends, there has been very little candor about our true strength vis-a-vis that of the communists, economic, military, or diplomatic.

The progress of Soviet education has been ignored, and the growing weakness of our foreign alliance has been carefully concealed.

As has been well said, "Our prestige and influence and confidence has declined, and every setback and every disappointment and every defeat has been reported as a triumph of statesmanship from which we have emerged more respected and invulnerable than ever.

We all remember Operation Candor, the project for telling the truth about nuclear weapons.

You read and listen to the news every day. Have you ever seen anything as mixed up in the minds of the public as this question of nuclear testing?

Only a few months ago, this administration was assuring the American people that Russia was on the point of collapsing.

What has collapsed has been our own foreign policy, together with much of our prosperity; and most, if not all, of our military superiority.

As has been well said by the chairman of the freedom of information committee of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, when you act on the basis of partial truth, you act on the basis of what those people believe who gave you that partial truth; but when you act on the basis of all the truth, you act on the basis of what you believe is right.

Why won't this administration recognize the people's right to know?

There will be many issues discussed in coming months.

The problem of unemployment—millions of people walking the streets in the most prosperous country in world history.

The problem of education—rather the lack of it—brought home to the American people by the sputniks.

The problem of the growing economic menace of communism—and our vacillating behavior in meeting that problem.

No issue will be stronger, however, than the issue of telling the people the truth.

The position of our party on these issues is clear.

Great Democratic city, State, and congressional victories next fall will be but a prologue to an even greater victory in 2 years.

Believing in the importance of a leadership which recognizes that the Government should be in partnership with the citizen, in 1960 the voters of this country will return their Government to the people, in the greatest Democratic victory this Nation has ever known.

H. R. 10464 Provides a Partial Answer to Our Shortage of Scientific and Engineering Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, this morning it was my privilege to appear before the Subcommittee on Health and Science of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in support of my bill H. R. 10464, which is designed to attack the problem resulting from our shortage of scientific and engineering manpower.

My statement follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH AND SCIENCE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, IN BEHALF OF H. R. 10464, MAY 13, 1958

Mr. Chairman, the opportunity of appearing before this Subcommittee on Health and Science of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in behalf of my bill, H. R. 10464, is appreciated.

My bill, H. R. 10464, is a companion bill to H. R. 10456 introduced by my colleague, Hon. MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois, chairman of the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy Subcommittee on Research and Development, of which I am ranking House Republican member.

Both of these bills result from lengthy hearings by the Joint Committee's Research and Development Subcommittee held in the spring of 1956 on the shortage of scientific and engineering manpower and our visit to Russia last fall as members of the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Therefore, this is truly a bipartisan legislative effort.

Mr. Chairman, the Price-Van Zandt bills amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 in order to provide for certain educational programs which will improve mathematics instruction in our secondary schools as well as refresher courses and fellowships for mathematics and science teachers.

The legislation is designed to attack one of the greatest deficiencies to be overcome in this country that exists in our secondary schools where a serious deterioration in the quality of mathematics instruction has taken place.

It is pretty well agreed that this deterioration in the quality of mathematics instruction has prevented many of our young people from pursuing college level studies in science and engineering.

To remedy this situation, the Price-Van Zandt bills provide that an award program be set up—with no strings attached—to provide a $500 scholarship to all high school seniors who can pass an examination of prescribed difficulty in mathematics.

This program will serve not only to remedy the enormous annual waste of potential scientific talent but will help restore mathematics to its rightful place as a basic element of the high school curriculum.

In addition to the scholarship program, another provision of the Price-Van Zandt bills provide a stepping up of the present summer institute program administered by the National Science Foundation by providing refresher courses for high school mathematics and science teachers.

In this connection, the present program is handicapped by the fact that the National Science Foundation was only able to provide funds for 108 institutions last year on its relatively small budget of $5.3 million.

There were over 200 qualified institutions which proposed to set up summer institutes with the Foundation's cooperation but were unable to do so because of the lack of funds since the $5.3 million available was wholly inadequate.

It is conservatively estimated that in addition there are at least 200 other qualified institutions in the country which would participate in the program if adequate funds were available.

Therefore the Price-Van Zandt bills increase the funds for summer institutes from $5.3 million to $25 million, this making possible the quadrupling of the present summer institute program of the National Science Foundation as a concrete means of assisting high school mathematics and science teachers by improving the quality of their instruction.

In addition to scholarships and the summer institute program, the Price-Van Zandt bills provide that there should be established by the National Science Foundation a program of summer fellowships for those high school teachers who already have their bachelor of arts degrees and who desire to increase their scientific knowledge.

The program—at a level of $10 million a year—will be a valuable supplement to the summer institute program and will provide the advanced training needed to stimulate and guide talented young people in our better schools. Then too, it will provide the added advantage of improving the quality of instruction among teachers.

Mr. Chairman, the proposals made in the Price-Van Zandt bills if translated into action will be an important first step toward insuring that this country will have an adequate supply of scientific and engineering talent to meet the scientific challenge of the future.

Moreover, if the intent of these bills is enacted into law the need will be met without creating serious unbalances in the social and economic fabric of this country by serving to strengthen the country measurably through improvements in the basic educational preparation we give to all our young people.

Mr. Chairman, the provisions of the Price-Van Zandt bills represent a means of meeting to a marked degree the Soviet challenge to American education, which we as members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy came in contact with last October in visiting Russia and talking with Russian scientists.

When Congressman PRICE and I returned to the United States last October, and after reviewing our observations in Russia, we concluded that no time should be lost in perfecting appropriate legislation to meet the Soviet challenge. As a result, we drafted the Price-Van Zandt bills. When we introduced them we made the following joint statement:

"MEETING THE NEED FOR SCIENTIFIC MANPOWER—AN INTELLIGENT APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM

"(Joint statement by Representative MELVIN PRICE (Democrat, Illinois) and Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT (Republican, Pennsylvania), chairman and ranking House minority member of the Research and Development Subcommittee, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, in the House of Representatives on Monday, February 3, 1958)

"We believe that the time has come, and in many respects is long overdue, for a forthright facing-up to the challenge presented to this country by the Soviets in their massive educational program aimed at outproducing the free world, both in quantity and quality, in the output of trained scientists and engineers.

"We are witnessing a life and death battle for brainpower in an age of rapid technological advance. The penalty for losing this battle is Soviet domination of the world and the destruction of our way of life as a free people. It is clear that we must act—and act promptly—to meet this threat. At the same time, we must not lose sight of our long-range objectives and adopt hasty measures which will jeopardize the attainment of these objectives.

"This battle for brainpower is not new. Back in the spring of 1956 the Research and Development Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, mindful of the mounting threat to this country posed by the Soviet Union, held extensive public hearings on the shortage of scientific and engineering manpower. As members of the subcommittee, we believed then, and we continue to believe today, that concrete remedial action is needed urgently if we are to meet the Soviet challenge successfully.

"Recent events, including Russian achievements in launching two earth satellites, serve to underscore this urgent need for action. We are faced not so much with a new situation as with dramatic proof of what many experts have been saying all along regarding the large scale efforts of the Soviets to achieve technological mastery of the world. Our recent firsthand visit to Russia where we had an opportunity to talk directly with top Russian scientists has clearly confirmed these findings.

"Since the advent of sputnik we have heard much in public forums and in the press about the need for crash programs to regain America's technological supremacy. We have heard proposals for stepping up scholarships in the individual scientific disciplines such as physics, chemistry, and biology and for channeling our young people into specific lines of activity within the scientific and engineering fields. These statements are reminiscent of the line of thinking which we ourselves indulged in prior to the subcommittee hearings in 1956.

"As the hearings progressed, however, it became clear that only by attacking the roots of the manpower problem, not its surface manifestations, can we effectively meet future requirements. We recognized then, as we do today, that in our haste to catch up with the Russians there is a natural tendency to call for special purpose legislation to cope with the pressing problems of the moment.

"But the more we looked at the problem, the more we became convinced that the shortage of scientists and engineers is only part of a larger shortage of specialized talent in all fields, and that the best and surest means of meeting future requirements in the scientific and engineering fields is to increase the overall supply of specialized talent—across the board. Laying undue emphasis on any one specialized field of scientific endeavor, to the exclusion of others, would create serious imbalances which would in the long run only serve to undermine the very strengths we are attempting to build up.

"In brief, we came to recognize that the shortage of specialized talent is total and that deficiencies exist in many areas which must be dealt with at the same time we are directing our attention to the scientific and engineering fields. Loading the deck in favor of one over the other is not only futile but may well be fatal to the long term national interest.

"It is clear, then, that any measures which are taken must be developed in the context of our overall needs and must serve to strengthen the Nation as a whole. This is not to say, however, that specific actions cannot be initiated now as part of a broad program of improvement, provided they contribute to our general long-term objectives.

"Going to the roots of the scientific manpower problem, the subcommittee found that one of the greatest deficiencies to be overcome is the serious deterioration in recent years in the quality of mathematics instruction in our high schools. We found that through inadequate preparation in our secondary schools, particularly in the traditional subjects of mathematics, many of our young people who might be scientifically inclined are actually prevented from pursuing college-level courses in science and engineering. This represents an enormous annual waste of potential scientific talent which we can ill afford if we are to compete effectively with the Russians in the years to come.

"Fortunately, this is one area in which concrete remedial action can and should be initiated immediately. We have been particularly impressed with the proposal originally made to the subcommittee at the 1956 hearings by Dr. I. I. Rabi, of Columbia University, that an award program be set up to provide a $500 scholarship to all high-school seniors who can pass an examination of prescribed difficulty in the traditional subjects of mathematics. There would be no strings attached to this award and there would be no requirement that the winners of such awards pursue a particular line of study, either in the scientific or other technical fields.

"The advantages of such an award program are obvious. In the first place, it would help restore mathematics to its rightful place as a basic element of the high-school curriculum through stimulating greater student interest in mathematics. An essential background would thus be provided for those intending to pursue scientific and engineering careers and at the same time the general curriculum would be strengthened for all students, whether or not they go on to specialize in these fields.

"The award program would also serve as an indirect stimulus to parents and community groups to seek improvements in mathematics instruction in their own local high schools. Since the program would be on a purely voluntary basis it would not involve the problem of Federal control of local educational institutions. Major emphasis would still remain on action by local groups but a new incentive would be provided for such groups to take the necessary corrective measures. This, it seems to us, is a commonsense approach to the problem and one which would achieve tangible results without upsetting delicate social and economic balances in this country.

"Intimately allied with interesting young people in science, is the caliber of the science teachers they have in high school. Without good teachers, well equipped with knowledge of recent developments in the scientific field, there will be no stimulus for students to excel in their subject, no one to alert youthful imagination to the challenges of the scientific frontier. It is difficult to calculate the influence good teachers have had in helping produce our scientific and other leaders of today, but no one would question that it has been substantial. Do we dare embark upon the future without assuring ourselves that we are doing everything possible to provide our young people with the best teachers available to prepare them for what lies ahead?

"But good teachers don't just happen. Incentives must be provided to attract young men and women of high intellectual caliber to the teaching profession. Once they are recruited, there must be continuing incentives provided to keep them in the profession. The question then arises: What form should these incentives take?

"As in the case of improving the high-school curriculum, much depends on the initiative and resourcefulness of local communities, particularly with regard to increasing teacher salaries, which in many areas are shockingly low. But beyond this, some means must be devised through which the Federal Government can lend assistance in cooperation with local authorities. Once again, this Federal assistance would have to be provided in such a way as to avoid undue interference with local school boards and State authorities.

"Perhaps the greatest need at the moment is to provide high-school teachers with the opportunity to improve their own knowledge of their subjects and thereby improve the quality of instruction offered their students. This applies to teachers of all subjects, but the need for improvement has become particularly critical in the case of mathematics and science teachers.

"One of the most successful means to date of meeting this need has been the summertime refresher courses for high-school teachers which have been held for the past several years under the auspices of the National Science Foundation. Through the cooperation of universities and institutions throughout the country, hundreds of teachers have attended special summer courses which average about 6 weeks in duration. Stipends of $75 per week are offered, together with $15 per dependent. The cost of running the courses is borne mutually by the Foundation and the participating university.

"While the program is excellent as far as it goes, it does not go far enough on its present limited budget to meet mounting needs. For example, the Foundation was able to provide funds for 108 institutions last year on its relatively small budget of $5.3 million. However, there were double that number of qualified institutions who proposed to set up summer institutes with the Foundation's cooperation but were unable to do so because of lack of funds. It is conservatively estimated that in addition to this, there are at least 200 other qualified institutions in this country who have not made specific proposals to the Foundation but who might be encouraged to join the program if funds were made available.

"We therefore propose, as a concrete means of assisting high-school math and science teachers and improving the quality of their instruction, that the present summer institute program of the Foundation for high-school teachers be quadrupled in size and that the present funding level for the program be increased from $5.3 million to $25 million. Chief value of such action would be to take an already going concern and through expanding its activities, increase the number of teachers being assisted with a minimum of delay and a maximum of effectiveness.

"In addition to the above program, we believe a new program should be established by the Foundation to provide summer fellowships for those high school teachers who already have their bachelor of arts degree but who desire to increase their scientific knowledge. Such a program—at a level of $10 million per year—should be a valuable supplement to the summer institute program and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

should provide the advance training which some of our teachers need to stimulate and guide talented young people in our better schools. It would have the added advantage of helping bring up the quality of instruction among teachers all the way up and down the line and would place a premium on competence.

"It is our conviction that the proposals we have made, if translated into action, would be an important first step toward insuring that this country will have an adequate supply of scientific and engineering talent to meet the scientific challenge of the future. They will help meet this need, moreover, without creating serious imbalances in the social and economic fabric of this country. They will, in fact, serve to strengthen the country measurably by providing improvements in the basic educational preparation we give to all our young people. This is the true answer to the Soviet challenge and in keeping with the best traditions of our free society.

"We are today introducing legislation in the House to carry out these proposals. We are hopeful it will receive prompt and favorable consideration."

Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege to address the annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Seconday School Principals Association at Harrisburg, Pa., on October 29, 1956, almost a full year before Sputnik I was launched.

My address was based in considerable measure on hearings held in 1956 by the Subcommittee on Research and Development of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I am a member.

These hearings delved in considerable detail into the reasons for the shortages of scientific and engineering manpower and showed conclusively that the deficiencies of our educational system are the fundamental reason for this shortage. Actually the crucial shortage is not that of scientists today, it is today's and tomorrow's shortage of talented teachers.

As experts testified in the course of these hearings the progress made in science and technology, in such fields as nuclear weapons, Jet propulsion, radar, plastics, and electronic computers, has been so great that our educational system as a whole has lagged.

Compared to today's needs our elementary and secondary schools, and even many of our colleges, are living in a horse and buggy era.

Nearly 2 years ago these hearings revealed, and I repeated in my Harrisburg, Pa., speech that Russians are training intensively about 3 times as many scientists as we are, that by 1960 every Russian child in the Soviet 10-year school program will have to study 5 years of physics, 5 years of biology, 4 years of chemistry, 10 years of mathematics through trigonometry, and 1 year of astronomy.

I told my Harrisburg audience in October 1956 that not only are the Soviets training engineers at a rate three times as fast as we are, but, despite the fact that their own industrial capacity is only half the size of ours, they are sending scores of these engineers into other lands, engineers who will, of course, help convert these lands to communism. In December 1955, Khrushchev and Bulganin offered to build and staff a technological institute in Rangoon, "a gift to the people of Burma from the people of Soviet Union," as they put it. The following year Russian technicians started building a steel mill for the Indians in India. Enticing inducements have been advanced to Egypt, Afghanistan, and Latin America.

I warned my Harrisburg audience that this type of penetration by the Soviets may be expected to grow rather than wane as the supply of trained Russian personnel becomes ever greater. As I have stressed again and again, we must not allow ourselves to fall behind the Russians. If this ever happens we could easily find ourselves outwitted, outmaneuvered, outthought, and outbuilt throughout the world.

I continued by saying that as never before we know the key to our continued leadership in the free world lies in our schools.' Therefore, there is no project in the Nation that should have a higher priority than the rapid improvement of our educational facilities. The teacher shortage is desperate and must be dealt with aggressively. This problem cannot be solved on the present basis of recruitment, preparation, and utilization of teachers. The problem of the teacher shortage must be attacked on many fronts. Local communities and States must face up to the fact that this is their problem and must provide the tax support required. Teachers' salaries must be increased to attract more capable persons into the profession. Greater incentives and rewards for outstanding teachers should be provided. Teachers can be relieved of a good many routine housekeeping and clerical chores.

Ways must be found, as I told the convention of Pennsylvania secondary school principals in October of 1956, "to make sure that our teachers receive the recognition and the prestige which is commensurate with their high responsibility of training our young people."

We must also make certain that we obtain more thorough means of identifying talent and more effective guidance for our young people.

The need is great and it is immediate. The future of America lies not just in the hands of its educators. The burden of responsibility for America's future lies upon all of our citizens. We must lift ourselves to a new and higher plain of concern, of hard work, of expenditure, and of dedication to the increased development and undergirding of America's key to the future, our educational system.

Mr. Chairman, let me repeat again that what I have read to you represents excerpts from my speech in Harrisburg, Pa., in October 1956.

In calling my views to your attention, I do not pose as an expert in the field of education. I share, however, the concern you and all other Americans have in our educational system which we like to think is the best in the world.

My views are based on the lengthy hearings of 1956 by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, my visit to Russia last fall, and my great desire to enable the United States to meet the Soviet challenge to the American educational system.

Therefore, I sincerely hope that the Price-Van Zandt bills will receive your favorable consideration.

Agriculture Is a Stabilizing Force in Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, various witnesses before our committee, including ex-President Truman, Walter Reuther, and a number of leftwing economists, have been mystified by the fact that consumer prices during this alleged recession have not sagged. They simply do not seem to understand it.

One of the reasons for the price firmness was very well expressed by Carroll Kilpatrick, in the Washington Post, May 3, 1958, in his very able article, "Agriculture Is a Stabilizing Force in Economy," which is herewith submitted for the RECORD:

AGRICULTURE IS A STABILIZING FORCE IN ECONOMY

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

The United States has become so accustomed to its farm problems that it is having difficulty adjusting to the fact that in the current recession agriculture is proving to be a strong and stabilizing force in the economy.

At the same time, Democratic politicians have become so accustomed to thinking there is a farm revolt against Republicans that they may be overlooking a gradual change in sentiment that could surprise them in November.

This is not to say that the farm problems have been solved or that Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson has become a hero in the farm States. Far from it. But in recent months farm income has been rising and the farmer, who previously felt embittered as he watched his city cousins prosper, now is happier because his relative position is much improved.

As recently as a few months ago, there was a loud and angry cry for Benson's resignation and a great outcry from congressional farm spokesmen of both parties about the farm depression. In the last few weeks, there has been relative quiet.

Despite the improved situation, experts in the Department of Agriculture do expect the farmer to gain as much in the next few months as he has in the last few. Prices of some important commodities are expected to decline somewhat, bringing a little relief to the hardpressed consumer. There will almost certainly be a big glut of wheat this year, with the amount put in Government storage probably reaching a record high and depressing grain prices.

In the first quarter of 1958, prices and incomes to farmers advanced, with prices up more than 7 percent above the first quarter of 1957. The April index of prices received was 10 percent above a year earlier and at the highest level since January 1953. Prices paid by farmers in April were up 3 percent from April 1957. The parity ratio was thus about 6 percent higher than a year earlier.

Why has there been this improvement in farm income during a period of general recession? In 1949 and again in 1953, as the two earlier postwar recessions got underway farm income declined.

Here are some of the possible explanations for upward movement of farm prices in this recession:

The farmer has already been through his recession. It started toward the end of the Korean war. The decline lasted almost 5 years, forcing many adjustments on the farm and in the farm economy.

The most vulnerable farm prices in a period of recession are commodities traded on the world market, such as wheat, cotton, and some dairy products. These have been supported by the Government and have been aided by the Soil Bank and the costly foreign disposal programs.

In the last few years, the American consumer has demanded a steadily more expensive diet. Whereas, a few years ago, the per-capita consumption of beef was about 60 pounds a year, it is now up to 80 pounds. The per-capita consumption of poultry has doubled since 1940.

Weather. The citrus crop was badly damaged by last winter's freezes, and some citrus prices have almost doubled. The damage to the early vegetable crop has forced up the price of spring vegetables. When the sum-

mer crops are harvested, prices should begin to decline.

Consumer spending for foods has actually risen during the recession despite the decline in spending for automobiles, houses, and other expensive items. Sales at retail stores were 9 percent higher in the first quarter of 1958 than in the comparable 1957 period. The demand for food has helped keep prices high.

The annual rate of farm operators' realized net income in the first quarter of this year rose to about $13 billion, as compared with a rate of $11.7 billion for the same quarter in 1957 and $11.5 billion for the full year 1957.

The Agriculture Department predicts that, barring a further downturn in the economy, farm income for 1958 will be from 5 to 10 percent higher than in 1957.

"In spite of the troublesome problems besetting agriculture today," Secretary Benson told a recent press conference, "the picture is encouraging. The downtrend in prices which started in 1951 has been reversed. The standard of living on farms is the highest in history. The buildup of surpluses has been reversed."

Before the year is out, Benson may have to revise his comment on surpluses. The drought is ended in the Great Plains, and there are favorable growing prospects in nearly all wheat areas.

Three years ago, the Commodity Credit Corporation held 1.3 billion bushels of wheat in storage. That has been whittled down to about 750 million bushels. But the carryover may rise again.

Soil conditions now are so favorable that the wheat yield per acre is expected to be 6 bushels greater than last year, and many more acres will be planted.

Obituary Notice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the East Liverpool Review, East Liverpool, Ohio, on May 6, 1958:

OBITUARY NOTICE

"Foreign competition, especially from Japan." That was the old story as another dinnerware concern prepared to close its doors.

The latest to feel the death blow from cheap labor and other operating conditions from abroad is the Pope-Gosser China Co. of Coshocton. The company was organized in 1902, but now has called a meeting of the shareholders this week to liquidate the business.

It's another example, becoming increasingly ominous to those trying to get the American pottery industry back on its feet of how inadequate tariff and lack of quota protection is knocking out industry in this country piece by piece. And while our people are trying to make both ends meet with dwindling paychecks the profits of those concerns from abroad are soaring as they flood our markets with their products.

The White House should be bombarded again with protests against this latest stab in the back to a once prosperous and proud industry. If nothing else, clip this editorial and send it to Washington.

Though President Eisenhower continues to encourage world trade, a continued pointing out of what foreign competition is doing to part of our economy may have the effect of bringing those safeguards necessary to preserve some vital gears in the American industrial machine.

Plain Talk on the Forest Preserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the great natural resources cherished by the people of the State of New York is the wilderness within our Catskill and Adirondack parks—our wild forest lands protected by an article in the State constitution which provides that our forest preserve lands shall be kept forever wild.

A forthright spokesman for public interest in wilderness protection has been the Honorable Sharon J. Mauhs, the State Conservation Commissioner whose appointment to this position I consider one of Gov. Averell Harriman's great contributions to conservation. Governor Harriman recently told the president of Friends of the Forest Preserve, Mr. Paul Schaefer, that of course he was opposed to lumbering the State forest preserve, and his conservation commissioner, Sharon J. Mauhs on April 23 explained in detail the State's position on this wilderness preservation issue.

While voicing this public sentiment in the plain talk of an address which was entitled "The Forest Preserve Should Not Be Lumbered," Commissioner Mauhs emphasized his wish to make it clear that we do not regard our position to be in conflict with forestry for forest products. In fact, he pointed out that for the privilege of maintaining a forest preserve forever wild we actually are dependent upon our commercial forests. He insisted, however, that such forests should as at present continue to be managed outside the Adirondack and Catskill Parks.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this address by New York State's conservation commissioner Sharon J. Mauhs, entitled "The Forest Preserve Should Not Be Lumbered," delivered on April 23, 1958, at the annual meeting of the Oneida Lake Association held in Syracuse, N. Y., be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE FOREST PRESERVE SHOULD NOT BE LUMBERED

(Speech delivered by Conservation Commissioner Sharon S. Mauhs, at the annual meeting of the Oneida Lake Association, held at Lincoln Auditorium, Central High School, Syracuse, N. Y., on April 23, 1958.)

I appreciate the invitation to be with you tonight and to talk to one of the largest single conservation associations in the State, because it gives me the opportunity to speak out on a subject I think deserves plain talk on the part of the Conservation Commissioner of this State.

For some weeks now there has been growing a somewhat curious chorus. The theme of this chorus is admiration for the great forest preserve of the Adirondacks and the Catskills, but underlying this theme is a strange proposal.

To make this great natural wonderland more beautiful, so they say, and to save the trees, they would cut down and lumber off portions of its great wilderness forests. They say they want to do this to end 63 years of neglect. They propose to bring in what they call scientific forestry and selective cutting, to remove, what they claim is now a forest cemetery.

I am not impressed by these statements. I am not impressed by this kind of argument.

RESPECT FOR FOREST MANAGEMENT

Now, let me say that I have a profound respect for good forest management in its rightful place. What I object to is using such terms as "scientific forestry" and "selective cutting" as a smoke screen to make the public think that you can log portions of the Adirondacks and the Catskills without messing up the woods. I do not want this department to be made the goat when people come to us, after we have supervised a cutting in some old-growth Adirondack hardwood, and say "So this is what you call forestry. I thought you told us it would be more beautiful when you got through."

It is true that there is spotty public land ownership in the forest preserve; that the State's holdings are not all in large, contiguous blocks of forest growth; that while there are large, unbroken blocks of forest preseve lands, there are also large numbers of scattered small areas of forest preserve which do not contribute to wilderness, and which constitute one of the big problems and one of the big headaches of forest preserve administration. This, of course, will be corrected in part as the result of the adoption of the detached parcel amendment last fall.

But this spotty public ownership, as I see it, is not an excuse for lumbering in the forest preserve. On the contrary, it is a reason to plan to consolidate our holdings where that should be done, and can be done, when it is feasible, and funds are available and for setting up in the forest preserve counties, outside the blue lines, and elsewhere in the state, more reforestation areas where timber production may be appropriately carried out. This would not, and need not, interfere with our wilderness forests.

A GREAT NATURAL RESOURCE

Now, let us take a look at today's forest preserve, and at the same time let us take a look at another great wilderness area in the Nation.

Then let us take a look ahead—to anticipate the problems of the future—so that we may determine whether these wilderness qualities of the forest preserve should be maintained, while we prepare, as we should prepare, for increasing thousands of our citizens to enjoy this environment.

What is the forest preserve?

It is one of our great natural resources.

It is an historical and a cultural resource.

It is expanse. Its purpose is wilderness. It is not a forest cemetery. On the contrary, it is one of the most beautiful wilderness areas in the United States. It has not been neglected for 63 years. On the contrary, the foresters and the rangers and other employees of the Conservation Department have given their blood and sweat and toil for at least 50 of these 63 years, to protect this wonderland against disease and forest pests and forest fires and unlawful cutting.

I have been in and over the forest preserve, I think, more times than most men.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

I cannot accept that kind of criticism of one of the finest wilderness areas in the Nation and of the finest men this department ever had, who have guarded it, and protected it, down to this day.

What is the forest preserve?

It is a whole complex of nature; trees and rocks and ferns and flowers and wildlife. It is clear water and clean air. It is the beauty of nature, as nature evolves. It is the solitude and the music of stillness. It invites man to adventure, to refreshment, and to wonder.

It is not mowed, and trimmed clean, and manicured, like a golf course or a city park. It was never intended to be, because wilderness exists only where nature is free, and where the hand of man is restrained.

These wilderness areas in the Adirondacks and Catskills, which belong to all the people, are set apart and dedicated by law, to be forever wild. Distance, ruggedness, climate, and the Constitution, are their most effective guardians.

Man, of course, is a part of the scene, because wilderness has no human value without man, but wilderness does not mean roads and motels and taverns and dance halls and merry-go-rounds and sawmills. These are all right in their places, but wilderness reaches out from the roadside, to be experienced by those who penetrate it, or by those who just look at it. This wilderness, this scenery, these natural objects, should remain unimpaired for the use of future generations.

THE FOREST PRESERVE AND THE PEOPLE

It is the will of the people of this State, as expressed in their constitution; in the determinations of governors, in the opinions of attorneys general, in the acts of legislatures, and in the decisions of courts, that we maintain this wilderness character for the benefit and the enjoyment of all the people.

There are qualities in the forest preserve you won't find anywhere else in the Western Hemisphere. These qualities provide that something, which makes the forest preserve one of the great natural wonders of America.

What are the features of wilderness?

A landscape of natural beauty.

An area removed from the sight and the sounds and the odors of mechanization and industry.

A vast area where thousands of citizens can feel safe and removed from highways and gas stations, and billboards, and from those other activities, the primary interest of which is making money.

A place where full enjoyment of life depends upon one's ability, one's physical skill, one's courage, and one's self-reliance.

PRIMEVAL WILDERNESS AND IDEALISM

The idea we hold today about wilderness are the result of many, many years of growth. The seed was planted long ago by great men. They saw a goal. They pointed out the direction.

I remember reading about a group of Montana citizens, who for 6 full weeks back in 1870, had been exploring with increasing awe, the remarkable country which today is known as Yellowstone National Park. At the end of the trail, they sat around a campfire, talking about this public land of the future. Those practical-minded citizens were so moved by the sight of these great natural wonders, and the impact of primeval wilderness, that they put aside, every one of them, all thought of personal gain. They there resolved that this wonderland should be forever preserved in public ownership, set apart as a shrine, for the use, and the enjoyment, and the inspiration of all.

Then in 1885, when the West was yet little more than a frontier, farsighted men conceived and brought into being another of the Nation's great treasures, the New York State forest preserve in the Adirondack and Catskill Mountains. In so doing they set a pattern for wilderness and forest protection which has never been equaled anywhere, and they recognized the need for maintaining this pattern, and these wilderness regions, for the benefit of generations to come.

And so for nearly three-quarters of a century New York State has pioneered, and I believe it will continue to pioneer, in guarding its wilderness forests, the scenic splendors of its wilderness landscapes, and the recreational values which they provide.

Our forest preserve was established in an atmosphere of high idealism. Yellowstone National Park was established in an atmosphere of high idealism. The men who gathered around that wilderness campfire in 1870, started the first major conservation movement in the United States. They were soon followed by the men from New York in 1885. These were the acts of unselfish men, which have become the guideposts to the world in conservation.

WILDERNESS: HERITAGE WITH AN OBLIGATION

We have inherited a great masterpiece; with that heritage is this obligation: To preserve, to protect, and to prepare this area for our enjoyment and inspiration and for the enjoyment and inspiration of our children and all other children to come.

Some people today want to remove this natural wilderness in sections of the forest preserve. Beyond all the hue and cry that they want to make the forests more beautiful by what they call selective cutting, or scientific forestry, I am afraid a lot of people across the State will be staying that the lumbering interests wouldn't be wanting to cut trees in the forest preserve unless they could make some money out of the deal.

Now just what are my good friends in the lumbering business concerned about? All the forests and all the trees we have in New York State are not just in the forest preserve. The truth of the matter is that there are only 2½ million acres in the forest preserve, while we have in this State over 12 million acres of commercial forests, where the lumber people can cut trees all they like, under their selective cutting practices. Why then do they want to pour this green gold of the forest preserve into the mouths of the saw mills?

As one of the custodians of the forest preserve, and in the face of these demands to cut down a part of it, I want to make it clear tonight that I believe these lands should not be taken for logging or for any other commercial operation.

On this broad front; the preservation of wilderness depends pretty much upon you. One of the most encouraging developments over the years has been the strengthening of conservation education. An informed public is the best safeguard of the integrity of the forest preserve's natural environment. Natural environment is the essential resource of a wilderness forest.

Wilderness serves all the people. Those who penetrate it gain its fullest reward. But even the wilderness beyond the road furnishes a tremendous setting and a tremendous background for others. People view, and enjoy, and are inspired by the wilderness, 5, 10, 20 miles away. Destroy that background, lumber off even a part of it, and the wilderness disappears. And there will also disappear the pleasure of those whose only contact with the wilderness is experienced as they look outward and over it, from a window or from the roadside.

PUBLIC ATTITUDE AND PUBLIC BENEFIT

The future will present many difficult problems. But the same factors which governed the writing of a great constitutional amendment will still guide the public in the days to come. I find every indication, as I travel about the State, that the public attitude in favor of preserving our great wilderness forests is becoming stronger.

What benefit does the public now get out of the forest preserve? Some people would have you think they get none, because we do not allow commercial recreational development or commercial cutting of the timber.

Is the forest preserve locked up? Can we build campsites, open up hiking and access trails, build more wilderness canoe routes, more lean-to's; can we improve our trout streams, our lakes, and our ponds? Of course we can. These are some of the things we are doing, and should continue to do in the forest preserve, because wilderness invites people to this kind of adventure, refreshment and recreation. And as I said before, man is part of the scene because wilderness has little human value unless you can see it, appreciate it, and enjoy it.

MEANING OF WILDERNESS PRESERVATION

Does wilderness preservation mean discarding hospitality? It does not.

Does it mean keeping people out? It does not.

Does it mean the elimination of tents and campsites and campfires and picnic areas and hiking trails and leanto's and canoe routes and public hunting and fishing? Of course it does not.

Does it mean people will have to walk a bit to reach their favorite trout stream, or trout pond, or hunting ground? Yes; it means that. There should be no vast network of new highways and jeep roads in these wilderness forests.

Without these, there are already open to the people many avenues of enjoyment and relaxation in the forest preserve, such as hunting, fishing, boating, swimming, hiking, camping, picnicking, photography, skiing, and just that plain relaxation which comes from standing out in the open with the wind in your face. We now have all these things; we can continue to have all these things and to increase their opportunities and we can preserve the wilderness at the same time.

What does wilderness preservation mean? It simply means preservation against commercial exploitation and private control. The beauty and the natural wonders of the forest preserve will not be endangered by reasonable public use, or even by some dead trees.

There is an old saying that all trees are wood, but pine is not mahogany. To me all trees in the forest preserve are mahogany. Undisturbed, natural beauty, is more than ample justification for the protection of its forests. I regard its growing trees—its monarchs, it shrubs, its second growth, its fallen trees, as exhibits, as museum pieces, valuable in their natural state because they are all a part of a natural association. However, the problem is not without difficulty. It will require clear heads and firm hands to keep this great forest preserve as it was meant to be.

* * * * *

CONSERVATION AND THE FUTURE

We in the Conservation Department believe that the good use of leisure, use that will strengthen the moral fiber of America, is one of our responsibilities. Soon we hope to have in action a program broad enough to overtake today's problems; broad enough to prepare for future problems before they develop. We will call this project forest reserve. I hope it will emphasize a firm determination to maintain, without compromise, article 14, section 1 of the Constitution.

Lumbering does not fit into this picture. * * * But we wish to make it clear that we do not regard our position to be in conflict with forestry for forest products. On the contrary, we are dependent upon our commercial forests to protect our wilderness forests. If ever we come to the borders of the Adirondack and Catskill preserve with a

need for timber which cannot be met elsewhere, then our wilderness areas are in trouble. It is to the foresters of New York State and their effective programs for sustained-yield cutting on the production forests to whom we also look for help in wilderness preservation. We in the Conservation Department recognize this—and we face our project forest preserve in a spirit of cooperation, and with a feeling that on sober second thought, the foresters and the forest industries will support us and cooperate with us in our determination to preserve our wilderness forests in the Adirondacks and Catskills.

Recreation and greater use and greater enjoyment of the forest preserve fit into this program in a very substantial degree. Stream and pond improvement; more public access sites to our lakes and streams; more foot trails and horse trails for better access to the remote areas; more campsites, more bathing and picnicking areas; more roadside clearings to afford better roadside views of beautiful panoramas for the enjoyment and the pleasure of the traveling public, are all part of this program.

* * * * *

We must always evaluate the forest preserve in terms of human benefits and human rights as opposed to financial benefits and property rights.

It will probably take longer than our lifetime to complete the job, but this is the direction in which we should move. The pattern is set. The way is clear to save and to use the most precious area we have in the State for a purpose for which it was intended to be used—refreshment of the body—refreshment of the mind—refreshment of the soul. These are human benefits, and I place them above, high above, financial benefits or financial gain.

People have a warm feeling for the word "wilderness." It reflects adventurous times and personal experiences. It reminds Americans that it is a part of American tradition. Americans think of wilderness as something which is close to all that is good and strong in their country's history.

May the interest of the people in this great, this wonderful forest preserve, continue to grow in the years ahead, and may it continue to provide forever, an inspiration and an outlet, for the mind and the soul, to those who venture into the woods, far beyond the end of a road.

The United States of America, Home for Public Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, spending billions upon billions of hard-earned tax dollars through a program advertised as foreign aid, ostensibly to help less fortunate people, gain friendship, and through that friendship, make our own future secure, we make ourselves ridiculous, defeating our own announced purpose by providing a home for criminals, especially for Communists.

The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights were epoch-making documents and adherence to the principles so enunciated have made this the land of freedom.

Unfortunately, legislation enacted by the Congress and decisions by our courts have made it possible for the Republic's enemies to carry on with safety many of their programs because they are protected either by legislation overstressing the right of the individual, when opposed to that of the public as a whole, or by strained constructions by the courts of that legislation.

Skipping any detailed statement as to that legislation, or comment on those decisions, permit me to give you an outline of the present situation which has existed over-long, which demands a solution now.

J. G. Hayden, who hails from Cass County, Mich., now the very efficient Washington correspondent of the Detroit News, on April 30, wrapped the situation up very completely and very neatly when he wrote:

WASHINGTON, April 30.—When a regional immigration officer last week blew his top and spirited one William Heikkila off to his native Finland, only to haul him back due to protest by a Federal judge, the United States Immigration Service was made to look ridiculous.

But an effect of that incident may be to prod Congress into passing a bill long requested by President Eisenhower to check the endless legal ring around by which many convicted aliens delay and frequently defeat final orders for deportation.

The most famous victor in that line was Harry Bridges, west coast labor leader, first recommended for deportation by a Seattle immigration office in 1937 and finally freed from a fourth deportation order by a San Francisco Federal judge in 1955—a span of 18 years. Once in the meantime Bridges was convicted of perjury and sentenced to 5 years in prison, but exonerated by a 4 to 3 (less than full majority) decision of the Supreme Court in 1954.

HELD ONLY 20 DAYS

The High Court did not dispute the finding of fact that Bridges had sworn falsely that he was not a Communist, but released him on the ground tha a 3-year statute of limitation had expired between his indictment in 1945 and conviction in 1949.

Arrested over and over during 18 years, Bridges' longest incarceration was 20 days—August 5 to August 20, 1950.

For Heikkila, who never has denied that he was a Communist card carrier for 10 years (1929 to 1939) the first warrant of deportation was issued in 1947. In the intervening 11 years, scores of legal actions to delay his deportation have been brought by lawyers for a so-called Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born, often identified as a Communist Party arm. And his latest reprieve, at cost of two Atlantic crossings, appears to have started the legal process once more from scratch.

There are other cases comparably notorious. One of them is Carlos Marcello, gambler and henchman of Frank Costello and once convicted as a drug peddler.

After Marcello had been exposed by his crime investigation in 1951, Senator KEFAUVER (Democrat, of Tennessee) called him "the evil genius of criminal activities in New Orleans" and urged his deportation "as fast as the wheels of justice can be sent into action."

Marcello was first cited for illegal entry to the United States in 1953 and, while never acquitted, still is in New Orleans a free man.

His lawyers have brought 42 separate legal actions, graphically chronicled by the Immigration Service on a chart nearly 6 feet long.

Recently Marcello's counselors dreamed up a wholly unique gimmick—a suit filed in Rome to stop the Italian Government from issuing an entry permit, without which he cannot be deported to his native Italy.

Simultaneously, suit has been filed in United States Federal court to stop deportation on the ground that persons sent back to Italy are miserable there.

ANOTHER CASE CITED

Since 1950 the Immigration Service has been trying in vain to deport another alleged Communist, Harry Carlisle, of Los Angeles, to England. Before the un-American Activities Committee several witnesses identified Carlisle as a Communist Party member and he himself has persistently taken the fifth amendment to escape testifying.

But up to date the law has been unable to catch up with him.

There are a host of like cases, indicative that almost anyone can escape deportation provided he can raise money to keep his lawyers working.

Former Attorney General Brownell first proposed that Congress move to stop these delays in deportation cases by the process of one consolidated appeal by way of the district, circuit courts, and the Supreme Court. Citing the failure of Congress to act, President Eisenhower a year ago warned that many criminals and traffickers in narcotics and subversion were using legal maneuvers to avoid justified expulsion.

Immigration Commissioner Joseph M. Swing asked plaintively last week: "How are we going to get rid of these deportable aliens who keep coming back to court?"

Polish Government-in-Exile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Julius Szygowski, Council of the Polish Republic in-Exile in Chicago, Ill., forwarded to me the following motion passed by the Polish Government-in-Exile located in London, England.

It does seem unfortunate that the United Nations has neglected to give to the people of the free world the truth concerning the facts regarding the aggression, infiltration, and military force used by the Soviets during the last 30 years to subjugate millions of free people. The following motion adopted by the Polish Government-in-Exile is contributing greatly in exposing to the people of the world the real truth about Communist aggression and infiltration.

EMERGENCY MOTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE POLISH GOVERNMENT

Whereas the Polish Government is called upon to apply to the relevant Government authorities of the United States of America and to the Congress asking for accelerated execution of the recommendations of the select congressional committee that in 1951 and 1952 conducted a thorough investigation of the terrible massacre at Katyn and which on the conclusion of its inquiry, filed a report together with recommendations that were to be carried out into effect by the President of the United States.

The terrible crime of Katyn and the fate of the other Polish servicemen that perished on the territory of the Soviet Union after incarceration in the detention camps

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of Kozielsk, Starobielsk, and Ostashkov has not so far, despite above-mentioned recommendations of the Selected Congressional Committee on the Katyn Massacre, been brought up before the forum of the United Nations Organization.

Motives: The current year will mark the 15th anniversary of the discovery during the war, at Katyn near Smolensk, of mass graves of horribly murdered Polish officers who had been held as prisoners of war by the Soviet authorities. When the Polish Government applied at the time to the International Red Cross in connection with this discovery, the Soviet Union broke off diplomatic relations with that government by its note of April 25, 1943. The text of the Soviet note, signed by Mr. Molotov, agrees with the version formulated by on April 21, 1943 in his letter to President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill, the British Prime Minister. It was only last year that these letters of Stalin were published in Moscow in a book issued by the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Though Stalin is now dead and Mr. Molotov no longer in power at the Kremlin, Moscow continues to uphold Stalin's official version of April 21, 1943, as is borne out by a comment dated 1957 in respect of Stalin's letter of February 4, 1944, to Mr. Churchill cited in volume I of Stalin's wartime correspondence.

London, March 29, 1958.

Respectfully submitted,

DR. JULIUS SZYGOWSKI.

Bipartisan Action on Klamath Purchase Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, now that S. 3051, the Klamath Reservation purchase bill, has been unanimously approved by the Senate, I should like to invite the attention of my colleagues to a thoughtful editorial from the Oregon Journal of Portland, Oreg., of May 9, 1958.

This editorial is entitled "Remarkable Bipartisanship Display." I am particularly pleased that it accords credit for bipartisan teamwork on this vital bill to Under Secretary of the Interior, Hatfield Chilson, to the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and to State Senator Leander Quiring, of Hermiston, Oreg. The able junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] might also have been so listed.

I also should like to add, on my own, the names of the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who was as cooperative and helpful as any committee chairman could be; the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who joined with me as cosponsor of the pioneer bill in this realm, S. 2047; and the able junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who suggested essential amendments which undoubtedly contributed to the unanimous action of the Senate on this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKABLE BIPARTISANSHIP DISPLAY

A few months ago, a prediction that the Seaton bill—which insures continued sustained-yield cutting of the Klamath Indian Reservation timber—would pass the Senate unopposed would have seemed rash indeed.

But it has done so, and with this action goes willingness of the Senate to spend up to $90 million for Federal purchase of the timber—if that appears to be the only way sustained-yield cutting can be maintained.

Behind this achievement is a remarkable display of bipartisanship which, if matched in other areas, would greatly increase Congress effectiveness.

The bipartisan team on Capitol Hill which did the spadework was comprised of Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee, and Assistant Secretary of the Interior Hatfield Chilson. Also effective in persuading Republican Senators has been Senator ARTHUR WATKINS (Republican, of Utah), member of the Interior Committee. The earlier willingness of Senator NEUBERGER to push the administration bill instead of his own has been a great factor in winning such a broad measure of support.

Senators were influenced too by the solid bipartisan front on the State level shown in the testimony of the State legislative interim committee on Indian affairs headed by Senator Leander Quiring (Republican, of Hermiston).

The measure may encounter more resistance in the House, but it has bipartisan friends there too, and its friendly treatment in the Senate ought to have some influence with the other branch. Those who have long been concerned with the Klamath problem, including not only the fate of the timber but the welfare of the Indians, are more cheerful now than they have been for years.

Our Debt to the American Indian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a very important article which deals with the American Indian. The article is entitled "Our Debt to the American Indian," and appeared in the February 1, 1958, issue of America. It was written by Miss Dana Ann Rush, who for 7 years has been associated with the Marquette League for Catholic Indian Missions.

Miss Rush traces the history of the United States Government's shabby treatment of the Indians. She tells how the land which was rightfully theirs was taken away from them.

The present abysmal poverty of these first Americans stems from man's greed for land—

She writes.

In conclusion, she agrees with Msgr. Bernard J. Cullen, director general of the Marquette League, that—

Every American who has found prosperity in the New World should see to it that the original owners of our rich country receive an equal chance to share America's bounty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR DEBT TO THE AMERICAN INDIAN

(By Dana Ann Rush)

The majority of Americans are not aware that within our borders there is a racial group as poor as any of the impoverished peoples of Asia or Africa. While we have been sending billions of dollars abroad to raise the economic level of destitute foreign nations, the American Indians, living below a decent standard, have a life expectancy of only 36 years, and on some reservations not more than 20 years.

Lack of nutritious food, poor sanitary conditions, and inadequate medical care are the causes of their high mortality rate. Glen L. Emmons, shortly after his appointment in 1953 as Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, stated that medical service for the Indians was 50 years behind that for non-Indian Americans. Dr. John R. Shaw, chief of the Bureau's Health Branch, reported in 1954 that there were 3,000 seeding cases of tuberculosis on the Navaho Reservation that were not hospitalized.

As late as 1954, more than one-half of the school-age Navahos were unable to enter school because the Government had failed to provide schools and teachers for them—had not, in a word, lived up to the treaty of 1868 which the Navahos had signed with the United States and which promised adequate school facilities.

DOMESTIC POINT 4

Through a number of emergency programs—trailer schools and the transfer of children to boarding schools in adjacent States—the school shortage has been remedied. In fact, this particular reservation is an example of what can be done for destitute Indian reservations through a domestic point 4 program. In 1950, the Navaho-Hopi rehabilitation program was adopted, and Congress appropriated around $88 million to be spent within 10 years. In 1957, its seventh year, the reservations not only have more schools, but some of their arid acres are under irrigation and a few paved highways make traveling easier.

Organizations working for the welfare of the Indians—the Marquette League for Catholic Indian Missions, the Association on American Indian Affairs, and the National Congress of American Indians—advocate the enactment of an Indian point 4 program and oppose the relocation of Indians to industrial centers.

The poverty that prevails among the Indians is not, as many believe, the result of shiftlessness. Their sufferings come from the indifference of the American public, from a century of Government mismanagement of Indian affairs, and from the fact that in exchange for 2.5 million square miles of the best land within our borders, the Indians were given mostly unprofitable land, land the white man did not want because he could not make it yield him a living.

Moreover, the red man was left no other resources for earning a living than this submarginal land. There are no industrial plants in his country, no jobs from various occupations found in towns and cities, because it takes a prosperous countryside to establish a prosperous town.

In contrast with these unhappy conditions are the high principles expressed in the United States Indian policy. Our country is the only one in world history credited with attempting to deal justly with conquered aborigines. Shortly after we became a nation, Chief Justice John Marshall ruled that the Indians, because of centuries of prior occupation, had a natural right to their land. Thereafter land was bought from them with the same formality as from a foreign nation. Most of the 400 treaties between the Indians and the United States that are found in the

archives of Washington concern real-estate deals.

The present abysmal poverty of these First Americans stems from man's greed for land. From the days of Davy Crockett, Daniel Boone and other pioneer frontiersmen, the Indians' natural rights to their homelands were violated. And despite the fact that we have possession of all the land that once belonged to the Indians, with the exception of a few dusty acres, legislation passed in 1953 and bills that will come before the 85th Congress when it convenes in January raise new threats. These laws and proposed laws are labeled by Joseph R. Garry, the Coeur d'Alene Indian who heads the National Congress of American Indians, as "further designs to reduce the Indian land holdings."

A review of Indian land history may answer the question: "What do we owe the American Indians?"

The American colonists based their rights to the land on rules created by Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence. That is, title to the land rested originally with the sovereign, who made grants to his lords, and they in turn had power to make further grants. Though the colonists bought land from the Indians, they did so only in order to avoid hostilities.

Chief Justice Marshall was free to invoke the Anglo-Saxon land theory, but he refused. Instead he recognized the Indians' aboriginal rights. The late Felix S. Cohen, author of many learned articles on Indians, traced the concept of this ruling back to a professor in a Spanish university in the days of the conquistadors. In 1537, Pope Paul III in a bull defined the concept when he declared that "the said Indians and all other peoples who may be discovered by Christians are by no means to be deprived of their liberty or the possession of their property."

By 1840, the Indians had ceded almost all their territory east of the Mississippi. Many treaties were made under duress and the land bought at unfair prices. In some cases the Indians were disarmed and forced to march to a new reservation.

"The chief task of the Government's Indian agent for the first 50 years of our national existence," says a recent Government pamphlet, "was to secure Indian land for the white settlers." These land-hungry Americans pushed the frontier farther and farther west, regardless of whether it was into land that we had guaranteed to the Indians in a solemn treaty for "so long as the sun set in the west."

In those covered-wagon days, the white settlers took the land they wanted, and defended with the shotgun their right to keep it. "The only good Indian is a dead one," expressed their sentiment. When a United States marshal arrived on the scene, more often than not he was persuaded to settle the dispute by removing the Indians to another area. Each move meant the surrender of large tracts of Indian land, which was either opened for homesteading or given by Congress to the railroad companies or to the new States which were being established.

The Osage Indians, subjects of the Americans' favorite Cinderella story, were moved 10 times between 1808 and 1870, each time to a less desirable location. They were the last of 20 tribes to be settled in the Indian Territory (now Oklahoma), and consequently received what was considered the "ash heap" of the region. They were miserably poor on their sandy acres—until oil was discovered there. At the peak of the oil boom (1925), each Osage received $13,200 annually for his share in the communally owned property.

GOVERNMENT AND THE INDIANS

In 1871 Congress asserted its right to deal directly with the Indians. Contracts, not treaties, became the term applied to those pieces of parchment bearing the seal of the United States which we had treated with no more respect than if they had been "scraps of paper."

But our national conscience again asserted itself. To protect the Indian, who was not considered competent to operate in the white man's economy, his land was put under the trusteeship of the Federal Government. Indian land, of course, had been tax free during the era when the tribes were regarded as foreign nations. It remained tax free under the Govevrnment's trusteeship.

But by 1887 the white settlers again became restless—they wahted more land. The General Allotment Act of 1887 abrogated trust protection. Individual Indians, judged competent to handle their own affairs, were granted fee patents of their tribal holdings. During the time the law was in force, the Indians lost 88 million acres of their best land.

ON THE WARPATH

In 1934 the Indian Reorganization Act terminated the General Allotment Act and, it was believed, postponed indefinitely the removal of trust protection over Indian reservations. But in August 1953, House Concurrent Resolution 108 enunciated a proposal not only to terminate the trusteeship, but for Federal withdrawal from Indian affairs in general. It was followed by bills proposing termination of the trustee status of some 10 tribes in a dozen different States.

The Indians and their friends went on the warpath. President Gary of the National Congress of American Indians called the measures the gravest threat in many years against his people. Termination meant the end of freedom from land taxation, an exemption which the Indians considered as compensation for the many thousands of acres taken from them in the different land exchanges. Moreover, since most of the reservations are made up of submarginal land, they feared that much of their remaining land would be lost should they be unable to carry the burden of taxes.

Six Indian reservations were "terminated" before the Indians and their friends were able to rally sentiment to their side. So far, however, House Concurrent Resolution 108 has never been rescinded, though champions of justice have pronounced it "a compromise of legal and moral issues, as well as unwise from the economic point of view."

It is up to our generation, according to LeVerne Madigan, executive secretary of the Association on American Indian Affairs, to decide whether the Indian peoples of the Great Plains—the Sioux, Winnebagos, Omahas and other tribes of the Dakotas and Nebraska—shall survive with self-esteem in communities simultaneously Indian and American, or whether they shall survive as landless individuals, migrating desolately from camp to camp. "The forces allied to cause or condone the breakdown of these Indian reservations," declares Mrs. Madigan, "are organized stock growers of the Dakotas and Nebraska—powerful in State and Federal politics, and who covet Indian lands."

The American press forced Congress to enact the Navaho-Hopi rehabilitation program after the blizzard of 1949 focused the eyes of the world on the Navaho Reservation, where 1 baby out of every 4 died before the age of 5 and the TB rate was 28 times higher than that in non-Indian communities. People who love justice and scorn greed can force Congress to inaugurate an Indian point 4 program now for all of these much-abused Americans. As Msgr. Bernard J. Cullen, director general of the Marquette League, says: "Every American who has found prosperity in the New World should see to it that the original owners of our rich country receive an equal chance to share America's bounty."

Report by Former Moscow CBS Correspondent Dan Schorr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Thursday evening, April 10, 1958, on the Edward R. Murrow CBS radio program, the former Moscow CBS correspondent, Dan Schorr, reported on a 20,000-mile lecture tour of the United States which he has just completed. Mr. Schorr gave an interesting report on the kinds of questions he has been asked as he traveled up and down the United States—questions which indicate a new depth of curiosity about the Soviet Union and the Soviet-American relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Schorr's comments be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. SCHORR. For 2 months, Ed, I have been on the lecture circuit, traveling 20,000 miles up and down America, talking about Russia to 26 groups of all kinds—students, townhalls, women's organizations, and trade conventions. I don't know how much they learned, but for me it has been an exciting voyage of discovery. From the hundreds of questions put to me in Mississippi and Ohio, in New Jersey and California, in New York and Oklahoma, I got a sense of America's postsputnik mood about the Soviet Union, which, in a way, reflects America's mood about itself.

America today is full of questions—uneasy, self-examining questions. I got them not only in formal question periods, but from people who would come up later to ask something special that was in their hearts, from fellow passengers on airplanes, and from taxi drivers. There were differences based on region, on profession, on special interest. But there was a clear and definite pattern of questions that arose everywhere.

It was clear that sputnik had shaken if not shattered, many conceptions about Russia, but new conceptions had not yet been crystallized. A University of Mississippi student, with an air of now wanting to know the worst, asked if I would list the most common misconceptions about Russia.

Others suggested that they had long been misled about Soviet strength. One wanted to know why America had been lulled with propaganda all these years. A few still inquired hopefully, but without much sense of conviction any more, whether Soviet rockets were all made by captured Germans, whether there was enough unrest in Russia to make the overthrow of the Communist regime possible, whether the death of Premier Khrushchev might not plunge Russia into chaos.

Khrushchev as a personality, fascinated many. At a luncheon of Detroit bankers and industrialists, one asked: "How long will he last?" And, for some reason, the question was followed by laughter. All over the country I was queried about his habits, and what languages he spoke and just how did he run the country. The Louisiana student asked: "Would it help to invite him to America?" Americans like to personalize their problems. But, now they are aware

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

that it isn't just Khrushchev, but Russia which must be understood. And the attempt to comprehend was deep and searching.

What was really on their minds was put by a lady in Cleveland: "Are we in greater danger of war since sputnik?" And a very old lady in Pomona, Calif., got up and said: "We in America are numb at the idea of an atomic war. How do the Russian people feel about this possibility?"

No one asked about the feasibility of a preventive war against Russia, not once. That idea seems almost obsolete today. But there was much perplexity about whether we could negotiate with the Russians and, if so, how? Why, asked the Drake University student in Des Moines, why is Russia pushing so hard for a summit conference? An auto company executive in Detroit, a housewife in Pomona, and a student in Florida were among the many who wanted to know how to work out a settlement with Russia. There was considerably more thinking about negotiations with Moscow than I had ever known before.

And along with that, the deep uneasy feeling that our leaders are not showing enough imagination and flexibility to negotiate, that today's events are leaving us behind. A girl at San Diego State College in California asked if I felt that our administration was a little psychotic about Russia. And many inquired whether it would help if Secretary of State Dulles was replaced. At a forum in Beverly Hills, Calif., a lady asked, half seriously: "Who is the greater obstacle to peace—Dulles or Khrushchev?"

Many questioners asked for an explanation of George Kennan's ideas about disengagement in central Europe, saying it was not clear from local papers what his ideas were. And, again and again, the question: "Are the Russians sincere? Can they be trusted?" At San Diego State College, the question: "What can we, as citizens, do to make our administration more aware?"

Many questions reflected special concerns. Almost everywhere the question about religion in Russia; could people go to church freely today? Some wanted to know about antisemitism in the Soviet Union. And oddly enough, almost every time I spoke in the South a question came—usually at the end of the evening and uttered with some misgivings—about the reaction in Russia to American problems of Negro integration. It was a subject which, as a visiting lecturer, aware of local sensitivities, I never raised; always, in the South, it was raised with me, usually with a bit of embarrassment.

Many questions reflected a profound hope that the West in general and America in particular could penetrate Russia. How effective, they asked in Oklahoma City, and in Palm Beach and Des Moines, how effective is the Voice of America? The student at Pennsylvania State Teachers College wanted to know if American history is taught in Russian schools. And, in San Diego, the wider question: Why is their propaganda so effective and ours so ineffective?

This Ed, is a sampling of hundreds of questions I have been asked about Russia. America—or at least the Americans who attend lectures—today feel shaken from their comfortable moorings about Russia. They are aware that the Soviet Union is a problem to live with. They are looking for simple, understandable answers that do not come. But they are open minded and searching, more ready than I have ever known them to discard prejudice and misconception. That is the sense of their questions to a lecturer. As to the answers, that, I'm afraid, would mean—heaven forbid—another lecture.

Mr. MURROW. On his lecture tour, Dan Schorr traveled 20,000 miles up and down America, lecturing and answering questions about Russia. He found an awareness of the problem and an eagerness to know. And he learned from the questions. For as Seneca said, "Speech is the index of the mind." "And curiosity," Julius Charles said, "is little more than another name for hope."

Goodnight and good luck.

The Four Dimensions of Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, American higher education is faced with unprecedented apprehension and uncertainty concerning its future. Pressures to train vitally needed specialists in a variety of fields, to prepare for a tripled enrollment and to meet the economic hazards induced by rising costs, have resulted in a need for a reappraisal of its purposes and objectives. It is in this context that the sober and incisive views of Yeshiva University's distinguished president are presented here:

THE FOUR DIMENSIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

(By Dr. Samuel Belkin, president, Yeshiva University)

During the last few months a silent revolution has shaken the American mentality. The great change in the attitudes of intelligent laymen, primarily in their approach to education, is broadcast by all of the modern media of communication. One needs only to read the public press, watch television or listen to the radio, to discover that suddenly the field of education has become a matter of great concern, not only to scholars but also to laymen. This rather startling reversal is due to the spreading realization that today knowledge is important not only for the continuation of our cultural heritage, but, indeed, for insuring the security of our land and preserving our democratic heritage. In fact it is becoming increasingly patent that our very lives depend on the advancement of knowledge, patricularly scientific knowledge.

Many concepts which heretofore engaged the interest of the select few who dedicated their lives to scholarship, are now daily topics of animated and stimulating discussions among intelligent laymen the world over. The term "basic research," until recently as far removed from the thoughts of civic-minded and even professional men, not to mention those who limited their interests to business, is now current on the lips of all. That scientists and philosophers have wrestled with the problems of time and space is understandable, but today even elementary schoolchildren prattle authoritatively about outer space. Science fiction is today a flourishing new genre of literature, and exclamations over the wonders of manmade artificial moons all but drown out the psalmist's wonderment before God's creation: "The heavens proclaim the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork. Day unto day poureth forth speech, and night unto night proclaimeth knowledge."

The change in the attitude of the American community is the direct result of the Russian success in placing into orbit two earth satellites. This technical and scientific achievement, which may ultimately prove to be the most dangerous weapon of war the human race has ever produced, has so greatly alarmed and frightened the free world that all quarters have suddenly begun to cry the great need of more and better trained scientists, and the urgency of accelerated progress in the fields of mathematics, physics, electronics, and technology in general. In fact, the absent-minded professor, in recent years fallen so low that he has even ceased to be a figure of fun, now threatens to become a popular hero.

THE SOVIET CHALLENGE

Over 40 years have passed since the Russian revolution. In all that time very few people seriously concerned themselves with the system and method of education developed by the Russians. Suddenly we learn that in the Russian gymnasia, which correspond to our American high schools, youngsters are trained primarily and intensively in the sciences, particularly in chemistry, biology, astronomy, physics, and mathematics. This sudden knowledge has set off a scramble to study and assess our own educational system. Some charge it with failure because it does not place sufficient emphasis on the scientific training of our younger generation and demand an immediate redress of this neglect. On the other hand, many educators throughout the land are deeply concerned lest our sudden awakening to the need for increased scientific study, in itself a potential blessing in disguise, may cause us to overtip the balance in the opposite direction and press the study of the sciences at the sacrifice of other disciplines.

Thus, we find ourselves in an unaccustomed but happy attitude, pondering what educational policy we should pursue, and seeking a course which will, at the same time, advance our cultural heritage and promote our national security. At such a moment, the most significant questions we must front are: What, in the final analysis, constitutes an educated man and what branches of knowledge must a man master if he is to be truly knowledgeable? What, indeed, should be the ideals and goals of a university education and how can we best educate a man so that he not only acquires book learning but also becomes a moral and useful citizen?

THE FOUR STUDIES OF MAN

It seems to me that there are four major dimensions, each with its own particular specialization, into which all human knowledge naturally falls. These four dimensions may be called the four studies of man.

I

The first of these is a study of the world into which we are born. From birth we find ourselves in a vast, strange, impersonal, and remote universe. Man, being endowed with a mind, has from the beginning of time attempted to discover the mysteries and secrets of the cosmos. From the very first he realized that the world is not mere accident, but is governed according to an order and possesses a special design. It is, therefore, in the very nature of man to search, and research, so that he may better understand the divinely inspired laws of nature. The more deeply man studies the essence and laws of the universe, the more is he able to discover many things in nature which remained hidden from previous generations. Many practical inventions were made possible by the theoretical discoveries which preceded them. The man who is interested primarily in basic research and who makes theoretical discoveries is the real scientist. The late Albert Einstein, the greatest scientist of our age, did not invent anything practical in his life. The cosmos was his laboratory and the pad and pencil his tools. He was far removed from the field of applied science and concerned himself only with the pursuit of knowledge for the sake of knowledge. His basic research, however,

triggered many inventions. The inventor harnesses the theoretical discoveries of the great minds and uses them for practical inventions. This is what is commonly called applied science.

The study of the world in which we are born we designate as the study of the natural sciences, encompassing such branches of knowledge as mathematics, physics, astronomy, geology, and their many subdivisions.

II

The second dimension of human knowledge we may characterize as the study of the peoples among whom we are born. We are not the first humans to come into being; generations preceded us. The nature of man does not permit him to live in an ivory tower, completely isolated from his immediate environment. We are interested in achieving a better understanding of the people among whom we are placed, among whom we live, as well as of the people who live and have lived on our globe throughout history. We are intuitively inclined to learn the languages, read the literature, study the philosophy and discover the arts of other human beings. We pass the history of civilization through our modern sieves seeking to determine the cultural contributions different races and civilizations have made to our contemporary world. We endeavor to appreciate better the experiences, trials and tribulations of generations gone by, to comprehend more fully the causes of wars and the achievements of peace. We carefully study the rise and fall of empires and nations; their cultural origins and their decadence, their laws and their mores; and finally, their lasting contributions to world civilization. This study we label social science. All aspects of human creativity and human experience are, in a larger sense, the province of the social sciences.

III

The third phase of knowledge, we may designate as the study of man himself. Philosophers characterized man as a microcosmos; our sagas, in their wisdom, taught: "The Holy One, blessed be He, said: the entire universe was created for the sake of man and one man is equal in importance to the entire world." The study of man is a study of his abilities and disabilities; of his strength and his weaknesses; of his mental anguish and his physical pain; of his body and his mind; of his conscious and his unconscious; of his integration and his final unavoidable disintegration. From time immemorial man has sought a better understanding of the human organism, with the ultimate aim of bringing peace of mind to the mentally disturbed and good health to the physically sick; of preserving for every human being his natural dignity and inner pride; of safeguarding every man's physical endowment and intellectual gifts. The biological sciences, insofar as they are dedicated to the alleviation of human suffering, and above all, the study of medicine—in all of its branches—seeking to ease bodily ailments and mental ills, fall into the third dimension of human knowledge.

There is yet another dimension of human knowledge. Assuming that we shall acquire a better understanding of the universe in which we are placed, assuming that we will attain a greater appreciation of those among whom we are placed, and finally, assuming that in the course of time, we may succeed in eradicating all the diseases which plague the human race, we will not yet have met the fundamental requirement for decent living.

All the things which are created through the ingenuity of the human mind, man can use for his advantage or for his disadvantage, for his service or for his disservice, for his benefit or for his destruction. Atomic energy may be a blessing to mankind but it can also be used to destroy cities and continents, if not civilization in toto. To use the Biblical metaphor, the tree of knowledge bears knowledge of good and evil alike. A great mathematician or physicist or chemist may use his knowledge to benefit his neighbor, but he can also use his greatness to harm his neighbor.

Knowledge, in all of its branches, is of greatest importance for the development of man, but it can bring the most proper and the greatest benefit to mankind only if man recognizes a unifying principle for man's creative ingenuity. This phase of knowledge I characterize the fourth dimension of human knowledge. Its main concern is with the moral and spiritual purpose of life which alone can give true meaning to human knowledge. This fourth dimension is, in the true sense of the term, a science of living and gives human existence a moral raison d'etra.

For our moral purposes in life we are entirely dependent upon our spiritual heritage and religious experiences, upon the things which we classify as the divine law rather than as the laws of nature. Recognition of the unalterable fact that the moral law is as binding on us as human beings as the laws of nature are on the cosmos, is of paramount importance for the survival of mankind. This moral and spiritual purpose of life in no way conflicts with the three branches of knowledge discussed above. On the contrary, it complements and supplements the knowledge man has acquired through centuries of living and thinking. It affords an end and ideal purpose for all the inventions and discoveries of the human mind. Only after we succeed in integrating the four phases of knowledge, can we hope to build a peace loving society.

THE TRAGEDY OF IMITATION

The greatest tragedy which could befall the free world would be for it to attempt to imitate the Russian system of education, which, we have been informed, places supreme emphasis on the natural sciences and technological skill. If we should develop a philosophy of education based on the centrality of the natural and biological studies, then we shall merely create human sputniks, an end totally foreign to our democratic way of life and our spiritual heritage. The only true education is a rounded one, one which takes in all phases of knowledge, and every man must be free to choose his particular field of specialization. A scientist is not exempt from having a proper understanding of the cultural heritage of the people among whom he is born. Indeed, he must be inspired with an even higher moral purpose of living.

How refreshing are the words of our sages: "But a single man was created to proclaim the greatness of the Holy One, blessed be He; for man stamps many coins with one seal, and they are all alike, but the King of Kings, the Holy One, Blessed be He, has stamped every man with the seal of the first man, yet not one of them is like his fellow man. Therefore, it is the duty of every man to proclaim 'for my sake the world was created.'"

In the totalitarian states the head of the state sets the pattern for the seal—permitting only one particular idea, one way of thinking and acting—and the population are merely the coins stamped out by that seal. They all look alike and they must faithfully repeat the imposed pattern. If any should deviate from the exact image of the seal, they are declared counterfeit and their circulation is deemed a danger to the state and to the seal itself. If the state announces that it demands proficiency in the technical sciences, then all students must excel in such fields, and it becomes an unwritten law that all gifted men and women, in their achievements, must reflect that attitude. They must be genuine coins and, stamped with one seal, they must all look alike. This is true not only in the field of knowledge but in every phase of human action. Each person must become a human sputnik, whose every mode of living and thinking is directed by the head of the state or party.

It is different, however, in a democracy which accepts as its root principle the infinite worth of the individual and which, at least theoretically, affirms that it is not only the right, but the duty of each man to say, "for my sake the world was created." In great measure, a democracy attempts to reproduce the divine seal which stamps all coins with the same image but recognizes that all coins must not necessarily look alike. Accepting the fact of basic likeness and the fundamental principles of agreement, a democracy nonetheless recognizes man's personal right to differ in his thinking and his actions from his fellow man. The Russian system of education which determines into which channels human thought can flow is, therefore, actually inconceivable in a free and democratic society.

On the other hand, it would be a serious error to neglect the sciences and not encourage students with particular aptitudes (in scientific fields) to specialize in those fields. An elementary knowledge of the natural sciences, on the high-school and college levels, should be required of students, as should a knowledge of the social sciences. This will give students a well-rounded education and will stimulate them to pursue their graduate work in that branch of knowledge in which they reveal particular ability of living.

THE PROBLEM IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

What then are the major problems in our American education? A beeping sputnik has called us to recognize our failure in science education. Is it not possible that we are also neglecting the other dimensions of knowledge? The contemporary crisis merely throws into focus our dereliction in failing to train students properly in the natural sciences. We now recognize our mistake. Will "crash" programs solve our problems? Are colleges and universities really to be blamed for our present state of affairs? Are our high-school teachers and principals the ones to be blamed for the widespread juvenile delinquency which has alarmed the Nation? Are we perhaps unconsciously trying to trace the root of the evil to the doorsteps of our schools and thus absolve ourselves of any blame and responsibility?

I would suggest that perhaps our present difficulties are attributable to a source outside of the school environment.

In order to cultivate learning in the school, in order to inspire the scientist to do his research, we must first, and above all, develop proper respect for the scholar. The Greek term "philosopher," which in the English language is used to designate one who devotes his entire life to a certain branch of knowledge, means, in its literal sense, a "lover of wisdom." One need not necessarily be a scholar to be a lover of learning. Indeed, one may be an industrialist, a businessman, a merchant, a professional man, or a laborer, and still be a philosopher—a lover of wisdom. The love of learning among the members of the community creates a climate congenial for the research of the scholar and encourages young students to take their studies seriously. Our sages declared that, in one way, giving honor to the Torah (Bible) is more important than learning of Torah, for only in an environment where learning is honored and respected is there hope that gifted men will dedicate their lives to learning and pursue their studies in their chosen fields.

The American people are the most charitable people in the world. They are, indeed, philanthropists in the full sense of the term, but somehow they have not revealed sufficient insight in recent years to qualify as philosophers. The community in its to-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

tality has shown neither great love for learning nor great respect for those who transmit knowledge to others. Somehow, the absentminded professor does not enjoy the same respect as the prosperous businessman or professional. But that does not necessarily mean that America lacks in brainpower or dedicated scholars and scientists in all branches of knowledge. On the contrary, in every field of learning there can be found ideal men and women who are dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, and are more than able to preserve our cultural heritage and advance our scientific understanding of the world. But if it desires to advance basic scientific research and general scholarship, the community must demonstrate a love for wisdom and a high regard for the men who are engaged in its service. The discouragement of scientists in America was summed up a few years ago by the leading scientist of the century, the late Albert Einstein, when, if my memory serves me right, he said, "If I had to live my life over again I would become a carpenter."

Evidence of an increasing appreciation in the nonacademic world for the teacher, the scholar, and the scientist would have a most salutary impact on the behavior of students in the secondary schools. Youngsters who have no respect for their teachers or parents, and therefore the populace in general, are merely reflectors of community attitude toward learning and those who are in charge of perpetuating and spreading learning. We decry college students who seek out the easy courses in order to amass the credits necessary for their diplomas as painlessly as possible, who display no interest in deepening their understanding of the world into which they were born and of the people among whom they live. In truth, however, they are merely reflecting in the school the practical climate of our time, which permits little interest in knowledge per se, though the latter, in the long run, is the most useful and practical thing in the world.

Fortunately, in the last few months there is a noticeable reawakening among lay people and increasing signs of respect for the scientist and scholar. People are more concerned with the curriculums of our colleges and are becoming more cognizant of the value of knowledge. True, this respect for knowledge, particularly for science, is a result of the fear which swept the free world in the wake of sputnik. But a reverence for knowledge, though at the moment it springs from fear, must ultimately lead to a reverence which will blossom out of love. Above all, however, we must remember one thing: Only when human knowledge is integrated with a high moral purpose and spiritual ideal can knowledge become a blessing to society.

Flood Control Testimony of Samuel T. Sheard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a timely, excellent statement recently made by my distinguished friend, Mr. Samuel T. Sheard, chairman of the executive committee of the Quinebaug-French River Manufacturers Association before the House Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Sheard and his business associates have made great contributions to flood control in flood-ravaged Massachusetts and Connecticut. Since he has been one of the outstanding leaders in the flood-control movement, his views are entitled to special consideration and weight.

I am in agreement with the various points he made before the committee, calling for speed to complete new flood-control projects in the area. His able views summarize the case for those who believe that we cannot afford to delay, but must press forward as rapidly as possible with essential flood-control projects, which he mentioned in his fine talk.

I want to commend and thank Mr. Sheard for his interest and splendid work, and particularly for coming to Washington to make such a persuasive argument before the committee. The fine public spirit manifested by Mr. Sheard and his associates and the fine contributions they have made are greatly appreciated by me and, I am sure, by all the people of our flood-stricken area. I heartily commend and thank Mr. Sheard and his association.

The statement follows:

My name is Samuel T. Sheard. I am assistant to the president of the American Optical Co. at Southbridge, Mass. I appear today as chairman of the executive committee of the Quinebaug-French River Manufacturers Association representing about 50 small business concerns in the Quinebaug and French River Valleys in southern Massachusetts and northern Connecticut. In effect, however, we speak for the entire population of those valleys, whose major centers are Southbridge and Webster, Mass., and Putnam, Conn.

The horrible flood, whipped up by the hurricane Diane, which swept down these valleys in August 1955, is still fresh in our minds; and the terrible resulting damage is still evident in spite of all the reconstruction and rehabilitation work. Some of we older citizens also recall 3 previous devastating floods in 1936 and 1938. This evidence, and the high water of this spring as a result of our heavy snowfall, makes the danger of flood ever apparent to all of us in this locality.

The Quinebaug-French River Manufacturers Association is basically sponsoring 1 project, even though it consists of 4 separate dams or reservoir areas; and the job must be completed in its entirety to make flood control successful in this area.

Wonderful progress has been made on our project as indicated by the recent completion of the Buffumville Dam, and the practical use of this dam became apparent when the dam was operated in connection with the recent high waters.

On the remaining three dams, bids have been requested or contracts have been let on the construction of the Hodges Village and East Brimfield Dams. On the Westville Dam, design studies have been initiated, and with additional funds it is expected that the design studies can be completed and plans and specifications are to be prepared for the construction of the dam.

We appreciate and respect the action of Congress in the allocation of funds to our project.

We are here today to urge you to approve appropriations asked by the Army engineers for our project, with its four inseparable flood-control dams consisting of East Brimfield and Westville on the Quinebaug River, with Hodges Village being the remaining dam on the French River, as the Buffumville Dam is completed.

In addition, we certainly hope that you can see your way clear to provide funds for land acquisition and the start of construction at Westville. We believe that the executive freeze on new projects is inapplicable in this case since, as I pointed out, Westville is just a part of one inseparable project. A circle 12 miles in diameter would enclose all 4 dams. In this connection I also would like to point out that 2 of the 3 principal towns in the area—Southbridge and Putnam—will lack adequate protection until Westville is completed.

The status of our project is as shown in the following table:

Project	Previously appropriated	1959 budget	Estimated total cost	Year of completion
Buffumville		0		Completed
East Brimfield	$2,550,000	$2,800,000	$7,300,000	1959
Hodges Village	2,340,000	2,700,000	5,300,000	1959
Westville	179,000	141,000	6,550,000	1960

There is also an allocation of another million dollars for the East Brimfield Dam under the increased expenditures for public works projects.

I am attaching to this report a consolidated map showing the project in its entirety with the area covered by this flood-control project.

Again, we would like to say that through the efficiency of the Army Corps of Engineers, the results to date on our project have been outstanding; and smart business judgment urges and warrants the completion of our project by an early date.

Thank you very much for giving us your time, and for the careful attention we know you will give our project when you go into executive session.

Herb Child Steps Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a timely editorial in the Clinton Daily Item concerning the service of my valued

friend, Mr. Herbert S. Child, a public servant of great ability and distinction.

I also include as part of my remarks the contents of a letter I recently wrote to Mr. Child, commending and thanking him for his invaluable service.

The able editor of the Item, Mr. William Coulter, performed a distinct public service in acknowledging and praising Mr. Child's memorable contributions.

HERB CHILD STEPS DOWN

Herbert S. Child, Clinton's financial watchdog, will soon step down as the town's accountant for the past 13 years.

It is with considerable regret that we see this being done. Although he will turn 75 April 27, the town has reaped rich rewards because of his presence in townhall.

A stubborn believer in what he thinks best for his town, he has become the center of many a controversy over the years. His love of the principle of home rule prompted his recent remark, "The hell with the State" as to whether or not Clinton needed State financial aid for a new high school.

Born in Brockton, he came to Clinton to work as an accountant for the Shuman Mill where he remained until the depression forced it out of business. Several town accountants were broken in under Herb's guiding hand.

It was thanks to Herb that Clinton adjusted so easily to the Uniform System of Accounts then being adopted by every city and town in the State. Herb became accountant in 1945 and since that time has never faltered in his bid to help the townspeople gain a better understanding of the town's finances.

In 1950, Tax Commissioner Henry F. Long told Herb, "It is so obvious that it does not need repeating, but the way you have kept the finances of Clinton sound through the years is just marvelous * * * you are entitled to tremendous commendation from those in Clinton who would face a rather difficult situation were it not for the able way in which you have handled the finances of Clinton."

It was on Herb's recommendation in 1953 that the selectmen voted that each voucher for traveling expenses must show the exact number of miles used for business purposes by town officials.

In the 1957 town report the finance committee paid its annual tribute saying, "To our able and distinguished town accountant, Herbert S. Child, who has so materially and invaluably advised and assisted us we express deep gratitude."

Able he is, and distinguished too.

Herb's beliefs are summed up in one of his annual reports:

"My motto is there is no substitute for the right way of doing my duty, and the town is entitled to value received for money expended."

This was more than a motto for Herb Child. It was his way of life. The town has benefited indeed and we congratulate him for it.

PHILBIN LAUDS TOWN ACCOUNTANT HERBERT CHILD

Under date of May 2, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN mailed a letter to Town Accountant Herbert S. Child, reading as follows:

"Let me state that we will all miss you in the public service of Clinton, where for so many years you have rendered such distinguished, outstanding service.

"Your honesty, efficiency, high competence and devotion to duty mark you indelibly as one of the greatest and finest public servants the town has ever had.

"You are also admired, and will long be remembered for your faithful performance and your forthright, candid expressions of what you deemed in the public interest.

"For the finance committee and myself, I tender you our sincere and profound thanks for your many notable services to our board throughout the years.

"The entire community owes you a very deep debt of gratitude, and it is sincerely felt by our fellow citizens.

"I hope and pray that you and Mrs. Child may enjoy many more happy years of devoted married life marked by good health and personal fulfillments.

"With usual good wishes to you both, I am,

"Sincerely yours,

"PHILIP J. PHILBIN,

"Chairman, Clinton Finance Committee."

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I wish to insert into the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks of the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, Governor of Michigan, on the occasion of Polish Constitution Day:

You honor me again by permitting me to share with you in the celebration of Polish Constitution Day.

How proper it is that we should gather here to celebrate that charter of freedom, adopted just 14 years after the signing of our own Declaration of Independence. The United States and Poland have always had, and will always have, the common bond of love of freedom, the common sharing of a deep, abiding faith in the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

The Polish nation and the Polish people have always treasured freedom. In the heart of every Pole burns the flame of determination that Poland shall some day again be free and take her rightful place in the company of the free nations of the world.

The cause of Poland is the cause of freedom. America must therefore never cease to espouse Poland's cause before the world. To do less than this is to betray our heritage, and the great principle of man's "unalienable right" to liberty, and to life, and to the orderly pursuit of happiness.

Until Poland is freed from the chains of tyranny, the work of the United States in seeking a just and lasting peace is not done.

The world cannot exist forever half free and half enslaved. I have no doubt what the ultimate outcome will be. Freedom will prevail because freedom alone can satisfy the deep hunger of mankind to walk upright in the full expression of individual dignity and human rights.

We should begin with a reaffirmation of the principle of self-determination so eloquently put forth by that great American, President Woodrow Wilson, in his justly famous Fourteen Points.

The world enjoyed a period of relative peace during the time when that principle was observed in European boundaries. When the iron might of Adolf Hitler, on September 1, 1939, violated that principle, the world was once again thrown into the turmoil of war.

At Yalta, the Soviet Union promised free elections for Poland, and then treacherously repudiated their promise, and that repudiation still stands as a black mark on the pages of history.

But we should not be deterred by the Soviet repudiation from constantly and consistently demanding free elections for Poland in all the forums of world opinion.

We should constantly and consistently reaffirm in the United Nations our goal of free elections for Poland and our intention to work for Poland's right to determine her own destiny by every means at our command.

We should insist that freedom for Poland be always in the minds of those whose responsibility it is to construct our foreign affairs.

We should assert to the Soviet Union over and over again our determination that Poland shall be free, and we should reflect that determination in our national policies of trade and assistance, expressed through programs which either help the Polish people, or make the Iron Curtain an increasingly costly barrier for the Soviets to maintain, or both.

We should encourage every possible personal contact with the Polish people to let them know that their cause has not been forgotten, that our people want them to be free, that the democratic ideals to which we both give allegiance are still vigorously alive.

We should seek in our trade policies and programs to reduce Poland's economic dependence on the Soviet Union by exploring any and all ways to increase Poland's economic ties with the Western World.

One such possibility is through the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

This organization known as GATT by its initials, was formed 10 years ago to promote international trade among its member nations.

There are 37 nations working out trade programs under this General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Czechoslovakia is the only Iron Curtain country which belongs, and she was not under Communist domination when she participated in the organization of GATT.

Poland has now applied for membership, and this application will be formally considered in October at the next session of GATT.

Acceptance of Poland's application might draw Poland closer to the West. There are, however, obstacles in the way which require the most serious study.

The underlying principle of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade is that trade arrangements involving tariffs are—with some exceptions—extended to all member nations.

Under existing legislation, the United States cannot extend to Poland the favored treatment normally extended by GATT nations to each other. A review of this legislation might now be in order in view of the possibility of Poland becoming a member of the GATT organization.

The application to join GATT indicates the interest of Poland in taking further steps toward trade with the West. During the first 6 months of 1957, Polish trade with the West was about equally balanced with her trade within the Communist orbit. In previous years, the trade ratio was about 30 percent with the West and about 70 percent with the Communist orbit nations.

To maintain the 50–50 balance in Poland's trade between the free nations and the Communist world, Poland needs help toward increasing her western foreign exchange, her funds in western currencies with which to purchase western goods.

Here again the United States should be alert to every opportunity to give assistance. The $98 million in credits we extended last year was mostly in agricultural commodities. This relieved an immediate need of the Polish people but it did not provide enough to push Poland's economic dealings with the West to higher levels. During the

last half of 1957, the trade pattern showed a new increase in trade with the east because of a lack of foreign exchange.

Shortly before the Easter recess, a Republican Member of the United States Senate—Senator JENNER of Indiana—offered an amendment to the surplus commodities program which would have prevented our Government in the future from sending surplus agricultural products to Poland.

This amendment was bad enough but another Republican Senator—the chairman of the Republican policy committee, Senator BRIDGES of New Hampshire—added still another amendment which would have undercut United States aid to some 50 countries, and among these countries were many nations we have to win to the side of freedom in our worldwide struggle with the imperialistic communistic movement of the Soviet Union.

Twenty-two Republicans voted for this Jenner-Bridges attempt to deny help to our friends, and 41 Democratic Senators voted against it. Happily for this Nation the measure was resoundingly defeated.

This example shows that the fight to help expand freedom in the world by the example of American generosity toward people who need our help is not a fight to be waged solely in international assemblies.

We must also fight those forces in our own Nation who seek to return to isolationism and let the rest of the world go hang.

These isolationists do not believe that freedom is our business wherever freedom has been destroyed, or wherever a threat to freedom is underway.

We reject this view because we know that freedom is indivisible.

We reject this view because we know that we cannot be truly free as long as one person anywhere is denied freedom.

We reject this view because we know a just and lasting peace will not be attained until oppression and misery are banished, and this will never be achieved unless America fulfills the responsibility of world leadership which the course of history has reposed in our hands.

We will not betray the trust and hope of the Polish people and of people everywhere who are emerging from centuries of oppression and moving toward the hoped-for day of liberty, prosperity, and peace.

We want no part of any backward step toward isolationism. We want to go forward to where our duty calls us—to give leadership to the world in the cause of peace and freedom.

The courage and stamina of the Polish people have survived many attempts to impose the will of another nation upon them. Poland has gained independence from the tyrannies which from time to time over centuries of history have attempted to subjugate the spirit of Poland.

So it has been in the past, and so it will be in the future. Communism will never succeed in breaking the Polish love of freedom and independence. Other tyrannies have tried and failed, and history will repeat itself in the case of the Soviet Union.

And your gathering here today itself is one means of keeping alive the torch of Polish freedom. I salute your spirit and your determination. Poland will prevail.

Mr. Pelly Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, one of the largest and most influential newspapers in western Washington has pointed up the outstanding efforts made by my colleague, THOMAS M. PELLY, in defense of the fishing industry incident to the Geneva Conference on the Law of the Sea.

Under unanimous consent, I would like to include an editorial from the Aberdeen World, as follows:

SEA LIMITS AND SPACE

Congressman TOM PELLY is right in saying that the United States is well out of the International Conference of the Law of the Sea that recently concluded its deliberations at Geneva. The Conference has been going on for many months, though all it was trying to do was to determine how far out at sea the jurisdiction of a nation extends.

The territorial limit has been 3 miles for several hundred years, but 86 countries represented at the Geneva meeting could not agree on proposals to extend the 3-mile limit to 6 miles or 10 miles or 12 miles. Any such extension would have changed the long-established fishing grounds to the detriment of fishermen.

What agreements were finally reached at Geneva have not been disclosed as yet, but so far as this country is concerned we take it that the limit remains at 3 miles. Mr. PELLY says that the State Department has announced that none of the agreements reached at Geneva will become valid until ratified by 22 of the 86 nations represented at Geneva. Mr. PELLY hints that ratification by 22 nations can give the force of law to all the nations of the world or to the 86 nations that participated in the Geneva conference.

At any rate, the 3-mile limit remains in effect, and probably will continue to do so even if 22 nations say otherwise.

But this Geneva affair raises wonder as to what will be the territorial limits of the nations in space. If we should get to the moon first, will we then own the moon? Would ownership of a planet belong to the nation that landed there first, or does or should outer space belong to any nation on the face of this earth? Of course, there may be nothing in space worth owning, but it's a good bet that Communist Russia will claim to outer space because they explored it first with a sputnik and also because they want the whole earth and everything else.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson Answers Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, there follows a radio report over station KRXK, of Rexburg, Idaho. I am sure readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be interested in the questions reported by Gene Shumate of Rexburg and the answers by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson:

A few weeks ago I wrote a letter to Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture. This followed the Presidential veto of the attempt by Congress to retain farm price supports at the present level for the remainder of the year. In the letter I explained to Mr. Benson that distance prevented attendance at his regular news conferences and that in lieu of such attendance, I would like answers to seven specific questions. When the Secretary returned to Washington from a trip West, he answered the questions. I'm sure we all appreciate this consideration and I'm sure you will be interested in the questions and answers.

Mr. Benson wrote: "In reply to your questions in the order listed in your letter:

"Question. President Eisenhower commented, at the time he vetoed the latest farm legislation, that what the farmer needed was a 'thaw' and not a 'freeze.' Exactly what does this mean?

"Answer. The President was referring to the need for more freedom to farmers in determining their production and marketing plans to meet rapidly changing conditions and to more flexibility to the Secretary in establishing the national average support levels and acreage allotments. The thaw versus freeze concept is discussed in the concluding paragraph of the President's message."

Breaking away from the letter for just a moment, we will quote that last paragraph mentioned:

"To meet the rapidly changing conditions in agriculture, farmers must be able to make their own management decisions on their own farms. They must not have their production and prices frozen in an outmoded pattern. They must not be made the captives of a restricted history; they must be given freedom to build a brighter future. This can be done if farmers and those who serve them will team up in support of sound legislative and administrative action."

That was the President's last paragraph in his message to Congress when he returned the Senate resolution without his approval.

Now, back to Secretary Benson's letter:

"Question. Is it your opinion that the lowering of support prices will lead to higher market prices for farm products in time for the farmer to benefit this year?

"Answer. The President's program is a long-time program which is not scheduled to go into effect until the 1959 crop season. Hence, there could be no benefits from the President's program in the 1958 crop season. Incidentally, to be effective beginning with the 1959 crop year, the President's program should be approved by Congress this year.

"Question. Is the recent 4-percent rise in farm prices due to a general improvement in farm produce or is it primarily livestock price rises?

"Answer. Prices of all the various groups for which the Department compiles prices except wool and dairy products increased from mid-February to mid-March when farm prices in general advanced 4 percent. The most important increase was in the form of continued higher prices for meat animals. Higher prices for potatoes, fruit, and eggs also contributed substantially to the increase.

"Question. How much of the increase in beef prices is due to unfavorable weather in the Southeast?

"Answer. Recent unfavorable weather in the Southeast had practically no effect on beef prices. However, the current price is partly reflecting the drought 2 years ago in the Southeast.

Question. How much of the increase in beef prices is due to the withholding of cattle from the market by southwestern raisers as they try to build up herds depleted by the recent drought?

"Answer. Most of the increase in beef prices is due to the reduction in slaughter supplies which is general throughout the United States, and the strong demand.

"Question. Is there any estimate in your Department of what the market prices on small grains would be if all supports and acreage allotments were removed; on wheat, for instance?

"Answer. The President's program does not contemplate the discontinuance of price supports. On the contrary, the program recognizes that there is nothing wrong with a sound and realistic storage and loan program. Under these circumstances we have

not made any estimates as to what prices would be without supports.

"Question. Do you feel that in the future the farmer must accept the fact that open market prices on foods and fibers, as well as dairy products, will maintain a level below prevailing prices and that the answer to profitable farming is the elimination of smaller units in favor of larger, more-efficient units?

"Answer. There is no reason to believe that farm prices will decline under the President's program. Currently, prices of nonprice-supported commodities (such as livestock) are higher, relatively speaking, than prices of supported commodities. The level of farm prices in the future will be influenced to a large degree by the extent to which markets can be expanded. As far as future supports are concerned, the President has indicated that they will be set at levels as high as could be justified under the criteria specified by law. Incidentally, the basic objective of the President's program is higher net income which depends upon the volume sold as well as price per unit. While in recent years there has been a trend to larger land holdings and fewer farms, the family farm is holding its own. We believe the family farm will always continue to be the backbone of American agriculture."

And these have been the answers from Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson to a recent letter in which I wrote him some specific questions.

Increasing Pay for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MERWIN COAD

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, recently, many questions have been raised concerning the status of legislation increasing pay scales and benefits for various groups of Federal employees. I have conducted extensive research to find answers to these questions, a summary of which I have compiled for the following talk given to the Iowa State Federation of Federal Employees at Ames, Iowa, last Saturday.

AN ADDRESS BY MERWIN COAD, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS, SIXTH IOWA DISTRICT, BEFORE THE IOWA STATE FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES, AMES, IOWA, MAY 10, 1958

Before I get into the main part of my talk, I want to express my thanks for this opportunity to be with you today. It is always gratifying, of course, to get back to Iowa, and the pleasure of returning home is made greater by occasions like this where one can see old friends and talk to the people one admires and respects.

As many of you know, this year, 1958, marks the 75th anniversary of the Civil Service Act. The merit system in the Federal Government really began when the Pendleton Act was signed by President Arthur on January 16, 1883. This law was the culmination of many years of increasing public disgust and indignation at the spoils system and growing demands for reform.

Through the years the idea of a civil service based upon merit has become stronger, and the merit system has been steadily expanded to the point that it now includes about 90 percent of all Government employees. The levels of efficiency and public service have grown and developed along with the merit system, and I believe that all thoughtful people would agree, in this diamond anniversary year, that the Civil Service Act of 1883 was one of the most significant pieces of legislation in American history.

I can say with all sincerity that I have always had a high regard for employees of the Government. Through the years they have given loyal and dedicated service, often in the face of criticism as widespread as it was unjust. Since I have been in Washington, I have seen no reason to change my long-held opinion on this matter; in fact, I am more than ever convinced that the American people are fortunate indeed to be served by Federal employees of such high caliber.

I would like to speak to you about some of the more important congressional legislation affecting you as Federal employees. In some ways this is a bit risky because anyone who tries to foresee just what Congress will do is really sticking his neck out. However, there are some solid facts to work on, and maybe we can make some intelligent guesses.

The biggest and most important item is, of course, the pay raise. I hope that all of you know where I stand on this matter. I have been in favor of an adequate pay raise ever since I got into Congress, and I expect to do everything in my power to bring about its early enactment. To me it is a shameful thing that the increase was not granted long ago. The trouble is that too often matters of this kind get so tangled up with a whole assortment of other issues that they no longer are considered and treated upon their own merits alone.

Please do not misunderstand me. I certainly do not mean to imply that there will be no pay increases. By all indications, quite the contrary is the case. I really believe that there almost surely will be an increase. I am simply saying that all the delay and apparent stalling have been very unfortunate and frustrating and, perhaps to some extent at least, inexcusable.

Of course, we should not forget that the first session of this Congress did pass both postal and classified pay bills. You will recall that the President vetoed them. The principal argument at the time was that the bills were inflationary. Now, with the country in a recession, some administration people say the bills would cost too much.

I must confess that this line of economic reasoning is too deep for me. First, it argues that no pay raise should be granted in good times because it would be inflationary; second, it argues that there should be no increase when times are not so good because it would cost too much.

As I said, this is a bit too much for me, and it may be rather difficult for you, or any other rational people, to understand.

The truth is that these arguments ignore the basic, critical facts about pay raises. They ignore the greatly increased cost of living which, so far at least, has not heard about our recession. They ignore the fact that there has been no pay raise since 1955. They ignore the fact that the pay of Federal employees has always lagged behind the pay in private business and industry, and is now even further behind than usual. In general, they ignore the fact that by any equitable standards of need and merit, an immediate and substantial pair raise is fully justified.

As you probably know from reading your newspapers, the fate of the pay bills is now tied in with the measure to increase the postal rates. This is not the place for a lengthy discussion of the postage rates as such, but because the final outcome of the pay bills seems to depend on the postal-rate legislation, a brief comment is necessary.

Some of you may be wondering what postal-rate increases have to do with your pay hikes. This is a good question, and one that defies any reasonable explanation as far as I am concerned. The administration has declared that the rate increase is needed, partly to help finance the Post Office Department and partly to help finance employees' pay raises.

I would like to say, parenthetically, that in my opinion the post office is a public-service organization. Delivering the mail is one of the most important services the Federal Government performs. And it must remain a service. The Post Office Department is not in business to make money. It is in business to deliver the mail. If it can be more or less self-financing, that is fine. But there is no possible justification for foisting unreasonable and exorbitant postage rates onto the public.

The linking together of postage rates and Federal employee pay scales is difficult to understand on the basis of doing what ought to be done in the easiest, fairest, and most practical way. If civil servants deserve a wage increase—and they most assuredly do—they deserve it regardless of how much it costs to mail a letter. There simply is not even the remotest connection between the two. The merits of one have nothing whatsoever to do with the merits of the other.

I repeat, I think you are going to get a pay raise in spite of the obstacles that have been placed in the way. Many of these obstacles have indeed already been overcome. Bills for both postal and classified pay increases have already moved a considerable distance along the legislative trail. Both the House and the Senate have passed bills for increases for classified workers. The bills are not the same, and the differences will have to be ironed out, but ultimate passage seems pretty well assured.

The pay raise may be the most significant issue affecting Federal employees, but it should not be allowed to obscure the fact that there are other important matters under consideration as well. As members of a Federal employees' association, you will be interested in learning about the progress that has been made toward gaining more official recognition of unions made up of civil servants.

Because of their very nature, unions of Government employees must be weaker than other unions. For example, one of the big differences is that members of a Government union have no right to strike. I think most of us agree that there should be no right to strike against the Government of the United States, but this does not mean that some of the other union activities should not be strengthened.

A subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has recently held hearings on a bill that would increase the bargaining power of Federal unions. This measure officially recognizes the right of leaders of these unions to represent the membership in cases where there is a dispute or grievance with a Federal agency.

Under this bill these disputes would be referred to an impartial board of arbitration made up of a representative from the agency involved, from the employee union, and a representative appointed by the Secretary of Labor. The proposed law provides that the decision of the arbitration board would be final and conclusive.

If this bill becomes law, it probably won't solve all of the labor problems in the Federal service, but it should substantially increase the bargaining power of the unions. I am sure that all of you will be interested in future developments in this field.

With regard to retirement, you will recall that there were very sweeping amendments to the Retirement Act in 1956. Not much is in the legislative mill at the present time touching upon the retirement of currently active civil servants.

However, those of you who have friends who retired before October 1956 will be happy to learn that they have a very good chance of receiving a boost in their annuities in the near future. Legislation to increase these annuities by about 10 percent has passed both Houses of Congress and is now before

a conference committee which is working out differences in details.

This is essentially a cost of living increase, and certainly a much deserved one. Many annuitants who retired before the liberalizing amendments of 1956 have had a very difficult time making ends meet. This pending bill should be of considerable help to them.

Other significant legislation that Congress is now considering concerns your Government life insurance. The great majority of civil servants are covered by this program, and it is easy to understand why. This insurance is inexpensive to buy and simple in its operation, and it provides an extra means of protection for the family of each Federal worker who has taken advantage of it.

Under the present arrangement this insurance costs the employee 25 cents each pay period for every $1,000 of coverage. The Government now pays in just one-half of this amount, or 12½ cents per each $1,000 covering the employee.

The proposed legislation calls for increases to 32 cents and 16 cents respectively for the employee and the Government. In return the value of the policy would decline to a maximum of only 50 percent of its original value after the employee reaches age 65 instead of to 25 percent, as is now the case.

Another provision of this bill, designed to make the law more generous, changes the years-of-service requirement for continuing cost-free insurance coverage after retirement. At present, an employee must have completed at least 15 years in order to be eligible to keep his insurance. The pending bill changes this to 12 years.

There are several other matters of interest I would like to discuss with you if we had the time. I doubt if immediate action can be expected on many of these items, but I might mention a few of them very briefly in case you are interested.

For example, there is the question of hours of work. In some businesses and industries and in many State and local governments, employees have been working somewhat less than a 40-hour week for some time. There are stirrings of interest about changing the length of the Federal work week, but at present it is just something to file in the back of your head.

With regard to health insurance plans for civil servants, the administration has asked that any action be deferred until next year.

The Treasury Department has recently issued a ruling that may affect any of you who have taken extended leave for educational purposes. The Department has declared, retroactive to January 1, 1954, that these education expenses are deductible if the purpose of the schooling was primarily aimed at improving your skills and abilities for your job. Those of you who have taken such leave might check with your personnel people to see if you are eligible.

As employees of the Federal Government we are the ones charged with the responsibility of making democracy work in the every day relations of life. We have a great opportunity and we are faced with mighty challenges. Surely we would every one renew the dedication we hold in those principles of democracy. We would make strong this Nation by our diligent and responsible service to the people of the entire Nation.

As persons employed by the Government we would make the whole strong by strengthening the individual. Let us not grow weary in well doing, but let us resolve that we shall serve admirably in the light of the knowledge that each servant is worthy of his hire.

America has been made great by the efforts of devoted persons in positions of public responsibility. America will remain strong and continue to be great for those who serve her will give in devotion to the task ahead.

Passage of Klamath Reservation Purchase Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senate Sees the Light," from the Oregonian of Portland, Oreg., of May 10, 1958. The editorial properly praises and heralds Members of this body for passage last week, by a unanimous verdict, of S. 3051 providing for orderly purchase of the natural resources and assets of the great Klamath Indian Reservation in southeastern Oregon.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE SEES THE LIGHT

Less than 2 months ago, it appeared unlikely that the United States Senate would even give a floor hearing to the Administration bill proposing Federal purchase of Klamath Reservation timberlands. Unanimous Senate passage of the bill Wednesday thus ranks as a remarkable achievement.

The Senate can take pride in this demonstration of its capacity for enlightened action on a complex issue which many Members understandably considered remote from their particular interests. The light was provided, as noted recently in these columns, by the bipartisan cloakroom teamwork of Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER and Assistant Secretary of Interior Hatfield Chilson. Great credit should also go to another Oregonian, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Ervin L. Peterson, who had a big hand in drawing the compromise bill which changed the tide so spectacularly in the Senate.

There can be little question that the $90 million appropriation ceiling will provide ample payment for the 1,649 Klamaths who have elected to cash in their tribal shares. The sum falls about $3 million short of the required realization value, but this amount will surely be realized through sale of fringe timber lots or sustained yield units to private bidders, who have until January 1, 1961, to share in the liquidation of the tribal timberlands.

Nor can there be much doubt that the House will act favorably on the bill after such a convincing display of unanimity in the Senate, even though the lower Chamber has yet to hold a committee hearing on the issue.

There appears to be assurance, therefore, that the Klamath termination will proceed with full justice to the Indians involved and with adequate protection to the lumber economy of the Northwest.

A remaining complication is the question of the attitudes of the 74 Indians who cast ballots in favor of remaining in the tribe and the 405 who abstained from voting. Many of these are bound to be envious of the $6,000-plus withdrawal shares apparently assured for the majority of Klamaths. But this is a small problem compared to that which loomed just a few weeks ago, when it appeared that the reservation property would be forced into a hasty and ruinous liquidation.

The Need for Reorganizing the Pentagon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important challenges before us, and one which must be met without further delay, is that of reorganizing our defense establishment to meet the demands of modern warfare. For if we do not successfully revamp our national defense organization, we may not be able to deter any would-be aggressors, much less withstand their onslaughts, should war ever come.

The President presented his plan for reshuffling the Pentagon over a month ago. It is a hard-headed reasoned program, drawn up under the supervision of our Chief Executive, one of the great military authorities of our time.

The simple, logical premise of the President's plan is that intercontinental missiles, anti-missile missiles, and all other modern weapons of war have so changed our military needs that all branches must to a certain extent be unified. Since these instruments of war cut across all services and must be used by all services, the units of all 3 branches must be combined under a unified command to carry out specific strategic missions.

That is exactly what the plan the President has propbsed would do. That is why I am behind its overall objectives, although I feel some of the specifics may have to be ironed out.

Mr. Speaker, we must all face up to the simple truth that the dividing lines of land, sea, and air simply does not mean anything today. What we must have is unified commands with clear and instant lines of authority to fight any future war—and to deter the possibility of war.

The result of putting the President's program to work would be a less costly, more flexible, more realistic defense, attuned to the needs of our times. Unfortunately, the plan has run into stubborn, and often unthinking opposition. But I feel confident that if the President will stick to his guns as he has indicated it is his intention to do, he will win the approval of Congress for the substance of his proposals.

Tearful attachments to outmoded concepts will not do in this day of ICBM's and outer space conquest. Modern, hard-headed, open-minded thinking must be the order of the day. The challenges to the free world demand that we face up to the facts unflinchingly and squarely. If every Member of Congress will do that, I feel sure we will be able to

pass an effective reorganization of our Defense Establishment before this session ends.

A vigorous plea for the President's reorganization program was recently penned by Andrew Wolfe, the thoughtful and well-informed editor of three fine weekly newspapers in my district. His commonsense, realistic views reflect, I am sure, the thinking of many Americans who want to see our defenses brought up to date. He also raises a number of challenging problems which must be faced as we move toward a fully modernized defense organization.

Under leave previously granted, I insert Mr. Wolfe's fine editorial, as it appeared in the Brighton-Pittsford Post, the Penfield Republican, and the East Rochester Herald last week:

THE PENTAGON STRUGGLE

We wonder how much longer the long-suffering American taxpayer is going to stand for the shenanigans in Washington aimed at preventing the long-needed reorganization of the Defense Department.

It seems to us that nothing can be plainer than the fact that the Nation needs a better unified command setup for its military establishment.

At a time when a few hours' headstart could win a war for a potential enemy, our military is mired in a fantastic organizational nightmare which in many of its basic concepts dates back to Civil War days.

Whether some of the military likes to think of it in this manner or not, policymaking and positive action are handcuffed by awkward divisions of authority.

In the critical effort to launch the first earth satellites, the Nation's efforts were channeled through command systems in some ways better adapted to buying cavalry horses or gunboats in the 1880's than to coping with the intricacies of modern science and warfare.

Some of the proponents of the President's plan, perhaps with a political weather eye open, have been insisting that the program does not envision the eventual merger of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. But we wonder if that problem shouldn't be brought into the open.

We think people should be asking questions as to whether or not the oldtime groupings of military personnel and skills are the most efficient which can be developed. Mind you, the day for tradition and nostalgia in military matters disappeared at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and all of our thinking must be examined in the fierce light of nuclear explosions.

Consider some of the anomalies of our present defense organization. We have an Army which operates a large fleet of service vessels on inland waters. And we have a Navy which operates its own army (the Marines), and the Marines in turn operate their own little air force, which is a part of the Navy's own air force which is separate from the United States Air Force.

In so vital an effort as the guided missile program, everybody got into the act—and the final result was to allow each service to do some work with the missiles, dividing their areas of work and experimentation on the highly arbitrary basis of the range of missiles.

Almost all evidence seems to indicate that this division of effort and resulting unhealthy competition greatly slowed the entire program.

We'd like to see some arguments as to why for example, the communications and signal arms of the various services couldn't be merged. We'd like to see arguments as to why the Marines couldn't retain their value and esprit de corps if they were made a specialized agency of the Defense Department instead of retaining the naval connection which dates to the days of wooden ships.

We'd like to hear arguments on how we can expect broad-gage leadership from men largely confined, from service academies onward, to the work done by one type of service.

And let's not be misled by talk about creating militarism and a general staff clique.

If the danger of an efficient military to democracy is so great, we'd better quit now and tell Khrushchev to send a commissar over as quickly as he can.

And one of the bitter things about this whole mess is the fact that these lessons all have been taught to us before.

Consider for example, the cavalry, alluded to above.

For many years the great military rivalry in the Nation was not Army-Navy, but infantry-cavalry. The cavalry bureau was an organization of great prominence and power.

But as soon as the machine gun was perfected, the cavalry became as obsolete as war chariots. Yet, it was 60 years before the last horse cavalry unit was disbanded.

The cavalry persisted when the worst military dangers were large-sized cannon. But today we are faced with dug-in thinking, which persists when the weapons of total destruction are at hand.

Just 16½ years ago the Nation experienced its worst military disaster at Pearl Harbor—in large measure because the Army and naval commanders in that area operated with almost total independence of one another.

With the memory of that disaster still fresh, everyone should be working to achieve the military unity so imperative in the world of today.

United States Economic Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently, the National Planning Association issued a joint statement on United States economic strategy in competitive coexistence. One does not need to agree with all the text of the statement to realize that it merits serious consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I urge all Senators to read it.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NPA JOINT STATEMENT ON UNITED STATES ECONOMIC STRATEGY IN COMPETITIVE COEXISTENCE

Khrushchev's confident announcement that the Soviets are out to win the struggle for competitive coexistence and that they will bury the West cannot be dismissed as mere boasting comparable to Hitler's talk about the "thousand year Reich." The Soviets are waging the struggle with determination and skill, both on the domestic and the international fronts. They are trying to outperform the West in the development of superweapons, conventional armaments, and technological and economic achievements. A large part of their effort is designed to forge the political, military, and economic instruments for use in international strategy. They divert resources to these purposes even though a larger improvement in the level of living of the people at home would make the life of the Soviet dictator much easier.

American reaction to this broadening Russian strategy has been focused predominantly on the armaments race, especially on the superweapons. Important as it is that the United States and its allies do not fall behind in the development of these weapons, undue concentration on this aspect of the struggle would be a mistake. Each side claims that it is developing these superweapons as a deterrent to possible aggression by the other side. Mutual deterrence may at best create a stalemate which would not hinder the Soviet Union from pursuing its aggressive policy by other means, particularly political subversion and economic penetration. If the United States continues to neglect or underestimate the Soviet capacity for covert aggression, the result may be as catastrophic as though we were to be decisively beaten in the armaments race. The purpose of this policy statement is to outline the nature of the economic aspect of what the Soviets have euphemistically named "competitive coexistence" and its implications for United States foreign economic activities.

THE ECONOMIC ASPECT OF COMPETITIVE COEXISTENCE

Today, the old patterns of political and economic order inherited from the 19th century have either disintegrated or are in process of rapid change. The underdeveloped countries—many of them newly independent—are struggling to start or accelerate their economic growth to satisfy the needs of rapidly growing populations and the intensified desires of their people for living standards above mere subsistence. Older industrialized nations in western Europe are venturing on novel forms of unification which promise higher productivity and expanding levels of living. Everywhere, there are new expectations, new objectives, and new ambitions. And, everywhere, there are economic obstacles and problems of unprecedented magnitudes which have to be overcome.

This underlying world situation provides both the setting of, and the means for, the current struggle. The Soviets have one vision of how this global process of political, social and economic transformation should come out. They envisage the worldwide triumph of communism, which they believe is guaranteed both by the objective processes of history and by their own superior power and strategy. Having failed to hasten this outcome through the crude, rigid, and direct "cold war" tactics of the Stalin era, they have shifted to the subtle, flexible and long-term strategy of what they call "competitive coexistence." This Soviet name is itself part of their new strategy, for it has deceived many into believing that there is no longer anything more serious at stake between the Communist system and our own than winning a popularity contest. In fact, defeat would be fatal for us because the Soviets conceive of coexistence as a temporary arrangement and have by no means abandoned their goal of worldwide communism.

The United States and its allies and friends throughout the world also have a vision of what the outcome of the fundamental world transformation should be. They seek a system of world order under law which protects the freedom and self-determination of all countries and their citizens, and fosters the economic and social developments necessary for improving the welfare of people everywhere. We, too, have devised

a strategy for achieving this objective, but there is grave doubt as to whether it is adequate for its purpose, particularly in the new period of competitive coexistence.

The problems faced by countries seeking to accelerate their economic growth and improve their social conditions provide some of the most important opportunities for the Soviets and for the West to influence the outcome of the fundamental transformation now in process. Both sides furnish various types of nonmilitary aid to, and encourage trade with, the countries struggling with economic and social difficulties beyond the capacity of their own resources. These foreign economic activities are usually of direct and immediate benefit to the recipient countries. At the same time, they are important ways of orienting the direction of economic and social change either toward the goal of universal communism, as projected by the Soviets, or toward the peaceful, free and progressing world order envisaged by the West. Hence, each side must not only understand the basic problems, but must also comprehend the other's strategy and tactics and must be concerned to forestall or counteract them.

THE SOVIET ECONOMIC OFFENSIVE

The current Soviet economic offensive is, in a sense, a belated recognition on their part of the large measure of success and the fundamental soundness of American foreign economic activities, particularly during the earlier postwar period. The Soviet effort now consists of technical assistance, extension of low-interest long-term credits, and the export of industrial equipment to, and purchase of goods in surplus in, other countries. The amounts involved in these aid and trade programs are large. Indeed, as a percentage of total national production, the Soviet aid programs in the non-Communist countries have exceeded in recent years the nonmilitary activities financed by the United States.

Soviet aid in the form of low-interest loans and grants totaled almost $2 billion in the period 1955 through 1957, of which more than half was extended directly by the Soviet Union and the remainder by Red China and the east European satellites. Most of this aid has been concentrated in a few countries which are either the likeliest candidates for Soviet subversion or are prominent neutrals, whose goodwill the Communists are encouraging while at the same time undermining their regimes. The largest recipients have been Egypt, Yugoslavia, Syria, India, Afghanistan, and Indonesia.

Interest rates on Soviet loans range from 2 to 2½ percent, with 12 years for repayment, which may be in commodities or local currencies. Conditions attached to Soviet loans and grants are quite flexible. Imported goods and services required for programs financed by Soviet aid must usually be purchased in Soviet bloc countries. But, without sacrificing its aid, a recipient country may refuse to accept Soviet technicians or to have its own technicians trained in the Soviet Union. Nor do recipient countries seem to be required to justify in detail the programs and projects they desire to finance with Soviet aid. Political and military commitments are apparently not demanded of recipient countries; the Soviets evidently expecting such ties to follow in the fullness of time.

Equally important in the Soviet economic offensive is the trade between the Communist bloc and other countries. Khrushchev has stated that the Soviet Union values its foreign trade more for political purposes than for any other. In 1956, the imports and exports of the Communist countries to the rest of the world totalled about $18 billion. As all external trade is conducted by government agencies, the Soviets can manipulate their purchases and sales to achieve specific noncommercial objectives. The Soviets make a practice of offering to buy large quantities of raw materials—for example, rice and cotton—from underdeveloped countries which are having difficulties in marketing these products elsewhere. This tactic is particularly effective politically in cases where American agricultural policy may not only prevent imports of these commodities into the United States but may also compel the United States to dispose of surpluses abroad in competition with other producing countries. Such a situation enhances Soviet prestige, even though the Soviet Union may later try to reexport unneeded quantities of these imports.

These Soviet trade and aid arrangements are important assets in winning the good will of recipient countries. They help to substantiate the picture of the Soviet Union as a formerly underdeveloped country which, by its own efforts and in an incredibly short time, has not only mastered its own development problems but has also achieved sufficient wealth and skill to assist other nations now facing similar difficulties. It is this image of the Soviet Union which today attracts non-Communist countries. In the absence of adequate alternatives for trade and aid, these countries will wittingly or unwittingly find that their economies are becoming increasingly dependent upon relations with the Soviet bloc. Such growing economic dependence, combined with undercover penetration and subversion, would inevitably draw many of these nations closer and closer into the Soviet orbit. This trend, if long continued, would mean that the emerging new world order will be much closer to the Soviet dream of a worldwide Communist empire than to the peaceful, free, and progressing system which we envision.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES

As yet, there has been too little understanding in the United States of the gravity of this Soviet challenge. For years, we underestimated the economic capabilities of the Soviet Union and pooh-poohed the possibility that it could provide aid in significant amounts to non-Communist countries, particularly in view of its already substantial commitments within the Communist bloc. Nor have we adequately grasped the implications for our own foreign economic activities of the flexible, subtle, and long-term strategy employed in the Soviet economic offensive. While the Soviets have been learning how to ape whatever was best in our original foreign-aid and trade programs, we have been allowing our own activities to lose much of their idealistic appeal and to bog down in bureaucratic and political restrictions. We are now trying to compete against a comprehensive, integrated, and far-sighted strategy with piecemeal, short-term, and routine expedients—a usually fatal, and in this case self-imposed, handicap.

The essential characteristic of the American aid and reciprocal-trade programs is mutual benefit. For the underdeveloped countries, the returns are comparatively immediate and tangible—more factories, farms, and public utilities, new skills and services, greater exports and imports. For the United States, the benefits are much longer term and largely intangible—the eventual evolution of a more effective and secure system of world economic and political order. This difference in the mutual benefits involved is largely responsible for many of the misunderstandings that have arisen on both sides, and for the current defects of our foreign economic activities.

If the underdeveloped countries are to obtain their part of the mutual advantages, the assistance they receive must be used wisely and efficiently. This means, for example, that mutually agreed and practicable programs for using aid must be worked out, and some supervision is required to insure that funds will actually be expended for those programed purposes. No one denies that a minimum of such conditions, procedures, and restrictions is necessary and desirable. But, over the past decade, they have multiplied and ossified to the point where underdeveloped countries are often justified in feeling that the terms and conditions of American assistance are too limiting, humiliating, and rigid, particularly when contrasted with the ease and flexibility of Soviet aid and trade.

At the same time, there has been a tendency for the Congress and the American people to become increasingly impatient with the long term and rather general character of the benefits derived by the United States from our overseas aid and trade relations. More and more groups and individuals in the United States have tended to believe that helping to build a better world order was all well and good, but that there should also be much more immediate and concrete returns for the funds expended and the import concessions granted. Again, we believe that there is some validity in this view. In consequence, the National Planning Association has urged on several occasions in recent years that as much American aid as possible be on a reimbursible basis. The NPA has also suggested that American tariff concessions should be granted not only in return for similar reductions by other countries but also in exchange for private investment guarantees and other economic measures which could actually improve the international flow of goods and capital.

Unfortunately, this legitimate American desire for a more immediate and tangible return has been pushed to unwarranted extremes in recent years. Our aid and reciprocal trade activities have been increasingly weighted down with various kinds of conditions, exceptions and expedients, whose primary and all too conspicuous purpose has often been to serve the direct and short-run advantage of particular interest groups or to satisfy certain doctrinaire economic and political preconceptions. This situation contrasts most unfavorably with the appearance of unselfishness and broadmindedness that the Soviets have deceptively given to their aid and trade activities.

Another major weakness of United States foreign economic activities in the period of competitive coexistence is our continued failure to recognize that they are likely to be an integral and ordinary feature of American foreign policy for as far ahead as we can now foresee. The economic and social difficulties they are designed to meet are deep seated, complex and not likely to be overcome for many years. Our Soviet opponents have already adopted a comprehensive, long-term strategy that sometimes yields them no immediately apparent advantage. Yet, in contrast both to the underlying problems and to the actions of our Soviet competitor, United States foreign economic activities are still regarded as temporary and extraordinary expedients and are authorized for short periods of time.

These and other defects of our current foreign economic activities have unfortunately tended to create a certain impression abroad which may well be more harmful than the shortcomings themselves. Our foreign economic activities have seemed begrudging, niggardly and petty-minded not only to the uncommitted nations but increasingly to our allies and friends as well. The recipient countries have been offended by our reiterated charges of waste and inefficiency; by our repeated complaints about giveaways and ratholes; by our ludicrous worries over the burdens under which the wealthiest Nation in human history is supposed to be laboring when it allocates less than a quarter of 1 percent of its gross national product to nonmilitary foreign aid. To them, we seem obsessed with quid-pro-quos and sound bank-

ing principles; too solicitous about placating domestic interest groups, often in advance of any complaints; and too timid about undertaking any action, however beneficial to the recipient countries, to which some influential American might object. They feel that we are preoccupied with a self-defeating concern about whether recipient countries are allies or neutrals; whether they are relying too much upon government enterprise; or whether they are also accepting aid from the Soviet Union or have virtuously rejected it. American actions abroad often seem petulant, suspicion-ridden, and overly self-interested to many noncommunist countries.

This superficially plausible picture of the spirit in which our foreign economic activities are conducted cannot simply be dismissed as the work of Communist propagandists and disgruntled nationalists in other countries. The tragedy is that our attitudes and actions have too often in recent years lent credence to this mistaken impression. At the same time, the Soviet Union has been increasingly successful at posing as the magnanimous, disinterested and trusting friend of all. We have largely ourselves to blame for this absurd reversal of the actual roles.

IMPROVING UNITED STATES FOREIGN ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES

It is not within the scope of this statement to review the many specific improvements which could be made in the conception and conduct of our foreign economic activities. But we do wish to emphasize our conviction that these improvements are not likely to be conceived and carried out unless there is a change in our basic attitude toward our foreign economic activities and in the spirit in which we administer them. Fundamentally, this means accepting the complexities and ambiguities of the period of competitive coexistence—not ignoring them or being overwhelmed by them. It means making clear to the rest of the world—not only by our words but more importantly by our deeds—that we have the maturity of understanding and the courage to forego immediate advantages, short-term expedients, and doctrinal purity for the sake of the basic human values and the long-range goals that are of such crucial importance not only to ourselves but to all mankind.

Such a revival of the original spirit of our foreign economic activities will be convincingly apparent when our current efforts are conducted in accordance with the following general principles and requirements:

1. The nonmilitary assistance of all types provided to other countries by the United States should be on a much larger scale than it now is, and should be extended in accordance with adequately planned and mutually agreed programs. It should be authorized and provided with funds by legislation separate from that concerned with military aid and mutual defense arrangements. It should be established as an integral and indefinitely continuing instrument of our foreign policy. This will make it possible to plan and administer aid on a long-term basis.

2. All existing statutory and administrative procedures, limitations, and exceptions should be reviewed, and either drastically reduced and simplified or abolished. This is not only desirable in itself. It will also provide the flexibility and speed of operation required for anticipating and countering Soviet attempts to exploit special situations and weaknesses that now exist abroad or are likely to arise in the future. In addition, it will help to attract competent personnel to the administration of the programs.

3. In principle, those countries should be eligible to receive American aid and trade concessions which are not actively unfriendly to the United States in various significant ways, including unjustified seizure and detention of American citizens and their property. With this exception, help should be ungrudgingly extended to any country desiring assistance regardless of whether it is an ally or a neutral.

4. Except in cases of disaster relief, American assistance provided in accordance with effective development programs should be on a reimbursable basis, with the terms, conditions and kinds of repayments suited to the particular needs and capabilities of each country. However, some grant funds will continue to be required to finance most technical assistance activities and to meet the special situations noted in 2 above.

5. Most underdeveloped countries lack the resources necessary to finance the transportation, communication, power, water, education, health and other basic facilities without which economic growth cannot occur. Hence, a large part of the increased aid should be allotted to these purposes.

6. More American support for economic and social development abroad should be channeled through appropriate international arrangements—U. N. agencies, regional and functional institutions, and other multinational organizations. Private business firms and nonprofit institutions should also be used to the maximum practicable extent.

7. The guiding principle of the reciprocal trade program should be that statutory and administrative import barriers should only be imposed in the comparatively few cases where the national interest is demonstrably at stake. Means alternative to import restrictions should be adopted to encourage and assist noncompetitive American producers to improve their productivity or shift to other lines of production.

Credit the GOP With a Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Bangor Daily News on May 10–11; which sets forth the typical Maine attitude toward Federal grants as the answer to every problem, foreign and domestic, and expresses the very general thought, in more appropriate terms, that work and thought solve more problems than gifts and gab:

[From the Bangor (Maine) Daily News of May 10–11, 1958]

CREDIT THE GOP WITH A PUBLIC SERVICE

The Republican majority of the 98th legislature displayed good judgment and a sense of public responsibility at the special session by rejecting proposals to extend the unemployment compensation act.

Democratic proponents failed to show the need for emergency alteration of the law—a law which the advisory council of the Maine Employment Security Commission declared only last week was meeting the test of the recession.

Tinkering with the law in the haste of an extra session could have been more harmful than beneficial—both to the State labor force and to industry. Placing jobless levies on 12,000 additional employers, as one measure proposed, or adding to the tax burden of employers now paying into the fund, would work against creation of jobs through industrial development. And jobs are the paramount need.

The Republican legislators were also wise in refusing to blindly accept Federal unemployment relief money before Congress had determined on what terms such money, if voted, would be offered to the States.

The special session was poorly timed for consideration of upward revision of jobless benefits. Summer jobs, including those provided by the multi-million-dollar highway and military projects, should improve the State's employment situation greatly in the months ahead. A new 26-week jobless compensation period started April 1.

It is unfortunate that the recession has been seized upon as a political football. The Republican solons earned the thanks of the citizens by refusing to join in the game. Like President Eisenhower at national level, they refused to be stampeded into hasty or extravagant action.

The antidote for a recession is jobs, not political oratory. The State's industrial development program should be pressed with redoubled vigor. The defeated proponents of the jobless measures should forget politics and join in constructive efforts to bring new jobs into the State. The money the State must now pay for the extra session, by the way, could no doubt have been profitably used in this direction by the State department of economic development.

Mineral Subsidies and the Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, conditions at home and abroad have forced the Congress and the executive branch to add vast sums to the budget which was submitted last January. Under these circumstances we should exercise great caution before embarking on new programs which will involve large expenditures.

There are apparently some individuals who are willing to pay any price to secure congressional approval of a further extension of the trade agreements program. On April 14, Mr. James Reston of the New York Times reported that:

The administration is deeply worried about the future of its foreign trade program—so much so that the State Department is now seriously considering a revision of two of this Government's pet economic doctrines.

These are its longstanding opposition to the principle of international commodity agreements, and its opposition to prolonged Government purchases of such things as domestic-produced lead and zinc.

Thus, to save the reciprocal trade agreement program in the Senate, State Department economic experts are urging a new Government-buying program of United States lead and zinc for stockpiling.

This statement was followed by Secretary Seaton's appearance before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee urging a 5-year Government price support program for 5 minerals. It is

readily apparent that this program was proposed as an alternative to tariff relief for lead and zinc producers. Secretary Seaton estimated the cost of this subsidy program at $161 million for the first year. I challenge his prediction that the cost will diminish as the economy resumes its long range growth. In my opinion a subsidy program will immediately encourage foreign producers to ship more of their products to the United States. This will further depress the market price of these minerals and thus require even greater subsidy payments. It is my understanding that the foreign producers do not favor this program, since it will tend to depress world market prices.

Instead of authorizing a new spending program, we should all remember that a tariff in addition to providing protection for domestic producers also provides revenue for the Federal Treasury. Any added revenue should make it easier for us to finance some of the additional expenditures we have authorized without further increasing the national debt.

It is quite obvious to all informed persons that this new subsidy plan was designed for only one purpose, namely, to assist in mobilizing congressional sentiment for the extension of the trade agreements program. The Wall Street Journal of April 29 carried this headline with reference to Secretary Seaton's program: "Administration Proposes 5-Year Price Support Plan for Five Minerals as Alternative to Tariff Hike, Quotas."

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind my friends who represent mining districts that the authorization of a subsidy program does not guarantee that the Congress will appropriate the necessary funds. Last year the Appropriations Committee was asked to provide funds for a mineral subsidy program authorized during the closing days of the 84th Congress. During the hearings on the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] expressed the sentiments of many Members of the Congress. He made it quite clear that the authorization of a subsidy program by a Congress does not commit future Congresses to appropriate the funds to implement it. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include at this point excerpts from the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations with reference to the urgent deficiency appropriations bill, 1957:

Mr. JENSEN. I have been sitting here listening to this colloquy among you, and one thing comes to my mind, as it always does when we talk about subsidies, subsiding anyone in America.

As I understand it, the reason for this subsidy to these mine operators is that they must be subsidized in order to meet foreign competition to at least some degree. Is that correct?

Mr. WORMSER. Correct.

Mr. JENSEN. Can you tell the committee what the ad valorem tax is on these different minerals involved?

Mr. WORMSER. Yes, sir. I think we have the rates here, and if we have them we can insert them in the record.

Mr. LIEBERT. Roughly 8 a unit. I don't have the specific ad valorem rates. I didn't anticipate this question.

Mr. JENSEN. Put the tariff for each one of these minerals in the record.

(The information follows:)

Tariff schedules for the four program commodities and antimony are as follows:

Tungsten, ore and concentrate (pound)	$0.50
Fluorspar, acid grade (short ton)	2.10
Asbestos, chrysotile	(1)
Columbium-tantalum, ore and concentrate	(1)
Antimony, ore, and concentrate	(1)
Regulus (pound)	.02

[1] Free.

Mr. JENSEN. The facts are that if we had a sufficient tariff to protect the domestic mine operators there would be no need for the expenditure of all this money which you have already spent and are here asking for $30 million more?

Mr. WORMSER. That is right.

Mr. JENSEN. This is a fair example of many other things where we have reduced our tariff walls to the point the country is being flooded by products from foreign countries, where labor costs are one-tenth to one-half of what our labor gets, and where the land is worth possibly only 5 cents an acre compared to $50 an acre here. Our land and labor is far higher than that, from twice as much to 10 times as much as mining labor in foreign countries.

It is wonderful to be bighearted. We have been so bighearted that I am afraid we will bust out at the seams one of these days, and the whole world will laugh at us and say, "Uncle Sam, it was wonderful, but you are sure a darn fool for spending money like a drunken billionaire."

I don't know whether the world will appreciate it in the long run or not.

I will make my speech very short and sweet. Just because Congress authorizes something, and just because someone got on the floor of the House or testified before a committee that they thought they needed $90 million to carry on this project, that doesn't mean this Appropriations Committee has to furnish the money. We don't.

Many times authorization bills go through, money is authorized, and the Appropriations Committee doesn't furnish one single dime to support that authorization.

If I vote for this this time, I promise you this much: It will be the last time I vote for money for this purpose. I will make you that promise, gentlemen, unless we put our tariffs up to protect the American worker and American industry to the point where we do not need at least this much money.

Reciprocal-trade treaties are wonderful, but it happens they are not reciprocal in too many places.

I will not promise you right now, gentlemen, that I will even vote for this, because I don't like the picture.

You have plenty of these materials for our defense program, and my guess is that most of these operators could live and possibly make a little money without this subsidy. I am not sure about that, but I do not like this kind of business. The quicker we get away from it, the better it will be for us and everybody else, I think, and also for industry, so they will know they cannot depend on Uncle Sam for such business as this.

That is the way it strikes me, gentlemen. I am just talking from my heart, and I don't want to be contrary.

But I sit here and listen to our chairman, who did a magnificent job in bringing out the facts, and I think you folks did a wonderful job in trying to answer as to the facts. I think you were honest. From the discussion I gather that Uncle Sam is being taken for a great big ride.

Do you have any answer to that little speech?

Mr. WORMSER. One short comment, Mr. JENSEN. The justification for it I see. I share your misgivings.

The tungsten mining industry deserves a bouquet. We didn't have a tungsten industry before. We had just a small industry. They did a fine war job and should be given a reasonable period to readjust themselves. I felt I could subscribe to this bill because it represented a transition period, and it also gave us a breathing spell to come out with some program which would enable that part of the tungsten industry to survive which could meet a competitive platform as delineated by whatever long-range program the administration and Congress adopts.

Mr. JENSEN. The big concerns that are in the tungsten business, certainly they can get along without this subsidy; can they not?

Mr. WORMSER. I am sure some of them can; yes, sir.

These remarks by the gentleman from Iowa should serve as a warning to any Member who believes that the authorization of a 5-year subsidy program would provide necessary stability for our domestic mining industry. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

Proponents of the mineral subsidy program are only interested in securing an extension of the trade agreements program. They seek to prevent the Congress from exercising its constitutional responsibility in accepting or rejecting the findings of the Tariff Commission. If they achieve their goals, I predict that the subsidy program will lapse and domestic minerals producers will have no relief.

When Secretary Seaton was asked whether the subsidy program had been offered as an offset to tariff legislation, he said:

I resent any implication that this is a slick political deal.

However, Secretary Dulles dispelled any doubt as to the purpose of this new program. He said:

It is the administration's hope and expectation that the subsidy program will avoid the necessity for higher tariffs or quotas. * * * Indeed, the subsidy is an alternative to higher tariffs or quotas. We don't need both.

Mr. Speaker, so that all the Members of the Congress may see through this obvious plan to secure the support of the mining districts at the taxpayer's expense, I include the New York Times article of April 15 and the Wall Street Journal article of April 29 which refer to relief for the mineral industry in lieu of a tariff may be included at this point:

[From the New York Times of April 15, 1958]

ADMINISTRATION MAPS MOVE TO SAVE ITS TRADE PROGRAM

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, April 14.—The administration is deeply worried about the future of its foreign trade program—so much so that the State Department is now seriously considering a revision of two of this Government's pet economic doctrines.

These are its long-standing opposition to the principle of international commodity agreements, and its opposition to prolonged Government purchases of such things as domestic-produced lead and zinc.

Thus, to save the reciprocal trade agreement program in the Senate, State Department economic experts are urging a new Government-buying program of United States lead and zinc for stockpiling.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Coincidentally, these same experts are discussing the feasibility of an international coffee commodity agreement to avoid financial distress and political trouble, particularly in Brazil and Colombia.

The administration ended its zinc-buying program last month, and allocated no funds for Government purchases of lead after June 30, 1958. These decisions, coupled with the competition of foreign-produced lead and zinc, have caused widespread unemployment in United States lead and zinc mines, and have greatly increased the demand in the Senate for high tariffs against lead and zinc imports.

In short, the situation is as follows:

Lead and zinc: Senators from the lead and zinc States—New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Utah, Montana, and to a lesser extent Wyoming—have served notice on the administration that they will not vote for the reciprocal trade agreements program unless the lead and zinc miners are given relief in one form or another.

This informal mining bloc, most of whose members have previously favored the reciprocal trade agreements program, is working closely with the Senate textile bloc and oil bloc, both of which also want protection againt foreign competition. And the combination has convinced the State Department economic experts that unless some concessions are made to the protectionists, the reciprocal trade agreements program will be severely crippled if not defeated.

Coffee: Brazil, Colombia and several other Latin American countries get 80 percent of their foreign exchange from the export of coffee, primarily to the United States and Europe. Their revenues from this country have been dropping steeply in the last 18 months.

COMPETITION FROM AFRICA

Meanwhile, competition from French and British African coffee has been hurting their market, particularly in Europe, and when the European common market agreements get into full operation, African coffee will enjoy a greater priority in the European market.

The question raised here, therefore, is whether to sit down with the Latin American coffee producers and discuss the problem, knowing that such a discussion would inevitably lead to proposals for an international coffee agreement similar to the sugar agreement now in operation.

In the past, the United States Government while feeling that the commodity agreement for sugar worked fairly well, has opposed the extension of this device to coffee. The idea here has been that the United States was the world's largest consumer of coffee and that it should buy coffee anywhere it could for the lowest possible price.

Accordingly, United States officials have refused to enter into international negotiations on a coffee commodity agreement. Now, however, they see serious trouble ahead for the Latin American nations—Guatemala and Costa Rica are involved as well as Brazil and Colombia—that depend primarily on this one crop for foreign exchange.

EXPORTS FROM BRAZIL

For example, Brazil's coffee exports to the United States dropped from $604,731,000 in 1956 to $528,402,000 in 1957—a decline of $76,329,000. Colombia's dropped in this same period by $24,638,000 and the estimates for the future are even more disturbing.

This is happening when the Soviet Union is in the midst of a major trade drive in Latin America. The State Department's argument is that it would undoubtedly be cheaper and safer in the long run to revise our theory about commodity agreements than to deal with the economic and political consequences of a financial crisis in the coffee-producing countries in the south.

There is, however, serious opposition to this line of thought within the administration. Some officials think the controversy over commodities agreements and stockpiling payments for lead and zinc will be the major issue within the executive branch of the Government in the next 3 months.

A QUESTION BY OPPONENTS

The opponents of commodity agreements ask why the administration should start down the road toward more commodity agreements when it has had so much trouble with trying to fix prices and agricultural quotas at home. The free market is the best market, these officials say. Therefore, they are opposed to the arguments being heard in the State Department.

Nevertheless, political considerations in both the lead and zinc and the coffee controversies are forcing a review of economic doctrine.

Even the State Department officials who are advocating a modification of present policies do not like commodity agreements or perpetual stockpiling programs, but they are faced with harsh alternatives and feel that the time has come to talk out the differences with the administration.

It is difficult to be precise about the Government purchases of lead and zinc in the past, for these are not published. Reliable estimates, however, put the cost at about $50 million a year.

The State Department argument is that this will be very little to pay if, as it believes, the future of the Trade Agreements Act depends on the votes of the mining bloc in the Senate.

State also argues that the Latin-American market for United States automobiles and other products will seriously decline unless some way is found to avoid a financial crisis in important parts of the hemisphere.

The Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, dealt with the Latin-American commodity price problem in a speech at Pan American Day ceremonies here this afternoon.

He said that the United States Government had realized "the potential consequences of violent fluctuations in the prices fo Latin America's exports and is daily searching for ways and means to contribute toward a solution."

"I can assure you," he said, "that we are truly anxious to help within the limits of what is sound and within our governmental capabilities. And we are always ready to discuss with our neighbors these mutual problems in an effort to find practical and acceptable solutions."

[From the Wall Street Journal of April 29, 1958]

ADMINISTRATION PROPOSES 5-YEAR PRICE SUPPORT PLAN FOR FIVE MINERALS AS ALTERNATIVE TO TARIFF HIKE, QUOTAS—COPPER, LEAD, ZINC, FLUORSPAR, TUNGSTEN NAMED; LIMIT SET ON AMOUNT

WASHINGTON.—The administration proposed a 5-year Government price support program for 5 minerals, apparently as an alternative to tariff relief for lead and zinc producers.

Interior Secretary Seaton, who outlined the proposal to a Senate Interior Subcommittee, urged quick approval so Tariff Commission recommendations for higher duties and import quotas would become completely academic.

Declaring the price-support scheme does more for lead and zinc than the tariff proposals, the Secretary said the administration plan contemplates extending present tariffs. He seemed to be indicating President Eisenhower would reject, or at least tone down, the Commission's recommendations.

Mr. Seaton asserted the new proposal has the endorsement of the President, who believes it to be the best way of solving the problems which confront us.

The program calls for payments to make up the difference between the domestic market and a stabilization price, with annual limits on the quantity the Government would support.

MINERALS' PRICE AND LIMIT

The minerals, with their new stabilization price and yearly limit, would be: Copper, 27.5 cents a pound, 1 million tons; lead, 14.75 cents a pound, 350,000 tons; zinc, 12.75 cents a pound, 550,000 tons; fluorspar (acid grade), $48 a short ton, 180,000 tons; and tungsten, $36 a short ton unit, 375,000 short ton units.

Mr. Seaton offered the scheme as an economic bridge across the present and temporary valleys of low consumptive requirements.

Four of the five minerals are now selling at a market price below the Government support figure listed by Mr. Seaton. Committee aids furnished current approximate prices as: Copper, 25 cents a pound; lead 12 cents a pound; zinc, 10 cents a pound; fluorspar, $50 a short ton for acid grade; and tungsten about $20 a short ton unit.

Government-delivered fluorspar in the high quality acid grade is more expensive at $53 a short ton, officials said. Interior Department aides said they arrived at the $18 support price as a compromise effort to help producers reorient themselves to the competitive commercial market. The bulk of domestically produced fluorspar is being sold now to the Government, which pays the premium price. However, the Federal purchase plan expires December 31.

COALITION GROUP

Some 15 Western States Senators are reported to have formed a coalition with lawmakers from textile and oil-producing States in an effort to use opposition to the President's bid to extend the Reciprocal Trade Act as a lever for higher tariff protection. The administration's minerals plan appeared to have been drawn up in an effort to placate the western bloc, where unemployment has reached serious proportions in the mining industry.

Senator ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, and Senator MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, both leaders in the mining State coalition, were surprised by the proposal. Mr. MANSFIELD remarked, "It looks to me like a Brannan plan now in effect for wool," and added "Off hand, the stabilization prices look too low and not realistic enough." Former Democratic Agriculture Secretary Charles F. Brannan once advocated direct subsidy payments similar to the minerals program for supporting farm commodities.

Mr. ANDERSON said he had not had time to study the minerals measure but commented "it may be something that will mean stability to the mining industry."

DISTRIBUTION SAFEGUARDS PLANNED

The 5-year plan will include safeguards to insure fair distribution of Government payments within each industry, Mr. Seaton promised. This specifically means limits upon each company to give both small and large producers a chance to participate, he said. The program would not require a new agency but would be administered by the Assistant Interior Secretary for mineral resources.

The support prices would be applied only to domestic new-mine production, and not to refinery operations. For 1957, the interior department estimates the following new mine production for the 5 minerals: Lead, 333,493 tons; zinc, 520,128 tons; copper, 1,076,922 tons; acid grade fluorspar, 192,000 short tons, and tungsten, 378,000 short-ton units. A short-ton unit, weighing 20 pounds, contains 15.862 pounds of tungsten.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. Seaton acknowledged that the current slump in demand for minerals has created grave problems both abroad and domestically. He said the 5-year scheme is aimed at insuring strategically sound domestic minerals production without disrupting economies of other nations.

The cost would be about $161 million the first year, he predicted, but would diminish as the economy resumes its long-range growth.

The minerals industry's financial woes have sparked various proposals for Government help. Last year, the administration backed lead and zinc and when these were not approved, urged quick action by the Tariff Commission on the industry's plea for relief.

Meanwhile, the problem has been complicated by completion of the Government stockpiling program for zinc, and the imminent end of Federal lead buying.

Now, however, the Tariff Commission has come up with a split decision recommending two types of relief. The 3 Democratic Members urged duties be raised to the Smoot-Hawley tariff levels passed in 1930: 1½ cents a pound on lead ore, 2⅛ cents a pound on lead pigs and bars, three-fifths of a cent a pound on zinc ores and 1¾ cents a pound on zinc blocks, pigs, or slabs.

Levels backed by the 3 Republicans were at the highest permissible mark of 50 percent above 1945's legal rates. These would be 1$\frac{9}{10}$ cents a pound on lead ores, 2$\frac{11}{20}$ cents on lead pigs and bars, 1$\frac{1}{5}$ cents on zinc ores and 2$\frac{1}{10}$ cents on zinc blocks, pigs and slabs. This trio also called for annual quotas on imports of lead ores of 82,700 tons and lead pigs and bars of 139,000 tons. They also recommended quotas of 237,400 tons on zinc ores and 88,200 tons on zinc blocks, pigs, and slabs.

The current tariff levels are three-fourths of a cent a pound on lead content of ore, 1$\frac{1}{16}$ cents a pound on lead and bars, three-fifths of a cent a pound on zinc ores and seven-tenths of a cent a pound on zinc blocks, pigs, or slabs. There are no quotas.

Whether mining State lawmakers would accept the price support scheme as an alternative to tariff relief was not clear. Senator WATKINS, Republican, of Utah, termed it a "fair compromise on the international situation."

He told reporters the plan isn't better than the quota and tariff urged by the Commission but is better than "just a straight tariff because we couldn't get one high enough to do the job."

WORST OF SLUMP OVER

The Senator specifically questioned whether the proposed support prices on zinc and lead would be high enough to stabilize the industry. "If we're going to keep the mines going, we will have to have reasonableness all around," he said. He warned that this applies to labor too, adding, "Consumers have a right to strike too, and apparently they've struck."

Senator ALLOTT, Republican, of Colorado, said he had information some mines were operating at a loss but were continuing to stay open in the hopes of a rise in prices. "They are in effect gambling against the future," he declared.

Mr. Seaton said it is the considered judgment of the administration that the worst of the current slump is over and that we may soon see an upturn. Many of the problems now plaguing the minerals industries should be alleviated when this occurs, Mr. Seaton said, adding that the administration, therefore, was recommending legislation to enable the Government to help private enterprise in long-range explorations of mineral resources.

He warned that one of the most serious aspects of the current slump is its impact upon exploration, an activity which is the first to be cut back and the last to be put again in operation.

Under present law expenditures for exploration may be treated as an operating expense for tax purposes up to a maximum of $100,000 a year for 4 years. Mr. Seaton said his Department has been discussing with the Treasury the possibility of raising this limitation. No decision has been reached, he stated.

Postal Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am sure that the great majority of the Senate hopes for early and affirmative action on the postal pay raise proposal. Adequate salary for postal and indeed all Government employees is long overdue.

This fact is very forcibly driven home by a letter called to my attention by Mr. Roy Hallbeck, legislative director, National Federation of Post Office Clerks. The letter was written by an Alabama wife of a postal employee.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House payment	$60.00
Groceries	100.00
Milk	10.00
Lights, water, gas	25.00
Insurance	16.12
Blue Cross	7.95
Telephone	5.06
School lunches	11.00
Gasoline (by stretching)	20.00
Monthly expenses	255.13
Bring home pay:	
Per 2 weeks	$130.00
Per month	260.00
Expenses (per month)	255.13
Balance left	4.87

509 WEST DUNCAN AVENUE,
Florence, Ala., May 9, 1958.

DEAR SIRS: This topic must be pretty old to you by now, but I thought I would try again, through you, to get our plight across to the right people. The topic I refer to is the postal raise. I know this is an odd way to start a letetr, but what better way to come to the point. As you can see by my figures, I have only the main things that have to come before anything else. The amount that is left ($4.87 per month) is what we have to buy badly-needed clothes, drugs, and so forth. Our medical expenses include a diabetic son. His insulin and other needs are not included in my list, but they must come above all else. We are expecting our third child in September. How can we meet such bills on $4.87 per month?

We have heard that the postal pay raise has all but been shelved. I guess we—those employed by the post office—are the only ones that even remember that there was such a bill. I remember the last raise we got. The whole time was spent in arguing about whether to color oleo or not. The other day I heard oleo mentioned again. If something isn't done soon, we won't be able to buy oleo, yellow or white.

Our trouble is very much like a friend with the toothache. If you don't have the toothache also, you hardly know how to sympathize with your friend. So, the ones who have the power to give the postal workers a raise can't possibly know what it is to live on so little.

I think the postal worker should be counted as a skilled workman, just as a boilermaker, ironworker, officeworker, or any of the other so-called skilled trades. After they learn their trade—about 4 years—they are through studying, but with the postal worker their studying goes on as long as they work for the post office. But unlike other skilled trades, what they learn isn't worth a darn away from the post office. How many stop to think how much time and effort is spent in studying for these exams? Do you think it is easy or even fun to learn over 1,000 post offices in the State of Alabama, and the right route to send the mail? Out of 100 cards you are allowed to miss 5. You won't take the same exam the next time. You study another State. How can anyone not class a postal clerk as a skilled worker? And if they do, how can they not pay him according to his and other skills? The skills I have mentioned before, make in 1 week what it takes my husband 2 weeks to make. Knowing this, how can they be expected to put their best foot forward?

I don't mean to bring our personal troubles to you. I want only to bring to your attention that we are only one in many thousands with the same trouble. Anywhere in the country you will find the same thing. My husband makes $130 every 2 weeks. That is his bring-home pay. Even before deductions this paycheck would hardly do what it should over a 2-week period. This every week would just about bring it up to the other skilled trades. But this we could never hope for. At one time the post office was a job to be looked up to. Now it is at the bottom of the list. This should not be.

You know by your own expenses that what I have listed does not cover near all that the average family has. These are only the bare necessities. I should have stopped this letter pages ago, but there is so much to be said. A book could be written on the raw deal the postal workers are getting.

I would like to thank you for your previous efforts in our behalf and hope and pray that it has not been all in vain.

Sincerely yours,
MRS. JUANITA ANDERSON.

Digest of Business Conditions and Probabilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. MUMMA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following digest on business conditions and probabilities.

WE ARE IN SERIOUS TROUBLE

Our goals of economic progress and national safety should be more goods and more jobs combined with stable buying power for our dollars.

There are dangers which threaten the attainment of these goals.

One danger is that we may not maintain the superiority of our industrial and

economic progress over that of the Soviet Union; the other is that continual erosion of the purchasing power of our money may injure most Americans, and in the end curtail our individual liberties and destroy our system of free competitive enterprise.

More Americans should understand these related dangers.

WILL WE WIN THE PRODUCTION BATTLE?

McCann-Erickson, Inc., in an advertisement under the above title said:

Khrushchev has just put this challenge to the American industrial system: Can it match and finally top the pace of Russia's global military-economic offensive without destroying its own freedom in the effort?

Hedley Donovan, editor of Fortune, reported Khrushchev as having said in his interview with the three American observers of the recent Russian election:

Our rates and tempos of growth are three and four times those of your country.* * * We are all convinced that we will overtake you, and this is not a matter of theory, but of fact.

The startling fact for is is that our rate of growth in physical output of goods and in productivity per man-hour worked has slackened, while Russia's has increased. And now we are in a serious recession in production and employment, yet with our prices of goods and services still rising.

We cannot hope to maintain our present economic superiority over Russia by working shorter hours, by feather-bedding, by increasing the cost of everything we produce, or by calling upon Government to subsidize a large part of our population.

There appears to be little if any willingness among the leaders of industry, labor, farmers, and governments to consent to the adjustments that would correct these conditions.

Arthur Krock, in the New York Times of December 12, mentioned 11 evidences of this attitude, among them the following:

1. Illegal and unjustified strikes and violence.

2. Opposition by labor union leaders to even mild legislative reforms to protect union members from abuses by their officials, and their condemnation of a congressional committee's statement of facts about labor racketeering.

3. Labor union demand for more leisure, higher wages, increased fringe benefits, unemployment insurance, Government spending, etc.

4. Agreements between employers and unions that make holding jobs contingent on union membership.

It would be unrealistic and unfair, in our opinion, to infer that no business managers are among those who are unwilling to accept the sacrifices and to consent to the adjustments imposed by the grim reality mentioned by Mr. Krock.

THE EROSION OF OUR MONEY VALUE

The American dollar has today a buying power less than half its buying power in 1940. It is about 3.5 percent less than a year ago, and 6.7 percent less than 2 years ago. It is still declining.

Each 1-percent increase in the Consumer Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics reduces total individual purchasing power about $3 billion.

The Argus Research Corp, commenting on this fact, said:

We talk about lowering taxes by, let us say, $6 billion; we could get the same effect if adamant labor-management attitude would permit a 2-percent cut in the cost of living.

It also would have the great advantage of not adding to inflationary pressure or Government debt. All consumers—not just some—could buy more goods and services.

Richard Gray, president of the building and construction trades department, AFL–CIO, said last December:

It will do us little good to achieve military superiority (to the Russians) if the cost and the ever-increasing inflation eventually result in widespread unemployment and a depression.

His proposal of a 1-year wage freeze in the construction industry was denounced by other labor leaders.

It would seem that labor leaders do not realize that inflation is the enemy of wage earners, not their friend; that it reduces the purchasing power of their incomes, savings, life insurance, and pension benefits; and that it is curbing the demand for their products to the point where per capita growth in unit consumption of goods has been stopped.

We do not intend to discuss the subject of inflation technically, or to mention the various factors affecting it. We hope to throw some light upon the controversial question of the causes of rising prices and of unemployment, and some possible means of correction.

The welfare of all Americans, including managers and owners of businesses and wage earners, also our national welfare, depend upon understanding the facts, and upon the adoption of wise policies to correct the dangerous trend.

As is well known, union leaders claim that unnecessarily high prices and profits and inadequate purchasing power are to blame for our present inflation and our business recession. They say that wages are too low; and they are pressing for higher wages, shorter hours, expanding fringe benefits, increased unemployment benefits, Government expenditures and reduced tax rates on low incomes.

Businessmen say that increases in wages and other labor costs not matched by increased productivity per man-hour, together with the actions of labor unions, which are made possible by their monopoly power and by our full employment act, are responsible for both conditions.

WHAT CREATES PURCHASING POWER?

Purchasing power comes entirely from output, in one way or another.

It may be consumers' purchasing power in the form of income, current or past, or borrowed money.

It may be business-purchasing power in the form of sales revenues, or profit after taxes, current or past, or borrowed money.

It may be Government purchasing power obtained from taxes or from borrowed money.

The current business recession was not caused by inadequate purchasing power. The total of disposable personal incomes and liquid savings and the funds available to corporations for capital expenditures were at the highest level ever reached.

Disposable personal incomes in 1957 totaled $300.6 billion—4.7 percent larger than in 1956, 11 percent larger than in 1955, 46 percent larger than in 1950. Most corporations had, or were able to obtain, funds for capital expenditures.

Average hourly earnings in manufacturing in 1957, $2.07, were 4.5 percent higher than in 1956, 10 percent higher than in 1955, 41 percent higher than in 1950.

Total compensation of employees was $254 billion in 1957, 5.4 percent more than in 1956, 14 percent more than in 1955, 65 percent more than in 1950.

The share of national income received by wage earners was 71.1 percent in 1957, the largest ever recorded except in 1932–33. It was 68.8 percent in 1955; 64.3 percent in 1950; 63.6 percent in 1948.

Declining demand was due mainly to five causes:

First. Consumer resistance to high prices.

Second. Some consumer markets temporarily saturated.

Third. Curtailed business investment in new plants and equipment because of weakened incentives, declining profits, the exorbitant demands of labor unions, and excessive capacity in some industries.

Fourth. Curtailed purchases for inventories.

Fifth. Curtailed defense purchases by Government.

It has been in the heavy goods' industries, which depend on investment and business spending, and in the automobile and steel industries, where wages are at the highest level, that unemployment has been the most seyere.

Business profits are not unreasonably large, except perhaps in a few cases.

Corporate profits, after taxes, $20 billion in 1957, were less than in 1956, 1955 or 1950. As a percentage of national income, they were 5.6 in 1957, 6.1 in 1956, 6.5 in 1955, 7.2 in 1950 and 9.2 in 1948. As a percent of sales, they were 5.2, 10 years ago, 3.5 recently, with the value of the dollar now 70 percent of what it was 10 years ago.

Obviously, handing a part of reduced profits over to wage earners would check improvement of equipment and plans to expand, and thus restirct job opportunity and ability to increase wages and worker benefits. A fact that every employee should understand is that business profits are the working man's best friend. The dynamic factor of the economy is the expectation of profits. Employees should resist any proposal that would result in reducing profits to a level that would lessen the employer's ability or incentive to invest in improved equipment or methods, or to expand.

The need for capital for new plants and equipment is going to increase greatly during the next seven years. A widespread reduction of business earnings below levels which afford a reasonable return on risk capital would seriously hamper the accumulation of adequate capital.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

THE "NEW" INFLATION, BY WHICH WE MEAN RISING PRICES

That something new has come to the United States is evident from the record of wages, productivity and prices.

Inflation is characteristic of wartime; it is unusual in peacetime. Usually, prices in the United States have declined after every major war. Between 1945 and 1951 the level of wholesale prices rose by 67 percent. During the next 3 years, the index of industrial prices stayed fairly stable. Since 1955, it has risen by 7.3 percent.

Another unusual feature of the present inflation is that both the Wholesale Price Index and the Consumer Price Index have risen in the midst of a recession. In past recessions, except 1953–54, prices moved downward. The wholesale and the consumer price indexes are now at their all-time high.

Never before has industrial production dropped 14 percent in a year while the BLS indexes of wholesale and consumer prices rose 2 percent and 3.5 percent respectively, and average hourly earnings of production workers in durable goods' manufacturing rose 2.8 percent, and in building construction, 5 percent.

A further general rise in prices would have the effect of further curtailing consumer buying and business investment in inventories, plans, and equipment.

WHAT IS CAUSING THE PRICE RISE?

Wages are the principal cost of production. Pay increases by industry leaders spread throughout the economy, and raise the prices of all commodities and services. Employee compensation accounts for 78 percent of the income generated in manufacturing—and in corporate business as a whole.

When money wages rise while output per man-hour rises more slowly, or not at all, unit labor costs must rise. Increased revenue from price increases is the only possible source of that part of the additional wage payments that is not offset by greater productivity, unless it can be taken from profits.

The impossibility of covering the increases in labor compensation in recent years by having employers accept smaller profits seems obvious, since profits before taxes of all corporations were $40 billion in 1950 and $41 billion in 1957, while the compensation of the working force in 1957, $254.4 billion, was $100 billion more than in 1950. If the net profits of recent years had been substantially less than they were, the effect upon capital investment would have been damaging to the Nation—and especially to labor.

A recent study by Fortune showed that since the end of the Korean war the 100 largest American industrial corporations had declines in earnings before taxes per dollar of sales of 16.3 percent; in earnings per dollar of net worth of 14.9 percent.

Ewan Clague, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, said in a Monthly Labor Review:

In the long run, after all temporary fluctuations have worked themselves out, productivity determines the real wages of workers. Wages may shoot skyward at great speed, but they are only worth what the productivity of industry yields in goods.

According to a BLS report, in the private sector of the economy, between 1947–56; (a) Money wages of employees, plus employer supplementary payments, increased 61 percent; (b) output per man-hour increased 26 percent; (c) per unit labor cost of production increased 28 percent; (d) per unit nonlabor cost increased 27 percent; (e) consumer prices increased 21.7 percent.

A disturbing fact is that output per man-hour in manufacturing, as estimated by the BLS, rose in 1956 and 1957 less than 1 percent yearly, as constrasted with an average of 3.5 percent in the 7 preceding years. As average hourly earnings have risen since 1950 more than output per man-hour, wage costs per unit of production have steadily increased. This has caused an upward pressure on prices.

It is obvious that the power of labor unions, largely the result of their exemptions from laws which apply to all other citizens, has put a continual upward pressure on prices. Their power is greater than even our largest corporations have.

Business monopoly is prohibited by law, and enforcement of antitrust laws has been vigorous in recent years, but there has been no restraint upon the actions of unions which had the effect of pushing prices up.

Labor union pressure is not the only cause of rising prices, but is the most important one.

We believe that neither unions nor employers should have the power to impose their arbitrary will on the other party in collective bargaining.

Management has a responsibility to keep its prices at a level that will stimulate its sales to an extent that will be beneficial to the company, its employees and the public.

Edward L. Dale said in a Times article:

In 1953, 1954, 1955 and much of 1956, consumer prices were stable, but money wages rose by 8 percent and real labor cost, after allowing for the rise in productivity, rose by 6 percent.

An essential of a dynamic industrial system and a stable currency is to pass to consumers the benefits of technological progress by price reductions that are commensurate with declines in real costs.

If labor and management continue to push up wage and price levels they will price themselves out of markets, both domestic and foreign. Unemployment would increase.

It is a responsibility of management to resist strongly union demands which will necessitate price increases.

It is a joint responsibility of management and labor to release to the fullest possible extent the potential strength of our economy.

This is a time for vision and patriotism.

Practical—Cum Laude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to your attention and that of my colleagues, an interesting editorial which has been widely reprinted throughout the country and which explains in a down-to-earth manner, the values of the independent business school. The editorial has appeared recently in many newspapers among them the Times Star of Alameda, Calif.

The editorial follows:

PRACTICAL—CUM LAUDE

In all the current commotion over higher education, our crying need for double-dome scientists we haven't got, we think it's high time somebody gave a thought to the kids—hundreds of thousands of them across the Nation—who do not go to college, and who will not be going to college, no matter what the inducements.

These are the youngsters who must shoulder responsibilities at a tender age, who must prepare themselves quickly to help out at home; the girls who want to be secretaries, the boys who want to be accountants but who may have to get their education via the night school route; still others who are frankly not students, but require some special grooming to prepare for the battle of life at a modest level. For these, a Government program that would force them into college would be both heartless and futile—just as it is tragic today to see young people in our colleges who are there because their parents insist upon it and can pay the bills.

And let us recognize, too, that no group of our citizenry contributes more to the Nation's economic and civil welfare, to keep the wheels turning in business and industry and our Government functioning at the national, State and local levels than these business school careerists. Without them, we should be in a bad way—but quick. In fact, we can think of nothing more chaotic and generally insufferable than a world of doubledomes.

Actually, so far as we can see, any institution to which high school graduates go in further preparation to deal with the world, whether a university or a business school, is in simple fact a college, and should be so established in the public mind.

It is encouraging, therefor, to note that this attitude is beginning to evolve. While it is not practical for youngsters of the Horatio Alger persuasion to devote time and money to football, the primrose path to acclaim, there is such a thing as school spirit in these specialized educational facilities.

In many business schools there are social functions and alumni organizations that keep memories green and contacts alive. More and more of these schools, we learn from E. R. Moore in Chicago, now conduct formal and impressive graduation exercises, complete with peroration, prayers and patriotism and even to caps and gowns. In fact, the Moore people have gotten out a booklet for business schools that spells out just how appropriate commencement exercises are arranged and conducted.

There is, in other words, growing recognition of the fact that it makes just as much sense to live for good old Spivis commercial as to die for dear old Harvard law.

Visits of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House have great esteem and affection for the distinguished Vice President, our former colleague, Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON.

Many people have been impressed by the obviously favorable impressions of the previous state visits, which our esteemed colleague has made. However, thousands of Americans are distressed by the reactions of his present tour of South America. In almost every country that he has visited, organized and unorganized protests of his presence have occurred. We have had the unhappy and very shocking spectacle of a Vice President of the United States being openly hissed, jeered and stoned in the streets and public places of some of our South American cities.

I appreciate that these demonstrations have come to large extent as the result of organized Communist propaganda and action. However, in some places, the news reports indicate, that many of the general public have approved of this discourteous treatment of our Vice President and joined in the cry that is taken up in many places of the world, "Go home Yanks" and "Down with Yankee imperialism," "Yankee Dog" and the like.

Like many Members of the House and many of the American people, I greatly deplore these insults and discourtesies to the esteemed Vice President of the United States while he is engaged in discharging his duty as a goodwill ambassador. I seriously doubt, considering the current experiences, that much good will is being developed as the result of his visit to South American countries. To the contrary, I think that bad will is being developed and the outbreaks occurring are simply giving opportunities to Communists and disgruntled elements to stage anti-American demonstrations, which are played up by the Communist and pro-Communist press and spread to all corners of the world.

Visits of state may well have their place in our foreign relations, but where they occasion derogatory outbursts and demands that distinguished visitors get out and other discourtesies, I doubt very much that any contribution is being made to bettering the relationships between our own Nation and our South American friends.

Perhaps there are more facets to the situation than meet the eye. For years we have known of the planned operations of the Communist conspiracy in many countries directed against this Nation and all friendly nations, indeed directed against democracy and freedom.

This question is for the executive department to decide, but I do not believe that the visit of any American dignitary to a foreign country should be the occasion for insults, vituperations, physical attacks and public disorder. Unless it can be assured in advance that our distinguished visitors are to be welcome and will receive respectful and courteous treatment, I believe that we should discontinue the practice of so-called state visits because, under the circumstances, there is reason for believing that they are currently doing more harm than good and causing humiliation, gratuitous insult and personal danger to some of our highest and most distinguished American leaders. We do not have to take that from any nation. We should not take it.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Both Houses cleared for White House bill carrying urgent deficiency appropriations.

Senate passed by 46 to 36 bill on area redevelopment.

House worked on mutual security authorization bill.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 7602–7623

Bills Introduced: 13 bills and 2 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3789–3801; S. J. Res. 173; and S. Con. Res. 87. Page 7603

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 3500, to require the full and fair disclosure of certain information in connection with the distribution of new automobiles in commerce, with amendments (S. Rept. 1555); and

S. 3502, to extend the Federal Airport Act through fiscal year 1963, with amendments (S. Rept. 1556). Page 7603

Bill Re-referred: S. 3710, extending certain provisions of Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act to veterans who entered active service after January 31, 1955, was re-referred to Committee on Armed Services after Committee on Finance was discharged from its further consideration. Page 7605

Urgent Deficiency Appropriations: Conference report on H. R. 12326, urgent deficiency appropriations for fiscal year 1958, was adopted. This action cleared the bill for the President. Page 7639

Veterans' Widows Pensions: Senate concurred in House amendment to and cleared for President H. R. 358, to increase benefits to widows of Spanish-American, Indian, Mexican, and Civil War veterans. Page 7639

Area Redevelopment: By 46 yeas to 36 nays, Senate passed without amendment S. 3683, Area Redevelopment Act, after rejecting, by voice vote, modified Cotton amendment barring designation as a redevelopment area of any area where special tax inducements are offered to engage in industrial or commercial activities; and, by 26 yeas to 59 nays, Bush amendment to prohibit any loan to assist in the relocation of an industry from one area to another.

Motion to reconsider passage of bill was tabled.

Pages 7623–7636, 7643–7644, 7659–7674

Veterans' Hospitalization: Senate made its unfinished business H. R. 6908, relating to hospitalization of veterans in the Philippines. Page 7674

Legislative Program: In addition to the program for the week as announced by majority leader yesterday, page D403 of DAILY DIGEST, it was announced that it is planned for Senate to consider H. R. 6908, veterans' hospitalization—Philippines, and S. 3468, construction of roads on Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations. Page 7602

Confirmations: Four nominations to Tax Court of U. S. were confirmed, along with 1 other civilian nomination; and 1 Army, 1 Air Force, 2 Navy, and 2 Marine Corps nominations. Page 7685

Nominations: Nomination of Ira A. Dixon, to be member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and numerous Navy nominations were received. Pages 7682–7685

Program for Wednesday: Senate adjourned at 7:45 p. m. until noon Wednesday, May 14, when at conclusion of morning business, it will consider for confirmation the nomination of Gordon MacLean Tiffany, of New Hampshire, to be Staff Director for Commission on Civil Rights, probably to be followed by S. 3500, auto pricing, and S. 3502, Federal Airport Act. Pages 7481–7482, 7526, 7601, 7602, 7682

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee continued its hearings on H. R. 11574, fiscal 1959 appropriations for independent offices, with testimony in behalf of funds for their respective Departments from the follow-

Appendix

Address by Hon. Estes Kefauver Before the Tennessee Municipal League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered yesterday to the Tennessee Municipal League, at Nashville.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER TO TENNESSEE MUNICIPAL LEAGUE, NASHVILLE, TENN., MAY 13, 1958

It is a privilege for me to meet with you here today to discuss some of the interrelated economic and political problems that confront us as public officials. I believe the theme for your convention, Economic Survival for Tennessee, is well chosen and indicative of the crucial decisions that need to be made. It is indicative that we realize troublesome economic conditions disappear only after decided effort and that the best treatment for declining economic activity is preventive treatment designed to stop the decline and reverse it.

It is refreshing to be among you municipal public officials. When one goes to Washington, it is possible to lose perspective on problems and to lose the sense of immediacy which comes to those who actually operate programs that affect our everyday lives. For this reason I take every opportunity afforded me to return to Tennessee and learn what you are thinking here. I am certain that I will learn as much or more from listening to you discuss your problems and aspirations than you will from hearing me.

I want to assure you that many of us in Washington are acutely aware of the growing problems of the States and municipalities. We have been striving against some opposition by the administration to take steps to counter the recession. As you know, the President vetoed the rivers and harbors bill recently and thus eliminated the chance of starting on many worthy and necessary flood-control and harbors projects. I would like to think otherwise, but I doubt very much that Congress will be able to override his veto. The Senate recently passed the community facilities bill, which I cosponsored, to expand the lending facilities for local public agencies and at lower interest in order that they might expand their efforts to improve physical conditions in their areas. The House has yet to act on this measure, but I am confident that it will pass. We have passed measures to speed up the highway program and the housing program. The Democratic Members and some Republicans are ready to take all necessary action to assist the economy in regaining its stability.

I think that we are at a critical period in this country's history. Of course, every period is critical in some ways, but I think that this one is especially important because of the changing nature of our society. Not too many decades ago we were primarily a rural people with a majority of our people on farms. Recent studies have revealed that no more than 12 percent of our population now live on farms and that the future holds further decreases. As you well know, this means that many of the people now living on farms will leave them to come to the city, and most of our children will find their livelihood there.

I have heard eminent students of municipal problems state that the biggest national, and I emphasize national, problem for the future will be that involving large concentrations of population. As our people gather even closer together, using up some of our most fertile farmland, overtaking our highways, crowding our parks, requiring increasing amounts of electricity, gas, and other natural resources, we are going to have to face the fundamental political, economic, and social problems that such concentrations of population bring. We have not faced these problems adequately as yet and there are few signs that we will. It is a lamentable fact that we so frequently recognize our problems only when they reach scandalous proportions. The National Government should be planning to assist the States and the localities in providing for the necessary adjustments and expansion of facilities because these metropolitan areas far exceed the ability of any single community and often even any State to support. In many instances, the metropolitan region itself crosses State boundaries.

Your organization is one of the most important instruments in the improvement of community conditions. Your members have the experience and firsthand knowledge of municipal problems. You know what it means when you talk about substandard housing, crowded streets, inadequate water supplies, poor zoning and planning, air and water pollution and the myriad other conditions that people in urban areas experience. I believe that it is your responsibility to come up with ideas for meeting our problems. The Federal and State Governments may be effective instruments for assisting in projects beyond the financial resources of the local governments but they have no monopoly on ideas. Your leadership, your guidance, and perhaps even more important, your goading and pressure can make things happen and make them happen in such a way that they actually lead to suitable solutions to your problems.

I have dwelled on these general conditions at length because I feel it is necessary to take the long view in considering our resources—human, industrial, and natural. We cannot plan our utilization of resources in traditional ways because the traditional society no longer exists. That is what some of our standpat friends refuse to recognize. They would have us treat a kitten and tiger the same way because they are of the same family. I would suggest that the cat and the tiger are essentially different from each other, whatever their similarities, and that handling of them must be somewhat different. In the same way, large numbers of people living in a small area need essentially different kinds of programs or handling than they do when they are spread over an extensive area, in spite of the fact that they remain people. And we must keep in our minds the one fact that perhaps outweighs all others, and that is rapid increase in population. Present estimates indicate that the population of the United States will reach 212 million by 1975. And most of these new souls will be crammed, stuffed, squeezed, herded, and polluted in cities unless we make the necessary efforts and, although it is painful to everyone to mention it, the necessary expenditures.

We have had in the Tennessee Valley one of the most farsighted resource programs that any nation or region has ever undertaken. The dream of the late George Norris, brought into being by the imaginative Franklin D. Roosevelt, the program is now 25 years old. It has virtually altered the face of the earth and certainly has altered the nature of our economy and our way of living. I do not have to tell you what the Tennessee Valley Authority has meant to all of us here and to the United States as a whole. But I am going to tell you anyway just so the record is clear in our minds. The TVA tamed a savage and unpredictable river that threatened every community, its property and citizens every year. It made this river a thing to be used for the betterment of the people of the valley in countless ways. Instead of wreaking havoc, the waters of the river became a broad liquid highway to transport our goods to and from the markets of the Nation. Our citizens no longer feared the river but used it as a place for recreation and relaxation. And, in cooperation with the Corps of Engineers, much the same thing has been done with the Cumberland River.

Certainly not the least important product of the TVA was the power produced at its dams. This relatively inexpensive power altered the economic system both on the farm and in the city. Where only 3 percent of our farms received electricity before TVA, now 95 percent of the farms receive it. New industry was attracted by our lower power rates and the burgeoning population of our cities was served with electrical energy. We are familiar, of course, with the extensive defense industrial development that was created owing to TVA power.

These direct benefits are enlarged immeasurably when one considers the collateral effects of TVA—the reforestation, the soil conservation, the advances in health, and other programs undertaken by the TVA in cooperation with the local and State governments. In sum, they constitute one of the greatest achievements in the history of the United States and provide a prototype for other regions which are beset with similar problems.

At the risk of the belaboring the obvious, which is always the privilege of a speaker, I want to point out some other well-known facts. The Tennessee Valley Authority is unique in that it is a Federal agency not operated from Washington. Its headquarters are located in the valley, close to the going operations and the people who benefited from its work. Thus, it was responsive to the needs of the communities and purposely set out to cooperate in a joint effort to alleviate suffering and improve economic and social conditions.

Secondly, the TVA takes unified approach to the natural resource question. While other areas continue to suffer from jurisdictional disputes and differences in opinion regarding policies, the TVA resolves whatever differences there are within itself and approaches all of its resources programs on a unified basis. Here is a clear recognition of the fact that resources, soil, water, tree,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and human, are interrelated and that they must be approached with a recognition of their interaction.

Admittedly the TVA has run into obstacles that have prevented it from realizing the full measure of its being. This has been particularly true during the past 5 years under a relatively unfriendly administration and an extremely unfriendly Bureau of the Budget. I think that it is fair to say that the President is unfavorable toward TVA when his chief aid, Sherman Adams, and the Bureau of the Budget use every devious method possible to restrict the TVA from fulfilling its potential service to the Tennessee Valley. This administration has cut the budget for the Authority and has prevented it thus far from expanding its power producing facilities to meet the growing needs of the area.

As a result of these obstacles, some people are urging other alternatives for carrying forward the programs formerly expected of the TVA, particularly in relation to the production of power. Some are proposing that municipalities, States and power districts take on the responsibility. I feel this will be ultimately self-defeating because it destroys the very assumptions on which the TVA has operated and takes too short a view of human affairs. I am convinced, and I am sure many of you share the conviction and surely the hope, that the political climate in Washington will not always be as negative toward TVA as it is at present. This is an election year and an opportunity to bring to Congress persons who are aware of the needs of our valley and sympathetic with the cause of river basin development. In 1960 we will have an opportunity to bring in an administration that will not only give support to our basin but will recognize the national needs in soil and water conservation. I say these things not from a sense of deep-seated partisanship since some of our best supporters are Republicans, such as JOHN SHERMAN COOPER of Kentucky, and 1 or 2 Tennessee Republican Congressmen. I only want to remind you that this period of relative uncertainty may be and can be followed by a vigorous resumption of developmental work if we take the necessary steps.

The more serious question relates to the effect on unified basin development if we accept some of the schemes that have been proposed. As I stated before, the TVA and its programs has recognized the essential unity of all the elements of the basin—human and natural. The entire valley's resources were managed to provide for a maximization of man's benefit. While protecting the resource base, the TVA had a clear understanding that a variety of man's needs required satisfaction. Here was balance of resources management because of the integrated approach.

Why was the TVA able to accomplish this? I do not think that we can find the answer in either the kind of men who staffed the TVA or the form of organization alone, although these contributed heavily to its success. The essential fact was that the TVA was and is a national instrumentality reaching into many States affecting the lives of millions of people. TVA thus took a broad view rather than a narrowly parochial view concerning the development of resources. The valley and its people constituted its realm and no arbitrary boundaries or special localities determined its decisions. And I think we have all benefited from this point of view.

Other alternatives invariably involve the assumption of responsibility by a locally constituted organization representative of the major political and economic units receiving benefit from the TVA system. And usually such alternatives center their attention on power, without consideration of the other facets of TVA's program. I would like to ask one or two questions about such schemes.

First, what would become of the broad viewpoint I have discussed here? Let me tell you from many years of experience in legislative bodies that the ultimate result would be a splintering of the unity that has so characterized our efforts heretofore. Each unit represented would consider first—what is in it for me—rather than, will this proposal meet the needs of people throughout the valley? There would be a tendency, not necessarily out of selfishness but more out of unfamiliarity with the problems of others, to be concerned about local interests rather than the public interest. One power district or REA or municipality claiming that it is not receiving its share of power. The power interests claiming that the river was being managed for navigation to the detriment of power production. The shipping companies claiming that there was insufficient recognition of their needs.

Conflicts of this sort have arisen in the past of course. But they have been settled because the public interest was always kept in the foreground and the local and private interests were required to meet the standards which the public interest imposed. I am extremely fearful that we will be giving up this public spirit that has so stimulated our efforts in this valley. For contrast, one need only see what has happened in other major river valleys where there has been less than the public interest in view. The States of the upper basin and lower basin of the Colorado and States within the two basins are constantly in conflict over the terms of the Colorado River compact. The various interests along the Missouri, alined with their governmental spokesman, are never in agreement on Missouri River development programs. Other instances could be cited. I do not think we want to endanger our future by adoption of such programs which invite dissension.

Another important aspect of the problem relates to the ultimate fate of the Tennessee Valley Authority itself. If its power functions are stripped away, will the Authority continue its work in flood control, soil conservation, reforestation, navigation and other activities? I have my doubts. The elimination of its power functions would be the first step in the dismemberment of TVA and its eventual destruction—a goal long sought by its enemies these many years. Power rates themselves would go up-up-up. Strong pressures would be created to return to the piece-meal approach to resource development and many of the existing programs would be reduced or eliminated entirely. The States of the valley would be required to undertake a much larger share of responsibility for resource development than is presently the case.

As you all know, all the valley Senators and Representatives, have sponsored what we consider to be the better way: self-financing for the TVA. The self-financing bill is now before the House of Representatives after having passed the Senate last year. I have every hope that such a bill will pass the House and be enacted into law. This bill would allow the TVA to issue revenue bonds for the construction of added power installations. Such a plan would allow the TVA to support its own expansion without having to obtain appropriations from Congress with all of its attendant difficulty. And certainly expansion is needed in view of the projected power needs of the valley. The TVA would remain intact as an organization and would continue to perform its many integrated programs. With appropriations, for its other related activities, we could expect a bright future for the valley.

We all recognize that the Tennessee Valley Authority and other agencies of the Federal Government cannot insure prosperity of our State. They can and have contributed heavily to our well-being, but in the long run our economic security lies in our own hands through the full development of our human and natural resources. We have perhaps done less than is possible to develop our resources and take adequate measures to meet our growing problems.

This meeting is evidence that there is a reawakening and desire to make up for lost time. I note that there has been considerable discussion of State and community planning and development programs at these sessions.

I note also that the Tennessee Municipal League has gone on record supporting larger appropriation for the department of economic development, the establishment of a Tennessee industrial building financing plan, and creation of a Tennessee dock authority. These activities are badly needed.

We have many serious economic problems in Tennessee. With coal mining and agriculture declining in economic importance, it is imperative that we find industrial outlets for our working population. We have a rapidly growing population, with many young people who are in need of opportunity here in Tennessee. It is a lamentable fact that so many of them are finding it necessary to leave the State in order to make a living. All of the States of the Union are in competition to obtain industry and we must take steps to insure that we are not deprived of our share of industrial expansion.

In conclusion, I would like to encourage you in your efforts to use your government at all levels to stimulate and expand your economic base. We have a tendency in this country to feel that governmental activity is somehow evil or a last resort. I think we should recognize that our governments have been instrumental in developing this Nation throughout our history: The railroads, atomic energy, technical assistance in agriculture, airlines, and many others. We should use our governments today to assist private enterprise in fulfilling its basic responsibility—always maintaining sufficient safeguards to prevent abuse—to provide the means of support for our expanding population and for higher standards of living. If our State government and the cities will develop the means to consult, to finance and administer cooperative programs, there is no reason why we cannot look to the future with confidence. You may be sure that if the States and municipalities do their share, the Federal Government will be forced to do what is necessary to supplement their efforts. I will certainly do all within my power to assist you from Washington.

Congressman James P. Devereux, of Maryland, a Man To Remember

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress are proud of the accomplishments of our Members. It is with real pleasure I have come upon the fascinating story of our good, friendly Congressman JIM DEVEREUX, of Maryland, that began on Wake Island on December 8, 1941, where he was the commanding officer of the United States Marines holding this American outpost for our good country.

Knowing that Congress and the American people would like to have the thrill-

ing episode of our United States history placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am submitting the article from the Reader's Digest of April 1942, condensed from the American Legion magazine. It is written by Donald Wilhelm, who gives a unique account of the heroic defense of Wake Island drawn not only from official sources but also from personal reporting.

Mr. Wilhelm talked with the officers and men who fought under Maj. JIM DEVEREUX; with Pan American and Marine Corps personnel from top to bottom; with generals, flight officers, and privates. During World War I Donald Wilhelm was an assistant to Herbert Hoover and after the war in that capacity traveled extensively in Europe on United States missions.

The article follows:

WHAT HAPPENED AT WAKE

(By Donald Wilhelm)

In his tent on Heel Point, Wake Island, Maj. JAMES PATRICK SINNOTT DEVEREUX awoke to reveille at 4:45. Sunday, December 7, at Pearl Harbor was Monday, December 8, here, for Wake is just west of the international date line.

Having shaved, with due regard for his small mustache, he strapped on his .45-caliber Colt and headed for the officers' mess. A wiry little man with the bulging brow of a student, he was quiet, slow to anger, slow to speak. He glanced at the sky and its sickly last-quarter moon: a good day for flying. His dawn patrol was already out over the Pacific.

The major was in his element. Son of an Army medical officer, he was born in Cuba, the fourth child of a famous Army-Navy-Marine family of 10 children. He had enlisted as a marine when 19. Though quiet, he was a fighter when roused, says one who saw action with him in Nicaragua, where he earned 1 of his 3 medals. He loved the life of a marine.

Wake is 2,004 miles west of Pearl Harbor, but only 352 miles from Taong, and 700 from the Marshall Islands where, he knew, the Japanese had strong air bases. The desolate coral atoll that is Wake had been built up on the rim of a sunken volcano, the crater forming a shallow lagoon 4 miles long by about a mile and a half wide. A coral reef hemmed in its northwest end, and the rest of it was surrounded by three islets that almost touched: Wilkes, the smallest; Peale, with its Pan-American Airways station; and Wake. Nowhere was the land more than a mile wide and the highest point on these treeless sandspits dotted with low green scrub growth was not 10 feet above high tide.

Beautiful, but what a place to defend.

When Pan-American Airways first planned to land on Wake, in 1935, it was uninhabited; lest we offend Japan, our Government had made it a bird sanctuary. Just a few months ago, the first construction workers and marines were sent out to strengthen Wake's defenses. DEVEREUX and the main body of marines had been there only a few weeks. He now had 25 officers and 418 men.

As DEVEREUX approached the officers' mess he saw the Philippine Clipper, in from Pearl Harbor at sundown the day before. At three minutes before seven, the big ship taxied to the far end of the lagoon, took off, and soared away toward Guam and Manila.

Less than half an hour later a marine came running excitedly from the radio shack, handed DEVEREUX a decoded radio message:

PEARL HARBOR HAS BEEN BOMBED

The little Major thanked the messenger—Jimmy, say his old messmates, was always scrupulously polite—and gave orders for the bugler to sound the call to arms.

At 7:30 the Clipper returned. The last man except one who saw much of DEVEREUX and escaped from Wake was her captain, J. H. Hamilton. Hamilton had received orders from San Francisco to return to Wake and report to DEVEREUX for instructions. He says he found the Major anything but excited. While steadily receiving reports and giving orders by phone and runner, DEVEREUX discussed the situation quietly and in detail. He wanted Captain Hamilton to take out the Pan-American personnel. He already had a thousand civilian workers to feed and care for. They had volunteered for fighting, but he had equipment for only a few. There was one other thing—would the Captain undertake a long-range reconnaissance? DEVEREUX's pursuit planes had but limited range.

As soon as the patrol areas were agreed on, Hamilton hurried back to the Pan-American hotel to summon his crew. He had scarcely reached it when he heard the drone of many motors, and saw a squadron of 12 planes approaching from the south. For a moment he hoped they were American planes. But then he saw flashes, heard explosions, saw black smoke rising—and knew the Japanese had struck. A second flight of 12 planes was now coming straight at him. For half an hour Hamilton and his crew experienced a little of what the men on Wake were to know for 2 weeks.

Crouching in the sand, with enemy machine guns blazing at them, they were so helpless that rage replaced fear. Chief Mechanic Earle was knocked flat by bomb concussion, got to his feet, was knocked flat again, once more struggled up and was struck by flying debris, but ran on to the Clipper. A section of the Clipper's side had been blown away. With a roar and flaming blast Pan American's hotel was torn apart. The machine shop was turned into a bonfire. The office building and employees' quarters were leveled. But by a miracle all the Clipper's crew escaped death. The ship itself had 26 bullet holes in her, but was in flying shape.

Spitting mad, some of the crew refused to leave. But at last, with 29 passengers and a crew of 10, the ship took off. Past Midway and the flaming marine barracks, it flew the 2,004 miles to Hawaii. Immediately Hamilton and his crew volunteered to take off again, to fly anywhere, bring anyone back to Hawaii.

At Wake the Jap planes had flown away southward and it was time for the major to take reckoning. Twenty-five marines had been killed and seven wounded, including Maj. Paul A. Putnam, commander of Wake's tiny Air Force. Eight of the twelve fighting planes that had been flown in from a carrier only a few days before had been caught on the ground. Seven were destroyed, another badly damaged. When the other 4 came in from patrol and landed, 1 struck debris and bent its propeller.

Four small fighting planes against all the planes and warships Japan could send.

For the rest, the marines had only pistols and rifles, six 5-inch Navy guns, 12 anti-aircraft guns, 18 machine guns of .50 caliber and 30 smaller ones. Altogether, not much more than the fire-power of a single destroyer.

The 10 miles of beach made it probable that the Japanese would try to land at several points simultaneously. To use his machine-gun crossfire most effectively, the major would have to split his little force, and he and his men would have to go out to meet the Japs without cover, against all the firepower of their warships and planes.

On the credit side of the ledger stood 400 marines, fighting mad.

Next day, at noon, 27 bombers came over to concentrate on the Wake hospital, where they knew the wounded would be. One of their planes was shot down. On the third day 27 again came over.

But the next day, December 11—when Tokyo announced a landing on Wake—was the little major's day. Putnam's planes reported 12 enemy ships were coming up over the horizon. There was a transport, a supply ship, several gunboats and destroyers, and a cruiser. This made DEVEREUX feel better. As a young officer he had been a coast artilleryman; his gun crews were handpicked.

DEVEREUX's biggest guns were 5-inch, while even a light cruiser would have 6-inch, perhaps 8-inch guns. Says a marine officer, once DEVEREUX's superior when they were together in China, "What Jimmy did was to play doggo. I can just see that little man with his binocs trained on that cruiser, praying: 'O, Lord, please give me a crack at her.'"

He ordered the gun captains to hold their fire until he gave the word. The fleet drew closer. Its biggest guns opened fire. Getting no answer, the cruiser drove down on the atoll with all her guns firing. Destroyers and gunboats also opened up as they came within range. The marines were getting the smell of exploding TNT; flying sand and debris showered over them, and the air was filled with the roar of Japanese planes. All of Putnam's planes—four—were in the air. "They made a total of 10 attacks," he said in his report. "Though greatly overloaded they performed splendidly. We claim the sinking of one ship and serious damage to another." Also, they brought down two bombers.

Meanwhile, DEVEREUX was still waiting. And still the cruiser came on.

"Ten thousand yards." • • • "Eight thousand." • • • "Six thousand."

Still our quiet little major held his fire, knowing that his men, straining to fight back, were growling, "What the hell's he waiting for."

Not until the cruiser stood at 4,700 yards and the enemy destroyers and gunboats were still closer did he give the word, "Fire."

Then the sweating and begrimed gun crews worked hard and fast. The 5-inch projectiles weigh 50 pounds. A smart crew fires 4 or 5 of these a minute, and up to 30 a minute of the 15-pound 3-inch shells. They converged their fire on that cruiser, and they sank her, a blazing wreck. Then they turned their guns on the other ships. Yes, they sank the Jap cruiser. And, two destroyers. And one gunboat.

Far from landing troops on Wake, as the Tokyo radio was announcing, what was left of the Japanese fleet made off. And the marines suffered not a single casualty. Honolulu reported that when DEVEREUX was asked by radio if he wanted anything, his reply was, "Send us more Japs."

But again it was time for him to take stock.

The enemy now knew he had 5-inch guns and where they were. They wouldn't risk his gunnery again, or Putnam's planes, without first working over the place with their bombers. They would try to pulverize every vital foot of Wake. And unless DEVEREUX used his guns, which were devouring precious ammunition, they would swoop progressively lower and machinegun more accurately.

The next day, December 12, 27 bombers rained explosives from 22,000 feet on Wake. On the 14th they concentrated 32 on the remnants of the airdrome. Though they lost 1 plane, they shot down 1 of ours and destroyed another on the ground, leaving 2. On the 15th day they sent 31 bombers and lost 3. Next day, 41 bombers concentrated all they had on the field guns and headquarters. On the 17th they sent 32 planes to fly very low and finish the job. They lost one.

Now it was their turn to take reckoning. On the 18th a single reconnaissance plane flew over to take photographs. Whatever these showed, they would not show why the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

American planes when shot down soon came up again.

Trained by service in remote places where parts are not available, marine ground crews know how to make much from little. Here at Wake, their shop ruined, tools scattered, 1st Lt. John Franklin Kinney, T. Sgt. W. J. Hamilton, and their men performed miracles to keep planes in the air.

"Parts and assemblies have been traded back and forth until no airplane can be identified," Major Putnam reported. "Engines have been switched, planes have been junked, stripped, rebuilt, all but created." At one time, his hastily penciled notes of the 20th say, "Only one serviceable plane was left. But the mechanics created another."

DEVEREUX knew he could not hold out much longer. The Navy knew it, too. On the night of December 19, a lone American flying boat settled on the lagoon. It had risked coming to bring out Maj. Walter L. J. Bayler, an air officer who had built the airdrome and who carried in his pocket Major Putnam's hurriedly written but invaluable report on air operations. He was the last officer who served with DEVEREUX and Putnam and escaped. The plane brought out the casualty list to the 20th. Among other mail it brought out a letter from DEVEREUX to his wife, who was in New York with their 8-year-old son.

It brought also such letters as this from Lt. Comdr. Elmer B. Greey to his wife in New Jersey: "Too much praise cannot be given to the Marines. Heroes have been made hourly here, and many will go unsung. But the Stars and Stripes are still at the top of the mast."

The men on Wake saw the big flying boat leave. They stayed. They weren't through yet. On the 22d the Stars and Stripes still flew and they still had their two planes, though one was barely able to stay up. That day a second lieutenant and a captain took them up against 60 Jap planes. The captain was shot down, wounded. The lieutenant did not return.

On December 23 the Navy reported: "Wake Island sustained another strong air attack on the 22d. An enemy force effected a landing on Wake the morning of the 23d."

On December 24 it reported: "Radio communication with Wake has been severed. Two enemy destroyers were lost in the final landing operations."

The curtain drops. Behind it, save for fragmentary reports from prisoners over the Japanese radio, there is only silence. As this is written, no one but the Japanese knows the fate of Major DEVEREUX. The Navy, as of February 20, "presumes" that he is a prisoner.

In his citation of Majors DEVEREUX and Putnam and their men, President Roosevelt wrote: "The courageous conduct of the men who defended Wake Island against overwhelming enemy forces from December 8 to December 22, 1941, has been noted with admiration by their fellow countrymen and the civilized world. It will not be forgotten as long as gallantry and heroism are respected."

The Monahans Sandhills of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a portion of an address delivered by J. Conrad Dunagan, of Monahans, Tex., president of the Monahans Sandhills Park Association, before the Fort Stockton, Tex., Historical Society.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY J. CONRAD DUNAGAN, PRESIDENT, MONAHANS SANDHILLS PARK ASSOCIATION, MARCH 21, 1958

Mr. Chairman, members of the Fort Stockton Historical Society, guests, you probably realize that the Monahans Sandhills State Park and Museum are close to my heart, and you probably know that I'm going to have to watch my time to keep from getting carried away with enthusiasm for this development and speaking too long.

Because I might get carried away and forget to say it, I want to say a couple of things about Fort Stockton before I begin on the Monahans Sandhills.

One thing which I admire about your community and your people is the evidence of intellectual and cultural maturity of which your very organization—the historical society—is a most prominent example. I've heard of few communities in our part of the country which have developed an organization such as you have here. It seems to me a sign of civic maturity.

In many of our west Texas communities, there is historical material which could be preserved and kept for the instruction of future generations, but I'm sorry to say that much of this material is gradually being lost. Perhaps the most perishable are the memories of the old timers. Unless their recollections are written down, it will be all too soon that they are lost forever. There must be thousands of fading photographs and letters—and papers—lying forgotten in back-room closets which could be preserved to give those who come after us a true picture of many aspects of life in this part of the world in pioneer days. I commend you for the work which your organization is doing along these lines.

Another thing upon which I would like to compliment you people of Fort Stockton is your awareness of the economic value of the tourist industry. The company to which I devote most of my time has the privilege of serving some 15 west Texas counties with soft drinks and I don't think there is a single community which has shown as much appreciation for the value of the visitors and a willingness to do something to interest them, as has Fort Stockton. The consrtuction of your tourist center, the decisive action which you took in preserving the Comanche Springs swimming pool, are among the visible manifestations of this spirit of appreciation for the visitor.

I hope that other nearby communities will follow your lead in developing facilities to attract the tourist. It is an obvious fact that tourists seldom come to a popular area to visit just one attraction—they like to visit an area which has many attractions. Look at southern California for example—or northern New Mexico—and Colorado. Each of our west Texas communities has some particular feature which can be developed into an interesting and different type of recreational facility. You have more than most: Old Fort Stockton, Comanche Springs, Rooney Park, the Riggs Museum, and, no doubt, others. McCamey has the Mendoza Trails Museum, Castle Gap, and the King Mountain. Alpine has the Big Bend Memorial Museum; near Fort Davis is the Davis Mountains State Park; there is Balmorhea State Park and Big Bend National Park. Odessa has a potentially great attraction in the Meteor Crater, a few miles west of town; right here between Pecos County and Crane County lies the famous Horsehead Crossing; and Monahans has the Sandhills.

Friendly rivalry between these communities in our area to see which can develop the most attractive points of interest can do nothing but good for all of our communities. The more that each community in this area helps itself, the more the entire group is helped to capture a share of this neglected gold mine of tourist dollars.

But, of course, we develop these facilities for more reasons than simply to gather in a harvest of tourist dollars. We develop them so that our own local and area citizens can enjoy and appreciate what nature—and man—have provided for us in this part of the world.

However, oftentimes it takes somebody from outside our own area to point out to us what we have that is unusual or interesting. I must admit that such was the case with me. Several years ago a banker friend of ours who is a vice president of the California Bank in Los Angeles, stopped at our house one Friday afternoon on his way to a banker's meeting in Dallas. We knew that the banker's convention didn't start until Sunday and we asked if he were going down early. "No," he said, "I've read and heard of Old Fort Stockton, and I just want to go down there and look at what remains of it. I've been fascinated by its history." He then asked me what sort of shape the fort was in, and I was ashamed to say that I had just never had the curiosity to go and see for myself.

The Monahans Sandhills was no exception. The first time I heard a man say he was going to take his family out and spend a day in the sandhills, I thought he was "nuts." I'd spent my boyhood in a part of that same strip of sand which extends northward for about a hundred miles into Gaines County. As a kid I rode horses through a lot of sand—helping on roundups and herding goats, in the days before we had any goat-proof fences. Sandhills meant nothing to me except just a stubborn obstacle to locomotion. I'd helped push our old Model "T" out of many a sandbed. The idea that anyone would deliberately choose to go spend a day in the sandhills just didn't make sense to me.

I was living in Midland in about 1931, when that "foolish man" proposed to hike through the sand, and with a year or so Kitty and I married and moved to Monahans, and I went out to the sandhills with a group of Boy Scouts. I began to realize certain recreational aspects of the sandhills. A couple of years later, my wife, Kitty, and I went back to the University of Texas and I chose the sandhills as a subject for a paper which I wrote in an English competition class.

However, it was not until more than 12 years later that we realized what we had in the sandhills. It came about in this way. Kitty had a program for the Wednesday Study Club. Her assignment was to speak on some local area subject. Another member of her club, Mrs. E. W. Sampson, while browsing through the Cokesbury Book Store in Dallas, had noticed a book which had a chapter in it on the Monahans sandhills. The book was Adventure With a Texas Naturalist, by Dr. Roy Bedichek, of the University of Texas. Kitty read the book and was quite enthusiastic about it, especially the part about the Monahans sandhills. I read it and became very enthusiastic, too. I want to read you 1 or 2 paragraphs from this book on the Sandhills:

"I found myself in the midst of a miniature forest of oak and mesquite. Each dune is crowned by an oak tree, 10 to 24 inches tall, loaded with acorns. Interspersed among the oaks and towering above them is scrub mesquite, heavy with clusters of long, yellowish beans hanging nearly to the ground.

"I venture the statement, without research, that in no other forested section, the Amazon Valley not excepted, is there to be

found a higher proportion of fruit to wood than in this Lilliputian jungle in the northern portion of Ward County. Vegetatively considered, it is as much a natural curiosity as the Painted Desert or the wonder areas of Yellowstone. This hummocky expanse of stunted growths, or an ample sample of it, should be reserved and protected as a State or national park.

"Dr. B. C. Tharp informs me that the little oak (Quercus havardii) is confined to the sandy south plains of Texas and of eastern New Mexico. Rarely reaching to a height of 30 inches, its slender stems arise from a thick rootstock buried 4 to 8 inches below the surface. It bears a fat acorn nearly an inch long and more than half an inch thick. Thus the old proverb, 'Great oaks from little acorns grow,' is reversed in this topsy-turvy land where only miniature oaks from giant acorns grow."

Dr. Bedicheck's words sounded wonderful and gave us an appreciation of a phase of the sandhills which we had not had before. However, we were at that time having postwar growing pains in our business and in our preoccupation with the daily details, it never occurred to us that probably nobody would ever develop the sand hills into a park unless we did it.

The years wore on, and finally, in 1951, we had occasion to visit in Washington, D. C., and through our Congressman, Ken Regan, we set up an appointment with the National Park Service. The national park people were very cooperative, but when they found that practically all the land in our area was under lease for oil and gas, they advised us to go to the State park route, because national parks must own their minerals and, obviously, the lands upon which the park could be developed were too valuable to acquire for park purposes, if the minerals were included.

Thereafter, we did get in touch with the Texas State Parks Board and they requested the National Park Service to make a survey to determine the feasibility of establishing a park in the area. This was done and I want to read to you a couple of excerpts from the National Park Service report:

"Investigation of the recreation resources of west Texas indicates that the Odessa-Monahans-Pecos area lacks adequate park facilities.

"The Monahans Sands is attractive in terrain, plant life, and archeological and historical significance, and is located so as to provide a useful and centrally located State park for this area.

"The local communities are interested in establishing a park in this part of the State and probably will be willing to acquire a site and present it to the State."

I will not try to tell you the story of how we worked and tried for years before we made our dream come true. Any of you who have spearheaded a drive to create something new and different for your community, knows of the many obstacles which prevent themselves and which must be overcome, one by one, before you can realize the goal. Some of the things which we had to overcome were:

1. The oil company lessee didn't want us to put the park on their lease; they were uneasy at the prospects of visitors, especially children, who might damage or be hurt by oil producing and drilling equipment.

2. The prominent rancher who had the grass lease was strongly opposed to giving up any ground and violently opposed having people in there who might chouse his cattle.

3. The owners of the land refused to sell.

4. The city had no way to acquire the land five miles from the city limits, and the county's park tax assessment had been raised to the maximum in the building of four community center buildings. Besides that, any funds which our county has are always divided into four parts (unless it's something like a courthouse, where you can't have one in each precinct), and usually each commissioner gets in the neighborhood of one-fourth of the total.

5. The land which was by all odds the most desirable for the park lay in two counties. Even if Ward County had the money, and the land was for sale, Ward County couldn't be expended for land in Winkler County. Winkler County was in no mood to put up money for a park which would benefit Monahans.

6. Ninety-five percent of the voters in our county had no conception of what the sand hills were like—they had been fenced off for years—and had little interest in the project.

7. We were going through a school scrap, where the board replaced the superintendent and the head football coach, and our town was divided into two bitter factions over this issue.

* * * * *

Perhaps you can understand that, with these things and other small troubles, it took us years to bring the park into reality. But we did finally make a dream come true and, after a long search we found a man to run our park and museum. A little later on in the program, Mr. Bob Larson is going to show you what we have.

Address by the Secretary of State on Minnesota's 100th Anniversary of Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on May 11, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] introduced the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, when he delivered an address, in Minneapolis, in commemoration of Minnesota's 100th anniversary of statehood.

I am happy to comply with the request of the Senator from Minnesota, by asking unanimous consent that the full text of the address by the Secretary of State be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of May 12, 1958]

WE LIVE IN A WORLD OF CHANGE

Governor Freeman, your royal highnesses, your excellencies, and citizens of Minnesota, I am delighted to share in this tribute to the people and State of Minnesota and to salute here the distinguished visitors who have traveled no little distance to join in the celebrations of your 100th anniversary.

I, myself have just returned this morning from Europe where I attended, at Copenhagen, a meeting of the foreign ministers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. That beautiful city of tradition and culture is a vivid reminder of the high ideals and vigorous endeavors by which Europe enriched our American heritage. From that city, I went on to Berlin.

Minnesota bears the imprint of Scandinavia. One finds here the Viking zest for adventure, industry, thriftiness, devotion to the rights of the individual and love of liberty.

One of the outstanding characteristics of the Scandinavian people has been that, on the one hand, they are stubborn when it comes to fundamental virtues and on the other hand they readily changed the political framework within which those virtues made themselves manifest.

For example, 3 of the 5 Scandinavian countries as we know them today assumed their present national independence only within this century—Norway (1905), Finland (1917) and Iceland (1944). But within a somewhat kaleidoscopic political scene, they have ever maintained spiritual and cultural solidarity.

That is the theme I would emphasize today. We live in a world of change. Indeed change is the law of life and vitality is often measured by change.

CHANGE MUST BE GOOD

That, however, does not mean everything changes. There are basic truths which are enduring and to which we must hold fast if change is to be orderly and conducive to good.

Sometimes rigidity and flexibility are posed as concepts that are mutually exclusive. Actually, they can go hand in hand. Enduring concepts of justice and right provide the dynamism that assures both the fact of change and the character of change.

The United States has sought to play worthily its part in a world where change is inevitable, and where change can be made benign if it reflects fundamental concepts as to the proper relation of man to God and of man to man.

Our Nation was founded by men of faith who were seeking not just to build a secure home for themselves but to conduct a great experiment in human liberty, the impact of which they hoped would be felt throughout the world. They were imbued with a sense of mission.

When our Nation was small, at its beginning, we conceived that our ability to change the world would be primarily through the influence of our conduct and example. We built here a society of extraordinary political, economic, and spiritual vigor. It did, indeed, attract attention all around the world and thus influenced the course of world events. We grew, because sharing was a central theme. We welcomed here those from other lands to partake equally the advantages and opportunities of the founders. The Original Thirteen States did not make of themselves a closed preserve. Their union was open to adherence by others and the original States on the Atlantic seaboard thus became 48 spanning a continent.

As our Nation has grown, the whole world has shrunk under the impact of new means and speeds of travel and communication. It is relatively much smaller now than was our continent 100 years ago. Under these changed conditions we continue to seek to propagate the enduring concepts of our founders.

WE CAN'T STAND ALONE

Our States here could not have survived in peaceful prosperity had each asserted total independence and rejected interdependence. Likewise, in the world today, nations cannot survive in peaceful prosperity if each emphasizes only independence and neglects interdependence.

Those Americans whose spirit faithfully reproduces the spirit of our past must seek to apply on a worldwide basis this principle of interdependence.

The United Nations represents such an effort. It exerts a great influence throughout the world. But we have to recognize that it fails to satisfy all of the needs of the world today. Its security council can be rendered impotent by the veto of any one

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of the five permanent members. Nine days ago the Soviet Union cast its 83d veto and thereby struck a grave blow to the good neighborliness and harmony which the charter prescribes.

The General Assembly of the U. N. exerts a great influence—makes recommendations; but it cannot act. Its influence is great with countries which have what our Declaration of Independence calls a decent respect for the opinions of mankind.

But it is otherwise with nations which lack such respect. Unhappily, the General Assembly resolutions with regard to Korea have been ignored to this day by the Soviet Union and by Communist China and its resolutions with respect to Hungary have been defied by the Soviet Union.

The United States does its best to help make the U. N. a strong, vigorous institution. But, for the reason I have indicated ,it has been necessary to supplement the United Nations by other security measures. These have taken the form, principally, of collective defense associations, which are specifically authorized by the United Nations Charter.

One of these collective security arrangements is established by the North Atlantic Treaty. The Foreign Ministers of the 15 NATO countries have just been meeting in Copenhagen. That meeting has provided a good demonstration of consultation and coordination without the sacrifices of independence.

FACTS ARE NEEDED

There are, of course, other such associations. There is the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, the Baghdad Pact, and the oldest of all, the Pan-American Union, now known as the Organization of American States.

By our participation in such regional and defensive groupings, the Nation supplements the United Nations where it is weak.

A further expression of the principle of interdependence is our mutual-security program—sometimes called foreign aid. We have been conducting this program in various forms now for 10 years since the first such major program—the Marshall plan—was adopted. That plan was designed to bring economic recovery to a Europe that had been dislocated and devastated by war.

The nations which originally benefited from the European recovery plan happily no longer need economic aid. Their economies flourish, and they have become important trade customers of the United States, contributing greatly to our own economic welfare. They have also contributed significantly to the collective military establishment of NATO. Our 1948 investment in Europe has paid off many times over.

Today our mutual-security programs serve primarily to provide military assistance, and in a few cases financial assistance, to equip and maintain armed forces needed to protect areas which are vitally important to the free world, including the United States.

To take an example, the cooperating countries have ground forces of about 5,600,000 men. But less than 1 million of these are Americans. Nearly 5 million are from other lands. They are to some extent equipped and otherwise helped out by our mutual-security program.

I can assure you it is far cheaper to get security that way than for the United States alone to raise and maintain the additional military forces that we would need if we stood alone.

We are providing a certain amount of economic assistance, principally in the form of loans—not gifts—to the less-developed countries, and particularly the newly independent countries. They are desperately eager to improve the lot of their people. They want to do this in freedom; but if they cannot find the way in freedom, they will be under strong compulsion to accept the assistance of the Soviet Union in building a materialistic totalitarian society.

RUSS OFFER AID, TOO

These Soviet offers are alluring on their face. But they are motivated—and conditioned—by a desire to subvert the genuine independence of the countries which accept them. That would be tragic for them, and for us. Our Nation wants and needs an environment of freedom. We dare not sit idly by to be more and more closely encircled by a hostile despotism which seeks to strangle us.

But even these collective measures cannot suffice to serve our ideals. The independence and prosperity of Nations must also be served and enriched by trading the products of their labors. In the modern world, trade is inevitably a part of the whole complex of a Nation's international relations, and indeed of its security.

In the United States we have given recognition and expression to this fact through our reciprocal trade agreements program. That program was originated 24 years ago and since then has been extended 10 times by Congress. It provides our farmers and our industrial workers with assured markets throughout the world. Since the program was inaugurated our foreign trade has expanded nearly tenfold.

The program is not just one of tariff reduction; it realistically takes account of the needs of some segments of our economy by providing restraints on foreign competition where protection is justified by the totality of our national interest.

Our reciprocal trade program not only contributes to the economic welfare of our Nation; it also contributes to our political and military security. To see this one need only recall the period of the early 1930's. We then sought relief from economic depression by raising our tariffs and devaluing our currency, without regard to the effect on others who were largely dependent on international trade.

What was the result? We did not get the relief we expected at home. But worse than that was the fact that our example was taken by others, notably Germany and Japan, as justification for policies of extreme nationalism, and of expansion, on the theory that economic livelihood was no longer attainable by normal methods of peaceful trade.

We cannot afford to risk today repetition of the disaster that followed that period. The renewal of the reciprocal trade agreements legislation is necessary both for our economic welfare and for our peace.

Now we are trying also to apply the principle of interdependence to the fields newly opened by science and exploration.

ATOMS FOR PEACE

Take the vast new area of physical power that is now made possible by the splitting of the atom—possibilities that are immeasurable. There we seek such international controls and safeguards as will assure atoms for peace, and, as President Eisenhower put it, "find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life.

"Take outer space—now for the first time becoming accessible to the devices of man, and soon to man himself. We seek that the new world beyond the limits of our earthly sphere shall be used only for peaceful purposes, and not for purposes of war.

The continent of Antarctica possesses natural posibilities which are now being intensively explored by the scientists of many countries cooperating in the Geophysical Year. We propose to establish in Antarctica an international regime which will prevent the monopolizing of any part of this new continent for the military purposes of any nation, but assure an open door for the peaceful pursuits of all mankind.

We see now arteries of travel opening up over north polar regions. We want to see established in that neighborhood an international system of inspection so that none need fear that these new polar routes will be traveled by bombers or by missiles unleashing surprise attack. We want only peaceful travel along these new paths, such as is developed by our Scandinavian friends to bring our nations closer.

In such ways as this, we seek to carry forward in this fore-shortened world the dynamic concepts of our founders. The spirit is the same—the spirit of the Viking, the spirit of the American frontiersman, constantly seeing new horizons, facing new challenges and responding to them.

These responses manifest our recognition of the fact that change is inevitable, that it is the law of life and that those who do not adapt themselves to change, who only oppose it blindly, not only lose the thrill of adventure and the joy of creation, but are themselves destroyed by change.

MEN HAVE RIGHTS

As we thus partake of change, we strive that change shall reflect certain values that are timeless and unchanging. We hold to the basic truths expressed by all the great religions that man is spiritual, having his origin and his destiny in God. We hold to certain political applications of these truths, proclaimed in the Magna-Carta, the Declaration of the Rights of Man, and our own Declaration of Independence.

We continue to believe men are indeed endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights including the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that just government derives its powers from the consent of the governed.

And we believe, as Abraham Lincoln said of our Declaration of Independence, that its principles mean "liberty not only to the people of this country but hope for the world for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weights should be lifted from the shoulders of all men."

These are principles that are challenged today by the adherents of materialistic atheism. In the face of that challenge we do not stubbornly stand still. We continue to pursue the path of change. But we do not change our principles. In that respect we are unchanging, steadfast and uncompromising. Only thus can we be true to the ideals brought to this nation from so many lands by God-fearing people, who consolidated here a new Nation, who began here a great new experiment, and who bring a new and dynamic approach to the problems of an ever-changing world.

Lake Texoma Represents Sound Investment of Federal Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Lake Texoma, located in Texas and our neighboring State of Oklahoma, is the largest body of water between the Great Lakes and the Gulf of Mexico.

This great lake was created when Denison Dam was built across the Red River, during World War II, as a flood-control project. It is a project of the

type included in the rivers and harbors bill recently passed by Congress and recently vetoed by the President.

Mr. President, a comprehensive story on Lake Texoma was published in the March issue of the magazine Popular Boating. This story gives an excellent account of the recreational features of this tremendously attractive playground. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Lake Texoma has to be big because it's in Texas. It has to be wonderful because it's in Oklahoma, too.

With more than 1,200 miles of irregular shoreline, Texoma is the largest body of water between the Great Lakes and the Gulf of Mexico. Otherwise known as the Denison Reservoir, and administered by the United States Army Corps of Engineers, Lake Texoma embraces many still-primitive areas with small tributaries and places that bear Indian names like Tishomingo and Washita. Texoma fans, however, boast with good reason that their lake provides some of the most modern boating facilities in the world.

This great lake is described in a local brochure as a huge-sprawling body of water that is sometimes as blue as a summer sky, and again as green as the eyes of a tawny, red-haired beauty." It has more visitors, annually, than almost any other national attraction, including the Yellowstone National Park and the Washington Monument.

Over 7,000 boats, ranging from skiffs to $100,000 cabin cruisers, are permanently berthed on the lake. Sometimes that many more are trailered in for weekend boat rides or fishing trips. There's plenty of room for all these craft, for the lake covers an area of 223 square miles. It was created when the Denison Dam was built across the Red River during World War II as a flood control measure. Its impounded flood waters are used to generate electricity for several hundred square miles of Texas and Oklahoma.

Texoma lies 65 percent in Oklahoma, 35 percent in Texas. A network of fine, paved highways makes it easily accessible to the several million people who live within a radius of 200 miles. It is estimated that more than 8 million persons visited the lake in 1957, compared with 4,079,000 registered in 1950. At least 10 million is the estimate for 1958.

Residents claim Texoma's tourist accomomations rival those in Florida and California. This is particularly true on the Oklahoma side, where the State planning and resources board has developed park facilities. At one of the most beautiful locations on the lake the board has erected the Lake Texoma Lodge, offering 300 air-conditioned rooms with ultramodern decor. Scores of modern cabins with kitchen facilities are also available.

Many other privately financed lodges around the lake provide ample accomodations for summer or winter visitors. And hundreds of privately owned cottages are found around the lake.

The Lake Texoma Association, an organization made up of residents and businessmen on both States, has its offices at the Denison, Tex., Chamber of Commerce. Charle Bowlby, Jr., of Durant, Okla., manager of the Willow Springs Lodge, is secretary of the organization. "Through this association," he reports, "we are able to get the fullest cooperation of people of both States. We are continually seeking to better our facilities, to promote safety and health measures. Because of the immense size of the lake, we must be a cohesive organization so that we can be most effective."

This group carries on an active publicity campaign, distributing thousands of pieces of literature each year, and takes a lead in promoting such water events as boat races, ski contests, and fishing rodeos.

Also active in lake promotion, and source of information for boaters, are the chambers of commerce in Denison, Gainesville, and Sherman, Tex., and Durant, Madill, and Ardmore, Okla.

Lake Texoma has been famous for its bass and crappie fishing since it was first built. It is kept well stocked and regulated by both the Texas Game and Fish Commission and the Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation. In the beginning, most of the boats on the lake were strictly fishing craft. Because of the immense size of the lake, safety prescribed larger boats and motors. With the appearance of bigger, faster boats, pleasure cruising has become prevalent. This type of boating, however, is generally confined to the large water. Coves are still reserved for fishermen.

A more picturesque spot for such a lake would be hard to find. The Red River, a part of the boundary between Texas and Oklahoma, has played its part in history. Fifty years ago, when Oklahoma was known as the Indian Territory, both Indians and whites found the fertile Red River Valley an ideal place in which to build their homes. Gainesville, just a few miles south of the river, became one of the important trading centers of north Texas and the southern part of the Indian Territory.

Indian names still are prevalent. For example, the Tishomingo River flows into the Washita, which becomes one of the important branches of Lake Texoma. Pioneer memories are also reflected in the names that dot maps of the area: Widow Moore Creek, Platter Flats, Butcher Pen Creek, Ignorant Hill School, and Prison Point are among them.

On the Texas side of the lake are the Big and Little Mineral Arms, the Eisenhower State Park, the Perrin Air Force Base, Island View and numerous creeks with names like Rock and Sandy.

Lake Texoma actually begins a short distance after the Red River passes under the bridge on Highway U. S. 77, connecting Gainesville and Ardmore. In this upper reach is found some of the best sand bass fishing and duck shooting in the whole lake area. Here the Red River becomes Delaware Bend and begins to spread out into Hickory Creek, reaching almost to Lake Murray, south of Ardmore.

The lake continues to widen as it floods over flats and covers the south bank of the Red River, the historic boundary line between the two States of Texas and Oklahoma.

Proximity to large centers of population like Dallas, Fort Worth, Tulsa, and Oklahoma City has had much to do with the intensive growth of recreational facilities on the lake. Dallas and Fort Worth are just 90 minutes away, over multilane highways, with Oklahoma City only a little more than 2 hours away.

There is probably no lake in the country that can compete with Texoma for varied entertainment. The increase in water ski activities is putting it on a par with top skiing waters of the Nation; launching ramps and parking areas around the lake have made is easier for boatowners to launch their rigs at any place they wish. Use of most of these ramps is free. In some, free gasoline has even been offered to attract customers.

Spacious sandy beaches have made Texoma a favorite spot for bathing beauty contests. And many industries of the Fort Worth-Dallas area maintain employee cabins around the lake. Some stage their own boat races and other special activities.

Prices around Lake Texoma have been held at a reasonable level. True, there are $50 per day suits available, but plenty of accommodations well within the range of the average fisherman can also be found. Numerous trailer courts make the lake an ideal place for the tourist who brings his home along, or likes to camp out. Public restrooms and shower stalls have been placed at frequent intervals around the lake.

There is fun available for every member of the family at Lake Texoma. Enclosed fishing barges, air conditioned in summer and heated in winter, make for comfortable year-around fishing. Playgrounds provide rides for the youngsters; dance halls liven things up for the young at heart. And just plain fishing is there for everyone.

Although fishing guides are not necessary on the lake, there are a few experts like Max Eggleston on the Texas side, and Tag Anderson in Oklahoma. They take parties out to where the big old lunkers hide, or where the sand bass are known to be running.

Sand bass have made Texoma famous for its fishing. They hit almost any day. Introduced into the lake by both the Texas and Oklahoma departments, they have increased so rapidly there is no catch limit on the Oklahoma side. Texas allows 25 per day, but since most area fishermen have licenses for both States, it would be rather hard to get a conviction for catching over the limit in Texas. A license, either resident or nonresident, costs $2.25 per year in Texas. The resident annual license in Oklahoma is $5. The State has a 10-day nonresident license for $2.25.

Lake Texoma also abounds in catfish and bream for the benefit of trotline and pole fishermen. Trolling is one of the more popular fishing methods, and these boatmen set out in fast craft to find where the gulls are feeding on shad. They know sand bass have sent the shad to the top. They troll with such rigs as deep-diving Bomber and Helldiver lures, and come away with tremendous strings of sand bass, plus some very large black bass as well.

There are rough fish, too, and carp fishermen have plenty of fun with dough bait. Skin divers can take carp, buffalo, and gar with gigs or bows and arrows; this will be a new sport on Texoma this year.

The lake has contributed heavily to the economy of the area. The Yellow Jacket Boat Co., at Denison; Texas Boat Co., at Lewisville, and Lone Star and Sports Kraft at Grand Prairie have found ready markets at Lake Texoma. There is the Bomber Bait Co., at Gainesville, and the Whopperstopper at Sherman, all pulling their business from Texoma.

Other boat manufacturers, repair shops, trailer manufacturers, and accessory makers also furnish employment to hundreds of persons as a direct result of the proximity of the lake.

The Denison Reservoir area and its 195,326 acres of federally owned land are officially administered by the Corps of Engineers. They are responsible for the administration, development, and maintenance of both the land and the lake, including facilities for boating, fishing, and camping. The engineers also issue boat permits, supervise public concessions, and issue leases for commercial and homesite development.

Constant records of the number and kind of visitors show that most boatmen come between April and October, but the area is used extensively throughout the entire year.

There are some 500 large inboard cruisers on the lake. More than 1,500 rental boats and motors are available at the different concessions. The large party boat, *Idle Time*, which once operated in the Ozark lakes, was moved down the Mississippi and up the Red River to Denison Dam. It was then hoisted over the dam with winches, to provide for festive excursions on the lake.

But a big boat is not required for fun. With so many facilities, there appears to be room on Texoma for many more visiting boatmen for many more years to come.

L. A. WILKE.

Address by Postmaster General Summerfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address delivered in Arlington, Va., by the distinguished Postmaster General, the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD, ARLINGTON, VA., MAY 11, 1958

It is with a deep feeling of humility that I accept this award from the American War Mothers on behalf of the 530,000 men and women of the United States Postal Service.

To receive this award here in this hallowed national shrine—with its concentration of memories of unselfish heroism and its reflections on the glorious past, lends an especial dignity to this occasion.

And, of course, there is the mystical, and often heart-breaking role that you, the dedicated mothers of heroic sons and daughters, have played in the preservation of all that we hold sacred, which gives any award you might bestow a significance beyond the scope of words to describe.

As your Postmaster General it gives me a sense of great accomplishment today to know that you have seen fit to honor the postal establishment—in the language of the award—"for the manner in which it has carried words from home to soldiers, sailors, marines, and aviators the world over."

The most satisfying of the services which the Post Office Department renders is the transmittal of messages and packages from home to our American boys and girls who are serving in the defense of our liberties in every corner of the free world.

To satisfactorily met this fundamental human need in times of peace or of war, the Department of Defense and the Post Office Department exercise a standing agreement which assures daily continuous liaison on the countless details pertaining to the regular and certain exchange of the mails between military personnel and their families and friends.

There is an extraordinary significance to this occasion, for the freedom which your sons and daughters are defending is especially symbolized and typified by the postal service which we are inclined so often to take for granted.

The postal service—that unique system of efficient, uncensored and intimate communication which you have honored today—is not only essential to human liberty, it is capable of existence only where liberty is a very special thing, something deep in the blood of men, imbedded in the soil, immovable as mountains.

Over half the world's surface, in those darkened areas behind the Iron and the Bamboo Curtains, a postal system such as ours is not only impossible, it is anathema. In those unhappy lands, opinion must be smuggled out of the brain like contraband. Communication between men is more circumscribed than it was in the darkest Middle Ages.

The crisis we Americans face today is second to none in our history. It takes its place with Valley Forge and Saratoga, with Gettysburg and Manassas, with the Argonne and with Midway and Normandy Beach, and with all the other periods of grave national peril.

Across half the world a materialistic, godless antagonist lies crouching, prepared to spring at the least sign of weakness on our part. The philosophy which motivates the leaders of our opposition is founded on a repudiation of the Divine purpose—a denial that man, created in the image of his Maker, should everywhere be free in spirit and free in person.

We have survived every other peril that has threatened to engulf us and I am certain that we shall survive the danger that we now face.

I believe too fervently in the tough and sturdy qualities of our people, to think otherwise.

I could never entertain doubts about the spiritual strength that flows from the courage, the eager competitive genius, the proud self-reliance, the instinctive confidence which characterize this generation of Americans just as much as they characterized those generations which preceded us.

I could never waver in my conviction that the deep religious faith, which is accountable for our political system and for the concepts immortalized by our Founding Fathers, would ever be defeated by the materialistic tyranny of Marxism.

But we must never allow this quiet confidence to degenerate into complacency. We enjoy no Divine exemption from the lessons of history. We must never be seduced into thinking that, just because we are right in our belief in God and the dignity of man, that we are therefore immune to the foul contagion of materialism which surrounds us.

We must constantly be on the alert that collectivistic socializing influences, which for years have been at large in our great country, shall never gain complete ascendency and destroy the individualistic virtues which are our principal strength.

We must constantly resist any monopoly of power by any economic groups—whether it be the leaders of labor or the leaders of industry—so that the rights of others can be disregarded or abused.

We must forever be on guard against the constant and growing tendency to make of our elective system a catspaw of the lowest common denominator of human character.

This is an obligation we owe to the millions of our youth who died before their time so that we could inherit the fruits of their generosity—life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness.

Your sons and daughters have been most generous.

We must always strive to be worthy of their generosity; to be worthy of the liberty we have received from their hands.

We must be willing to sacrifice—of ourselves and of our substance—in order to preserve our way of life.

The cost of keeping ahead of our antagonist is enormous. We pay the cost in taxes; we pay the cost in the disruption of the careers of our young men and women. Thankfully, because of the leadership of a great President, we are no longer paying the cost in human lives.

The monetary cost of preparedness has amounted to $200 billion during the last 5 years. In a time of total peace those $200 billion would have bought highways and hospitals and schools and hydroelectric dams sufficient to supply our needs for many years to come. Those $200 billion would have performed miracles in the alleviation of human suffering, the relief of human misery, but they had to be diverted for the cause of survival.

The price has been enormous—but whatever it is, whatever it may be in the future—we can afford it—because any alternative is so much worse. A free America will always be willing and able to afford the cost of survival.

I know you are aware of these things. As American War Mothers you have contributed much and you are still making a notable contribution to the perpetuation of peace.

As mothers of our human bulwarks against enslavement, you provide a source of spiritual strength which no evil can subdue.

You know full well, from the rich but sometimes bitter experience of your own lives, that freedom is not something that can be won or lost in a day—it is not bought in the market place or rented for a weekend. It is something that must be owned outright by those who have fought to preserve it and who have earned the right to pass it on to their children.

There are trials yet to come. There will be strategems against our safety and our future.

But if we as a Nation show the same talent for sacrifice, the same willingness to stand our ground against a malignant fate as you have shown, then we shall remain free and powerful, a benign influence in a world no longer troubled by incipient hostilities.

With you help and your inspiration we shall together accomplish this.

May God Almighty bless your efforts and grant them success.

Thank you very much.

Tribute To Former President Woodrow Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on May 5, 1958, Mrs. J. Allen Frear, Jr., the accomplished wife of the able and distinguished junior Senator from Delaware, made an eloquent address at the wreath-laying ceremonies at the tomb of Woodrow Wilson, in the Washington Cathedral. This address merits the attention of all who revere the memory of Woodrow Wilson. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Frear's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT WOODROW WILSON AT THE NATIONAL CATHEDRAL, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 5, 1958, DELIVERED BY MRS. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR., PRESIDENT, WOMAN'S NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB

SANCTUARY

I like to go into a place
When only God is there,
And bending low upon my knees
I bow my head in prayer.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

No doubt or fear can touch me there
My spirit is at rest,
For I am in my Father's house
A loved and sheltered guest.

And when I must go forth again
Where men indifferent plod,
I am the better for the time
That I have spent with God.

Thirty-four years ago the voice of a great Democrat, and a greater American, was stilled. Few men have left a more honorable estate than did this man, or so great a multitude of beneficiaries. For his heirs number all the peoples of the earth; and their inheritance—although it cannot be measured in dollars or cents, or in worldly goods—was magnificent.

The legacy that Woodrow Wilson left behind was an ideal, an ideal of peace and a kinship of nations; a kinship that asks no nation to abandon its right to individual action or opinion, but only that all nations abandon the age-old premise that might makes right.

As in all the course of human events, here was a prophet less honored among his own, than those standing enough distant to gain a truer perspective. The years—and the lessons they have taught—have gradually begun to bring the never-finished canvas of history into clearer focus, so that the brush strokes of its greatest artists can be better appreciated.

The patterns of the canvas of this 20th century, and its creators such as Woodrow Wilson, as viewed today, are more sharply defined, or at least we are more aware of them than in the past. Perhaps it is because so much history has been crowding onto the canvas that its impact has become inescapable. Perhaps it is because the old kaleidoscope of colors on the mixing palette has given away to a single color—to the scarlet of two world wars and of many smaller, but no less menacing conflicts, convulsing the outposts of nationalism, and to the scarlet of th flames encompassing the launching platforms of space-age rockets.

More and more, as I think of Woodrow Wilson, I associate him with a second man—a second advocate of American neutrality as a stabilizing force in a turbulent world, a second fighter in times of adversity. In many ways the scholarly, reserved Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the master politician and strategist, were spiritual brothers. Both strove to maintain American neutrality in the midst of chaos. Both found that the pen and the ploughshare were poor protection against the forces of evil. Both, in the end, must have felt that they were drinking of the bitter cup when they put pen to paper to declare that ploughshares must become weapons of war. For the one, the bitter cup was drunk at Eastertide. For the other, at the beginning of the Christmas season. For each, the entrance of the United States into the war was both an end and a beginning—the end of a dream, and the beginning of a new Christian crusade.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt lived long enough to know that the crusade would eventually succeed, that right would indeed conquer might. He died too early to learn that the world he left behind would yet know little of peace, and much of war. Woodrow Wilson, in a sense was less fortunate. True, he lived to see the end of one war. But he lived to drink of still another bitter cup, as angry debate in the Halls of Congress presaged the defeat of his hope that the United States would associate itself with the League of Nations—an ideal brought into reality through his own dedicated determination that the world must find peace, or else destroy itself. Wodrow Wilson must surely have felt that he had failed in all, when he did not succeed in persuading his own people to embrace an idea so readily accepted by nations more stricken than his own. He must have foreseen, too, that without the prestige of the United States, the League of Nations could not long endure.

Yet, who are we to say that Woodrow Wilson did not live to see his own country embrace his ideal of a world forum, or that he does not live to see that body—the United Nations—faltering, though it sometimes seems to be, yet struggling to become the guiding force for permanent peace.

And so, can we not have the faith, then to believe that the spirit of Woodrow Wilson is ever present in the assembly halls of the tall edifice on the river front of the world's greatest city—unseen, but speaking with a sure voice to his heirs—to the men and women of 67 nations—counseling with them to believe that might can never make right, that peace in their time can indeed by their heritage, a heritage which they, in turn, can pass on to those who come after.

As Longfellow has so well expressed:

"Lives of great men all remind us
We may make our lives sublime
And, departing leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time."

The Late Alvan T. Fuller, Former Governor of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Boston Herald of May 2 concerning the late Alvan T. Fuller, ex-Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. During his 80 years, Governor Fuller made many important contributions to the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and his service as Governor was exemplary. He contributed to the business success of the State, and was a noted philanthropist. I believe that this editorial well sums up the service of the late Alvan T. Fuller.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Herald of May 2, 1958]

ALVAN T. FULLER

"In his 4 years of service he has faced tasks which would have broken a man of less physical and intellectual stamina. He has borne his heaviest burdens in silence * * * with a full realization that he was performing thankless tasks for which his only reward would be the approval of his own conscience. No braver man has ever been Governor."

On January 2, 1929, when we wrote these words in the Herald, Alvan T. Fuller, an ex-Governor, faced the long and lonely walk down the steps of the statehouse into private life. Behind him lay four of the stormiest years in the history of the Commonwealth, years that demanded a Governor of extraordinary resolution. Ahead lay, presumably, the benign years of retirement.

But an individual like Alvan Fuller could never be satisfied with inactivity. Even in the dusk of his life span he was a force. The habit of service to the State and to the numerous charities that he sustained from an anonymous position was too ingrained. He sought the background yet he was still an impressive and vibrant part of the Massachusetts he cherished.

Governor Fuller's life was a success story; but it was also, more importantly, a symbol of Emerson's dictum that the only ultimate triumph is the triumph of ideals. Typical of the man was the fact that he never accepted a salary or allowance or expense in any public office he held. He kept faith in the ideals of business, which had brought him personal success, and applied those ideals to government.

Nowadays, it is rather fashionable to believe that business is incompatible with good government; that they are two different orders of administration. But rectitude is not exclusive to business; nor sound economy; nor loyalty; nor discipline; nor the refusal to dilute one's standards for the passing moment.

The Sacco-Vanzetti case was the most controversial incident of Governor Fuller's political career, and it was unparalleled for the bitterness and high feeling engendered, which ripples even today. The Governor acted in accordance with his conscience. The terrible pressures of that time did not sway his judgment; and he took the course compatible with his belief after dispassionately examining the evidence. He could not do otherwise.

The acrid debates that have swirled over Sacco-Vanzetti too often have obscured the courage of the Fuller position, the anguished humanity that went into its finality, and the very real achievements of his administration. That his was a distinguished term even his most outspoken foes acknowledge. The valedictory we wrote in 1929 withstands the test of time.

Alvan Fuller contributed to Massachusetts on many levels. As a businessman he showed acumen, nerve, and imagination. As a public figure he served selflessly. As a philanthropist he contributed generously and wisely. He was the prototype of the unselfish success; and his ultimate triumph was Emersonian and enduring.

Tenth Anniversary of the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which was published in one of New Hampshire's leading daily newspapers, the Concord Daily Monitor, on Saturday, April 26. This fine editorial, entitled "Israel's 10 Years," relates to the 10th anniversary of the State of Israel.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISRAEL'S 10 YEARS

A tiny new state entered the family of sovereign nations in the spring of 1948 in the midst of crashing turmoil and beleaguerement by hostile armies. Since that time Israel has had to fight for survival from the moment of its birth.

In spite of tremendous handicaps, Israel not only has survived through the decade just past, but it has steadily gained in economic and industrial strength, in its population and in its cultural and military resources. For centuries a cherished dream

has been a Jewish homeland. In a measure almost beyond belief, courage and resourcefulness have made this dream a reality.

Israel has had more than its share of travail. To build a refuge for immigrants, to maintain a firm economic status and to hold off antagonistic neighbors who would throttle the nation, if they could, has been a tremendous task.

A cardinal tenet of Israeli policy has been peaceful relations with its neighbors. The Israel Government has never stopped trying to negotiate a peace settlement with the Arab States because they know cooperation between them and the Arabs would be the best thing for everyone in the Middle East. But if their offers of amity continue to be repulsed, they will not give up what they have.

The conflict between the Arabs and Israel is of long standing. It started from the moment the United Nations endorsed an independent Israeli State in Palestine, together with a separate Arab State. The Arabs refused to accept the United Nations decree, and they set out to nullify it with arms before the Israelis could form the state allowed them by the United Nations partition plan. Arab armies spilled into Palestine from all directions in a frantic effort to drive the Israeli defenders into the sea.

That these and subsequent attacks have been repulsed is a tribute to the ability of Israel to hold its own against repeated raids across its boundary. There is still an armed truce facing Israel. There is still the haunting problem of what to do with Arab refugees.

Looking back, Israel can point to progress under great stress. Looking ahead, Israel can be hopeful that tensions will ease, that the economic situation will be even brighter and that it will be able to maintain its position as a stronghold of democracy in the Middle East.

The Bronx Has Everything

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, with equal justice the Bronx might be known as the "Borough of Universities" or the "Borough of Parks." Its schools and colleges, including Fordham, New York University, Manhattan, Mt. St. Vincent, New York State Maritime College, the Salvation Army College, and Hunter, are numerous and outstanding and more than one-fifth of its total area is devoted to its park system.

Jonas Bronck, who purchased a 500-acre estate in 1641, was the first settler. Neighbors spoke of visiting "the Broncks" and in time the name was applied to the whole region.

City Island, in Long Island Sound off the Bronx shore, is a leading pleasure boating center.

The story of the growth of the Bronx and its outlook for the future has been compiled by the Bronx Chamber of Commerce, which is set forth below:

THE BRONX HAS EVERYTHING

The Bronx is the borough of the future. Overcrowded, overburdened Manhattan has burst its seams. Industry is marching northward.

The population is well over the one and a half million mark (estimated to be 1,700,000). It is larger than the cities of Boston, Baltimore, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, or St. Louis. In 1900, the population was 200,507.

The borough has an area of 42.75 square miles or 27,365 acres. Its greater length is 8.1 miles and its greatest width is 9.2 miles. It is the only borough on the mainland. All of the water surrounding 3 sides of the Bronx is navigable, and there are 3 navigable streams in the borough: (1) Eastchester Creek or Hutchinson River, navigable through Pelham Bay Park to Mount Vernon; (2) Westchester Creek, navigable from East River to Tremont Avenue near Westchester Square; and (3) Bronx River, formerly navigable from the East River to West Farms, but under Commissioner Moses' highway improvement plans now navigable only to a turning basin at 172d Street.

A network of super highways ribbon through its boundaries—Major Deegan Expressway—the southern terminus of the New England Thruway into Bruckner Boulevard—Cross Bronx Expressway, and so forth.

The highest natural elevation in the Bronx is Riverdale Hill, 284.5 feet above sea level at 250th Street and Iselin Avenue. Even at the Concurse and 199th Street it is 148.64 feet. The Bronx, known as the Borough of Universities has 8 large colleges of which 3 have football teams; Fordham, New York University, and Manhattan. The other five are Hunter College, Mount St. Vincent, State University Maritime College, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, and the Salvation Army College. Other educational facilities include 9 public high schools, over 100 public schools, all kinds of parochial and private schools as well as excellent business schools.

The Bronx has the largest park area for a community of its size in any city of the United States, 5,755 acres—Pelham Bay Park—the city's largest—Van Cortlandt Park, Bronx Park, and a score of smaller ones. Bronx Zoo houses approximately 2,600 specimens in 252 acres.

The Bronx has 200 churches of every denomination and 99 theaters including 1 open air drive-in-theater.

A new 63-acre municipal hospital center has been constructed in the East Bronx. Units include Jacobi Hospital, Van Etten Hospital, and the new $1 million Einstein College of Medicine. Eight-million-dollar Misericordia Hospital is under construction in the North Bronx. There are 75 banks and banking institutions in the Bronx.

Industrial expansion has been strong these past 5 years. Hunts Point industrial development—iron, steelworking plants, gypsum and cement factories—known locally as Little Pittsburgh. Diverse manufacturing includes electrical equipment, rotary presses, printer's ink, machinery, hardware, paper products, furniture, foreign currency, postal and revenue stamps, securities, glassware, ceramics, upholstery, paints, varnishes, woodworking, boats and marine equipment. The Bronx is the plywood center for the lumber industry, and boasts of the largest haulage company east of the Mississippi. The postwar years have seen strong development of the plastics industry.

Huge residential areas cater locally to neighborhood needs, groceries, meats, dairy products, men's and women's apparel, cleaning and dyeing, drugs, confections, and automobile repairing. The borough does more than $500 million worth of retail trade annually.

The Bronx is served by 5 railroads, only 2 of which, however, carry passengers here. The city tax department lists 797 Bronx structures as factory buildings. There are 2,444 store buildings and 2,062 garages. Many of the latter have been converted to manufacturing use. Commercial type buildings in the Bronx includes 219 warehouses, 70 loft buildings, 71 office buildings, and 2,450 miscellaneous types. Although there are 8 cemeteries, only 2 of them, Woodlawn and St. Raymond's, are now in use. With its healthful climate, the Bronx doesn't need any more. Ours is the lowest death rate in the city of New York.

The Bronx lies in the heart of the most densely populated area in the United States. It is the natural geographic hub of the entire metropolitan area, adjacent to New Jersey, Westchester County, upper New York State, and New England, Queens, Brooklyn and Manhattan. It is the ideal depot for the manufacturer and distributor of national products.

Bronx Terminal Market, 151st and Exterior Streets, covering about 37 acres, is the most complete market in the metropolitan area. The location is ideal for the distribution of all types of food; delivery can be made to the entire New York area, Westchester, Long Island, and a good part of New Jersey, without passing through congested traffic. There are approximately 100 wholesale merchants; the cold storage warehouse has a 3.5 million cubic foot capacity; refrigerating plant has a capacity of approximately 1,000 tons, there are 3 miles of railroad tracks with a 300-car capacity.

The Bronx provides an excellent labor market. Its huge population consists mostly of wage earners. Its residents are small homeowners and apartment dwellings; 91 percent of the people pay rent. There are 22,294 one-family dwellings—20,775 two-family dwellings and 19,988 multi-family buildings. Apartment housebuilding has jumped—over 200 new apartment buildings in the last 5 years. Riverdale abounds in new luxury apartments. Throg's Neck, Baychester, Pelham Bay areas have had extensive single home development. Public housing—18 projects are in full operation with 20,972 families—cost $253,722,258; 10 new projects buildings—will house 9,579 families. Located in the west central part of the Bronx is the Fordham Road district, its largest and most important shopping area. Serving the consumer cross-section that shops here are department stores, many chain and independent specialty shops and variety stores. Developing earlier than Fordham Road as a shopping district, 149th Street and Third Avenue still serves much of the east Bronx. Most stores run a bargain operation and offer merchandise with feature plans for easy credit terms.

Parkchester, a huge, privately owned housing development, in the Unionport section of the Bronx (266 acres—40,000 persons—greatest single apartment community in the world), has a modern and complete shopping district. One of the first branches of any downtown department store opened here nearly a decade ago. The Parkchester shopping district has many of the features of the modern shopping center as well as those of a district.

The Mallory Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mallory Critics" from the Washington Evening Star of May 10.

The editorial points out some facts that should be brought to the attention of every Member of Congress in considering the legislation to modify the Supreme Court's ruling in the Mallory case.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 10, 1958]

MALLORY CRITICS

The decision of the Judicial Conference to indorse the Keating-Willis bill, which would modify the Supreme Court's Mallory ruling, ought to carry much weight with Congress. For it is especially significant that all of the judges who participated in the voting cast their ballots in favor of the pending legislation.

It is true that some of the judges abstained from voting. We do not know the precise division among these judges. But it certainly is true that some of them favor the modification while others oppose it.

The effect of the Mallory ruling is to invalidate voluntary confessions and any other evidence given by a suspect to police unless the former has been arraigned without unnecessary delay. This is the interpretation which the Supreme Court has put on rule 5 (a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

There are 2 things to remember. One is that the Court's decision purports to reflect the will of Congress in approving the rules. The other is that the Supreme Court Advisory Committee, which drafted the rules, expressly rejected a proposal to invalidate confessions obtained under circumstances comparable to those in the Mallory case. For years the courts here adhered to the view of the advisory committee.

The point of this is that Congress unquestionably has the right, if it sees fit, to modify the Mallory rule, and the modification proposed in the pending bill would not entail any drastic or revolutionary change in the law which had prevailed here for many, many years. Criminal suspects still would be protected against third-degree tactics and corced confessions. But if they voluntarily confess, then their confessions would not be thrown out merely because of some delay in arraignment.

We believe that adoption of the Keating-Willis bill, or something like it, is essential if there is to be reasonably adequate law enforcement in the Nation's Capital. It was difficult enough, prior to Mallory, to obtain convictions. Now, as a result of Mallory, this becomes virtually impossible in many types of crimes. And it is the public which suffers.

Representative McCormack's Remarks Commemorating the 10th Anniversary of the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege and a pleasure for me to take this opportunity to call to the attention of this body the very forceful and inspiring words spoken by one of our most able and distinguished colleagues, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts. These words were delivered in Baltimore on the occasion of our city's commemoration of the 10th anniversary of the founding of the state of Israel.

I am indeed honored, and I feel that the people of Baltimore were extremely fortunate, in that the gentleman from Massachusetts took time from his extremely busy schedule to join our celebration. This celebration was held in the Lyric Theater in Baltimore on April 24, 1958, and in attendance were more than 1,500 persons including the Governor of Maryland, the mayor of the city of Baltimore, other Members of this body, and other distinguished guests.

Because of the importance of this message, I include in the RECORD the principal address delivered by our distinguished and respected majority leader, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK:

Mr. Toastmaster, Reverend Clergy, Your Excellency Governor McKeldin, the distinguished visitors from Israel, my close friends and distinguished colleagues, Congressman SAMUEL FRIEDEL and Congressman GEORGE FALLON, distinguished and invited guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am very happy to be with you tonight as a result of the invitation extended by you to me through my valued friend, Congressman FRIEDEL. When I received the invitation from Congressman FRIEDEL, I was in Boston over the Easter holidays. My favorable response was immediate. I could not say "No" to my good friend, SAM FRIEDEL. There is no Member of Congress who enjoys the confidence and respect of his colleagues more than does Congressman FRIEDEL, and this also applies to Congressman FALLON. In paying my respects to one, I also pay my respects to the other, because they are both indivisible, as they are both outstanding Members of Congress and highly respected by Democratic and Republican Members thereof. The people of the districts represented by Congressman FRIEDEL and Congressman FALLON are justified in feeling proud of them.

Ten years ago there came into the council of the nations of the world a new nation, comprised of people of proud and ancient lineage, the new nation of Israel.

Established under the most trying circumstances, its people with the desire and will for independence and freedom, have made history during the past 10 years that is remarkable and outstanding.

The United States, through former President Truman, was one of the first countries to recognize the new nation—an act of great importance—giving early strength and dignity to the new nation, as well as hope and confidence to her people.

Instead of being treated with friendship by her neighbors, they have treated Israel and her people with hatred and with determination to destroy her.

While Israel has prospered and advanced during the past 10 years, the implacable hatred of her neighbors still exists.

As a result, Israel has a staggering military defense burden involving one-sixth (officially) to one-half (unofficially) of her national budget.

Prime Minister Ben-Gurion, one of the ablest statesmen and leaders of this trying period of history, has evidenced clearly the desire and willingness of Israel to negotiate peace in the Middle East, but to no avail due to the hatred of Israel that exists in her neighbors.

In addition, Israel has a chronic trade deficit and last year it was nearly $300 million.

As long as present conditions exist, it is imperative for Israel to be strong from a military angle.

It is therefore necessary for friends of Israel throughout the world to continue financial assistance in order that Israel might survive, and for her brave people to prosper.

On the governmental level our Government should manifest its friendship for Israel in concrete form.

It is in the national interest of our country to see that a friendly and independent Israel exists.

The people of Israel with their democratic government are dedicated to liberty and to the inherent rights of man. They stand for a government of law and not of men. They believe in the same fundamental ideals and principles of government as we of America do.

The form of government may be different, but the substance of government is the same.

There is no nation in the Middle East, and even further, there is no nation in the world, whose friendship we can rely upon more than we can that of Israel.

And in our dealings with other nations, by all means we should not forget or ignore our friends, and this applies with particular emphasis to brave Israel.

I make this statement because our present administration seems to be undergoing a change toward Nasser.

We hear of an intention to remove restrictions imposed on Egypt as a result of Nasser's nationalization of the Suez Canal in 1956, and in particular, to unfreeze Egyptian assets in the United States amounting to about $30 million.

There is also under consideration administrative action to furnish United States Army dredges to improve the Suez Canal—to deepen and enlarge the canal—and also to add the united Arab Republic to be eligible for United States economic grants and loans.

We are aware that the World Bank within the past few weeks has announced that it would help plan Egyptian expansion of the Suez Canal.

Under no conditions should any change toward Nasser be to the disadvantage of Israel.

These are times when he who is not with us is against us and one thing is certain, Israel has always been with us.

The cause of the unrest in the Middle East is mainly due to Nasser; to his intense ambitions and to his hatred of Israel and her people.

Any policy on our part should have a complete regard for the best interests of our friends throughout the world. And in the Middle East this should in particular apply to Israel.

Speaking as I am as an American to Americans, and seeing the relationship that exists between our country and Israel, and from the angle of the best interests of America, it is in our best interest to see that Israel retains her independence and that her people advance and prosper. For Israel is the one nation in the Middle East area upon whom we can depend. Her friendship for us is not superficial. It is real, significant and lasting.

And in the light of the intense interest of the Soviet Union in helping Nasser, and in cooperating with those who are bent on destroying Israel, our country might well announce, as it properly did in the case of Turkey, that an attack on Israel would be considered as an offensive act to us and contrary to our national interests. There are other steps that we can and should do, but such an announcement is of paramount importance and would have a most beneficial effect, not only in connection with Israel, but in connection with our entire interest in the Middle East area.

While the main cause of tensions in the Middle East is the dictatorial ambitions of Nasser and his hatred of Israel, the main

source of his strength is the military and economic assistance he receives from the Soviet Union.

In connection with this it must be borne in mind that Khrushchev, and those associated with him in the Communist Party, and those in the Soviet Union, are anti-Semites.

It is very apparent that Khrushchev is complete master of the Soviet Union. It is strange to read the erroneous impression conveyed to the Western World about changes that have recently taken place in the Communist Party and in the Soviet Government itself by the elevation of Khrushchev as both leader of the party, and Prime Minister of the Soviet Union.

While Khrushchev is the master at the present time, he is more the expression of an entire new team taking over than as yet the sole power. As he consolidates his control, he will then tend to become another Stalin. He may use different methods, but the end will be the same.

Let us take a look at the new team.

For example, the first deputy prime minister is one Kozlov. He is a strong Khrushchev man. He is anti-Semitic—bitterly so.

Another top team member is Poliansky. Under Khrushchev his rise has been rapid. He is also bitterly anti-Semitic.

I could mention others, but the interesting thing to note is that with Khrushchev the head of the party, and also the actual head of the state, he has selected as top officials of the Soviet Union men who are pronouncedly, or bitterly, anti-Semitic.

And this fact must be evaluated properly in connection with the Soviet policy in the middle east, and particularly in connection with Israel.

And this makes it all the more imperative that the United States should affirmatively and definitely state its position, serving notice that the national interest of the United States, and the national interest of Israel are consisent with each other, that any attempt to destroy Israel as a nation will be considered as an offensive act by the United States.

Let us view briefly the remarkable record made by Israel during the past 10 years. For example, its population has increased from 650,000 to 2 million souls. During this period 450 villages have been built, farming land has been more than doubled—industry has increased sevenfold. Under the leadership of Ben-Gurion, Israel and her people are looking forward to the future building of a network of farms, factories, and mines in the Negev Desert, reclaiming the desert for useful purposes. Little Israel looks forward to the development of its commerce.

Its defense consists of a highly trained army plus a ready reserve that includes almost every able-bodied man and woman, but this constitutes a great financial burden. It is absolutely necessary for little and brave Israel to maintain such defenses. Without the aid of the Soviet Union, the combined forces of the Arab nations, even if concentrated on little Israel, would be unable to bring about its destruction. For the people of Israel have the fight and they will fight if attacked.

Under the leadership of Ben-Gurion, every honorable effort has been made with her neighbors to bring about peace in the Middle East. All of these offers have been rejected. We read in the papers of Nasser's statement of the aggressive intent of Israel. The very facts show the hypocrisy of his statement about any aggressive intent on the part of Israel. For Israel is a nation of only 8,050 square miles, while the 7 Arab States have an area of 1,675,234 square miles. The population of the Arab States is 47,797,000, while the population of Israel is a little under 2 million. The exact population of Israel as of December 31, 1956 was 1,677,455. During the next 10 years with its broad immigration policy to help persecuted Jews throughout the world, and the normal increase of population under peaceful conditions, the population of Israel will not exceed 4 million persons.

The history of Israel and its progress during the past 10 years is one of the most remarkable in history.

While we honor and congratulate this brave little country and her people on their 10th anniversary, and while Israel is much stronger than it was 10 years ago, danger still exists in the person of Nasser and what he represents, backed up by the support of the Soviet Union. All that Israel wants is peace with her neighbors and in that peace to not only advance herself, but to make her contributions, if desired, toward the advancement of her neighbors and their peoples.

The Vice President's Goodwill Tour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Constantine Brown which was published in the Washington Evening Star of May 12, 1958.

I commend this article to my colleagues and the public.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISDOM OF NIXON TRIP QUESTIONED—HISTORY OF JAUNTS SINCE WILSON'S TIME SHOWS STAY-AT-HOME POLICY PREFERABLE

(By Constantine Brown)

Was it necessary to expose Vice President NIXON, the second highest elected official of the United States, to insults and physical assaults such as he suffered at the hands of Communist-led students and crowds in Latin America?

Is the idea well founded that state visits by American Presidents, Vice Presidents, and other high-ranking officials to foreign countries stimulate good will toward the United States?

These are questions which many foreign political observers are asking after Mr. NIXON's grueling receptions not only in Peru and Argentina but, to a lesser degree, in other Latin American Republics.

Nobody in Buenos Aires appeared to have found it necessary to apologize for the traffic jam which prevented Mr. NIXON, who was the official representative of the United States at the inauguration of the Argentine President, from attending the swearing-in ceremonies. Yet this was the official purpose of the visit.

Was not the old practice of the American President and Vice President tending to their knitting at home a better one? The old saying that familiarity breeds contempt could well be applied to the good-will traipsings of the highest American officials all over the world.

Until the end of World War I there was what might be described as an unwritten law that the Chief Executive and his first lieutenant never leave American shores. President Wilson broke the tradition and went to the Paris Conference in 1919. Hindsight taught us that this country and for that matter the rest of the world would have been much better off today had he remained in Washington and insisted from afar that his 14 points be accepted.

Hindsight also shows us that President Roosevelt's two meetings with Stalin and Churchill at Teheran and Yalta helped plunge the world into the present turmoil, which might have been avoided had he stayed at home and directed diplomacy from the White House on the basis of the sound principles of the Atlantic Charter established with Churchill at Argentia on August 19, 1941.

President Truman did not do particularly well at the Potsdam Conference. He realized this and refused thereafter all tempting invitations to cross the Atlantic again. President Eisenhower burned his fingers at the summit conference at Geneva in 1955 but still feels inclined to cross the Atlantic again if given a chance for another top-level parley.

For good-will trips, Mr. Eisenhower deputizes his second in command, Vice President NIXON, to represent him and the powerful United States. This is an entirely new departure in our established diplomacy. Its wisdom is being questioned by many observers who are aware of the Communist infiltrations all over the world. They wonder whether the dignity of our country would not be better served if our Chief Executive and his heir presumptive were spared insults and physical assaults by staying home.

Experts on Latin American affairs point out that the ardent Latin students and crowds who displayed much more than a lack of courtesy to Mr. NIXON were urged on in their actions by Communist agents and fellow traveling students and jeer leaders. This is unquestionably true, and we may have to take some blame for it. The administrations during and soon after the war rammed the Soviet regime down the throats of the South American Governments by pressuring them to give diplomatic recognition to the Reds for the sake of good neighborliness. We thus naively helped establish in South America centers of Communist infection which are now mushrooming everywhere.

The governments such as in Peru and Argentina have excellent police forces well accustomed to handling demonstrations and and demonstrators. But they felt that in Mr. NIXON'S case it was preferable not to use the strong arm.

Withdrawal of Federal Troops From Little Rock High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Nashville Banner of Nashville, Tenn., has been one of the leading publications in voicing the protests of supporters of constitutional law against the action of the Federal Government at Central High School in Little Rock, Ark. The Banner has been an eloquent spokesman for constitutional government.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the May 8 edition of the Banner entitled "The Lesson to Uncle Sam: Never Again," in which the Banner expresses its reaction to the or-

dered withdrawal of Federal troops from the Little Rock school.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LESSON TO UNCLE SAM: NEVER AGAIN

With the ordered withdrawal of all Federal troops from Little Rock's Central High School, a stupid, tragic blunder will wend its way into history. A Nation of conscience, concerned for the fundamentals of constitutional law, trusts it never will be repeated.

By that affront, Little Rock became an occupied city in violation of bedrock principle. The Federal Government was in an untenable position, unrelieved by the obvious fact that it was on a spot of its own making, and unredeemed by repentance at leisure of a bungle contrived in haste.

Unquestionably the President was pushed into that insufferable action by advisory forces of reckless irresponsibility. That is no excuse for military invasion of a sovereign State, remindful of reconstruction and prejudicial to the very cause of orderly government and balanced authority, American style.

That this withdrawal coincides with the end of the school year is, of course, significant. It at least indicates, however, that the Army does not intend to chaperon these eight or so children through the vacation periods.

It is a safe wager that Federal authorities have had an ample lesson in this experience, dissuading them from notions of armed encroachment—or bayonet rule—in the future. The difficulty of graceful extrication speaks for itself. The high dive of dudgeon busted several necks, including that of the erstwhile Attorney General, Herbert Brownell, Jr., who nudged Uncle Sam out onto that tricky limb.

Wounds can heal—whatever the scar they leave—if treated intelligently. The Little Rock blunder inflicted that wound. It provides a perpetual lesson of how not to treat a case or an issue which is, under the law, for local or State amelioration.

It is an inglorious chapter thus concluded.

The departure of these troops will be 9 months late.

They should never have been sent.

Let this be the end of an experience that affronted decency and could have erupted into major tragedy for the Nation.

Purebred Dairy Cattle Month Proclaimed in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, in my State of Michigan, the month of May has been proclaimed as Purebred Dairy Cattle Month in recognition of the great progress which has been made in the dairy industry through the combined efforts of various organizations interested in the farmer and all of our citizens.

It is fitting that such recognition be given the purebred dairy cattle industry. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the words of this proclamation, which are most appropriate.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Much of the credit for the vast progress that has been made in breeding and developing the dairy cattle of this land should be given to the purebred dairy cattle associations, the research and service work done by State and national departments of agriculture, the extension staff of our colleges of agriculture, and the master breeders of the Nation. The able and energetic men who are concerned with bettering our dairy herds never cease to strive for better animals which will provide greater production.

All dairymen profit from the program of the purebred dairy cattle associations, thus providing more and better dairy products more economically. The cow is the production unit that is the key to an industry giving employment to one-seventh of our population and furnishing about one-fourth of our food supply. Dairy products provide nature's most nearly perfect food which is the basis for building young strong bodies for a greater America.

Leadership of American Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday, in the spirit of Mother's Day which we celebrated last Sunday, I pointed out the splendid work of the United Nations Commission on the status of women.

I pointed out then that we of the United States have rightly taken the lead in helping to improve the position of women throughout the world; particularly in the underdeveloped world, where, after long centuries, women are at least coming into their own.

Perhaps the finest of all ways, however, by which we are helping the cause of women's equality throughout the globe—legal, political, economic, social, psychological equality, is by example.

Whose example? The example set by inspiring American women leaders, themselves—single women and married women.

Every time a woman rises to high position in the United States, in the halls of the United States Congress, in the executive branch of the Government, in the judiciary; every time a woman rises to high position in private fields of endeavor; by her very rise, she enheartens women throughout the world.

INSPIRATION FROM THE FAMOUS AND THE UNKNOWN

And a woman need not be famous to set a shining example.

In millions of American homes, there are relatively unknown women who inspire us all by their patient, devoted work—as homemakers, as mothers, as wives, yes, too, as members of the P. T. A. and of neighborhood councils and of women's clubs.

Of course, a particular source of inspiration is the woman of fame like Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, Helen Keller, Senator Margaret Chase Smith, Dr. Katherine Oettinger, Mrs. Alice Leopold, Clare Luce, Ann Morrow Lindbergh, Helen Hayes, Oveta Culp Hobby, and countless others.

CONQUERING ANY SENSE OF LIMITATION

Every such famous woman demonstrates by dynamic example to women in the United States and abroad that no one should have a sense of personal limitation.

The basic fact that a potential leader is a woman, or that a potential leader had origins in some particular class or economic condition or geographic area, or race or creed, this or any other irrelevant circumstance of birth, should not serve to prevent any natural-born leader from rising to the highest position, attainable by dint of his or her native ability.

In looking around our land, one finds a great many fine women—similar to those whom I have mentioned—who can well serve as illustrations of the point I have just made as sources of inspiration to women everywhere.

NO SELF-IMPOSED BONDS

And the reason I say everywhere is because we need to have women here in our own United States break whatever bonds are upon them—self-imposed bonds, like personal feelings of inadequacy, or bonds imposed by unthinking men; bonds which limit their growth and prevent them from making their fullest contribution to society.

I could cite many other symbols of women who have long since proven that every human being should be considered on his or her own merits and not on the basis of his or her sex.

I cite, now, two such women in related fields.

One is in Government life. One is in private life; but is active in so many public causes that one might almost consider her in public life, as well.

DEDICATED PUBLIC SERVICE BY MISS SWITZER

The first is the director of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Miss Mary Elizabeth Switzer; an esteemed civil servant since 1921 who has made immeasurable contributions to the cause of rehabilitating the handicapped. This latter is a subject which I have brought to the attention of my colleagues on many occasions, particularly in connection with last week's meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

Among the many honors Miss Switzer has received is a doctorate of law from Adelphi College, Long Island, N. Y.—a fine educational institution which emphasizes, as she does, the serving professions.

PRIVATE CIVIC LEADERSHIP BY MRS. LASKER

The second is the famous Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, a great woman in her own right who has deep roots in my own State. Mrs. Lasker has generously and selflessly written worthy chapters in the annals of civic and humanitarian achievement of this country, chapters which take their place alongside the fine pages written by her late husband, dean of the American advertising world.

I ask unanimous consent that two biographical summaries of these fine women be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The first from the Milwaukee Journal dates back to an appearance at Marquette University in 1956 by Miss Switzer, but the article is still timely.

The second is from the May 2 issue of the New York Herald Tribune, at the time Mrs. Roosevelt presented the 9th annual Albert Lasker Medical Journalism awards, in the presence of Mrs. Lasker and other distinguished Americans.

There being no objection, the biographies were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT'S FAVORITE AUNT

Most people think of Government officials as a strange strata, hands tied with red tape, hearts buried somewhere beneath a barrel of statistics, and a half dozen secretaries away from any caller.

But Miss Mary Elizabeth Switzer quietly disproves the legend. Director of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, she visited Milwaukee to attend the Marquette University conference on international cooperation for the improvement of our health and welfare.

In the last three and a half decades Miss Switzer's days have been filled with the famous, and much of her time has been spent on policies which have shaped and governed the country. She has helped lay the groundwork for many important health and rehabilitation services, cancer and heart foundations, war-research-center legislation. Adviser to cabinet members and presidents, assistant to the high Government officials, researcher, consultant, Miss Switzer has probably organized, expedited, revamped, researched, guided, overseen, bossed, and shouldered responsibilities for more projects, organizations, committees, programs, services, and legislation than any other woman in Washington since the day in 1921 when the Treasury Department hired her as an economist and she began to inspect factories and small businesses in the District of Columbia for the Minimum Wage Board.

LIKE A FAVORITE AUNT

The 1955 Who's Who in America summarizes Miss Switzer in 3⅝ inches of closely set type, outlining 35 years of impressive positions in her Government career. But the concise compendium tells nothing of the ups and downs, the warmth and courage of this pioneer, nor how her eyes crinkle when she smiles. Last week, gray haired, sweet-faced, a sparkling peacock on her shoulder, and not a secretary nor a snip of redtape in sight, she was as approachable and good humored as a favorite aunt, and, indeed, looked quite like one.

All through the years, she admitted, she has found that shrewd judgment and talent must be tempered with emotions.

MUST INVEST EMOTIONS

"Of course, I'm much better at my job because I'm a woman," she nodded energetically. "Being a woman, I know I bring to it something no man can bring. That's our greatest trouble in this field. We need more women. I wish I could interest women's colleges; I wish I could get more young women interested. We need an emotional investment that only women can put into it. I think, for instance, the fact that I'm a woman has made it possible for me to see and do a great many things in my present job that have never been done before."

Where does such a women begin the long climb to head one of the most important administrative job's in today's government?

Quite simply, Miss Switzer pointed out, at the bottom.

FEW WOMEN WORKING

A long-legged, pretty girl, brought up in the mill town district of Newton, Mass., she waited on tables and took care of kids to work her way through Radcliffe. When she got her diploma in 1921, she was the first undergraduate in the history of the college to major in international law, and she has been drawing heavily ever since on that background.

In Washington, by chance because she was an admirer of Elizabeth Brandeis, Mary Elizabeth Switzer found herself one of the first women in the then relatively small Government bureaucracy.

"There were a few in child labor and home economics, but for a long time I was the only college educated woman you could see in the Treasury Department," she recalled.

The late Tracy Copp, Green Bay, who organized the vocational rehabilitation work she now heads, was her first friend in Washington, Miss Switzer recalled. "She was my ideal. It was her conduct and demeanor as a public servant that I tried to imitate, not always with too great success. But I suppose that was because she was not as emotional as I."

The young civil servant found she had to put her talented hands to everything, including mimeographing.

* * * * *

In the years that followed she served as assistant to the assistant secretary of the Treasury in charge of public health, a member of the committee to coordinate health and welfare, and finally, as assistant to Paul McNutt, head of the Federal Security Agency.

SHOULDERED RESPONSIBILITIES

"It was in that position I came to a kind of maturity," Miss Switzer reflected. "I was just the right age. And when I look back now and realize the responsibilities I took during the war years, it makes me shudder."

To this woman fell the job of drafting the revolutionary 1943 bill to expand vocational rehabilitation, the task of organizing the war research center and many other jobs, including procurement of medical personnel for the War Manpower Commission. She helped draft the charter for the UN. World Health Organization, has represented the United States at several international health conferences, and among scores of other affiliations served as a member of the board of visitors at St. Elizabeths Hospital, Washington, and the board of trustees of the Menninger Foundation.

Finally in 1950 she was asked to head the vocational rehabilitation office.

"I was flabbergasted," she exclaimed. "All these years I'd been a staff person with tremendous responsibilities, of course, but always in someone else's name. Suddenly I was at the top of the pyramid, and I had to say "Yes" and "No" myself. I've turned out to be kind of an unconventional administrator, I guess."

WOMAN'S INFLUENCE

In 5 years, under this unconventional administrator, the office's appropriations have almost doubled; there are new, even broader legislations. Scores of grants for schools and individuals are helping increase trained personnel in the field.

"I want to put the emphasis on the importance of the human aspects and symbols. It's a kind of 'You do this for the least of these and you do it for me' idea." Moreover, Miss Switzer has set about to get private and public organizations to work together, and wants desperately to begin weeding out those people "at the bottom of the heap who are dependent and willing to do anything to remain dependent."

The Government's certificate of merit, 1 of 2 nonprofessional honorary memberships in the American Psychiatric Association, and several honorary degrees have been heaped on the executive.

EMOTIONAL OBJECTIVE

Perhaps she was most pleased with a citation from Tufts University last year which singled her out as a woman who had combined subjective emotional and personal drive and deep feeling with the ability to administer objectively, proving once and for all that the two could be combined successfully. "And I suppose that's exactly what I have been trying to do all these years," she mused.

Although there have been temptations to leave Government service through the years, Miss Switzer, strangely enough, has turned them all down.

"I like the Government for several reasons," she said candidly. "First of all because of my background. I don't demand a large reimbursement for my services. I think I'm being adequately compensated for my work. And I like the anonymity of the Government as an employer. It's a great deal different than having your destiny tied up with 1 person or 1 firm. You can be yourself inside and still do a good job for the Government."

LEARNED TO LOVE

Two things, she admits, have brought her a rare peace and contentment. First of all she likes what she's doing.

Second, she said, "I think I'm well adjusted because I haven't too many desires beyond my capacity."

* * * * * *

"You should have the courage to love," she said thoughtfully. "And if you have the courage to love, you'll get love in return. Love your fellowman, your country, and your job. That is the keystone, I think."

Although she spends many hours in her offices and traveling about the world, Miss Switzer likes nothing so much as to be at home in the big house in Alexandria, Va., which she shares with Miss Isabella Diamond, a Treasury librarian, puttering about cooking or reading.

"Yes," she mused, "I'm blessed with health, with security, and a wonderful companion. I love people and there are people who love me—here, there, and yonder. So I think I'm pretty lucky."

MRS. LASKER—PATRON OF MEDICINE

When the Albert Lasker Medical Journalism Awards were presented yesterday, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt remarked that the outstanding characteristic of Mrs. Albert D. Lasker is her imagination.

"Not only can she grasp an idea quickly when it is presented to her," Mrs. Roosevelt said, "but she sees where you can go with it."

This ability has carried Mrs. Lasker, president and founder of the Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation, into a variety of enterprises that have left her unmistable mark on a large segment of the American scene.

The foundation is dedicated to medical research. It underwrites pilot projects in basic research related to the major illnesses—now principally heart diseases, cancer, and mental illness—and also fosters dissemination of public information on the needs of medical research.

Mrs. Lasker's activity in supporting science, however, goes beyond the work of the foundation. She is a board member of the New York City Board of Hospitals, the Citizen Advisory Councils of the United States Public Health Service, the American Heart Association, and the American Cancer Society. She is a vice president of the Planned Parenthood Federation and secretary of the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York.

But the imagination that sparks Mrs. Lasker's works sees more than science. Her early training in fine art at the University of Wisconsin and at Radcliffe College has not left her. She owns one of the finest private collections of modern and French impressionist paintings, and her bent for sharing her assets with the world has led her to publishing a book of color reproductions of her paintings, which she has distributed to colleges around the country.

Mrs. Lasker's love of beauty has led her into yet another activity which affects the

life of almost every citizen of New York. She is personally, and quietly, responsible for twice-yearly plantings of large beds of colorful flowers in public places around town.

These are dedicated to her mother, the late Mrs. Sara J. Woodard, who helped found 2 of the 3 public parks in Watertown, Wis., where Mrs. Lasker was born. As with her support of medical projects, Mrs. Lasker hopes these plantings will sparkplug a movement that others will carry on.

For all her projects, Mrs. Lasker still has time for a family life. She visits regularly with the three children by a previous marriage of Mr. Lasker, an advertising executive who died in 1952, and with their children. She maintains a town house at 29 Beekman Place and a farm house at Amenia, N. Y., where she indulges her love of flowers and greenery.

Are Americans Aware?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following speech by GORDON H. SCHERER at rally sponsored by Aware, Inc., at Hunter College in New York City on Wednesday evening, May 7, 1958:

ARE AMERICANS AWARE?

What has been said here tonight should be applauded by every red-blooded American. Unfortunately, however, it will bring wide and varied reactions. They will range from approbation by our fast-waning patriotic societies to contempt and hatred by the Communist conspirators within our American community. The ill will of the latter, our sworn enemies and would-be destroyers, we expect. They are the challenge we must face in our time.

There is also that fast-growing, cynical segment of the populace which scorns and scoffs at any mention of patriotism. To them Americanism is not even secondary to one-worldism. To them the American heritage and basic constitutional rights should be chipped away and even surrendered when political expediency—treaty by Executive agreement—demands.

Then last there is that group of self-styled loyal citizens to whom the word "Americanism" is distasteful although they do not admit it. They are the extreme leftwing, who for one reason or another have lost faith in the American system. They are the people who through the years, wittingly and unwittingly, have given their names, money, and prestige to innumerable Communist-front organizations and causes. Among them are those who are the foolish and naive puppets of the Communist agents within.

These are the people to whom Georgi Dimitrov, one of the top world Communists, referred when he said:

"As Soviet power grows, there will be greater aversion to Communist parties everywhere. So we must practice the techniques of withdrawal. Never appear in the foreground: Let our friends do the work."

Dimitrov continues, and listen to this:

"We must always remember that one sympathizer is generally worth more than a dozen militant Communists. A university professor, who without being a party member lends himself to the interests of the Soviet Union, is worth more than a hundred men with party cards."

If Dimitrov were making that statement tonight, he could well include the industrialist Cyrus Eaton who made a tremendous contribution to the Soviet cause this last Sunday night when over a nationwide hookup he made his vicious attack upon the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the security agencies of this Nation. Do you know who paid for that program—the Fund for the Republic.

Eaton is part of an epidemic of color blindness which has affected certain segments of America. The victim cannot see the gory Red record of mass murder and subversion which the international Communist apparatus is writing daily. Eaton's scurrilous attack on the FBI and our security system climaxes a series of his public utterances which are being beamed by the Soviet propaganda machine to the four corners of the earth.

It is more than coincidence that in December of 1955 the official Russian governmental organ Izvestia hailed Cyrus S. Eaton for his expressions on peaceful coexistence; that another organ of the Communist international apparatus New Times in October 1957 contains an article by Eaton in which he rapturously extols the virtues of the Soviet Union and states that he "has achieved a better firsthand understanding" by the contact he has had with Soviet representatives in the United States.

It is likewise more than coincidence that in addition to attacking the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Eaton has repeatedly attacked what he has characterized as the "anti-Russian belligerence" of the United States.

Can he not see that the international Communist apparatus, now controlling one-third of the population of this earth, with a fifth column 25 million strong permeating the world, is now at war with the 1 nation which stands in the way of its world domination?

Can he not see that the Federal Bureau of Investigation—far from being a "Hitler-like gestapo" as he describes it—is the principal bulwark of our liberties and the chief weapon of the Nation against internal subversion?

In the March 1958 issue of the periodical, the Progressive, Eaton states "I am firmly convinced that the Russians want peace." Can he not see that the only peace which the international Communist apparatus wants is a peace in which freedom is forever subdued by the forces of tyranny?

In the light of Eaton's conduct, listen to how significant are the concluding words of Georgi Dimitrov:

"Every man has his value, his merit. The writer who, without being a party member, defends the Soviet Union, the union leader who is outside our ranks but defends Soviet international policy, is worth more than a thousand party members."

Yes, ladies and gentlemen, industrialist Cyrus Eaton who is not a Communist but who defends, as Dimitrov said, Soviet international policy is worth more than a thousand party members.

The Cyrus Eatons are the people who will ridicule and condemn what has been said here tonight, what this great organization of Aware is trying to accomplish, what the FBI and the investigating committees of Congress are doing. And why?

The answer is simple. These are the forces which have turned back the cover and shown how these gentlemen were foolishly and carelessly sleeping in the same beds with the agents of the Kremlin. They did not like the exposé and ever since have been attempting to discredit those who put the spotlight on the naked truth of Communist-front subversion within the United States.

The tragedy of this hour is that, in spite of all that has been revealed, so few Americans—in fact, only a hnadful—really understand the Communist mind and are aware of the strategy being used by the Soviets to reach their goal of world domination.

Such lack of knowledge is understandable when even the Supreme Court of the United States, by a series of disheartening decisions, has demonstrated that it, too, has failed to grasp the modus operandi of at least one phase of the total offensive now being waged against the free world by the Kremlin.

As long as the Supreme Court has violated all precedent by going beyond the record and consulting the dubious writings of foreign socialists as authority for its decisions, may I suggest that the High Court take a look at a book written by E. H. Cookridge, an authority on the Communist conspiratorial apparatus.

The Court might eventually learn that the Communist Party is not a political party as we know political parties in the United States—that we are not dealing with or investigating an economic or political philosophy, as the Court's recent decisions suggest.

It might at long last find out, as Cookridge says:

"We are dealing with the sordid story of theft of atomic and NATO secrets, of arson, sabotage, poisoning, assassination, infiltration, and subversion, plotted in Moscow and carried out all over the world."

As you know, it was the investigating committees of the Congress which finally brought to light the penetration of this fifth column in the United States. They recommended law after law to deal with this threat from within.

With one fell swoop last year, the Supreme Court seriously weakened, if not destroyed, most of the weapons that have been available to deal effectively with this fifth column.

Our committee was commencing hearings in San Francisco on the day the Supreme Court handed down the Watkins decision, dealing with congressional investigations of Communists, and the Yates case freeing the convicted California Communists. On that day—Red Monday—a former chairman of the Communist Party in California rejoicingly exclaimed:

"It was the greatest victory the Communist Party has ever received." She continued, "It will mark a rejuvenation of the party in America. We have lost some of our members in the last few years, but now we are on our way."

The committee saw and felt that rejuvenation at the San Francisco hearing. During the last few years, the Communist hangers-on at such hearings had diminished. Their enthusiasm had been dampened. The hostile witnesses exhibited less confidence in the ultimate triumph of the Communist cause.

All this was changed in San Francisco. The Communists filled the large hearing room and overflowed into the corridors. Their snide and vituperative remarks to committee members as they passed through the halls were again in evidence. The witnesses and the lawyers were jubilant as well as arrogant. The delaying tactics, the evasiveness, and the long Communist propaganda speeches returned.

Yes, it was a great day for the Kremlin but an ominous one for the people of the United States.

It was these decisions of the Supreme Court which inspired the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee to begin its current campaign to subvert our security agencies. Do I hear someone say that no one pays any attention to this Communist-front Emergency Civil Liberties Committee and its cohorts?

Listen to how a newspaper in the Nation's Capital has been brainwashed (and I am being charitable when I say "brainwashed"). The Washington Post, in an editorial designed to influence Congress against voting

for the appropriation to the Committee on Un-American Activities this year, said:

"For 20 years the committee has been disclosing and reporting on the pattern of Communist infiltration of American life; this part of its function has long since been completed, and the pattern of the past no longer has much application to the present."

The editorial then continued with a plea to strangle the committee.

If time permitted, I could give you example after example of subversive activities being brought to the cold light of common day by the committee—activities revealing a diabolical pattern not of the past but of the present. Let's take a look at just one case which is as current as today's newspaper.

We have been worried about sputniks in outer space. The committee uncovered a sputnik right in the Congress of the United States—not 5 years ago, not 2 years ago, not 1 year ago, but just a few months ago.

The Communist record of one Wilfred Lumer was recently brought to light. Now who is Wilfred Lumer? He is the man who was doing research for Members of the House and for at least two committees of this Congress. The results of his handiwork found their way into reports on legislation that is being considered by this present Congress.

Let me quote just two questions and answers from his testimony which will clearly illustrate my point.

"Mr. ARENS (counsel for the committee). Have you reported your activities on the Hill, on Capitol Hill, over the course of the last several years to a person known by you to be a Communist?

"Mr. LUMER. I must decline to answer that question on the grounds of the first and fifth amendments.

"Mr. ARENS. We have information, and I want to be absolutely frank with you, Mr. Lumer—we have information that in the recent past you have been in contact with, and under discipline of, Sam Abbott, a ranking Communist in the District of Columbia. We want to give you an opportunity now while under oath to deny it.

"Mr. LUMER. I must decline to answer that on the grounds of the first and fifth amendments."

Today the Soviets are holding out the olive branch. A worldwide peace offensive is now in progress. According to our friends in left field, all we have to do is sit down at summit conferences and enter into a few executive agreements with the gangsters of the Kremlin—the slaughterers of the Hungarian freedom-fighters, and we will be on our way toward peace. But the kind of peace, I assure you, that we would buy at a price.

I need not remind you that the United States has already had 19 top level conferences with the schemers of the Kremlin.

Forty agreements resulted; only three, which the Soviets felt were to their advantage, have been kept. In all, the butchers of the Kremlin, in the short span of their 40-year history, have entered into nearly 1,000 treaties, nonaggression pacts, and agreements with other countries. In every single instance when it served the interest of the Soviet Union to do so, these pacts were flagrantly violated in its drive toward world domination.

Another compelling objection to continued dealings with the masters of the Kremlin is the effect such meetings have on the people inside the Soviet orbit—the great majority of whom are anti-Communist. Eugene Lyons, in his book entitled "Our Secret Allies," dramatically points out that, if we are ever to win this conflict, we will need these secret allies—the people behind the Iron Curtain.

We have just given $225 million to neutralist India, yet Nehru, among other things, tells the world that Russia's occupation of Hungary is no different from our position in Japan.

A short time ago we sent $63 million in farm surpluses to Communist Yugoslavia after we cut off military aid to Tito at his request because such contributions were embarrassing both to him and his bed-partner Khrushchev.

Of the $193 million doled out to Communist Poland in less than a year, $98 million was given as late as February. It did not go to the Polish people in their fight for freedom but to Gomulka. As Senator STYLES BRIDGES said:

"We merely made it possible for Gomulka to quiet the natural unrest in opposition to his Communist regime. Far from helping free people along the road to self-determination, we are actually forging stronger chains for their bondage."

What has become of the honor of this Nation when we attempt to bribe our sworn enemies and betray those whom they hold in bondage? Is this the price we must pay for so-called peace?

The recognition of Red China and its admission to the United Nations—for which, I am sorry to say, there is a growing sentiment—would mean the death knell of anti-Communist resistance on the part of some 500 million Chinese who, historically and traditionally, have been friendly to this country. So few have been able to see through the Communist line—parrotted by dupes and soft heads—namely, that recognition of the Red clique in Peiping was the same as recognition of the millions whom they have enslaved.

Before Americans are seduced by the current Communist peace offensive, they should reflect upon a statement by Dimitri Z. Manuilsky, made in 1931 when he was instructor in the Lenin school of political warfare in Moscow. He said:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable.

"To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep, so we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions."

Friends, does this have a familiar ring today?

Manuilsky continued: "The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

And now listen to J. Edgar Hoover, the greatest authority on internal subversion, in his latest Independence Day warning to the American people. He said:

"Public apathy is the sure way to national suicide, to death of individual freedom. It allowed the Communists to penetrate and make satellites of once-free countries, and it is presently enabling them to honeycomb and weaken the structures of the remaining countries, and there is today a terrifying apathy on the part of Americans toward the deadliest danger which this country has ever faced. Some of that apathy is deliberately induced."

Hoover continued: "The Communist Party in the United States is not out of business; it is not dead; it is not even dormant. It is, however, well on its way to achieving its current objective, which is to make you believe that it is shattered, ineffective, and dying. When it has fully achieved this first objective, it will then proceed inflexibly toward its final goal.

"Those who try to minimize its danger are either uninformed or they have a deadly ax to grind."

Today there are those who still think of war only in terms of military aggression, of planes, guided missiles, and nuclear projectiles.

So few understand that firepower—destructive force—is only one of the weapons, one phase of the total offensive being waged by the Soviets against the West.

Here is the appraisal of Gen. Albert Wedemeyer who, you will recall, served as chief of our World War II planning operations. Testifying recently before the Committee on Un American Activities, the General said:

"The Soviets are obtaining their objectives without the use of military force. If I were the senior planner in the Soviet hierarchy, I would advise Khrushchev to continue to do exactly what he is doing now."

Russia has apparently abandoned the centuries-old concept of war. She does not want to destroy the cities of the United States or of any other country of the free world if she can possibly avoid it.

Mr. Edward Hunter, one of the great authorities on Communist psychological warfare, a newspaper correspondent, author, lecturer, and a former officer in the OSS, who spent more than 31 years in countries under various forms of Communist pressure and attack, testified in closed session before the Committee on Un-American Activities a few weeks ago.

Mr. Hunter testified out of the wealth of his experience and first-hand knowledge:

"War has changed its form. The Communists have discovered that a man killed by a bullet is useless. He can dig no coal. They have discovered that a demolished city is useless. Its mills produce no cloth. The objective of modern warfare is to capture intact the minds of the people and their possessions so that they can be put to use.

"This is the modern conception of salvery, that puts all others into the kindergarten age."

Hunter continued: "The United States is the main battlefield in this war. I mean specifically the people and the soil and the resources of the United States. They seek to conquer the United States in a manner so that it voluntarily falls into the Red orbit. If we have to be conquered by destructive nuclear-age weapons, it will be considered a setback by the Kremlin. Their objective is to make the same use of the American people as they make of the Czechs in the uranium mines in Czechoslovakia and as they make of the Chinese in the mills of China.

"We are to become the subjects of a new world order for the benefit of a mad little knot of deposits in the Kremlin. We are losing so fast that, unless we put a very drastic end to it, the question of who is winning will be academic in a decade."

Hunter concluded: "I have been watching developments under communism in other parts of the world for more than 30 years, and now I see exactly the same developments back here in America. I see primarily as part of this softening-up process in America the liquidation of what we used to recognize as right and wrong, what we used to accept as absolute moral standards."

Khrushchev, just 3 weeks ago tonight, in a speech to diplomats, including the United States Ambassador, said:

"We will beat the capitalists, but that does not mean killing anybody.

"When we win in this competition, we will also reeducate you. We Bolsheviks are a ravenous people. What we achieved in the past is very little. We want more and more."

Just a few weeks ago the Washington Star, in headlining the latest statement of Allen Dulles Chief of our Central Intelligence Agency, printed: "Subversion, Not Arms, is Chief Red Weapon."

All of the credible evidence indicates that the firepower and destructive force of the East and the West are fairly well balanced. The Russians are not dumb. They know that an all-out nuclear war will mean the total destruction of their cities—that today the United States in all probability would win such a conflict. Consequently, we are not going to have a nuclear showdown in the foreseeable future.

The Kremlin is not going to sign its own death warrant—and why should it? So few understand that in the last decade the Communists have been incredibly successful in expanding the Soviet empire by the use of a weapon far more effective than sputniks or nuclear missiles and certainly less costly.

So few are aware that the insidious and diabolical weapon of infiltration and subversion has done the job of taking approximately one-third of the earth's surface and one-third of its people into the Communist orbit and that another one-third, in the so-called neutral bloc, is fast drifting toward Russian satelliteism.

So few are aware that, while the near equality of firepower between the East and West creates the present military stalemate, the effective weapon of infiltration and subversion is the deadly cancer at work on the institutions and governments of free men everywhere.

We are not engaged in a popularity contest with a competing economic system. We are not merely faced with certain annoying adjustments which should be made so that we may coexist with a different system of government. We are now in a death grip with an enemy the likes of which for debasement and inhumanity the world has never before experienced, an enemy whom we can ignore, appease, negotiate with, only at the expense of our survival.

This is the challenge of our day to all patriots of this Republic. We must accept this challenge. We shall either dedicate ourselves to it or face slavery and destruction.

The Role of the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the June edition of the Army Information Digest.

The lead article entitled "Limited War: The Prospects and Possibilities," is a most scholarly and authoritative presentation which treats the subject in a most understandable and direct manner.

In views the question of whether limited war is, in fact, a possibility and a probability, as contrasted with the probability of general war or a war of nuclear devastation. The premises are set forth in a completely realistic fashion, and lead to the conclusion that not only is limited war possible, but also that there is a valid distinction between unlimited and limited military operations.

Mr. President, I commend the article as a timely and definitive treatise for the reading of the Members of the Senate. Notwithstanding the fact that I am advised by the Public Printer that it will require approximately 3¼ pages, at a cost of $263.25, to publish the article in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIMITED WAR: THE PROSPECTS AND POSSIBILITIES

THE SOVIETS TRY BLACKMAIL

The Soviets are trying to blackmail the West into inaction by insisting in their propaganda that any local or limited war will inevitably expand into all-out fighting; yet, concurrently, they are strengthening their own capabilities for limited war. The grave danger here is that they may conclude they can get away with limited adventures, on the theory that the West fears to intervene, lest it bring on the atomic holocaust. To accept this Soviet speculative premise would mean that their blackmail has worked. The West would be inviting disaster if it even seemed to hesitate because of this potential miscalculation by the Soviets.

There is no inexorable logic that makes it inevitable that henceforth any war will become total war. Most wars have had limited objectives, and have been limited wars. This was notably true of the Korean war, and it can continue to be true. But there is an essential precondition in sustaining limited operations: maintenance of the strategic reserve. Behind the capability to fight limited war, there must be the capability of fighting total war with every weapon. That's the grim persuader against reckless expansion of objectives and methods.

The choice the West has is not between absolute safety, and grave risks. The choice is between degrees of risk; and the smallest risk the West can take is to be prepared for any kind of war, anywhere, any time, which clearly means that limited wars must be considered possible, if not likely.

The greatest danger is that a little war will get out of control, and may expand into all-out war. The likelihood of this increases with the length of the conflict. Long continued fighting may cause the political issues at stake to assume expanded, exaggerated significance, and almost certainly will result in whipped up emotional furies. That is the background that gives urgent meaning to General Taylor's statement: "If we are forced to fight a limited war, it is essential that we react promptly and decisively."

It is generally accepted that with the power of modern weapons, a war between the United States and the Soviet Union, if waged to its utmost limits, would bring down disaster upon mankind. The growth of nuclear stockpiles, and the development of means for delivering them, have produced a situation in which the deliberate initiation of unlimited hostilities represents an unacceptable course of action for both sides in the prevailing East-West struggle.

However, this has in no way mitigated the character of the conflict. On the contrary, the Soviets give every indication of utilizing their nuclear striking power as a screen behind which to intensify the cold war. There is every reason to expect that the Communist will continue to seek opportunities for expansion.

In this protracted struggle, the takeover by subversion and coup d' etat will probably remain the preferred tactic. Failing this, the Communists will not hesitate to employ military power in the attainment of any objective which they consider significant in advancing their objective of world domination.

With no abatement of the cold war in prospect, and because of the disastrous consequences of an unlimited war, the West is faced with a fateful problem. How can Communist expansion, whether by military or nonmilitary means, be thwarted without incurring unacceptable risks?

In many ways, the problem of forestalling Communist expansion by so-called peaceful political and economic penetration is the most difficult challenge facing the free world. It will require a high degree of ingenuity and skill to outmatch the Soviets in this contest. Fortunately, this is an area where the West possesses unrivalled spiritual and material resources. The principal need is a recognition of the character of the challenge and a determination to beat the Communists at their own game.

The threat of Communist expansion by nonmilitary means is not unrelated to the military threat. The Communist takeover in much of Eastern Europe was made possible and is preserved only by the presence of military power. Similarly, a western strategy to counter further Communist penetration must be reinforced by military power which neutralizes the Soviet bloc military threat. Western influence among many of the uncommitted nations, for example, is not likely to prosper unless there is also security against Communist military encroachment.

The relationship between military and nonmilitary programs becomes even more meaningful in terms of long-term objectives. The containment of Communist expansion is important, but it is not a sufficient strategy. Our ultimate objective is a cessation in the cold war itself.

The minimum precondition for inducing the Soviet bloc nations to abandon the goal of world conquest is the denial of further opportunity for military expansion. With a military equilibrium, there can be some hope that evolutionary changes will occur in the bloc regimes so that they will no longer constitute a threat to free nations.

In the light of these general considerations, the military problem resolves itself down into one fundamental question. How can military power be used as a rational and effective instrument for supporting national policy objectives?

Only limited war can serve a coherent purpose. An all-out war would be a political disaster, a senseless thing without an object.

Because war is a political act, and must serve a political purpose, the controlling principle in war is the principle of the objective. It is not possible to conceive of any rational purpose that would be served by an unrestricted nuclear war. The most basic United States objective, therefore, is to avert such a disaster.

At the same time the United States recognizes that its own security is bound up with the security of free peoples everywhere. Even the United States, with all its strengths, could not survive a state of siege in a Communist-dominated world. Accordingly, this Nation has rejected isolationism in favor of a forward strategy.

So that there should be no misunderstanding of United States intentions, a series of multilateral and bilateral treaties have been negotiated as a sort of a diplomatic warning system. And to make the deterrent effect of this warning system doubly meaningful, the United States has deployed its own forces in support of these treaty arrangements, and has strengthened allied forces through various military assistance programs.

The purpose of these regional security arrangements can be stated very simply. The object is to deter aggression by making it unmistakably clear to any would-be aggressor that aggression will not succeed. The free nations of the world are determined that they will not be picked off one by one. Thus, the treaties provide that an attack against one will be considered either an attack against all, or a threat to the security of all. And lest there be any room for ambiguous interpretation in certain areas,

these treaty arrangements have been further reinforced by the Taiwan resolution and the American doctrine.

These regional security arrangements constitute, in effect, a political deterrent. The free world has witnessed how, even at a time when the United States had a near atomic monopoly, the Communists did not hesitate to employ their military resources in areas which did not involve a direct challenge to the United States. The Communists miscalculated with respect to our political intentions in the case of Korea. The system of free world alliances is intended to remove this cause for miscalculation.

Now the free world is faced with a new danger—a new source of possible miscalculation. The Soviets may conclude that they can get away with limited adventures because the West will not risk intervention for fear of precipitating all-out hostilities. Communist propaganda has played heavily on this theme during the past 2 years, insisting that any local war would inevitably expand. Yet concurrently the Soviets have strengthened their own capabilities for limited war.

The obviously calculated purpose of this propaganda is to blackmail the free world into inaction. The effects of tihs propaganda are reinforced to the degree that the free world is unprepared to meet a limited challenge with other than an all-out response.

The deterrent to the all-out war is not likely to deter limited or disguised aggression because the Soviets are likely to believe that their own nuclear delivery capabilities will deter the West from an all-out response to anything less than a direct challenge. The Soviets may miscalculate that they can get away with it.

The danger is that if the only courses of military action open to the West would involve grave risk of expanding hostilities, then the Soviet calculation might prove correct. If the Soviets calculate correctly, the West has been blackmailed into inaction; if the Soviets miscalculate, the West is faced with the all-out war it sought to deter.

The only way out of this dilemma—for the alternatives are unacceptable—is to insure that the free world can muster the forces necessary to defeat aggression wherever it may occur without resort to courses of action which would be likely to bring about all-out war. In other words, the West must be able to deal effectively with limited challenges, employing limited means. The balance of forces required to defeat limited aggression are significantly different in many respects from the forces which are needed to deter or wage all-out war.

TYPES OF WARFARE

Modern war may be visualized as a continuum, ranging in violence from a low extreme of guerrilla warfare at one end to the opposite extreme of all-out or unrestricted warfare at the other. However, the distinctive thing about this continuum is that, at the extreme of violence, the continuum tends to break off, with all-out war being not merely different in degree but different in kind from other warfare.

The forces required to wage an unlimited war and the priority of tasks will be significantly different from forces and tasks for limited warfare. Thus, the distinction between all-out or total war and warfare which is less than total provides a useful and meaningful framework for planning.

Warfare which is less than total is commonly characterized as limited war. While this term is subject to possible misinterpretation, it has become generally accepted as descriptive of any conflict which is not unlimited from the point of view of the United States.

Limited wars have limited objectives. In a contest between unmatched powers, however, a war which may appear as limited for one side may very well be an unlimited conflict for the other. An unlimited war, on the other hand, visualizes the complete overthrow of the enemy. In modern war, this would normally require the destruction of the government of the opposing nation.

Probably the most basic truth about war in modern times is that limited war has been the norm, whereas total war has been the aberration. Considering the disastrous character of World Wars I and II, it is essential to ask: Is there some inexorable logic in human events which makes it inevitable that henceforth any major war will be a total war? On the answer to this question may well rest the fate of civilization.

Clausewitz considered that limited wars are likely under two sets of circumstances. The first case is where the political tensions or aims are small. The second case is where the military means are such that the overthrow of the enemy either cannot be visualized at all or can only be approached indirectly.

In the past, whenever the political objective was not the overthrow of the enemy nation, wars tended to be limited. Also, whenever the military means were insufficient to accomplish the overthrow of the enemy, wars have been limited.

The ultimate political aim of the U. S. S. R. is essentially unlimited. The Soviets contemplate the progressive and complete subordination of independent nations to a Communist hegemony. The free nations, on their part, are equally determined to secure their liberty. These disparate, essentially unlimited objectives give rise to great political tensions. In this situation, any war may assume totality.

Balancing this tendency is the other case posited by Clausewitz wherein limited war is likely because the military means are such that the overthrow of the enemy cannot be visualized at all. While this dictum was premised on the insufficiency of the means, it is no less valid when the means may be sufficient to overthrow the enemy but would also produce universal disaster. A victory robbed of its meaning is no victory at all.

Thus, the Soviets are forced to seek the accomplishment of their objective by indirect means. They realize that the United States cannot be defeated directly. This objective must be approached indirectly, by sapping the energy of the free world, and by neutralizing the United States. By this calculation, the prize plum will be ripe for picking once the balance of power has swung in favor of the Soviets so that further resistance would be futile. This is what the Soviets mean when they talk about competitive coexistence. This is their preferred battleground.

By the same logic, the United States appreciates that its own security is dependent upon preventing such a swing in the world balance of power so that the issue in any war would pose the issue of national survival. This Nation also recognizes that it must live with the threat a long time. It is not possible to conceive of destroying the source of the threat militarily without at the same time destroying the values and institutions we are striving to secure.

These, then, are some of the fundamental reasons why limited war is the most likely threat so long as both United States and the U. S. S. R. are powerfully restrained from the deliberate initiation of all-out war.

While the all-out assault against the United States is certainly the greatest danger, it is the piecemeal loss of the free world to limited and camouflaged aggression that constitutes the greatest long-term threat to the Nation's security. A most basic national objective, therefore, is to insure that the United States security position shall not be so eroded. The Nation must be prepared to employ its Armed Forces as necessary, in support of this objective.

DOCTRINE FOR LIMITED WAR

An important element in preparedness for limited war is well-defined doctrine. This doctrinal requirement demands not only thoroughly developed military doctrine, but also the integration of military concepts with doctrine for exploiting other elements of national power such as diplomacy, the domestic economy, psychological operations, and the like. What might be termed a national doctrine for limited war is required.

Any consideration of doctrine for limited war must begin by answering the question whether limited war is possible in the atomic age. From the foregoing discussion, it is evident that this question must be answered in the affirmative. Both recent history and considerations of logic dictate this conclusion. Therefore, the first element of doctrine for limited war is that limited war is possible.

Quite apart from logic and historical experience, there are also important psychological factors involved in this element of doctrine. If, for example, the free world were induced to believe that limited wars are not possible, the Communists would find a readymade climate for atomic blackmail. Also, if the West becomes convinced that any war will inevitably expand into an all-out war, and the Soviets are similarly persuaded, then there is a danger that the thought will become father to the reality. Then in a war brought on by accident or miscalculation, both sides might feel constrained to expand the conflict rather than be put at an operational disadvantage.

If, on the other hand, the presumption is that limited wars are possible, then there is some hope of keeping a war from expanding once it has broken out. The only sound basis for planning, therefore, is to assume that warfare can be limited. Without this premise there is no basis for further development of doctrine for limited war. Moreover, this premise is crucial to the deterrence of all-out war in a conflict which might have begun accidentally or by miscalculation.

The second element of doctrine for limited war is that it is possible to make a valid distinction between limited vs. unlimited operations. The significant difference for the purposes of developing doctrine for limited war is that unlimited operations will involve attacks against the basic strengths of the contending parties, whereas limited operations are directed against enemy military forces.

In a limited war, the basic strengths of the contending parties must remain essentially immune to attack. There will also be restrictions on operations against enemy military forces whenever such operations are likely to threaten the strategic balance of power. This subject will be explored more fully when examining the various techniques of limitation.

The third and most basic doctrinal element in limited war is the principle of the objective. This is the most decisive limitation in limited war. By definition, a limited war is fought for a limited objective. Any idea of a limited war producing unconditional surrender is a contradiction in terms.

The elements of doctrine considered thus far constitute the essential framework for examining what Dr. Max Millikan of Massachussets Institute of Technology has called the techniques of limitation in warfare. This is the fourth element of limited war doctrine. And it is in this area that the critical doctrinal problems emerge.

The basic problem, however, can be stated quite simply, and it is this: All operations in a limited war must be clearly in consonance with a limited objective. Any techniques for limiting hostilities must satisfy

this prerequisite. An important aspect of this requirement is that there must be no cause for the enemy to misinterpret intentions. This problem is posed by Dr. Millikan in these terms: "Our signals must be persuasive."

The basic principle of war involved in devising techniques of limitation is economy of force. The force employed should be sufficient to gain the objective—and no more—and should be applied with discrimination to insure that there is no cause for misunderstanding as to the objective.

While it is a relatively simple matter to recognize that there will be operational limitations in a limited war, it is much more difficult to validate the techniques of limitation. Indeed, the difficulties involved are so formidable that many analysts have been led to conclude that it is not possible to define limitations which will stand up in the crucible of war. One must concede that this conclusion may be correct.

But here again we are faced, in part, with a psychological problem. If it is conceded that no limitations on military operations can be sustained, then it would logically follow that there is no utility in attempting to devise ground rules. Yet without tacit acceptance of such limitations, all hope of limiting warfare is forfeited. On the other hand, if one proceeds on the assumption that the mutual acceptance of restrictions is possible, it is imperative that the free world develop tactical concepts for such limited operations.

The absolute precondition for validating any techniques of limitation is that both sides must remain convinced that it is in this own interests to avoid an expansion of hostilities. In other words, the deterrent to all-out war is important not only to deter the deliberate launching of unlimited hostilities, but also as a deterrent to an expansion of hostilities in limited war.

The essential precondition, therefore, in sustaining limited operations is the maintenance of the strategic deterrent. This is the fifth element of doctrine for limited war.

Barring the act of a madman, it must be assumed that the Soviets will be deterred from the deliberate initiation of all-out war so long a they remain convinced that under any and all circumstances, the consequences of such an act would be unacceptable. The maintenance of this conviction is a first charge upon the Military Establishment.

The determination of what would be unacceptable to the Soviets in a total war involves a calculation of many variables, some of which probably cannot be discerned at all or evaluated with any accuracy by the western mind. It is important, however, that such a calculation be made, utilizing the best intelligence available, and then adding a margin for error to insure that the U. S. S. a margin for error to insure that the U. S. S. R. realizes, beyond peradventure, that all-out war would work its own destruction.

This is not the occasion to attempt such a calculation in quantitative terms. However, these are some of the factors which must be considered:

(1) The offensive capability of the free world to retaliate, under all conditions. This capability is dependent, in part, on the ability of the free world to defend its offensive weapons systems by both active and passive means.

(2) The net damage to the United States and the U. S. S. R. to be expected in a nuclear exchange. The threshold of acceptability for the Soviets may depend in considerable degree on their estimate of comparative damage. A major factor in this assessment is the comparative ability of the United States and the U. S. S. R. to defend themselves from nuclear attack.

(3) Finally and related to (2), the estimated residual capabilities of both sides. Here again, the Soviets might be prepared to accept heavier casualties and damage than otherwise if it were calculated that the balance of residual capabilities was favorable to the attainment of Communist objectives.

It is because of this residual capabilities factor that the effectiveness of a deterrent to all-out war cannot be judged solely in terms of the net capabilities of the United States and the U. S. S. R. in a strategic nuclear exchange. While the first phase of such a conflict would undoubtedly consist principally of what might be termed survival operations, the issue might still have to be decided by subsequent operations in which the climactic act would be performed by the man on the ground, physically capable of imposing his will to the degree necessary to secure the objective.

TECHNIQUES OF LIMITATION

Assuming the maintenance of the strategic deterrent as the absolute precondition for limited war, what are some of the techniques of limitation? Broadly speaking, the limitations will involve such matters as the area of the conflict, the targets to be attacked, and the weapons to be employed.

It is not possible, with respect to any one of these limitations, to devise one set of criteria for limiting military operations that is necessarily any more valid than any other set. But, as indicated earlier, it is important that there be some "ground rules," and that these rules should be such that the enemy is persuaded that operations are in keeping with a limited objective.

The matter of area limitation is self-explanatory. This is probably the limitation which is most easily sustained. In the Korean War, for example, the United Nations forces limited operations to the Korean Peninsula. Accordingly there was no difficulty in maintaining a correlation between military operations and the limited objective sought.

The Communist limitation was of a somewhat different character. In addition to limiting operation to the Korean Peninsula, the Communists also refrained from all but relatively minor air attacks on United Nations forces, and from efforts to sever sea or air lines of communications.

United Nations forces, on the other hand, conducted virtually unrestricted air operations within the confines of the Korean Peninsula. The West, of course, did not utilize atomic weapons. However, there is no reason to conclude that the use of atomic firepower in the Korean War would in itself have necessarily led to an expansion of hostilities.

The significant thing about the Korean War experience is that both sides used quite different criteria for limiting operations. Nonetheless, the limitations were sustained because both sides judged it in their interests not to expand hostilities to a higher level of violence by committing additional resources. Both sides were, in effect, prepared to accept an outcome which fell short of the desired objective rather than risk expansion of the war.

The willingness to settle for a limited defeat or the frustration of an objective is inherent in any doctrine for limited war. It is equally important that diplomatic channels be kept open and that the opportunity for graceful retreat not be foreclosed.

While an area limitation, as in Korea, is probably the most easily validated, it is at the same time the one which is hardest to define in advance. There is no yardstick by which to calculate a normal zone for military operations. In one area of the world, military operations might extend over a vast expanse. In another area, operations in a limited war might have to be very carefully circumscribed geographically. It becomes necessary to fall back on the general rule that operations should not extend beyond that area which very clearly has a direct impact on the ability to conduct operations, as necessary to attain the objective.

With respect to target limitations, it is only possible to generalize as to what those limitations might be. In certain situations, there might be no limitations on the targets that could be attacked within the limited area of the conflict. More typically, however, it could be expected that some target limitations would apply.

As already indicated, as a minimum it would be necessary to forego attacks on the basic strengths of the contending parties. Attacks on certain types of targets would undoubtedly be interpreted by the opposing forces as threatening the strategic balance. For example, attacks on targets which resulted in the attrition of elements of the strategic deterrent might force an opponent to resort to all-out attack in desperation, rather than permit such a deterioration in the strategic balance. By the same token, both sides must avoid operations which would dissipate their own strategic deterrent in limited operations.

Approaching the problem more positively, there is no reason why attacks cannot be made within the prescribed area of operations on all those targets which have a direct effect on the operations of the tactical forces. This would include attacks on the opposing ground forces, field depots, supply installations, and other support facilities, the interdiction of lines of communications which directly support tactical operations, neutralization of enemy air and missile forces engaged in direct support of tactical operations, and the like. Again, the primary requirement is that the targets under attack bear an evident relationship to the declared objective of the operations.

The final technique of limitation is that of weapons limitation. It is in this area that the most difficult doctrinal problem arises—namely, the use of atomic weapons. The basic question is usually put in these terms: How is it possible to limit the use of atomic weapons?

Does not the employment of atomic weapons mark the dividing line between limited and all-out war?

If one side uses a small atomic weapon, will not the opponent retaliate with a larger one, and so on, until the war has expanded into unlimited war?

Once nuclear weapons are used, is there any logical point at which to stop?

There can be no categorical, all-inclusive answer to this question. The truth probably is that there is no logical place to stop, and yet either or both sides may, in fact, restrict themselves in the use of nuclear weapons. For there is no reason to believe that, so long as both sides desire to limit hostilities, the use of atomic fire will in itself lead to all-out war.

Inherent in all of these techniques of limitation is the presumption that each side must make a new calculation of its risks whenever it expands the conflict in area, in the targets attacked, or in the weapons employed. These risks must be weighed against the worth of the objective.

The conduct of military operations under these conditions will require cool heads and steady nerves. And the side that possesses military capabilities which are militarily effective in accomplishing the objective and yet do not require the deliberate expansion of hostilities has a tremendous advantage in this war of nerves.

The essence of the strategic problem, therefore, is to be able to conduct military operations effectively despite area, target, and weapons limitations. There is no reason why the West need preclude itself from the use of atomic weapons in limited war, for fear of expanding hostilities. However, it must be recognized that limited war operations will generally involve coming to the

aid of an ally. Thus a Western decision to initiate the use of atomic weapons must have the approval of the ally on whose territory the war is being fought. Soviet propaganda is attempting to convince the free world that any use of atomic weapons means total war. It is therefore important to both ourselves and our allies that the use of atomic weapons in a limited war be carefully circumscribed and related to a limited objective.

If these techniques of limitation are to be sustained, it is of the utmost importance that aggression be resisted promptly and successfully. The greatest danger of all-out war is to be found in the little war getting out of control. The likelihood of this happening is increased as the political issues at stake assume an expanded significance. The tensions involved are likely to be in direct proportion to the value of the prize to be won or lost.

The sixth element of doctrine for limited war, therefore, is rapid counteraction. The ability to intervene quickly and to repel an aggression is of basic importance in limited war and, in turn, to the deterrence of all-out war. Once territory is lost, it is extremely difficult to regain without a major effort. In this situation there may be a tendency to rely on threats of punishment in an effort to force the withdrawal of the aggressor. This may well precipitate a series of ultimatums and counter ultimatums until the positions of both sides have become frozen and can no longer be accommodated short of one side or the other either withdrawing or making good on its threat.

On the other hand, if significant military power can be deployed quickly to the area of the aggression, can stop the enemy advance promptly, and then restore the status quo, the risks of intervention are greatly reduced.

It is sometimes argued that the free world cannot muster sufficient forces at any point on the periphery of the Sino-Soviet bloc to defend successfully because the Soviets can operate on interior lines. Yet, insofar as peripheral actions are concerned, the advantage of operating on interior lines vanishes when the land area in question is hemispheric in extent. There is no reason why the West cannot outmatch the Soviets in strategic mobility if adequate sea and air lift is available.

It is imperative that this strategic factor be exploited fully. The prospects for limiting hostilities are greatly enhanced by a capability for rapid counteraction.

The seventh and final element of doctrine for limited war is so evident that it requires no extensive elaboration—mutual support. Very obviously all of the Armed Forces, operating as a tri-dimensional team, are required for the conduct of limited war operations, just as they are needed in event of all-out war.

The Army is, of courses, dependent upon the Air Force—and in some cases the Navy also—for tactical air support. Also, the attainment of the necessary strategic mobility to make rapid counteraction possible requires suitable airlift and high-speed sealift; the Army is dependent upon the Air Force and Navy respectively for this support. It is only by exploiting the full capabilities of all the services in mutually supporting operations that limited war—or all-out war—can be fought succesfully.

These, then, are the principal elements of limited war doctrine:

1. Limited war is possible.

2. There is a valid distinction between unlimited and limited operations.

3. Maintenance of the objective.

4. In limited wars, limitations will be placed upon area of conflict, targets subject to attack, and weapons employed.

5. The absolute precondition for limited war is the maintenance of the strategic deterrent.

6. Rapid and effective counteraction is the single most important operational capability for limited war.

7. Mutual support.

Army programs are designed to support this doctrine, as well as to meet the requirements for deterring all-out war. These are among the Army's first priority objectives.

With limited war the most likely threat to the Nation's security, and with the expansion of a limited war the most likely source of an all-out conflict, the capability to wage limited war effectively is the surest guaranty of the Nation's security. The deterrent to the all-out war is not enough, for it cannot assurdly deter limited war, and it is not designed for the conduct of limited operations.

The tactical forces necessary for limited war are no less important to the Nation's security than maintenance of the strategic deterrent. There must be options open to the free world in resisting Communist aggression—options which lie between inaction on the one hand and actions carrying undue risk of all-out war on the other. In preparing to meet the most overwhelming danger, the lesser danger but more likely threat cannot be neglected. There must be no chink in the armor of deferrence.

Address of Hon. Edith Nourse Rogers, Archbishop Cushing Benefit Dinner for New College of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, Boston, Mass., May 11, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

ADDRESS OF EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS—ARCHBISHOP CUSHING BENEFIT DINNER FOR NEW COLLEGE OF THE OBLATES OF MARY IMMACULATE, SUNDAY, MAY 11, 1958, BOSTON, MASS.

His Excellency, Archbishop Cushing, the Very Reverend Father Richard, distinguished clergy, Father Morissette, the toastmaster, Mr. Goguen, and the countless friends of the oblate fathers of Mary Immaculate:

It is an honor to be here this evening and to be invited to this important dinner event of Archbishop Cushing in the interest of a new Oblate college for this vicinity. Everyone who is associated with the efforts to secure the funds for the construction of this greatly needed new College of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate is confident of success.

Our eminent archbishop of Boston, besides being one of the world's great spiritual leaders, is a constant inspiration to his fellow men for the successful accomplishment of all things that are good and right. The power of his distinguished leadership and the force of his seemingly limitless energy and physical strength, combined with his friendliness, understanding, and kindness, command a respect that towers high above mortal men. Because of his being among us, our lives are richer and our communities are finer. Having his blessing, and the power of his inspiration and leadership, this new Oblate college will come into being and within a very short time the power of its Christian influences, through its graduate missionaries, will extend to many parts of the world.

As we meet here tonight, the need for education is great. In almost every field of human endeavor, there is a great need for the wider and wider expansion of educational facilities. Not only is this true here in the United States where our population has increased to 180 million people, but it is also a fact in so many other countries in the world.

With our civilization standing on the threshold of adventures into limitless space, there is a tremendous call for men and women trained in the physical sciences, in engineering, and chemistry. In not only our country, but in every other land, there is an urgent need for more doctors, more nurses, and more persons devoted to research to care for the physical ills and diseases of mankind.

In the years just ahead, many of our young men and women must realize this need and must take advantage of this opportunity to train themselves for this service to humanity.

As demanding as these needs are, however, they are not as pressing as the need for dedicated young men and women trained, very carefully trained, in serving the spiritual requirements of expanding populations of people all over the earth. The primary, basic, necessary requirement for world peace at this time and in the future, is a knowledge of, and a faith in God. It is a fact that any nation today whose people believe in and fear God, whose government leaders are God-fearing and strong in their faith, that such a nation is not only a peaceful nation, but one which strives to find peaceful solutions to all controversies.

Never has there been a greater call for vastly expanding facilities in which more and more brilliant young men can receive the necessary training to find themselves and dedicate themselves to God, to serve and feed the human spirit, to bring men in all parts of the world into the pathways of knowledge, faith, trust, and right.

It is at institutions such as this planned new College of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate that young men are prepared and trained for the priesthood. A large percentage of these young men go to foreign missions to such places as the Arctic Circle beyond the tree line or DEW line. This area is considered so difficult that construction companies on the DEW line found that only 2 percent of the men who signed up for the regular term of 2 years remained for the allotted time, and this despite the salary of a thousand dollars a month for unskilled labor. But the intrepid Oblate missionaries remain for life.

They go to such places at Haiti, one of the Latin American countries and the only Negro republic in the Americas. They go to the ricefields of Japan, to the tropical countries of Africa and South America. They can be found on every continent in the world.

This Oblate College is deserving of your support, not only because it brings the gospel of Christ and the message of Christ spelled out by long and lonely vigils, but because it brings the message of America to people that wish to be free.

These young men will be very effective American ambassadors for the American way of life. The will be effective not because they will grace the parlors of the rich and the wealthy and the mighty but they will bring the message of America down to the poor, the needy, the outcast. They will take it to the factory, to the farm, to the jungle,

to the disease-ridden countries such as Laos. They will not only talk the American way of life, they will live according to the best principles and traditions of the American way of life.

In supporting the education, training, and work of these missionaries, the people of America will be supporting the first line of offense against the errors and evils of communism. They would bring the message of Christ and the peace of Christ in opposition to the creed of hate and tyranny over the minds of men that is so well propagated by the Communists. These men are filled with the love of Christ and are loyal, strong Americans because their country, yours and mine, has been founded on the principle of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Wherever there is suffering, wherever there is disease, wherever there is evil, the Oblates are ready to meet the challenge.

In their dedicated labors these Oblates are not looking for 1 red penny for themselves. They are God's ambassadors, they are America's ambassadors, they are your ambassadors. Where else in the wide world could you find such effective ambassadors whose pay is the native food they eat and the cassock that covers them. This is truly a noble calling; it is a royal vocation; it is a work of love; it is the work of God on this earth. This is the Oblates of Mary Immaculate.

The preparation that these young men receive is according to the strict regulations of the code of canon law. The church wants her priests to have an education second to no other system in the world. These young men will spend 3 years pursuing the study of philosophy and the social sciences. This is done after a 2-year college course elsewhere in the humanities. They then study theology for 5 years. The Oblates not only want holy men; they want learned men. They work on the principle that God's instruments should be well educated and equal to the education gained in any other profession. The Oblates realize that in this day and age their priests must not only be content to fight hatred with love, but falsehood with truth. This is why it takes so long to prepare a young man for the Oblate priesthood This is why this new college and others like it of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate are so greatly needed at this time.

This is a noble cause we are thinking about tonight. It is a holy cause, and it is of tremendous necessity. This new college for the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, and others like it in other places, must soon be a reality. From its classrooms will come dedicated men, strong in their faith, convinced in their mission, and relentless in their efforts to prevail over evil, showing mankind the pointless absurdity of evil, and the fact that evil can never prevail over right. These are the dedicated men who will hold godless communism at bay, who will stand as the bulwark in preventing the evil forces of communism from infiltrating not only our own country but other lands on this earth. These are the men who, through spiritual enlightenment and faith, will force godless communism to its knees; and, on its knees, communism will disappear from this earth.

This is the gigantic crisis of this civilization. It is my belief, my confident belief, that our civilization as we know it can be saved. It may be destroyed by the scientific missiles of destruction known today, but it can be saved by missionaries of the faith, by dedicated men bringing mankind in all nations to the realization their spirit belongs to God. Man must know, wherever he may be, that without faith there is no meaning to life.

This, then, is the crisis. Here, then, is the need for this new college, this new institution to train men who in their efforts combined with others can save our civilization and the life to come. Here is the need for this new College of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate. I am confident that with the strength and inspiration of his excellency, the archbishop, and with such determined effort and work of the Very Reverend Father Richard, and Father Morissete, the funds for the construction of this new college will be provided, and that in the very near future it will be in operation.

Here in America we have been blessed to have such giants of spiritual leadership as the eminent archbishop of Boston. May this blessing long continue to be ours. We haveg reatly and deeply benefited from the labors and constant help of energetic and tireless priests such as Father Richard and Father Morrisette. They have done so much for so many—so well.

They need and must have the necessary support to build and operate this new College of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate. We know they will succeed.

Thank you—you have given me wonderful attention.

The Donable Surplus Property Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a release from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicating that our educational, health, and civil defense institutions received Federal surplus property valued at $81,919,998 during the quarter January through March 1958.

It is gratifying to me to call to the attention of the Congress and to the American people that every State in the Union and Alaska, District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico received surplus property in considerable amounts during this period.

By far, the bulk of the surplus property comes from the military agencies and the donation of the property to education, health, and civil defense is an excellent way at the present time to dispose of the surplus property. Experience has shown that when the property is put up for sale it yields but 6 or 7 percent of its acquisition value to the taxpayers.

I have been convinced for some time that more effective management of the numerous supply and service systems of the Department of Defense would greatly reduce the volume of surplus property, and as I indicated in my remarks on May 5, 1958, I am hopeful that the Armed Services Committee will report a reorganization bill which will permit the development of a much more efficient supply and service system in the Department of Defense. In the meantime, however, the best possible use that can be made of surplus property is to donate it to these institutions which have the highest priority in the minds of the American people.

The release follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Personal property made available for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil-defense organizations and real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions Jan. 1 through Mar. 31, 1958 (acquisition cost)

[In accordance with sec. 203 (o), Public Law 152, 81st Cong., as amended]

States	Personal property	Real property	Total
Total	$78,775,277	$3,144,721	$81,919,998
Alabama	2,398,298		2,398,298
Arizona	660,377	15,860	676,237
Arkansas	426,913	14,049	440,962
California	10,813,010	1,009,953	11,822,963
Colorado	935,249	35,033	970,282
Connecticut	1,759,172		1,759,172
Delaware	309,972		309,972
Florida	2,277,982		2,277,982
Georgia	2,079,910		2,079,910
Idaho	578,526		578,526
Illinois	3,778,206		3,778,206
Indiana	1,522,698		1,522,698
Iowa	540,833		540,833
Kansas	677,781		677,781
Kentucky	995,967		995,967
Louisiana	984,596	7,093	991,689
Maine	1,086,373		1,086,373
Maryland	1,578,822	713,176	2,291,998
Massachusetts	1,561,401	8,200	1,569,601
Michigan	2,132,960		2,132,960
Minnesota	794,891		794,891
Mississippi	1,415,623		1,415,623
Missouri	3,192,074		3,192,074
Montana	198,957	6,960	205,917
Nebraska	1,867,797		1,867,797
Nevada	321,752		321,752
New Hampshire	363,429		363,429
New Jersey	1,752,940		1,752,940
New Mexico	626,781	164,875	791,656
New York	6,196,442	11,952	6,208,394
North Carolina	2,937,259		2,937,259
North Dakota	102,810	7,730	110,540
Ohio	1,926,687	21,433	1,948,120
Oklahoma	1,106,337	29,795	1,136,132
Oregon	2,166,146		2,166,146
Pennsylvania	1,693,309	266,159	1,959,468
Rhode Island	306,897		306,897
South Carolina	1,345,531		1,345,531
South Dakota	373,186		373,186
Tennessee	1,924,909	14,326	1,939,235
Texas	3,202,999	500,456	3,703,455
Utah	560,883	4,768	565,651
Vermont	189,887		189,887
Virginia	1,566,272	85,000	1,651,272
Washington	1,924,606	210,638	2,135,244
West Virginia	777,055		777,055
Wisconsin	964,414	2,265	966,679
Wyoming	595,272		535,272
Alaska	114,003	15,000	129,003
District of Columbia	214,453		214,453
Hawaii	659,007		659,007
Puerto Rico	353,623		353,623
Virgin Islands			

Reciprocal Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Robert T. Stevens has had many years of experience with one of the greatest corporations in America. He gained additional knowledge in the field of business, trade and world affairs as a very distinguished Secretary of the Army in this administration. Mr. Stevens is a great American, patriotic, and is tremendously interested in preserving our free-enterprise system as the greatest bulwark the free world has against Communist imperialism. Secretary Stevens realizes the importance of trade. He advocates truly mutually advantageous reciprocal

trade. He does not believe that the sacrifice of some of our greatest industries to low-wage foreign imports can possibly strengthen this country or the free world.

While this House is considering this important issue, it might be well for us all to study carefully this great speech by an outstanding American. The following is the major portion of Mr. Stevens' speech as recently delivered in the great State of Montana:

While we are on the subject of competition, I would like to turn now to another matter which is of great importance to the continuance of a strong and vital America. It is a subject which involves unreasonable competition. It could impair the dynamic, American economy, which we all agree is so essential to the security of our country.

I refer to something that could not only tear down much that you here in this room have erected but much that you dream of bettering. This subject has been described by the use of catch phrases like "trade, not aid" and, in mathematical terms it sounds like 2 plus 2 equal 4, but, in actual operation it is more like 2 minus 2, which equals nothing. I am speaking of the proposed legislation before Congress right now, known as the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. It is up for renewal for another 5 years and the plan would authorize substantial additional tariff cutting powers. Many of the top level men of our Government have spoken for the program. These are friends of mine. I differ honestly with them on this measure but that does not lessen my regard for them as public servants or as personal friends. Their voices and pens are, however, diligently at work to keep this amazing world trade anachronism intact. Free trade proponents from commerce and industry are fighting side by side with my friends in Government to extend this ill-advised legislation.

An enormous number of well-intentioned and fine people really believe that these so-called reciprocal trade agreements are actually "reciprocal." Nothing could be further from the truth. This legislation was enacted originally in 1934 as an "emergency" measure to aid the country during depression times and was frankly called "an emergency measure for emergency conditions." It has been renewed 10 times for varying periods and the emergency never ends, in spite of the fact that since Pearl Harbor, in 1941, our country has experienced greater economic growth than ever known by any nation since time began. Instead of being an "emergency" measure, today its friends now call it an "anti-recession" measure. They move with the times and always have an opportunistic reason for renewal.

This emergency measure has kept growing like a blight: wider, more complex, and more dangerous, at the expense of many American workers and many American businesses. While textiles and other soft goods were hit hard at first, today the whirlwind of cheap imports is affecting many kinds of goods and machinery. Our people divide sharply on this subject and the Congress itself breaks up into large blocs of those who are for and those who are against, or those who lean toward or those who lean against. Many of our people have tranquilized their own convictions by repeating a little sing-song that deserves some comment. The sing-song goes something like this: "Free trade means no conflict between nations and that means no wars and that in the end means that our sons will not go forth to battle." Who among us has the courage to take issue with such sentimental reasoning? It is a strong America that will deter war, not an America with holes in its military and economic armor.

The shocking fact is that many American markets and American jobs are just as easy for foreigners to take as stealing a baby's candy. Let's consider these salient points:

1. Wages paid to workers abroad, making all kinds of goods that we buy, range from 35 or 40 cents an hour down to about 8 cents per hour. By comparison I'm sure it is unnecessary for me to cite the hourly rates of the average worker in the United States.

2. In 1934 when the tariff cutting spree began, the average tariff levels protecting our industries were 46.7 percent—now they are 11.7 percent. The so-called protection is three-quarters gone. And there will be more of the same if the act is renewed as proposed.

This has been mercilessly destructive to the basic foundations of American jobs. You, as engineers, know full well that no amount of technological improvement in processing can compensate for those wage differentials, in the light of what you know about present day equipment here and abroad. As a matter of fact, many foreign countries have very modern, new equipment that was partly paid for by you and by me, as American taxpayers. How can we as a Nation give money, know-how and lowered tariffs to our friends abroad and not have trouble at home. We can't eat our cake and have it too.

Now what about the reciprocity in our trade agreements? Well, in the first place, as these successive trade agreements were made with various countries, all the benefits were passed around to all the other trade agreement countries. As you know, this is called the most favored nation clause. It is not surprising that the country with the lowest wages and the required skills gets the business. Obviously, again, because our wages are 5 to 10 times greater than those of other countries we didn't get the business, we got the "bizness."

The whole thing reduces itself to very understandable elements if we take a look at the facts and forget the much touted slogans. For most items, wages are the deciding factor in measuring what country will make which product, depending upon where the necessary skills and materials can be made available. For example, England controlled the wool goods export market for centuries. In recent years the Italians, with lower wages and excellent skills, have chased the British woolen goods off many trade routes. And now the Japanese are invading the wool goods export market in a big way. Japanese goods made of wool are seriously affecting the already stricken woolen manufacturing industry of the United States. This is bad for the wool growing industry in which Montana is so vitally interested, as well as being bad for the American worker.

With our generous showering of goods, services, and money upon so many lands, in addition to having cut our average tariff rates by three-quarters and with foreign wages so far below ours, what did our foreign friends do? How did they reciprocate? The facts show that the 89 trading nations, other than the United States, have developed no less than 36 different ingenious practices, restrictive to international trade and investment. As examples:

Sixty-two countries require import licenses to get goods into the countries, and skullduggery is rampant in this area.

Forty-six require export licenses, sometimes tied up with stringent currency controls.

Twenty-six have restrictions on outgoing capital movements.

Twenty-eight have restrictions on incoming capital movements.

Thirty-three have exchange licenses.

Twenty-three have multiple exchange rates.

Nine have import quotas, but the import licenses operating in 62 countries are, in effect, just the same as quotas.

The problem is the same whether it be in Rhode Island, Ohio, Georgia, or Montana. Only the names of the products involved are different. The blight is on a vast variety of items—textiles, machinery, machine and hand tools, chemicals, metals, cameras, appliances, and countless others. The great State of Montana is probably first in the Nation in zinc, third in copper, and fifth in lead production in the United States. As you know, the price structure is not only disheartening but is ruinous to many American mining companies. It is tough on many Montanans who depend so greatly upon these metals for their livelihood. We get the same end result whenever low-cost imports shut down plants and mines and people are put out of jobs.

Probably one of the least understood phases of the market place, and certainly the phase misunderstood by most of the proponents of free trade, is the psychological effect of the sale of a small quantity of really cheap and unrestricted imported goods on the basic price level of the rest of the domestic supply. The result is dramatic, immediate, and destructive. The price of all the rest of the goods, no matter how high the wages, rent, heat, light, taxes, and other items of cost that went into them, will grind inexorably downward with the sureness of the pull of gravity.

Unrestricted imports encourage the disintegration of price levels based upon American costs. There may be a temporary advantage to consumers but, if uncontrolled, it will wreak havoc on employment in America. The result is decreased purchasing power, hardship, relief, and a lower standard of living. American jobs must be preserved for American workers.

What advantage is there to the American worker and his family if we permit the further liberalization of these foreign trade laws? The gains that have been made in the fields of minimum wages, overtime pay, social security, industrial safety, health and welfare could be seriously affected. Any manufacturer can now escape American labor legislation and most American taxes simply by locating his plant abroad. The laws governing interstate commerce should not discriminate against goods produced in the United States.

Why should two identical garments, one manufactured in the United States and the other manufactured in Japan run into different rules at our State borders? If, as is true, we have legislated costs on the United States product, is it fair or reasonable that foreign goods should move in interstate commerce entirely exempt from the rules that apply to American manufacturers?

In my judgment, the American people are to fair minded to approve this type of unfair competition if they understood it. The point is that our laws should take into account the high costs of American manufacture when evaluating the entry of foreign goods into our country. Tariffs, quotas, or a combination of both are necessary if we are to preserve our American standard of living. And let us not forget that American industry has twice been the arsenal of democracy in world wars. Is it wise, in the nuclear age, to decimate, under the halo of reciprocal trade, industries which were essential to allied victories in World War I and II?

Ladies and gentlemen, it is fantastic to many American businessmen to speak of this idea of international trade as reciprocity. Almost alone, we have done all the giving and yielding and losing. It was all the American Government's idea in the first

place, 24 years ago, and we sold it all over the world. The act took the tariff control out of the hands of Congress and gave it to the executive branch. The control of American international trade should go back into the hands of Congress, where it belongs. This is the point at which local conditions register promptly and accurately.

Two bills are now in the House Ways and Means Committee and will shortly be acted upon. One is the Dorn bill—H. R. 11250 and the other is the Simpson bill—H. R. 11462.

Both bills return the determination of when American industry, and thus, our country is injured to the Congress, through the medium of the Tariff Commission, by whatever name it may be called. Under these bills economists in the State Department could no longer use global politics, sputniks, or other convenient reasons to overrule the true facts when our industries and mines are actually hurt, as is now the case.

I urge all of you connected in one way or another with American free enterprise to give serious thought to this vital and current subject and to advise your Congressmen and Senators how you feel. There isn't too much time. I have opposed the encroachment upon American jobs of these misleading trade agreements since their inception and I shall continue to do so until some form of equitable relief, based upon the American standard of living, is available.

The danger is clear and present. No one can deny that we must stop being complacent about our technical educational system. By the same token, we cannot be complacent over the fact that our country has actually become the battlefield for cheaply made imported manufactured goods. The American standard of living is under attack from overseas. Many countries who are attacking us in this way are our friends. They rely on our economic strength and our aid. Personally I believe most of them would understand our problem if our representatives at the international bargaining table would present our situation effectively and fearlessly. Let us join together to remind our government of the necessity of defending our hard won high standards of living. I thank you.

Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors Suggests Federal Legislation for Public Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a copy of a resolution adopted on April 29 by the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors, suggesting Federal legislation for public assistance.

A memorandum from Mr. John W. Rankin, director of the Milwaukee County Institutions and Departments, relating to this subject, is also enclosed.

The Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County notes the problems faced by persons needing public assistance who do not meet State residence requirements for such aid, and recommends the enactment of Federal legislation to provide Federal assistance for such persons.

In accordance with the wishes expressed by the board, I include the resolution in the RECORD, and commend it to the attention of the membership of this body:

Be it resolved, That the following resolution as submitted by Supervisor Duffey be and the same is hereby adopted as recommended by the legislative committee after appearances by Charles O'Neill, executive director of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, and J. T. Petska, secretary of the Milwaukee County Property Owners Association, and due consideration and deliberation having been held by said committee on the subject matter:

"Whereas the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors was the primary sponsor of the so-called relief residency requirement bill which was introduced and enacted into law at the 1957 session of the Wisconsin Legislature as chapter 190 of the Laws of Wisconsin of 1957; and

"Whereas since the enactment of this legislation and its practical application to various unforeseen factual situations, deficiencies in the law have glaringly been brought to light; and

"Whereas conflicting interpretations have been applied to the term 'continuous residence,' some interpretations so strictly construed that Wisconsin residents having all the other prerogatives of citizenship in this State may be denied relief because of temporary absence from the State; and

"Whereas it was not the intention of this body when sponsoring this bill that it give rise to any inequities or unjust hardships to those of our citizenry who have met with financial reversals; and

"Whereas our country is now in the midst of a financial recession with more than 5 million persons unemployed; and

"Whereas the current unemployment situation in this community has caused a sharp rise in the number of persons requiring public financial assistance; and

"Whereas since the 16th day of June 1957 persons without continuous residence in the State of Wisconsin for a period of at least 1 year have been refused such assistance by reason of the provisions of chapter 190 of the Laws of Wisconsin of 1957; and

"Whereas those nonresident persons who are in actual need of financial assistance from the community have had, since the enactment of this law, no place to turn for assistance except to a few private charitable agencies, which agencies have strained their limited resources in an attempt to meet the emergency needs of these unfortunate and destitute people; and

"Whereas a great many of such persons have now become stateless persons, although they are bona fide citizens of the United States of America, because they are unable in the time of their need to establish the required minimum legal term of residence in any State for the purpose of receiving public aid; and further, because all the States of the Nation, with the exception of the State of New York, have laws specifying that such residence is a condition precedent to the granting of public aid: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors*, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to promptly consider and enact, not only as an antirecession measure but as a means of meeting serious social problems, enabling legislation to provide Federal aids which will meet the most urgent needs of these stateless persons; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That authenticated copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Governor of the State of Wisconsin for his presentation to the proper committee at the governors' conference to be held at Miami, Fla., May 18 to May 21, 1958, as well as to the Wisconsin Members of the Congress of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That such Wisconsin Members of Congress be requested to jointly take proper action to insure that this resolution be spread upon the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the purpose of making known the contents thereof to all Members of the Congress of the United States."

MILWAUKEE COUNTY INSTITUTIONS AND DEPARTMENTS,
Milwaukee, Wis., April 25, 1958.

From: John W. Rankin, director, Milwaukee County Institutions and Departments.

Subject: Suggested Federal legislation for public assistance.

Many proposals are being discussed which would provide that the Federal Government assist local communities in the granting of assistance to needy persons during this time of recession. Since the Honorable Vernon W. Thompson, Governor of Wisconsin, will shortly attend the conference of governors where such legislation will be discussed, it is proposed that the Governor should have some indication from the Milwaukee County Board of Public Welfare of its feeling inasmuch as this is the largest metropolitan community in the State of Wisconsin.

It is recommended therefore that your honorable body approve of the board of public welfare forwarding to the Governor the following letter which outlines the board's position:

"Knowing that you are concerned about general assistance problems in the State of Wisconsin and plan to propose certain remedies at the forthcoming conference of governors, we would like to make certain recommendations.

"We, as members of the Milwaukee County Board of Public Welfare, have had considerable experience in dealing with applicants for general assistance, both those who have lived in Wisconsin for many years and those who have more lately migrated here. We have witnessed the migration of people to work in Milwaukee industries during 1941–46 and again in 1951 through 1953. We have also seen the increase in assistance applications that occurred in 1949 and 1950, in 1953 and 1954, and at the present time. We believe that the remedy is an amendment to the Social Security Act which provides reimbursement as follows:

"(*a*) A formula of 50–50 between the Federal Government and the States and localities for all assistance applicants who have lived in Wisconsin for more than 1 year; and

"(*b*) A 100-percent Federal reimbursement for assistance applicants who have lived in Wisconsin for less than 1 year.

"The reasons for these recommendations will be discussed in turn:

"A. FEDERAL REIMBURSEMENT FOR GENERAL ASSISTANCE

"At the present time, the whole country is in the midst of a recession. If spending for general assistance cases continues throughout the year at the March level, Milwaukee County will face a deficit of over $3 million.

"The Federal Government now helps with the financing of other forms of public assistance and should do the same for general assistance. Originally, it was believed unemployment in a local community could be solved by the local community and, therefore, the burden of financing should fall on its members. Today, it is generally recognized that our economy is very closely interlocked throughout the whole of our Nation and when a recession hits one part of it or one major industry, it is very quickly felt by all the other parts and most of the other industries. This suggests strongly that the burden of paying the costs of providing relief to the unemployed should be shifted in part at least to a Federal tax base. It is suggested that this burden be shared

on a 50–50 basis between the Federal Government and the several States.

"B. 100 PERCENT REIMBURSEMENT FOR MIGRANTS

"Each State now has its own residence laws which determine eligibility for assistance to migrants. A wide variety of patterns exist throughout the country. As a result, a fairly large number of citizens have become stateless. They are the responsibility of no State or community. They have been written out of the statutes and their difficulties result in endless bickering between the States where the migrant finds himself unemployed and the States where he formerly lived. Their number naturally increases in periods of economic recession.

"It is possible that a uniform residence law might be developed and adopted by all the States. This would take considerable time and there is no assurance that all State legislatures would adopt it. An alternative would be to have the Federal Government assume responsibility for 100 percent of the costs involved in providing assistance to stateless people. This could be done by an amendment to the Social Security Act providing for administration of the program by the States and localities and reimbursement by the Federal Social Security Administration.

"Migrants are human beings in interstate commerce. The Federal Government constitutionally and traditionally has had jurisdiction over things which move in interstate commerce. The plight of migrants is an acute social problem throughout the Nation affecting farm workers, as well as nonresidents in large cities when they find themselves thrown out of work.

"Most population forecasters see migration between States and localities increasing in the next 20 years. As our economy expands, as new industries and occupations develop, there will be continually reoccurring demand for large numbers of people to move to new localities. If recessions occur before they have established roots in the new communities, the cost of their assistance needs should not fall on the new community but on the Nation as a whole which has profited by their migration."

JOHN W. RANKIN, *Director.*

Japanese Editors Visit Troy—Greatly Impressed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN R. BUSH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Troy Gazette-Register on May 8, 1958. It so happens that Troy is in Bradford County, the third largest county in the State of Pennsylvania. It is one of the 8 counties comprising the 17th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, which I have the honor and privilege of representing.

JAPANESE EDITORS VISIT TROY—GREATLY IMPRESSED

TROY.—Two Japanese editors were visitors in Troy this week.

They are Shimpei Ikejima and Shozo Ogiya. Both are from Tokyo, the metropolitan capital of Japan.

These prominent editors, one of a weekly magazine section of a daily newspaper of 1,500,000 circulation, and the other, an editor of a monthly publication of 700,000, came to Troy as guests of C. Dixxon Avery, editor of the Troy Gazette-Register.

Flying in from Japan, Mr. Ikejima and Mr. Ogiya first stopped for 4 days in Hawaii's Honolulu, then at San Francisco, next at Washington, all by air.

They arrived in Troy Sunday night after a flight from Boston to Newark, N. J., and then by train to Elmira, N. Y. They departed Wednesday morning for Detroit, to resume their tour of the United States which will end after a 2 months' stay.

Governmental Institute of Washington, D. C., a branch of the State Department, are the sponsors. Manaku Fukuda, a native Californian of Japanese ancestry, is their interpreter. Mr. Ikejima, a traveler of some renown, speaks English well enough to get along. Mr. Ogiya can express himself, but needs some assistance of the interpretive expression of Mr. Fukuda.

Both editors are graduates of the University of Tokyo. They are vitally interested in behind-the-scenes activities of social and economic import.

Troy is the only small town they are visiting during their trip around the United States. And they have expressed their pleasure in being able to talk to the grassroots people of America, although they did not say so in so many words, probably because the American expression, "grassroots," is unknown in their country, and, therefore, in their language of expression.

What they endeavored to convey, was that it was good to talk to the people of a community like Troy, official and unofficial, in order to feel the pulse of America.

Troy has been designated as a must place of visit for Japanese journalists by the Governmental Affairs Institute, because it so wonderfully well exemplifies small community life.

Three years ago two editors from Japan came to Troy. Last year another editor made the visit. This year, two others.

How it all started, explains the editor of the Troy Gazette-Register, is when Chojiro Kitagawa and Shigemitsu Okazaki asked Governmental Affairs to make it possible for them to visit Mr. Avery (the editor) in Troy, Pa.

The editor of your paper had been in Japan during the administration of General MacArthur, first as a political analyst in MacArthur's headquarters, and later, as Chief of Information for a region administered by military government.

As Information Chief, Mr. Avery made numerous acquaintances, and several of these learning of the impending visit of the two Japanese editors, proffered overtures that they contact Mr. Avery. And so it started. Mr. Avery expressed delight that these international contacts persist, and that Troy is so honored by the must on the American tour.

Arriving in Troy on Sunday night, the two visiting editors and their interpreter registered at the Troy Hotel. Monday morning they spent some time inspecting the operation of the Troy Gazette-Register and in talking with visitors who happened to call at the newspaper office. They met several political figures in the county at this time.

A visit was paid to the W. R. Croman elementary school where they visited the 5th and 6th grades of Mrs. Mary Van Keuren's class. Here they spoke in English and Japanese to the students, answering many questions and illustrating Japanese writing. They dined at the school's cafeteria and signed many autographs for the children.

In the afternoon they paid a visit to the Towanda Daily Review as guests of David Turner, copublisher of the paper. Mr. Turner is not only president of the Pennsylvania Newspaper Publishers Association, but is also secretary of the Republican party of Bradford County.

En route back from Towanda to Troy, the Japanese editors paid a visit to Robert Weldy, postmaster of Burlington, as well as owner and operator of Weldy's store in the borough.

A dinner at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Avery in Troy concluded the day's activities.

The next day they visited the milk receiving plant of Troy Dairy at Columbia Cross Roads. This was followed with a visit to the milk-bottling plant of Edgewood Dairy in Troy.

The afternoon marked a visit to Troy Community Hospital where Fred Pomeroy, Jr., acted as guide and host. The remainder of the time was spent in talking to various persons in the town, as they happened to meet.

Mr. Ikejima and Mr. Ogiya, together with their interpreter, departed for Elmira at 9:45 a. m., Wednesday. They enplaned for Buffalo, to resume their tour of the United States.

Before departing the two Japanese editors issued statements. These follow:

"When I was in the fifth grade in a Tokyo school, a visitor from Siam talked to us and I became very interested in Siam, as a result. In fact, I was impressed with what I heard that I resolved I would visit Siam one day. And that has come about," Mr. Ikejima said.

"Last Monday, I visited the Croman School's fifth and sixth grades and I was given the opportunity of talking to the students about Japan.

"I hope that some of them, one day, will be able to visit Japan."

Mr. Ikejima then mentioned Troy's beauty. He had this to say: "Troy is a very beautiful place. In Japan there are, too, many beautiful places and I am sure that any Trojan who will have the pleasure of visiting Japan will be pleased with similar beauty.

"It is important that people travel and they should include Japan in their travels. Our children in Japan would certainly welcome the children of Troy."

Mr. Ogiya went into greater detail when asked about his reactions to a visit in Troy.

"While I was in Washington, D. C., during the preparation of our schedule of visits in America, Mr. Bergheim (director with Governmental Affairs Institute) highly recommended a visit to Troy," he said.

"I felt that Troy had something very romantic and alluring and gladly consented to make the visit. I have been pleased greatly.

"Mr. Bergheim also said that the reason Troy was recommended for a visit was that a visit to New York City would not give a true picture of American life. New York is peculiar in itself, very cosmopolitan, but in a small community you will find something real of American living.

"After spending 2 days in Troy I feel that what Mr. Bergheim said is true, and for the following reasons:

"1. In New York City my camera was stolen from a hotel room. Here in Troy, I left a tip for the maid the first day I was at the Troy Hotel, but she would not accept it. I insisted on the second day that she take it, saying that she had well earned it, but she still refused, giving a reason. That reason was that she was paid to do her work and that was why she did her work so well.

"2. Troy, with its small population, has everything a large city has. In fact, it is a miniature small city.

"For instance, Mr. Avery (the local newspaper publisher), runs a newspaper that is a miniature New York Times—with everything excepting the New York Times circulation. I believe that the New York Times had no less an auspicious history than the Troy Gazette-Register.

"I also believe that Benjamin Franklin's first newspaper had similar beginning. Mr. Franklin stressed personal news, national

happenings, local news of economic nature, school news, conditions of schools, and so forth. All of this, being basic to worthwhile newspapers all over the world.

"3. After my visit to the Troy Community Hospital, all I can say, briefly, is 'simply wonderful.' I feel that its equipment and conveniences are superior to anything we now have in Japan.

"I would like to pay my respects to the people of Troy who have made it possible to have such a wonderful hospital."

In conclusion of the interview with this newspaper Mr. Ogiya said that if he had remained 3 days longer in Troy he would have met at least a third of the people here.

He expressed his deep feeling that children everywhere are the truly likeable people of the world.

Asked by the editor of this paper, "What is the most impressive thing you experienced in Troy?" the two editors had this to say:

"I was most impressed with your fine community hospital," said Mr. Ikejima.

"I was greatly impressed by the friendliness of all the people I met, officially and informally," said Mr. Ogiya.

Aerial Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have flown in and out of Miami's busy International Airport have been impressed with the number of foreign airlines operating to and from the United States through the Miami gateway.

This has been particularly impressive to those of us fortunate enough to serve on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Many times in hearings before our committee we have been told of the serious problems United States air carriers face in competing with foreign lines.

Through these hearings we have learned, for instance, that it is not unusual for foreign carriers to pay their personnel—flight and ground crews—only half as much in salaries and wages as are paid by our own carriers. We have learned also that, more often than not, the national lines of other countries are either owned outright or substantially controlled by their governments. This strong foreign competition, Mr. Speaker, is not without considerable financing nor is it without the best in modern equipment and when jets begin operating in Latin America within another year there is no guarantee that a United States airline will be the first in the field with new jet service.

This inequitable arrangement, Mr. Speaker, whereby foreign lines outnumber United States international carriers serving Miami by almost 10 to 1 is not isolated nor would it be possible without the cooperation of our own Government. We all know that Air France was providing nonstop service between New York and Mexico City long before the Civil Aeronautics Board even held hearings for the purpose of certificating an American carrier over the same route. We were shocked to learn, several months ago, that Qantas, the commercial air arm of the Australian Government, was given Australia-San Francisco-New York-London rights by our Government which still denies a transcontinental route to the only United States carrier which can hope to compete with Quantas, BOAC, KLM, Air France, and SAS in round-the-world operations.

It may already be too late, Mr. Speaker, but it is my hope that our State Department and our Civil Aeronautics Board will take a long hard look at any further negotiations with foreign governments which would continue to endanger the survival of our own independently owned air carriers. Subsidy payments to our international carriers have diminished to the point of being negligible. The easiest way to get our international airlines back on subsidy is to continue to hand out lush routes in the United States to their foreign competitors on an indiscriminate basis.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD a most informative article published in the May 5 issue of Time, entitled "Aerial Battle":

AERIAL BATTLE

International airline operations in Latin America, only 13 years ago the virtually unchallenged preserve of Pan American World Airways and Panagra, have become the world's hottest commercial aerial battle. Fifty-six international lines, including 37 fast comers incorporated in Latin America, now fight for passengers.

The newcomers are grabbing business mostly by making themselves the "discount houses of the air." Brazil's big Real-Aerovias charges only $432 for the round-trip excursion flight between Miami and Buenos Aires, as compared with the $779 asked by International Air Transport Association members such as Pan American. Panama's Aerovias flies from Panama to Miami for $55, versus the standard $94—and serves Scotch highballs on the house. Last week, grimly preparing to meet the competition, Panagra got set to introduce an excursion fare of its own that will undercut IATA rates by 30 percent.[1]

	Panagra excursion	IATA tourist
New York-Lima	$428.40	$567.00
New York-Santiago	576.80	771.60
New York-Buenos Aires	638.40	872.60

ON THE CHEAP

Latin American airlines make rate-cutting work by an assortment of economies. Many fly aerial jitneys, such as war-surplus C–46's converted from United States Air Force freighters into lumbering passenger planes. Chile's thriving Cinta line paints its four-engined airliners Panagra yellow and green, and calls one flight El Latinamericano in cousinly association to Panagra's crack El Inter Americano—but not even dubbing the plane Super DC–4B makes it anything but an unpressurized, 230-mile-per-hour DC–4.

Other lines save enough on wages and low taxes to use up-to-the-minute equipment. To fly fine 325-mile-per-hour Super-H Constellations, Real's chief pilots get $900 a month, only about half what a United States captain makes for the same job. Nicaragua's tiny Lanica line recently put a pair of turboprop Viscounts on its Miami-Lima service.

CHAMPAGNE FARE

But many Latin American airlines in the international runs have not had to cut rates to get business. Chile's Linea Aérea Nacional, for example, is subsidized by the Government, does a sedate business at IATA rates by appealing to national pride. Others offer special services, such as the direct European flights of Panair do Brasil, Cubana Airlines and Colombia's 38-year-old Avianca.

Varig of Brazil offers champagne-and-lobster catering. The turboprop Britannias of Aeronaves de Mexico feature speed; they have cut the New York-Mexico City flight to 6½ hours. Safety standards are generally high because international airlines must meet the requirements of the strictest country they land in, which in the case of 26 Latin American airlines is the United States.

FAIR PROSPECTS

"Sure there's plenty of international competition," says Real-Aerovias President Linneu Gomes, "but we can beat it. We offer speed, service, safety, and new planes." Real has built its fleet to 120 (v. Panagra's 19), and most of the other lines have big expansion plans. The state-owned Argentine Airline is wrapping up a $28 million deal for 6 de Havilland Comet 4 pure jets to start 13-hour service between Buenos Aires and New York (almost a year before Panagra gets DC–8 jets on the same run). Varig has ordered French Caravelle jets; Real has bought four Convair jet 880's, will fly a route to Tokyo. An Antarctic route from Chile to New Zealand seems a live possibility, cutting the present 14,400-mile flight via Honolulu down to 5,400 miles via McMurdo Sound.

The effect is bound to be a tighter squeeze on United States carriers. Braniff Airways, which began flying to Buenos Aires in 1948 and still gets a United States subsidy ($550,000 in the first half of 1957), may have to ask for more. Pan American's Latin American division, which in 1956 went off a subsidy that had been averaging $11 million a year, and Panagra, which went off subsidy at the end of 1954, may have to appeal again for aid from the United States.

[1] Sample round-trip fares:

The Tamassee DAR School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, during the recent Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, a splendid address concerning the Tamassee DAR School was delivered by Mrs. Zora Butts Barnett, a graduate of this fine school. Tamassee DAR School is located in the district it is my pleasure to represent in Congress and I am personally proud of my friendship with Dr. Ralph H. Cain, superintendent of the school. This speech is a tribute to the patriotism and generosity of all those who have made this educational institution such a successful reality and I commend it to the attention of the Members of this House:

THE TAMASSEE DAR SCHOOL

(By Mrs. Zora Butts Barnett)

My dear DAR ladies (that's what we called you at Tamassee), it is a great privilege to have this opportunity of finding some words to express the feelings from my heart to you personally. It's breathtaking to witness your great organization in action for the first time. I'm really scared, for my knees are shaking.

First, I wish to bring love and devotion from each alumnus in our Tamassee Alumni Association. It is composed of all students who have attended Tamassee since its founding.

Each year Tamassee invites us back with our families for the annual banquet—and what a grand affair.

Someone once asked me what Tamassee had meant to me. I promptly replied, "Everything," for without Tamassee I would not be standing before you today. In all probability, I'd still be plowing oxen on the Rocky hillsides of Oconee County, S. C. Perhaps I wouldn't know how to feed my family the right foods. I'm sure that I wouldn't be able to teach, as I do today, the young married ladies' Sunday school class in our local Presbyterian church. The size of my family did not permit many luxuries, and I realized early in life that there were more valuable things than just guiding that plow.

I loved school so much that I spent 2 years in the seventh grade. During this time I was teaching a Sunday school class of young people my own age. Perhaps it was this experience and the years spent in the open that I gained a vision of what lay beyond those mountains, and I resolved to find out.

My first opportunity came when I won a 2 months' scholarship to Dr. Wil Lou Gray's Opportunity School for 2 consecutive summers.

I was elated then when Mrs. Carl Whitmire, a teacher in our community, asked if I would like to attend high school. My joy knew no bounds.

It was then that I met Dr. Cain for the first time and learned of your Tamassee. In response to a letter, he made us a visit. He found me working alongside my brothers in the torrid heat. After taking pictures, he asked me if I would go to Tamassee if I were given an opportunity. My quick reply was "Yes." In September I went to the school with a 2-bushel hamper filled with beans and a bushel of potatoes with which to pay for my uniforms and shoes. I began as a freshman in high school at 20 years of age with a great determination to learn and discover myself.

During summer vacations, I went back to my home community bursting with dreams and more determination. There were many places that I could put into practice what I was learning at Tamassee. The mothers of undernourished children needed to know what made them that way. Sally, a neighbor, wanted help in cutting and making a dress. Then there was the family canning to do besides canning some fruit for Tamassee to help pay for shoes and uniforms.

Wasn't it our own past State regent who called Tamassee a many-splendored thing. That spirit of Tamassee helps an individual organize himself and all his component forces. It is a builder of human souls, that is, it begins with and in the total person, intellectually, physically, socially emotionally, and spiritually. Tamassee, which is an instrument of God, cooperates in every way to make its students aware of their need to grow and excel in character and achievement. At Tamassee students are taught to rise above and against the winds of their unfinished environment which threatens to smash them into the sinkholes of drudgery. It teaches them to rise above themselves and grow toward higher attainments. Perhaps, the following incidents will illustrate what I mean.

At the beginning of each school year, Dr. Cain would say "Our Tamassee students are too fine to mar or deface any part of our lovely buildings." Always letting us know that the highest type of behavior was expected of us. Another time he might say, "I saw a piece of paper on such and such a walk, as I came to chapel." We wouldn't dare let him see another piece of paper on our beautiful campus. That's the Tamassee spirit which each student has caught.

Tamassee and Dr. Cain are synonymous terms to those who love Tamassee and Dr. Cain. He has given to many a new way of thinking. He has helped to create an institution comparable to any. His past accomplishments for your fine school is a preface to its future. His great integrity and gift of inspiring others has lighted the way for hundreds of boys and girls whose lives would otherwise have been drab and colorless. He inspires confidence in one's self. I must say that Dr. Cain and Tamassee lead students out of themselves onto the road of learning.

I look with awe upon the great DAR organization, for the power it possesses to change and shape the lives of the less fortunate. Time does not permit, but I could go into great details here about such qualities of character as loyalty, and patriotism, but the most important things I learned, were to live, appreciate beauty, and to get along with others. Tamassee stimulated my ambition and awakened in me a desire to serve others with a greater determination.

After completing the 4-year high-school course in 3 years, I was graduated in 1939. During that summer I worked as a maid for a wealthy family on Lake George in New York and earned $75. That September I entered Berea College as a freshman, where I worked and paid my way, with the exception of a $75 scholarship in home economics, the first year. Then during the third and fourth years I borrowed $125 from the DAR scholarship loan fund and spent each summer at the college in order to remain a full-time student.

In June 1943, I received a Bachelor of Science degree and since that time I have taught in the schools of Oconee County. With the first money I received I returned the borrowed money.

When I left Tamassee, I went with a vision in my eyes, my diploma in my hand, a voice in my ears, a song in my heart, and a prayer on my lips. The vision has never faded. I have dared to travel the star-blazed road—dared to follow the vision until now I have a master's degree from Clemson College. Thank you—thank you, again for letting me live.

May God continue his blessings on the DAR, Dr. Cain, and Tamassee that they may be spared to carry the educational torch for the mountain boys and girls of the future.

NATO Gets a New Vitality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

NATO GETS A NEW VITALITY

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Soviet arrogance and the persistence of John Foster Dulles have given NATO, our chief military alliance, a new vitality.

Soviet negotiators seem to have overreached themselves in their demands for a summit conference strictly on their own terms. Encouraged, apparently by western citizens who have been insisting that the United States must thenceforth treat the Communist bloc as an equal, the Soviets have sought to transform this equality into fact.

They have insisted that at any summit conference the U. S. S. R. should be flanked by Poland and Czechoslovakia just as the United States would be by Britain and France.

This, of course, in addition to the fact that the U. S. S. R. has flatly refused to discuss either of the 2 issues most important to the West, the liberation of the Kremlin's European satellites and the reunification of Germany by free elections—as the U. S. S. R. promised at the summit meeting in 1955.

REDS CONTRIBUTED

Such Soviet intransigence played into the hands of the American Secretary of State. For, almost alone among western statesmen, Mr. Dulles has kept his head in the face of unceasing clamor for immediate negotiation by pacifists, scientists, politicians, and nervous citizens.

Despite all the talk about the (doubtless real) threat to civilization and the human race, the American Secretary of State has insisted that the threat was just as real to Russians as to Americans.

Therefore, it was no argument for accepting any sort of settlement that would pave the way for future communization of the world. He has insisted that while the West would like a reasonable settlement, it has no need to cringe or whine or beg for it.

At the NATO meeting in Paris last December, the Secretary's position was unpopular. Our allies, properly dismayed by the evidence of Soviet superiority in the development of rockets, then made American acceptance of a new summit meeting with the Russians a condition for their acceptance of our request to install on their territories launching sites for American intermediate range missiles—the best we have. Secretary Dulles consented.

Had the U. S. S. R. then showed itself reasonable, a summit meeting would now be sure. But the propaganda success of the sputniks went to Moscow's head. It raised its voice considerably—and its conditions for a meeting. Mr. Dulles set about making clear to our allies that the new Soviet conditions for a meeting were unreasonable. He answered patiently each of Moscow's numerous diplomatic epistles and its loudly brayed claims. But he refused to yield.

MODIFICATIONS NEEDED

Now at Copenhagen our NATO allies have accepted the American position that there will be no summit meeting until the Soviets modify their demands. This is a triumph for Mr. Dulles and for commonsense.

To be sure, the conference also agreed that the members will not "be discouraged or give up their attachment to the principle of negotiations" with the U. S. S. R. (however futile they believe such negotiations to be). They welcome further technical negotiations "on detailed measures of control over disarmament."

These are propaganda concessions. There is still a danger that the Western nations will be dragged to an ill-prepared disarmament or summit conference and there compelled by public opinion to make dangerous and quite unnecessary concessions to the U. S. S. R. But the danger is smaller.

Meanwhile the Copenhagen conference got down to the serious business of strengthening NATO. The Foreign Ministers noted progress toward coordination of policy among the members, a necessity if NATO is to endure.

Furthermore, they formally recognized that economic cooperation is also essential among the members of the alliance. This

is a salutary, if long overdue, attempt to implement article 2 of the NATO treaty. If it succeeds, the prospects for the West will brighten considerably.

Onions Should Be Removed From Futures Trading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the Senate will soon act upon the important and long-overdue bill to eliminate onions from futures trading, H. R. 376. I urge favorable consideration and passage of this bill and commend to general attention the following points:

First. This legislation has no quarrel with the principle of futures trading or futures trading as it is conducted in the stable, large-volume commodities that are raw products essential to manufacturing processes. This legislation calls for the elimination of a serious misapplication of the practice of futures trading. Futures trading in onions, because of the very small volume and perishable nature of the crop, has become, not an economic tool, but a gambling device for use by professional speculators.

Second. The higher onion income in Texas in 1957 was quite largely due to an excellent crop on large new acreage planted in the northern panhandle section of Texas, an area that was not a heavy onion producer in the past. This northern Texas crop came on in late spring and summer during the season when the depressing effect of the futures market was no longer felt.

Third. Futures trading in the more stable commodities essential to manufacturing processes renders a real economic service in that it enables both supplier and manufacturer to hedge his transactions. According to the last CEA report of October 31, 1957, only 10.4 percent of futures trading in onions can be classed as hedging. Of this 10.4 percent more than one-half are transactions by brokers on onions which they have financed and thus also become speculative, even though actual onions are involved. Based on the figures in this neutral report, less than 5 percent of all futures trading can be classed as legitimate hedging.

Fourth. The bills introduced in 1956 to eliminate futures trading in perishables and the present bills calling for the elimination of futures trading in onions are the only bills in the history of the Congress that have dealt specifically with the elimination of a perishable commodity from organized futures trading. Other bills down through history that were designed to eliminate futures trading in more stable commodities failed to pass because Congress recognized that trading in these commodities rendered a vital service. Futures trading in onions on the contrary renders no service, is detrimental to onion growers and shippers throughout the country and has developed such an unsavory reputation that it is discrediting the practice of futures trading in all commodities in the eyes of the public.

Fifth. Regulation of futures trading has been attempted for several years and the very serious maneuvered breaks in the market in February and December 1957 have been evidence that regulation was ineffective.

Sixth. In testimony before the House Agriculture Committee and the Senate Agriculture Committee, CEA witnesses stated that short-term fluctuations in onion prices had been greater since the advent of futures trading.

Seventh. Futures trading in onions was instituted by the Mercantile Exchange about 15 years ago over strenuous objections from the onion industry both growers and shippers.

Eighth. Futures trading in onions has a decidedly depressing effect on the cash markets for the crop. During the past several years with the exception of 2 very short periods, onion futures prices have consistently been 20 cents to 30 cents per 50-pound bag lower than prevailing cash markets. In 1 instance, in 1956, the futures market was driven down to a low of 10 cents per 50-pound bag. In 1957, the market was broken from $2.20 down to 87 cents in a period of 3 weeks' time, in spite of a small supply of onions on hand.

Belmont Abbey College Looks to the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the Charlotte Observer, Charlotte, N. C., carried on May 11, 1958, two very interesting articles on Belmont Abbey College at Belmont, N. C. These articles entitled "Belmont Abbey College Looks to the Future," and "Citizens Lend Helping Hand," describe the history of this unique institution of higher learning and its mission for the future.

Belmont Abbey College was founded by members of the Benedictine Order of the Catholic Church in 1878, and since that time it has made an outstanding contribution to the educational life of North Carolina. The college is in the midst of an expansion program, and friends of the institution, Protestant and Catholic, are contributing of their time and resources to assist in its development.

Mr. Speaker, I commend these articles to the attention of the Members of the House and under unanimous consent include them in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer of May 11, 1958]

BELMONT ABBEY COLLEGE LOOKS TO THE FUTURE

BELMONT.—Priests with taproots sunk in the sixth century are adapting to the educational age of guided missiles and commuting college students.

But they're not only changing with the time, they're helping change it. Through a unique program, the Mecklenburg-Gaston communities are being educated about the type institution Belmont Abbey College is.

For 82 years it's been a little-understood neighbor.

In a heavily protestant section, inevitably a lot of misinformation has existed about a college run by Catholic priests in the midst of a 900-acre tract.

Their monastic life since coming here in 1876 tended to restrict contact with the public and heighten the mystery.

After three-quarters of a century, a better understanding was overdue.

THIRTY-SIX TOP SALESMEN AT WORK

To do the job, the abbey has enlisted 36 of the best salesmen around, men who are leading citizens in their communities' affairs. They're called the board of advisors and although the advice they give is worth thousands, they aren't paid a cent.

They have no real authority, yet their influence is already remarkably evident after a year and a half of existence.

It is paradoxical that the things being stressed by the board might be regarded as new. They aren't. The college is not doing anything it hasn't done over the past decades.

Its basic commitment still is to turn out an educated man, without regard to his religious affiliation.

World War II started events leading to the creation of the board of advisors, for in those postwar days, a flood of students came, mostly by automobile.

COMMUTING STUDENT BODY

Belmont Abbey College's complexion changed. What had been a predominantly boarding population from throughout the United States and overseas, became a commuting student body.

Thus, the geographic emphasis became focussed on Gaston and Mecklenburg Counties, from which two-thirds of today's students are drawn.

Obviously, the college officials reasoned, the abbey should begin to tailor itself to the new situation. Having become a senior college in 1952 (with degrees offered in eight majors) and later gaining full accreditation, it was in an unusual position to help the community take giant steps of progress.

FORM BOARD OF ADVISERS

In December 1956, the board of advisers was formed. It was not 36 men strong to begin with. Several leaders of the area were picked as a nucleus and they chose the others.

No attention was paid to religion in their choices. In fact, only six of them are Catholics.

The 44-member faculty of the college itself has six Protestants on it and one of them is a Methodist minister.

It will surprise some to know that while Catholics make up 40 percent of the abbey's student body, there are more Baptists attending the college than Catholics.

This is one of the points the advisers are trying to stress: Although Belmont Abbey College is a Catholic institution, it is not a denominational college in the usual sense that it derives support from the church or any church organization.

It is really a private, independent college, relying on the work of its members alone for

organization, administration, and financial support.

All property belongs to the Belmont St. Benedictine Order. Members of the order choose their own head (abbot) who appoints the college president from the order's members. Decisions within the group usually are on a simple majority vote.

No religion courses are required for the students (except for the Catholics) and no chapel programs are held.

"The policy of the abbey is to respect the conscience and religious belief of its students who are not Catholic," says the Very Reverend Cuthbert E. Allen, president. "It is our purpose to train informed and educated individuals."

BENEDICTINES EARN MONEY

All money comes from the work of the 95 men who comprise the Benedictines in Belmont, member of the oldest order of religious in the Catholic Church and having its antecedents in the sixth century.

Each Benedictine abbey, however, is separate and autonomous, related to the others by the Benedictine rule, traditions and descent.

Members earn money on private projects such as gardening, architecture, writing and the like. Their work for the abbey is dedicated work, of course.

All they earn outside is paid into the order's common treasury and each receives the modest amount his own needs require.

Even to the community leaders chosen as advisers, much of this was new information. It changed their perspectives. They weren't content to advise, they wanted to do.

DO FAST JOB ON BIG PROJECT

In only one year, they have completed a major project.

March 1957 was the beginning date, as the college talked to the advisors about physical expansion. A library was their most needed building, the priests said (their volumes are the sixth largest college collection in the State). But how should they go about a $400,000 capital expansion?

The board of advisors suggested that since the priests had never solicited money, that the board be allowed to do it. A committee took it on.

In a year's time, they quietly raised $350,000—and $150,000 was from Gaston County alone. The remaining funds were obtained by the college. The building is already underway.

Educational institutions everywhere can choose their students how. Even with some of the highest academic standards in the State, so great is the number of applicants that the Abbey turns away twice as many as it admits.

Its student body of 550 is at the quantitative limit set by the priests. They believe a larger number would break down the intimacy of a small college, lead to bigger classes and a more impersonal administrative control.

So, the college knows pretty much what its building needs will be.

Not so many new structures are expected as the remodeling of old ones. The facilities for the 152 boarding students are overcrowded, for instance, and need enlarging.

SERVICE: THAT'S THE MOTTO

The board of advisors, of course, will fill a role beyond that of financial advisor and procurer. Their goal, and in this they already are succeeding, is to interpret Belmont Abbey College to the people it seeks to serve. Says Board Chairman R. Grady Rankin of Gastonia:

"The board realized what a wonderful thing this college was doing for our local people in two counties * * * It is developing into a real college of the community. We are going to gradually become an urban college and the plan is not to become a campus college but a college of the community."

And Father Cuthbert adds: "We plan to become a commuting college because it will fit more into our tradition as Benedictines. We are independent and distinct from any other Benedictine College, of which there are about 14 in the United States. We are part of North Carolina and whoever comes here as a member of our community becomes a North Carolinian.

"We are a local college and in that tradition we are developing our program in that direction."

CITIZENS LEND HELPING HAND

Members of the board of advisers of Belmont Abbey College are:

Chairman, R. Grady Rankin, textile industrialist, Gastonia.

Vice chairman: J. Harold Lineberger, secretary-treasurer, Lineberger Textile interests, Belmont.

Claude H. Allard, manager, Nagautuck Chemical Division, United States Rubber Co., Gastonia; Ben E. Atkins, editor, the Gastonia Gazette, Gastonia; James D. Barbee, vice president, Cramerton division, Burlington Industries, Inc., Cramerton; W. O. Barrett, editor Mount Holly News and Belmont Banner; Col. Francis J. Beatty, president, Standard Bonded Warehouse Co., Charlotte.

Lewis E. Chittum, treasurer, American and Efird Mills, Inc., Mount Holly; Charles H. Crutchfield, executive vice president, Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co., Charlotte; Rush S. Dickson, president, American and Efird Mills, Inc., Charlotte; Bernard J. Doris, partner, Doris Jewelers, Augusta Ga.; John E. Eck, Sr., and John E. Eck, Jr., partners, John E. Eck, certified public accountants, Gastonia.

Louis H. Feldman, president, Danville Dairy Products Co., Belmont; J. Paul Ford, cashier-treasurer, Bank of Belmont; Harley B. Gaston, Sr., attorney at law, Gastonia; Edward F. Gallagher, president, Good Will Publishing Co., Gastonia; Charles D. Gray, Sr., president, Gray and Daniel, Inc., Gastonia.

Leo F. Henebry, president, Henebry Jewelry Co., Roanoke, Va.; Hobart H. Joost, vice president, H. C. Hare Insurance Co., Jacksonville, Fla.; R. Emmet Kerr, senior vice president, American Trust Co., Charlotte; C. A. McKnight, editor, the Charlotte Observer, Charlotte; Dr. Charles B. Norris, physician, Charlotte; Cecil C. Prince, editor, the Charlotte News, Charlotte; J. G. Reading, president, National Bank of Commerce, Gastonia.

Dr. Harry D. Riddle, physician, Gastonia; J. C. Roberts, president, Textiles, Inc., Gastonia; Leon Schneider, mayor, city of Gastonia; Edward A. Sheehan, president, A. B. Beveridge Co., Augusta, Ga.; Julian C. Sipple, Jr., attorney at law, Savannah, Ga.; Frederick T. Stant, Jr., attorney at law, Norfolk, Va.; Edward A. Stumpf, Jr., industrialist, Richmond, Va.; Basil L. Whitener, United States Representative, 11th District of North Carolina, Gastonia; Charles A. Williams, Jr., president, Williams & Shelton Co., Charlotte.

An Editor's Appraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILL E. NEAL
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, apropos of the propriety of assuming a recurring obligation to extend military and economic aid to foreign nations, I submit an editorial carried in the Parkersburg News of May 13. The editorial follows:

SOVIETS STRIVE FOR A DOUBTFUL ASSET

The time has come in world affairs where, if the National Planning Association has the situation sized up correctly, we must bid against Soviet Russia for the favor of the so-called underdeveloped countries.

Pointing out that the Soviets are proffering aid with far fewer strings than are attached to our own, the association calls for a loosening up of our foreign-aid policy, and adds:

"The recipient countries have been offended by our reiterated charges of waste and inefficiency; by our repeated complaints about giveaways and ratholes; by our ludicrous worries over the burdens under which the wealthiest nation in human history is supposed to be laboring when it allocates less than a quarter of 1 percent of its gross national product to nonmilitary foreign aid."

The inference here seems to be that these people are entitled and that if we fail to provide it with proper regard for the sensibilities of the recipients they will take their business elsewhere. If all we have succeeded in doing thus far is to offend the people we have been helping, and if, as also seems to be the inference, a state of dependence is to be their perpetual lot, it would seem both that our foreign aid has done very little good and that the Soviets will be receiving a doubtful asset if they take over for us.

It may be that foreign aid represents but a trivial portion of our gross national product, but whatever percentage it is, the burden is not something to be laughed off when the Government is some $280 billion in debt despite a tax burden that is straining the resources of the economy.

Most of the world got along for centuries without economic assistance from either the United States or Russia. It is an open question whether or not they are any better off now that there is competition for the privilege of helping them.

One wonders if American aid to neutral nations in Asia and Africa is not just an open invitation to Russia to infiltrate these countries with Communist propaganda under the guise of economic assistance.

One wonders, too, if not tempted to pit one source of economic aid against another, these so-styled neutrals would not be exceedingly wary of Communist influence.

Knowing Communist policy as we do, are we not encouraging rather than preventing them from extending their sphere of influence?

Sixteenth Anniversary of the Women's Army Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today, May 14, 1958, marks the 16th anniversary of the establishment of the Women's Army Corps of our United States Army. I feel a special interest and pride in this splendid organization, for it was I who, on May 28, 1941, intro-

duced a bill in the House of Representatives to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States.

There were two basic reasons why I—together with many others—was so vitally interested in the establishment of a women's service in our Army. The first was to alleviate the acute shortage of manpower. The second was to answer an undeniable demand from American women that they be permitted to serve their country, together with the men of America, to protect and defend their cherished freedoms and democratic principles and ideals.

During the past 16 years, the thousands of women who have served and who are now serving in the Women's Army Corps have more than justified the creation of that organization. Their outstanding performance of duty during World War II resulted in the passage by Congress in June 1948, of legislation making the Women's Army Corps a permanent and integrated part of the Regular Army and of the Army Reserve.

Their primary mission is to constitute a nucleus of trained military women upon which expansion of the Corps would be based in time of national emergency. They also contribute voluntarily the womanpower needed to help meet military manpower requirements.

During the Korean war, they accomplished their primary mission in a superior manner. Many WAC reservists were called to active duty and served with distinction. Enlistments of women were increased, and the increased training requirement was efficiently met.

Now, in peacetime, a well-trained nucleus is being maintained. Members of the Corps are contributing to the Army each day their voluntary services in the occupational skills required in the modern Army. They are adding to the splendid record of dedicated and loyal service which began 16 years ago.

I am proud of the Women's Army Corps. I am proud of the part I played in bringing it into existence.

FACT SHEET, UNITED STATES WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS

MISSION

The primary mission of the United States Women's Army Corps is the same as that of the other components of the Army—the defense of the United States of America. The WAC carries out its mission within the Army by making available to the Army the special skills of its members who volunteer for noncombatant duties, and by constituting a nucleus of trained military women upon which the rapid expansion of the Corps would be based in time of national emergency.

HISTORY

A shortage of manpower developed early in World War II. The Army's need for the administrative and technical skills of women led Congress to enact a law on May 14, 1942, establishing the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps. By a subsequent act of Congress, the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, on September 1, 1943, became the Women's Army Corps, a component of the Army of the United States.

During World War II more than 150,000 women served in the WAC in the United States, Europe, Africa, the Southwest Pacific, China, India, Hawaii, the Philippines, and Alaska. At the end of the war, the Army, faced with the loss of its women soldiers, asked Congress to make the WAC a permanent part of the Military Establishment. The law making the WAC a component of the Regular Army of the United States and a part of the Army Reserve was signed by the President on June 12, 1948.

On the occasion of the 15th anniversary of the Women's Army Corps, May 14, 1957, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chief of Staff, United States Army, in his congratulatory message stated:

"Over the past 15 years and through 2 wars the women soldiers of the Corps have displayed a high degree of professionalism in a variety of military skills. By its dignity, discipline, and duties performed, the Women's Army Corps has established itself as an essential part of the Army."

Today there are approximately 8,000 WAC's Regular Army and Reserve, on active duty. They are serving throughout the United States and in France, Germany, Italy, Formosa, Hawaii, Japan, Korea, and Okinawa. Approximately 2,000 WAC officers and enlisted women are serving in the Army Reserve not on active duty.

Director of the WAC today is Col. Mary Louise Milligan.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

1. Enlisted: Single women, with no dependents, from 18 to 34 years of age inclusive, who have a high-school diploma or its equivalent and who are United States citizens (or who have declared their intentions to become citizens) may apply for enlistment. Applicants under the age of 21 years must have the written consent of parents or guardians. High mental, physical, and moral standards must be met. Terms of enlistment are from 2 to 6 years. Women meeting these requirements may also enlist for assignment to vacancies in Army Reserve units. WAC reservists participate in weekly drills and summer training and may apply for periods of extended active duty in the Army. They are eligible to attend service schools and enroll in Army extension courses. Term of enlistment in the Army Reserve is normally 3 years.

2. Officer: (a) The direct commission program constitutes the major source of WAC officers. The requirements are a baccalaureate degree from an accredited college or university, age 20 through 32 years, United States citizenship (or declaration of intention to become a citizen), single or married but no dependents or legal responsibility for persons under 18, satisfactory completion of required mental tests and personal interviews, and satisfactory security clearance. High mental, moral, and physical standards must be met. Individuals are commissioned as second or first lieutenants in the Reserve and are called to active duty for a minimum of 2 years.

(b) Officers are also obtained from well-qualified enlisted women between the ages of 20 and 28 through the Officer Candidate School program. Highly qualified non-commissioned officers and warrant officers, not over 29 years of age, may also be appointed as second lieutenants in the Reserve. Regulations governing these programs are the same for both male and female personnel of the Army.

(c) Qualified women who are juniors in accredited colleges or universities may enlist in the Army Reserve for the purpose of attending a 4-weeks' officer summer training course at Fort McClellan. Upon satisfactory completion of the course and graduation from college, they may apply for a commission as a second lieutenant in the Reserve and concurrent active duty. They will then complete their training at Fort McClellan before being assigned to Army duty.

(d) Qualified women may apply for commissions in the Army Reserve for assignment to Reserve units where appropriate vacancies exist. They participate in weekly drills and summer training and may be called to active duty. Also WO's and enlisted women of the Army Reserve not on active duty who meet the eligibility requirements may apply to attend OCS in an active duty status.

TRAINING AND ASSIGNMENT

1. Training: (a) Army training for enlisted women is accomplished by two methods: attendance at specialiazed Army schools and on-the-job training. Upon completing 8 weeks of basic training at the United States Women's Army Corps Center, Fort McClellan, Ala., enlisted women attend Army schools throughout the country to train for the work for which they have shown special aptitude in scientifically designed tests. As they progress in their Army careers, Army advanced courses are also open to enlisted women. Army schools include Finance, Signal, Adjutant General, Information, Intelligence, Quartermaster, Engineer, Medical, Chemical, and Food Service.

(b) Newly appointed WAC officers attend a 20-weeks' WAC officer basic course at Fort McClellan. Later, they may be selected to attend the WAC officer advanced course and/or various high-level Army schools open to both men and women officers. These schools include Adjutant General, Information, Finance, Signal, Quartermaster, Psychological Warfare, Foreign Area Specialist Training, Strategic Intelligence, Foreign Language, Transportation, Command and General Staff College, and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. Officers selected on a best-qualified basis are trained at civilian institutions at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Selected officers may also enroll in civilian colleges in a final semester plan for the purpose of acquiring a baccalaureate degree. In addition, off-duty college courses granting credit toward a degree are conducted by civilian universities at most Army installations for the benefit of Army personnel.

2. Utilization: (a) Enlisted women are utilized in 7 of the 10 occupational fields established to furnish a career pattern: Army antiaircraft and artillery static units, electronics, precision maintenance, military crafts, motor, clerical, graphics, general technical and special assignments fields. They are assigned in administration, communications, finance, information, machine accounting, supply, medical, food service, security, electronics, coding, and as control-tower and link-trainer operators at Army aviation installations.

(b) WAC officers are assigned in 115 military occupational specialties. They are utilized in staff and operational assignments at all levels of command and staff in the Army. They are assigned in the following career areas: personnel and administration, intelligence, training and instruction, logistics, comptrollership, information, troop education, civil affairs and military government, legal and legislative, communications, special service and recruiting. WAC officers are also assigned in administrative and training positions within the Women's Army Corps in command of WAC detachments.

BENEFITS

Army women receive the same pay and benefits as Army men and are eligible for the same promotions as Army men through the rank of lieutenant colonel. The WAC has one colonel, the director. All Army personnel while on active duty receive medical and dental care and are included in social-security benefits. Enlisted members of the Army are also eligible for retirement pay after a minimum of 20 years' service; officers may retire after 20 to 30 years' service, depending upon their age, grade, and status.

WHERE TO APPLY

Application for enlistment in the United States Women's Army Corps should be made

at the nearest Army recruiting office. Further information may also be obtained by writing to the nearest Army headquarters, or to The Adjutant General, Washington, D. C. The Army headquarters are: Headquarters First United States Army, Governors Island, New York 4, N. Y.; Headquarters Second United States Army, Fort George G. Meade, Md.; Headquarters Third United States Army, Fort McPherson, Ga.; Headquarters Fourth United States Army, Fort Sam Houston, Tex.; Headquarters Fifth United States Army, 1660 East Hyde Park Boulevard, Chicago 15, Ill.; Headquarters Sixth United States Army, Presidio of San Francisco, Calif.; Headquarters MDW, United States Army, room 1537, Building T-7, Gravelly Point, Va.

HISTORY OF WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS BY CALENDAR DATES

May 14, 1942: Congress approved Public Law 554, creating the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps. The bill was introduced by Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts.

May 14, 1942: President Roosevelt signed the bill.

May 14, 1942: Oveta Culp Hobby, of Houston, Tex., was sworn in as Director, with rank of colonel.

July 20, 1942: Four hundred and forty officer candidates and three hundred and thirty enlisted women began training at Fort Des Moines, Iowa.

November 2, 1942: First officer candidate class made up entirely of enlisted women began training at Fort Des Moines. (Eighty-eight percent of the WAC officers were from the ranks.)

January 27, 1943: First contingent of enlisted women to serve outside the continental limits of the United States arrived at allied headquarters at Algiers.

May 14, 1943: First anniversary—60,000 members of WAAC on duty at 100 military installations in United States and overseas.

July 1, 1943: Public Law 110, making the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps a component of the Army of the United States, rather than an auxiliary, was signed by the President. From this date it was known as the Women's Army Corps.

July 5, 1943: Director Hobby took the oath of office as a colonel, Army of the United States, thus becoming the first woman to be admitted to the new component of the Army (WAC).

July 20, 1943: Large contingent arrived in England for duty with the 8th Air Force.

October 15, 1943: Vanguard, consisting of 1 WAC officer and 2 WAC sergeants, arrived in India for duty with China-Burma-India headquarters.

November 15, 1943: First detachment of Wacs arrived in Italy. (Some of these women had been in Africa with NATOUSA.)

December 20, 1943: First detachments arrived at Cairo, Egypt, for duty with headquarters, United States Army Forces in the Middle East.

January 28, 1944: The first Wacs to be sent to the Pacific Area arrived in New Caledonia.

March 15, 1944: Five officers arrived in Australia, forerunner to several large WAC contingents.

March 17, 1944: First detachments arrived in Hawaii.

May 16, 1944: First detachments arrived in New Guinea.

July 16, 1944: Large contingent left for Normany, France. This group later went on to Paris.

September 13, 1944: Air Transport Command detachment arrived at Casablanca, North Africa.

November 15, 1944: First two WAC officers arrived in Chungking, China.

November 26, 1944: Vanguard arrived on Leyte, Philippine Islands.

January 1, 1945: Colonel Hobby awarded the Distinguished Service Medal.

March 7, 1945: First Wacs arrived in Manila.

April 14, 1945: First Wacs arrived at Ladd Field, Alaska.

July 12, 1945: Colonel Hobby retired to inactive duty status. Lt. Col. Westray Battle Boyce became director of WAC with rank of colonel.

August 3, 1945: First contingent of Wacs arrived in Chungking, China.

August 29, 1945: Enlistments in the Women's Army Corps were closed.

September 1945: Colonel Boyce made worldwide inspection of WAC units overseas.

November 17, 1945: Sixtieth and final class of officers commissioned at Fort Des Moines, Iowa.

December 15, 1945: Fort Des Moines, Iowa, closed.

July 26, 1946: First bill providing for WAC in RA and ORC introduced into Congress.

August 10, 1946: Two hundred enlisted women transferred to Yokohama to work with Eighth Army Headquarters.

November 1946: Colonel Boyce inspected all WAC installations in Europe.

March 5, 1947: Colonel Boyce retired by reason of physical disability. Lt. Col. Mary A. Hallaren appointed acting director.

April 16, 1947: Legislation providing for the inclusion of WAC in Regular Army and Organized Reserve Corps presented to Congress.

May 7, 1947: Lt. Col. Mary A. Hallaren became director, WAC with rank of colonel.

May 14, 1947: Fifth anniversary—9,517 Wacs on duty in the United States, Germany, Austria, Italy, Panama, Japan, and China; 3,009 overseas.

July 2, 1947: First hearing of WAC-WAVE legislation (S. 1641) was held in Senate Armed Services Subcommittee.

July 16, 1947: S. 1641 was approved by Senate Armed Services Committee.

July 23, 1947: S. 1641 unanimously approved on Senate floor. First hearing held in House Armed Services Subcommittee.

August 5, 1947: Lt. Col. Mary L. Milligan appointed deputy director, WAC.

September 30, 1947: WAC reentry program terminated.

March 24, 1948: Amended form of S. 1641 reported favorably out of House Armed Services Committee by vote of 26 to 1. The amended bill provides for enlistment and appointment of women in Organized Reserve and extends WAC, AUS for 1 year.

April 1, 1948: Twenty WAC officers and 70 enlisted women reported for recruiters' instructors course at Camp Lee, Va.

May 19, 1948: Joint Senate-House Conference Committee reported out an amended form of S. 1641 which authorized women in Regular and Reserve forces but which placed restrictions on the number of Regular officers and enlisted women who could be on duty during the 2-year period immediately following passage of legislation.

May 26, 1948: Senate by voice vote approved report of Senate-House Conference Committee.

May 26, 1948: First WAC officers and enlisted women graduated from TAG recruiters' instructors course at Camp Lee, Va.

June 2, 1948: House vote 206 to 133 approved report of Senate-House Conference Committee.

June 12, 1948: The President (Harry S. Truman) signed the Women's Armed Services Integration Act, Public Law 625, 80th Congress.

June 15, 1948: GO No. 43, D/A established WAC training center at Camp Lee, Va., with Lt. Col. Elizabeth C. Smith as commanding officer.

June 16–18, 1948: WAC Staff Advisors Conference.

July 5–September 30, 1948: Screening centers for WAC officers in operation.

July 8, 1948: First Wacs enlisted in Regular Army.

July 13, 1948: Maj. Irene O. Galloway appointed WAC staff adviser, EUCOM.

September 27, 1948: First enlistments in WAC Regular Army from civilian life.

October 4, 1948: First basic class and first officer candidate class (Regular Army) began training at WAC training center, Camp Lee, Va.

December 3, 1948: Colonel Hallaren sworn in WAC, Regular Army, and made director, WAC.

December 10, 1948: First WAC, Regular Army, basic trainees graduated at Camp Lee, Va. Press day held.

December 18, 1948: President signed list of 199 appointments in WAC, Regular Army.

April 1, 1949: First WAC Regular Army officer candidate class graduated—37 members, with Gen. Omar Bradley as speaker.

April 1, 1949: President signed list of 93 appointments in WAC, Regular Army.

April 28, 1949: Eleven offered appointments as warrant officers, Regular Army.

April 12, 1949: Colonel Hallaren left for 2-months' inspection tour of EUCOM.

June 10, 1949: Army accepted design of women's uniform (taupe) as recommended by Miss Shaver's committee and as designed by Hattie Carnegie.

June 12, 1949: End of WAC (AUS).

July 15, 1949: Two 2-weeks' summer training programs for WAC personnel in the ORC initiated at Camp Lee, Va., with Secretary of the Army Gordon Gray attending the opening.

July 15, 1949: First WAC officers went on competitive tour.

July 22, 1949: President signed third increment of WAC officers—40 officers selected.

September 12–16, 1949: WAC staff advisers conference.

January 4, 1950: Maj. Robin Elliott appointed WAC staff adviser, Fourth Army.

January 1950: Lt. Col. F. Marie Clark appointed WAC staff adviser, AFFE, replacing Lt. Col. Mary K. Moynahan.

February 3, 1950: First promotions of WAC Regular Army officers.

February 23, 1950: New uniform for women in Army shown to public by Hattie Carnegie in New York.

May 1–8, 1950: First temporary promotions of WAC officers. First college graduates appointed second lieutenants, ORC, and ordered to EAD for WAC company officer course (WCOC) in September.

May 7, 1950: Colonel Hallaren left for 1 month's inspection trip of FECOM.

August 21, 1950: Voluntary recall of WAC enlisted Reservists and company grade WAC officers started due to Korean emergency.

August 23, 1950: Separation for marriage regulation suspended.

September 7, 1950: First ORC officers reported to training center for WAC company officer course.

September 22, 1950: Involuntary recall of company grade WAC officers and enlisted women of the ORC authorized.

December 1, 1950: Major Harriet N. Moses appointed WAC staff advisor, Sixth Army.

January 8, 1951: WAC MOS 405 training transferred to training divisions.

January 1951: First WCOC class graduated—41 members.

February 1, 1951: Lt. Col. Ruby E. Herman assumed command of WAC training center.

February 8, 1951: First budget hearing on Fort McClellan as permanent WAC training center was held.

February 20, 1951: Maj. Annie V. Gardner appointed WAC staff advisor, MDW.

March 1, 1951: New taupe uniform for Army women authorized to be worn.

May 2–4, 1951: WAC staff advisors conference—Secretary of the Army Frank W. Pace

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

spoke to all Wacs, WAC training center, Fort Lee, Va.

May 21, 1951: Program for appointment of women college graduates as second lieutenants, first lieutenants, and captains, Organized Reserve Corps, for active duty to fill basic branch requirements announced.

May 30, 1951: Lt. Col. Emily C. Gorman appointed WAC staff advisor, 2d Army, replacing Maj. Sue Lynch.

June 11, 1951: Series of five 1-week seminars for detachment commanders and company grade staff officers started at WAC training center.

June 19, 1951: Public Law 51, 82d Congress, suspended 2-percent limitation on WAC personnel until July 31, 1954.

June 30, 1951: That part of public works bill for which appropriations were requested for fiscal year 1957 was authorized for WAC training center at Fort McClellan, approved by House Armed Services Committee.

July 20, 1951: Separation for marriage regulation reinstated for enlisted women only.

September 17, 1951: Department of Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the services held first meeting; a representative group visited the WAC training center, Fort Lee, Va. Fall and spring meetings will be held annually.

November 11, 1951: Initiation of Department of Defense campaign to secure 72,000 women for the 9 branches of the women's services.

January 12, 1952: First associate WAC company officer class (enlisted women appointed as officers) graduated—33 members.

February 15, 1952: Colonel Hallaren awarded Legion of Honor (rank of Chevalier) by French Government, presented by Brig. Gen. Jacques de la Boisse, French Army, military attaché, at the office of the military attaché, Washington, D. C.

February 25, 1952: Uniform Board approved an evening dress uniform for women officers of the Army.

March 17, 1952: Lt. Col. Anne E. Sweeney appointed WAC staff adviser, Fourth Army.

April 4, 1952: Colonel Hallaren departed on inspection trip to EUCOM April 4 to May 12, 1952.

May 14, 1952: 10th anniversary. Approximately 1,200 officers, 60 warrant officers, and 10,000 enlisted women on active duty.

May 16, 1952: Lt. Col. Lillian Harris appointed WAC staff advisor, AFFE.

July 11, 1952: Assistant Secretary of the Army Fred Korth visited the WAC training center, Fort Lee, Va.

July 17, 1952: Filming of Never Wave at a Wac, starring Rosalind Russell, began at WAC training center, Fort Lee, Va.

August 29, 1952: Lt. Col. Mary L. Milligan, deputy director, WAC (first Regular Army Deputy) departed for EUCOM on permanent change of station.

September 11, 1952: First day of issue of commemorative stamp on women in the services. Special presentation ceremony at the White House.

September 15, 1952: Lt. Col. Mary L. Milligan appointed WAC staff adviser USAREUR.

September 16, 1952: Regulation on evening dress uniform for women personnel published.

September 25, 1952: Women's Army Corps School, authorized by 2d Army headquarters, at the Women's Army Corps training center, Fort Lee, Va.

October 7, 1952: Separation for marriage regulation reinstated for female officers.

October 7, 1952: Ground-breaking ceremony at Fort McClellan, Ala., for permanent WAC training center.

October 27, 1952: Maj. Mary E. Kelly appointed WAC staff adviser, MDW.

October 1952: Maj. Rebecca S. Parks appointed WAC staff adviser, 3d Army, replacing Lt. Col. Mary M. Pugh.

November 24, 1952: Lt. Col. Irene O. Galloway assumed command of the WAC training center, Fort Lee, Va.

December 26, 1952: Lt. Col. Eleanore C. Sullivan assumed command of the WAC training center, Fort Lee, Va.

January 1, 1953: Armed Forces women's selection test replaced AFQT for processing of female applicants for enlistment in the WAC.

January 3, 1953: Colonel Hallaren completed tour as Director and Lt. Col. Irene O. Galloway appointed Director, WAC, with rank of colonel. Lt. Col. Emily C. Gorman appointed Deputy Director.

January 5, 1953: Maj. Margorie C. Power appointed WAC staff adviser, Fifth Army, replacing Maj. Virginia Mathew.

January 15, 1953: Lt. Col. Lillian Foushee appointed WAC staff adviser, First Army.

January 20, 1953: Fourteenth Army Band, WAC training center, Fort Lee, Va., and composite group of enlisted women from MDW marched in inaugural parade.

March 4, 1953: Conference of WAC recruiting supervisors from the six continental armies.

April 1, 1953: Maj. Pauline V. Linch appointed WAC staff adviser, Second Army.

May 4–6, 1953: WAC staff advisers conference.

June 3, 1953: S. 2040, a bill "To define service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service under certain conditions" introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL and referred to Committee on Armed Services.

June 1953: First postwar WACS used as control tower operators at Fort Sill, Okla.

July 1, 1953: Assistant Secretary of the Army James P. Mitchell visited the WAC Center, Fort Lee, Va.

November 18, 1953: GO No. 87 D/A redesignated WAC training center to WAC center, and designated the Women's Army Corps School as a class I activity of the center, at Fort Lee, Va.

January 1, 1954: Title of WAC Company Officer Course changed to WAC Officer Basic Course.

February 1, 1954: Space allocated for one WAC officer to attend the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, class of September 1954.

February 19, 1954: Lt. Col. Verna A. McCluskey appointed WAC staff adviser, Third Army.

February 23, 1954: First WAC officer advanced course opened with 30 students. General Weible, Assistant Chief of Staff for Operations and Administration, and Colonel Galloway attended the opening ceremonies.

February 25, 1954: Senate bill 2040 approved by Senate Committee on Armed Services.

March 2, 1954: Senate bill 2040 passed by Senate. No action by House of Representatives.

April 16, 1954: Lt. Col. Elizabeth C. Smith appointed WAC staff advisor, 6th Army.

April 16, 1954: Lt. Col. Helen H. Bouffier appointed WAC staff advisor, AFFE.

May 11, 1954: First officers and EW on permanent change of station left the WAC center, Fort Lee, Va., for Fort McClellan, Ala., to open the permanent WAC center there.

May 13, 1954: Summer light taupe uniform (optional) authorized.

May 16, 1954: Lt. Col. Arlene G. Scheidenheim appointed WAC staff advisor, 4th Army.

May 26, 1954: GO No. 38, D/A, established the Women's Army Corps Center as a class I activity at Fort McClellan, Ala., effective June 10, 1954; and the Women's Army Corps School as a class I activity of the WAC center, Fort McClellan, Ala. GO No. 38, D/A, ordered the discontinuance of the above activities at Fort Lee, Va., effective August 15, 1954.

July 2, 1954: Two spaces were allocated for WAC officers to attend associate class No. 55–2, C & GS School, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., in January 1955. Same quota will apply to future classes.

July 10, 1954: Twenty-nine WAC officers graduated from the first class of the Women's Army Corps advanced officer course.

July 1954: WAC clerical training reinstituted at WAC center.

August 10, 1954: An additional allowance of $80.00 for uniforms granted to EW assigned to recruiting.

August 13, 1954: H. R. 8041, Eighty-third Congress, second Session was enacted, "To provide benefits under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration based upon service in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps under certain conditions."

August 20, 1954: Maj. Nellie M. Young appointed WAC staff advisor 3d Army.

September 27, 1954: Dedication of the WAC center, Fort McClellan, Ala. Chief of Staff of the Army, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, addressed the group.

November 1954: First WAC officer (Maj. Elinor J. Connor) entered intelligence specialist training program.

November 15–17, 1954: WAC staff advisers conference. WAC center, Fort McClellan, Ala., was visited.

January 1955: Assignment of 2 WAC officer procurement officers to each CONUS Army begun.

January 1955: Lt. Col. Alice A. Parrish appointed WAC staff adviser, MDW.

January 15, 1955: WAC officer assigned to National Manpower Council to study womanpower of Nation.

March 2–4, 1955: MPPD conference: Orientation of WAC officers assigned to procurement of officers from colleges and universities.

April 20, 1955: Lt. Col. Anne E. Sweeney became WAC staff adviser, 6th Army.

April 1955: The Women's Army Corps by Mattie E. Treadwell, series of United States Army in World War II histories, was published.

May–June 1955: Capt. Pa-ob Poshakrishna, director of WAC, Thailand, TDY at WAC center and office of the director, WAC.

June 18, 1955: Lt. Col. F. Marie Clark assumed command of WAC center. Groundbreaking ceremony for WAC chapel, Brig. Gen. (Chaplain) F. A. Tobey, deputy chief of chaplains presiding. Graduation of WOAC II and WOBC class 2, fiscal year 1955.

September 1955: First WAC enlisted woman, Pvt. Regina C. Jones, becomes resident of Old Soldiers' Home.

September 28, 1955: Laying of cornerstone for WAC chapel, WAC center, Fort McClellan, Ala.

October 28, 1955: Lt. Col. Cora M. Foster became WAC staff adviser, 3d Army.

November 1955: First WAC EW assigned to ARAACOM headquarters to be followed by larger group.

December 21, 1955: Lt. Col. Nora G. Springfield became WAC staff adviser, 2d Army.

Jan. 30, 1956: Retirement of first Lt. Col. WAC, Regular Army, with 28 years' service credit, Lt. Col. Helen Novak Baer.

February 1956: WAC officer, Lt. Col. Lenore C. Price, assigned to KMAG (Korea) as adviser for Women's Army Corps of Korean Army.

March 1956: Authorized recruiting spaces reduced from 95 to 62 officers and from 139 to 124 enlisted women.

March 13, 1956: Perpetual award for the woman champion in bowling in Army all-events annual contest named in honor of Lt. Col. Mary A. Hallaren.

March 17–24, 1956: Lt. Col. Rebecca S. Parks, representative of director, WAC, visited following South American countries: Peru, Chile, Uruguay, and Paraguay. Ori-

ented Paraguayan officials concerning the Women's Army Corps.

March 20, 1956: Army Uniform Board approved the Army green uniform as the future winter service uniform for women members of the Army. Also approved a 2-piece green and white hairline stripe, dacron and cotton summer service uniform.

April 30, 1956: Mrs. Ingegeda Soderburg, member of directorate of the Association of the Swedish Women's Auxiliary Defense Service (Swedish Lottas) visited office, director, Women's Army Corps for orientation in WAC activities.

May 12, 1956: Dedication of WAC chapel, Fort McClellan, Ala.

May 14, 1956: Lt. Col. Margaret A. Kimpton became WAC staff advisor, USAREUR.

May 24, 1956: Lt. Col. Stig Ljunggern, Swedish Army, was briefed regarding the Women's Army Corps Reserve program.

June 1, 1956: Miss Simone Robins, French lawyer and writer was oriented regarding WAC activities for an article to appear in Bellone magazine for the review of the French feminine forces.

August 1956: Six Burmese women officers entered WAC officer basic course for training.

August 4, 1956: Lt. Col. Norma M. Flachsland became WAC staff advisor, 1st Army.

August 31, 1956: Lt. Col. Sara L. Sturgis became WAC staff advisor, 5th Army.

October 11, 1956: Lt. Col. Frances Lathrope appointed commanding officer of WAC center and commandant of WAC school.

October 22, 1956: Maj. Cynthia Van Auken became WAC staff advisor, headquarters United States ARADCOM.

November 1956: First WAC officer, (Maj. Alice N. Howes) entered information specialization program.

December 6, 1956: Army Chief of Staff and Secretary of the Army approved the Army blue uniform as an optional uniform for women members of the Army.

December 8, 1956: Lt. Col. Annie V. Gardner appointed WAC staff advisor, AFFE.

December 31, 1956: DA GO No. 59 redesignated the office of the director, Women's Army Corps (8532) as office of the director, United States Women's Army Corps.

January 3, 1957. Draft of Department of Defense sponsored legislation to define service as a member of the WAAC as active military service under certain conditions sent to Speaker of House of Representatives and President of the Senate.

January 3, 1957: Col. Irene O. Galloway completed tour as director. Lt. Col. Mary L. Milligan appointed director, United States WAC, with rank of colonel. Lt. Col. Anne E. Sweeney, appointed deputy director.

January 6, 1957. Lt. Col. Emily C. Gorman became WAC staff advisor, headquarters, United States CONARC.

January 10, 1957: H. R. 2408, Eighty-fifth Congress (see January 3 entry) introduced by Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana and referred to Committee on Armed Services.

January 14, 1957; H. R. 2883, Eighty-fifth Congress (see January 3 entry) introduced by Mrs. ROGERS and referred to Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

January 21, 1957: Fourteenth Army WAC band participated in the inaugural parade.

February 11, 1957: First enlisted woman began training as control tower operator at Keesler Air Force Base, Miss. Four completed training during third quarter fiscal year 1957.

February 12, 1957: Secretary of the Army approved the Army green uniform as the future winter service uniform for women members of the Army.

February 20, 1957: H. R. 5186, 85th Congress, introduced by Mr. VINSON and referred to Committee on Armed Services. Purpose of bill to permit WO's Green and Alley to remain on active duty until completion of 20 years' service.

February 1957: Six Burmese women officers received observer training at WAC center and in the Washington area upon completion of WOBC.

March 1957: Womanpower published by National Manpower Council.

April 9, 1957: H. R. 5186 approved by Committee on Armed Services and committed to the Committee of the Whole House.

May 7, 1957: DA GO No. 24, redesignated the Women's Army Corps Center as the United States Women's Army Corps Center and the Women's Army Corps School as the United States Women's Army Corps School.

May 14, 1957: Fifteenth anniversary. Approximately 820 officers, 43 warrant officers, and 7,200 enlisted women on active duty.

June 14, 1957: S. 2305, 85th Congress (see January 3 entry), introduced by Mr. Young and referred to Committee on Armed Services.

June 28, 1957: Graduation of WOBC No. 2, fiscal year 1957, and WOAC No. 4, Maj. Gen. James L. Richardson, chief, CMD, TAGO, was guest speaker. Col. Mary L. Milligan also attended. Three Korean women officers completed WOBC.

July 14, 1957: Nineteen college juniors began first 4-week orientation and indoctrination course at United States WAC center.

July 18, 1957: Lt. Cols. Hortense Boutell and Lillian Harris and Maj. Mary L. Sullivan first WAC officers selected for logistics officer program.

July 24, 1957: Two WAC officers from United States WAC center witnessed atomic explosion at Desert Rock.

July 1957: First WAC officer (Lt. Col. Ruth Briggs) entered foreign area specialization training program.

August 16, 1957: Senate Committee on Armed Services approved a substitute bill for S. 2305 and ordered it reported to the Senate.

August 20, 1957: Senate-approved substitute bill for S. 2305.

Report of New York County Lawyers' Association on H. R. 8361

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the committee on the Federal courts of the New York County Lawyers' Association adopted, on April 28, 1958, a report disapproving the provisions of H. R. 8361 relating to writs of habeas corpus.

The report of the committee is as follows:

Report of committee on the Federal courts on H. R. 8361 which seeks to amend section 2254 of title 28 of the United States Code, in relation to application for a writ of habeas corpus:

Recommendation: Disapproval.

This bill is an attempt to reduce litigation in the Federal courts. However, under section 3 of the amendment, a multiplicity of actions in the State courts would be required before a Federal writ of habeas corpus could be issued. This multiplicity of actions would effect a bar to an indigent defendant in State custody to seeking his possible Federal remedies. For those defendants who would not be entirely barred, it would work an undue hardship.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL COURTS.

The Council To Improve the Health Care of the Aged—Sound Approach to a Serious Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during the past 20 years nursing homes have become a significant part of the Nation's medical care facilities. They have increased very rapidly and the public is becoming more aware of nursing homes and the role they play in the community in caring for the chronically ill and aged. There are many circumstances that have influenced the rapid growth of nursing homes, for example, the expansion of the life span; large increases in our aged population; significant advances in medicine-public health services; the fact that many of our family dwellings and homes are too small to accommodate a family and the aging parent, together with the fact that quite often both husband and wife find it necessary to work and therefore there is no one at home to care for the aged; the tremendous growth of insurance and pensions systems. Because of this expansion there has been a great deal of concern about the standards in these homes and the realization of the significant contribution nursing homes are making and should be making to our older citizens.

I was quite happy to learn that recently the American Medical Association together with the American Nursing Homes Association, the American Hospital Association, and the American Dental Association announced the formation of the Council To Improve the Health Care of the Aged. I am quite sure that this good news was well received by all of us who are interested in solving the problems of providing good health care at reasonable prices for our elder citizens. I am very much convinced of the need for expanding our financing facilities to encourage the construction and development of all types of nursing homes. Consonant with this belief, I intend to testify before the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee on May 19.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial which appeared in the May 11 edition of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. I would but reaffirm the writer's conclusion that "the new professional organization has raised hopes which we trust its dedication and hard, practical work will help bring to realization":

NEW HELP FOR THE ELDERLY

The joining together of medical, hospital, nursing, and dental associations in a Joint Council To Improve the Health Care of the Aged is an encouraging development in a field in which encouragements are never too numerous. Its objectives of more and better nursing homes throughout the country,

and "more medical facilities with costs tailored to the limited means of the aged," are of almost desperate importance in Missouri, as everywhere in the Nation.

Money needs to be made available for the construction of nursing homes. Many present operators of nursing homes need to be better trained and, still further, persons capable of becoming skilled operators need to be brought into the picture. Our older citizens need to be enabled to bridge the gap between the most they can afford to pay and the least at which adequate nursing-home facilities can be offered.

The new professional organization has raised hopes which we trust its dedication and hard, practical work will help bring to realization.

Galloping Collectivitis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Galloping Collectivitis," by Anthony Harrigan, from the May 9 issue of U. S. A.

Mr. Harrigan, the editorial writer for the Charleston News and Courier, of Charleston, S. C., is one of the leading and able young writers of my State. In this article, he has summed up in masterful fashion the threat to individual liberty which is inherent in the movement to destroy State and local governments.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GALLOPING COLLECTIVITIS

(By Anthony Harrigan)

"The fate of every democracy, of every government based on the sovereignty of the people, depends on the choice it makes between these opposite principles, absolute power on the one hand, and on the other the restraints of legality and the authority of tradition. * * * In a demoracy the power is already in the hands of those who seek to subvert and abolish the law. The process of subversion is consequently irresistible, and far more rapid."

This is the view held by Lord Acton, the great 19th century English historian, on the issue of States rights in the American Republic—the issue which underlies all the major questions that have agitated our country and form the substance of the constitutional history of the United States.

Today the thoughts of American conservatives turn to Acton's penetrating analysis of the great issue confronting us. Today there is recognition of the antagonism between believes in States rights and the advocates of a totalitarian "liberal" democracy. There is an awareness of the real and present danger that the principle of local self-rule or States rights may pass from the life of the Republic.

To be sure, principles do not disappear completely from the heart of a nation, though they may pass temporarily from law and the practices of government. There always is the possibility that weakened sinews of a nation conceived in the spirit of liberty may regain former strength and enjoy a restoration of their libertarian vigor.

Twenty years ago, Charles A. Beard, the American historian, gave in an essay "The Constitution and States Rights" a preview of the anti-States rights philosophy that has gained widespread acceptance in our time.

"The ideas," wrote Beard, "originally associated with that instrument [our Constitution] and the rights of States under it cannot be effectively applied to the changed configuration of interests. * * * The time approaches when, if the processes of history continue, positive definition and formulation will come. Happy will be the Nation if clear and flexible intelligence resolve the consequent dilemma by the operation of flexible institutions."

In short, Beard argued that the end of the States is ordained, should be so, and that new units of government must be considered in the United States.

In the light of recent Supreme Court decisions that strike at the heritage of States rights, Americans would do well to review why these rights are not enjoying support.

DREAD DISEASE

Let us consider these questions: What is the intellectual disease that has been destroying States rights? Is it possible for Americans to do anything to arrest its deathly work?

There is no real difficulty in defining the disease. It is galloping collectivitis, a rampant form of mania for assaults upon people's local associations and local liberties. The disease is spread in epidemic proportion by carriers using educational instruction and propaganda to enforce uniformity of opinion.

Under the influence of galloping collectivitis, people suffer from the delusion that attacks against a plurality of jurisdiction and power are defenses of human rights. Yet it will be found, upon studying the matter, that many so-called defenses of human rights and protestations of the Federal Government's right to enforce uniformity are—with false assumptions laid bare—attacks upon liberty itself.

"Collectivitis" is the desire, in the word of Russell Kirk, that individuals be mere specks in a tapioca-pudding society.

Advocates of big government and a bloc society, seek a world without honorifics, cut down by the leveling winds of utilitarianism, committed to the notion of easy materialistic living as the best possible style of life, conditioned to the idea of the central government guaranteeing livelihood and economic security to the masses, and dominated by so-called property-less bureaucrats.

MAIN SYMPTOM

The chief symptom of collectivitis is lust for making over the world in a single image. This making over entails the introduction of uniformity and conformity as democratic principles, and the portrayal of a social nirvana wherein every citizen thinks and acts like every other.

Without a doubt, the forces of constitutional liberty in America have been weakened by another disease, a creeping paralysis. This disease restrains their own efforts to immunize our country against galloping collectivitis.

VANITY, ALL IS VANITY

It seems that too many Americans have lost their ability to think clearly about the nature of sovereignty and the proper checks on popular power. Demos is god, and the American people and many of their political leaders are forbidden by the collectivists to show a trace of political agnosticism. Louis XIV, the Russian Czars, Caesar himself were not more hedged-around, more protected from criticism and censure than are the American people today in exercising their so-called democracy. Self-flattery on the part of the people, their flattery by the office-holding industry, the self-flattery of demagogic politicians, of some secular-minded clergy and of other persons who ought to know better, are betraying our Republic. The crowd is king and brooks no criticism.

It is ironical that the supposed age of freedom has been most productive of devices which check liberty. What monarchy failed to achieve, totalitarian democracy is achieving, and rapidly.

Moderns, save in rare instances, will not give allegiance to absolute monarchies, but they will give it to absolute democracies. They will not accept the notion that kings can do no wrong, but they will accept the idea that democratic majorities can do no wrong. There is the root of the trouble.

As D. W. Brogan points out, "* * * if the people is always right and the people is the state, then there can be no danger in surrendering into the hands of its mandatories complete, uncontrolled and irrecoverable power. But, as all sensible men know, majorities are capable of grievous wrongs and stupendous follies. Even more readily than kings will they conscript the population, despoil wealth, institute inquisitorial procedures, regiment persons and opinion, and rely on policy procedures in times of stress."

Modern democracies, then, have witnessed the transfer into the hands of the supposed representatives of the people what Bertrand de Jouvenel has termed "the whole complex of rights, duties, and resources which had been built up during the monarchy for the behoof of the king."

The fact that the power has passed into the hands of representatives is proof of the fact that the rule of the people is a polite fiction. It is said the people rule, whereas the fiction of popular participation in the rule of society is merely a device whereby each individual feels the weight of the alleged general interest incarnate in itself which regards every act of private particular interest as an antisocial act. Hence the crowd is personified and endowed with vast powers, and the individual is lost and deprived of freedom. The general will, interpreted by official interpreters (the bureaucrats) "falls with all the weight of an irresistible force on those very wills which have joined in the formation of it."

DEMOCRATIC ABSOLUTISM

What does this mean in terms of States' rights and the law?

It means that democratic absolutism has destroyed the old concept of immutable principles in law, resulting in a breakdown of States rights.

Formerly, change came about in the law through the long processes of time, the gradual development of customs and traditions, the slow work of history. (There had to be an almost universal acceptance of the unwritten law before it was written, codified.) With the advent of democratic absolutism—the tyranny of the majorities—law has become a creature of elections and electioneering. Law has become, in the words of Bertrand de Jouvenel, a "function of opinion." And so it is that the most important questions of social life in the American Republic have become questions of political court action.

Today Americans know in their hearts that there is scarcely a single rule of existence, political and cultural, which does not hang on political court action tied to elections and the competition for votes. Law is no longer a majestic expression of the rights and aspirations of the people, but an expression of the political passions reigning at the moment.

It is tragic but true that the highroad to political advancement in America today is participation in the seduction of the people with the words they wish to hear. The

majority of men in politics have to take part in the enormous bamboozling attempt. Only a handful of political leaders, mostly veterans of the House of Representatives and the Senate who have attained that seniority and security in office which puts away fear of reprisal, are in a position to speak the truth and present the facts uncolored by flattery.

American is in need of leaders who speak out early as well as late in life, who are unafraid. But the political climate is not productive of a Cato. Pressure groups daily increase their harassment of elected officials. The demands for "correct" opinions are unceasing.

The United States Supreme Court is "packed" to represent the forces of majority supremacy. The doctrine of limited Government and local autonomy, a doctrine as old as the Republic, is virtually without a representative on the Court.

SOCIAL SCIENCE REIGNS SUPREME

What is the liberty under law in which the Supreme Court professes itself interested? It seems to be freedom to have proper governmental objective determined by courts which rely more on the advice of psychologists and social scientists than on precedent and established practice. It seems to be freedom from fear of every sort of government except the Federal Government.

Those persons who are afflicted with galloping collectivitis propose to use the processes of government to achieve the obectives of tyrannical governments, the obectives of complete, uncontrolled, and irrecoverable power. How can this be achieved? The only way is by destruction of the bulwarks of liberty, the rights of the States. The all-embracing Federal Government, greedy for power, relies on legislation, indoctrination, and federally directed economic activities to achieve its ends. These are the means of subversion to wreck a republican government.

The contest between those who would expand the powers of Federal Government and those who would retain strong checks on Federal activity has been carried on in the courts. It has been an unequal contest. The advocates of Federal control have won most of the major decisions to date.

A century ago, John C. Calhoun observed, "The end of the contest would be the subversion of the Constitution, whether by the undermining process of construction * * * or by the substituting in practice of what is called party usage. By one or the other, the restrictions (on the Federal power) would ultimately be ended, and the Government converted into one of unlimited powers."

It is essential to bear in mind that a government of unlimited power—whether it be controlled by 1 man, by 1 party, or by 1 section, or 1 powerful majority—is a tyranny with all the evil features the word suggests.

Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Andrew Gahagan, of New York, and a member of the board of directors of Kenmetal, Inc., Latrobe, Pa., had an interesting and informative article in the Kenmetals house organ, which I feel holds sufficient interest that I am presenting it in the RECORD that it may be available for a wider reading than otherwise. Mr. Gahagan has worked effectively, and without fatigue, over the years in the interests of our system of enterprise of free management and free labor. He has made many fine contributions in this important field:

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

(By Andrew Gahagan)

Twenty-five dollars taken away from each of 40 million families in the United States would amount to one billion dollars.

When our Government people in Washington talk about $3½ billion for foreign aid in 1 year, they are thus talking about a sum of money equal to almost $90 for every family in the United States. Three and one-half billion dollars is also about the amount of taxpayers' dollars it took to pay for all of the expenses of running the Federal Government each year just prior to the year 1932.

We ask, "How have we gotten to the point where our Government people take such vast sums of money away from American families and distribute it to peoples in other countries all over the globe?"

Some of these countries have as many natural resources, or raw materials, as we have here in the United States. And their people are just as strong, just as intelligent, and just as industrious as the workers in the United States.

Why is it, then, that we here in America have the highest standard of living, with more and better food, clothing and homes, and more automobiles, telephones, and other goods and services than any other people in the world?

It is because in America we have a lot of tools and horsepower to help Americans convert raw materials into goods and services. We can think of horsepower as mechanical workers who do not get tired, do not have to sleep every night, and consume things only when they are working. We feed them fuel oil, waterpower, and things that human workers do not consume. These mechanical workers supply about 95 percent of all of the energy required to convert raw materials into goods and services.

In fact, it is estimated that the horsepower in the United States in the form of steam and diesel plants, railway locomotives, tractors, trucks, etc., is equivalent to the energy that could be exerted by 3 billion human workers. There are only about 2½ billion men, women, and children in all of the world.

Why is it, then, that Americans have more mechanical helpers than there are men, women, and children in all of the world, including the United States?

The answer to this question is that it is due entirely to our system of government which is based on protection for private property and the limitation which our Constitution and the Bill of Rights has placed on the power of the Government, including its power to make new laws and rules and regulations to restrict the liberties of the citizens. Our republican form of government is still the newest thing in government in the last 5,000 years.

Under the American private-property system, a man can take his savings and know-how and go into the production of tungsten carbides, or into the production of any other goods and services he desires, without first getting permission from His Majesty the King, or some dictator or government bureaucrat. His only boss has been the customer who decides whether he wants the goods and services produced and whether he is agreeable to paying the prices asked. If the producer fails to satisfy customers, he eventually goes out of business. If he satisfies customers, he continues to grow and hence, have the opportunity to serve more customers with more and better products.

Now, if other countries want our standard of living, they too can have it, not as a gift from the American taxpayers, but by protecting private property in their own countries against confiscation by government bureaucrats, gangsters and dictators operating through force or through taxes or hidden inflation taxes due to the permanent high prices caused by governments creating and spending inflation money.

The American Government's foreign policy should say to the other countries:

"It is none of our business what kind of Government you wish to have in your country. If you want to have a communistic, socialistic or dictatorial government, that is all right with us.

"But we here in America believe in the private property system because it has given Americans more goods and services for more people and more freedom than any other system yet devised by man. We will not, therefore, take American taxpayers hard-earned money and use it to support socialism, communism or any other government property system at home or abroad.

"We are, therefore, only interested in helping people who have our same philosophy of protection for private property. We will make this help available through the Export-Import Bank, or other agency as long-term loans, or guaranties of long-term loans, to private individuals or companies. We will expect your governments to agree that as long as these loans are outstanding, such industries will not be nationalized or taken over and called government property.

"If at any time American taxpayers' dollars are used to buy food and clothing for people in foreign lands, it will be distributed by American Red Cross workers as gifts from Americans instead of as gifts from socialistic or dictatorial governments, wherever they be.

"In short, our foreign policy will be to protect the private property system throughout the world as we believe this to be the best system for mankind."

And then our Government should also add:

"We will stop confiscating the people's property here in the United States through the Karl Marxian device of robbing successful people by means of the graduated income tax, and we will also return to the citizens their complete right to an honest convertible gold coin money system."

Proposed Reorganization of the Department of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL VINSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert a letter I have received from Mr. Ferdinand Eberstadt with respect to the proposed reorganization of the Department of Defense.

Mr. Eberstadt is one of the outstanding authorities in America on defense organization. He was Chairman of the Committee on National Security Organization, the task force of the Hoover

Commission, which conducted under his leadership what is generally recognized as one of the most thorough, objective, and constructive examinations of our defense organization ever made. During World War II he was Chairman of the Army and Navy Munitions Board and Vice Chairman of the War Production Board. Later, at the request of Mr. James Forrestal, then Secretary of the Navy, he conducted an extensive study of defense organization. This study, officially entitled "Unification of the War and Navy Departments and Postwar Organization for National Security," but widely known as the Eberstadt report, provided much of the basis for unification in the Defense Establishment.

I know of no civilian in the United States better qualified to comment on the proposed reorganization of the Department of Defense. The letter which follows is, in my opinion, the most searching analysis and the clearest explanation I have seen regarding the problems and issues confronting Congress as a result of the President's defense reorganization proposals. I urge every Member of the House to read this letter very carefully. It is worthy of the highest consideration:

F. EBERSTADT & CO.,
New York, N. Y., May 12, 1958.

The Honorable CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your request, I have studied the bill (H. R. 11958) and the testimony on it given before your committee, and take the liberty of setting forth my views below.

It is not difficult to state the objectives of our Defense Department, or even the principles applicable to sound departmental organization. Nowhere have these objectives and principles been better stated than in various speeches and messages of our President. The application, however, of these principles to the huge and complex conglomeration of men and materials constituting the Defense Department is neither simple nor easy. Persons of high patriotic purpose and competence differ widely on these matters. Almost every question is closely balanced with pros and cons. Thus, while it is dangerous in the extreme to establish a rigid form of defense organization unresponsive to the appalling speed, scope, and magnitude of the modern weapons that are the fruits of the increasing acceleration of scientific discovery, on the other hand, an institution of this magnitude to be manageable and effective must have a solid foundation and a strong framework.

And so, the answer to these complex questions can only be found in the sort of thoughtful, deliberate, and careful exploring and weighing of their various conflicting aspects in the pattern set by your committee. The more careful and scrutinizing the study, the more likely a sound solution.

Those who have observed these matters over the past devade or so know that whenever things go wrong in the military field in one way or another, the conventional culprits are "the organization of the Defense Department" and "interservice rivalries." Little attention is paid to whether the troubles might possibly be the natural consequences of decisions and policies—or lack of them. The prescription to cure such military ills is almost always the same—more and more power and authority for the Secretary of Defense and more and more concentration of authority over strategic planning.

And so each successive amendment to the original act of 1947 has aimed at clarifying and strengthening the authority of the Secretary of Defense over the operations of the Department to a point where I doubt that there remain any words in the English language whereby Congress could possibly convey to the Secretary of Defense more or clearer power and authority to run his Department beyond what he now possesses. I take the liberty, however, of pointing out that nothing tarnishes and corrodes faster than unused authority. To quote Poor Richard, "the used key stays bright." It is thus pertinent to inquire whether, over the past years, the Secretaries of Defense have, as a matter of fact, always fully employed the power and authority at their disposal.

For my part, any doubts as to the adequacy of the Secretary's authority to manage the Department became academic after Secretary Louis Johnson terminated construction on the aircraft carrier *Forrestal* and his decision stuck. Whether or not the decision was a sound one, particularly in the light of hindsight, is beside the point. The real point is that, undeterred by any concern for "fuzzy language," "sand in the gearbox," or "gray areas," Secretary Johnson grasped his authority firmly and used it. Furthermore, I know of no instance since the act of 1947 was passed where the Secretary's power and authority have been seriously challenged.

And still the requests for further power for the Secretary of Defense continue. However, in the bill before you, the request for additional power for the Secretary in one important respect is of a somewhat different nature than that sought heretofore. The power there requested relates not primarily to the determination of policies, etc., but involves the right to rearrange or abolish basic functions of the military departments.

This raises a serious constitutional question on which it may be difficult to draw a clear and sharp line. Certainly, it would not seem to be consistent with the constitutional obligations of the Congress to grant the Secretary unlimited and undefined authority in this field. Where, in our time, legislatures have surrendered their constitutional powers, the result has usually not been good. The nub of the question then is, How far can (or should) Congress go in assigning powers of this sort to the Secretary of Defense without abdicating its constitutional function and without jeopardizing our national security, bearing in mind that we may not always be so fortunate, as we are at the moment, in having a distinguished military men in the White House and a competent Secretary in the Pentagon?

Solution to the problem is rendered more difficult by the fact that although such sweeping authority is sought, no clear plan or program for its intended use has been presented either in the President's message, the bill, or the testimony before your committee by witnesses supporting the bill. One is thus left with the impression that such authority cannot be urgently or immediately needed since no clear plan for its use exists. Failure to present such plans and programs fortifies the conclusion that the troubles may reside more in decisions and policies than in organization and service rivalries.

It seemed reasonable to assume that the changes requested with respect to the Joint staff must be tied into some definite plan but witnesses deny its existence. How can it be that such drastic powers over roles and missions are sought and still no plan for its use exists? That's what the Secretary has said so it must be correct. Would it not therefore be wiser to defer drastic action until reasonable definite justification is presented?

Obviously, Congress should be willing to make proper changes in the law where the need is convincingly presented and substantiated, but, quite apart from any Constitutional question, there's a real question as to whether Congress should give the Defense Department authority to make changes of so vital a sort where the Defense Department itself doesn't seem to know specifically why they are needed and how they will be used. If important changes are necessary, they should not be delayed for an instant, but simply conferring such broad authority to meet unstated needs would not seem to solve anything.

Among the specific changes in the present law requested in the bill is the abolition of words which provide for the separate administration of the military departments. The original conception of the function of the Secretary of Defense was that he would determine major policies and not become involved in details of administration. His job is too big to handle in any other way. To the extent that that conception has been departed from, the effectiveness of the Secretary has been impaired and the organization of the Department weakened. Theoretically, the Department could best be administered by the Secretary operating through the Armed Forces Policy Council, consisting of the three departmental Secretaries on the civilian side, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the military side, plus the sound suggestion that the man responsible for the research and engineering be included. Of course, this is too extreme. The practical answer lies somewhere between that theoretical setup and the present one where the Office of the Secretary now contains around 3,000 persons.

Today the Secretary does not administer too little—he probably administers too much. I have been advised that from this office have issued orders concerning the disposal of garbage and the mowing of vegetative areas, a phrase which is probably the high point of bureaucratic gobbledygook. Certainly there are more worthy matters for secretarial attention.

I favor retention of the present separately administered arrangement, not on the grounds of tradition, service prerogatives, or even on the more important one of morale, but because I know of no better form of administrative organization. If the three military departments did not exist, they or other alternative administrative units would have to be created and it seems much sounder and safer to retain and work with what exists than to attempt something entirely new.

Certain witnesses before your committee, while admitting the Secretary's clear and adequate authority to administer the departments, have suggested elimination of the words "separately administered" on the grounds that they constituted a psychological barrier. My opinion is that a few clear and firm decisions in this field by the Secretary might be more effective even than legislative enactment in removing any psychological inhibitions that subordinates might entertain with respect to the Secretary's authority.

I believe that the effectiveness of the Department would be greatly increased if it were streamlined by reducing the size of the Secretary's office by a couple of thousand people so that the Secretary, heavily weighed down with burdens and duties, could occupy himself only with matters of primary importance.

To sum up, my feeling is that the main difficulty with respect to secretarial authority is not lack of legal authority or the present organizational structure. It resides in the need for clear, firm, and prompt decision. The question is not more authority, but more use of what now exists.

In the matter of strategic planning there have been wide differences of opinion. Some favor concentration of authority in a single military Chief of Staff supported by a General Staff, following the type of military structure prevalent on the continent of Europe. Others prefer the broader-based Joint

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Chiefs of Staff system, modeled more along British lines, the type used and developed by us during the Second World War. My own objections to the Single Chief of Staff system as a means of strategic planning are based on its tendency to create a single rigid military line or dogma. This is dangerous at all times but, in the rapidly changing circumstances in which we live, where flexibility and speed are essential, it could well be fatal. The bill before you does not go that far, but it tends in that direction. The Joint Chiefs are to be whittled down on both sides of the ledger. Their responsibility and authority with respect to their respective services is to be diminished, and their relationship to the Joint Staff diluted—in neither instance perhaps to a dangerous degree. I mention this simply to indicate a continuance of this trend, which, if it goes on, must logically and eventually result in the appointment of a single Chief of Staff, presiding over a large general staff.

The essence of the Joint Chiefs of Staff type of planning is that those responsible for the conception of the strategic plans should also be responsible for their execution. They should freely, and without hindrance or restraint, be in a position to discuss and criticize strategic plans and programs and to present and advocate the employment of the fullest capacity of their respective services. As a matter of fact, the testimony before your committee indicates that the Joint Chiefs of Staff system seems to be working well. None of the Joint Chiefs who testified suggested any major change in that institution. I believe that impairment of that magnificent military machine—the Joint Chiefs of Staff system—would seriously jeopardize our national security.

The elimination of the right of service chiefs and departmental secretaries to lay their grievances before Congress, the elimination of reports by the departmental secretaries, the reduction of the Secretary's report from a semi-annual to an annual basis the addition of prerequisites to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the whittling away of the rights of the department commanders, both with respect to their departments and with respect to other functions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, an unlimited increase in the size of the Joint Staff—all tend in the same direction though neither singly nor in the aggregate, do they go the full distance in setting up a Chief of Staff supported by a conventional general staff. Future requests of the same sort, however, may have that result, so that while attention should certainly be paid to those aspects of these requests which seem constructive, care should be exercised with respect to the statutory language employed so as not, inadvertently, to open the door to the creation in fact, if not in form, of a Chief of Staff and a General Staff.

Experience indicates the wisdom of setting a reasonable limit to the size of the Joint Staff. The changes requested with respect to the status of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and its director do not seem unduly drastic. However, in view of the continuing tendencies noted above, proper provisions should be inserted to protect the sound functioning of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff.

Another important matter dealt with in this bill relates to unified commands. Unified commands are important for many reasons, amongst others because they offer a promising, practical and flexible means of enabling our combatant forces, in an orderly manner, to effect those transitions in doctrine and practice necessary to keep pace with the rapidly changing weapons technology. The authority of the unified commanders over their forces should, of course, be clear and definite and, to whatever extent present laws and regulations obstruct that, they should be amended. Similarly, the line of authority from the President to the commander of joint or unified forces should be clear and rapid. I believe that this is principally a matter of internal regulation but, to the extent that there are legal obstacles, they should be removed.

There remains the question of how best to deal with research within the Defense Department in such manner that both in strategic plans and in weapons we may remain in the forefront. During the Second World War there existed an Office of Research and Development outside of the military departments, but in close relation with them. The arrangement was extremely productive. The most conspicuous scientific development, of course, was in the atomic field. Following the war, the Atomic Energy Commission was created—a civilian body, but with a continuous and intimate relationship to the military. That is a pattern which, it seems to me, has proven sound and fruitful.

In the original National Security Act, a Research and Development Board was provided for, headed by a Chairman who derived his authority from the Secretary. Experience convinced some people that the Chairman's authority was not definite enough, and it was clarified in the amendments of 1949. The Reorganization Plan No. 6 favored bureaucrats over boards. Thus an Assistant Secretary of Defense in charge of Research and Development replaced the Board and its Chairman. There seems to be a feeling that none of these expedients worked out and it is now suggested that the Secretary's power in that field be more specifically delegated, under his supervision, to a Director of Research and Engineering, who will also have certain power in the field of contracts and procurement.

There is now apparently an office of missiles under Mr. Holaday, a unit in charge of space developments under Mr. Johnson, both of whom I am sure are competent people. These matters are so closely related to the jurisdiction of the proposed new Director of Research that, at the very least, it would seem advisable to combine them into one unit under his direction. My own feeling is that, where basic research is concerned, it is better done outside than within the Department, and that, so far as applied research is concerned, it can be handled better by the military departments under the strong direction of the Director than whitin the Secretary's office itself. However, it seems to me that, subject to the avoidance of duplication and the creation of clear lines of authority from the Secretary to the new Director, to the various operating units, as suggested above, the proposal is in substance worthy of adoption, at least on a trial basis.

I hope you will not feel that by this long letter I have imposed unduly on your heavily burdened time. You realize, I know, the magnitude and complexity of this subject.

In closing, may I state that, in my opinion, the Nation owes you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of your committee, a great debt of gratitude for your patient, scrutinizing, and constructive study of this matter which goes to the very heart of our national survival.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

F. EBERSTADT.

Israelis Pleaded With Arabs To Stay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we read and hear much about the Arab refugees still homeless after the Arab-Israeli conflict of 1948. The following story, written by the noted journalist, Leo Heiman, is an accurate account of how and why the Arabs left Israel. Mr. Heiman's story appeared in The American Zionist, April–May 1958 issue.

ISRAELIS PLEADED WITH ARABS TO STAY

(By Leo Heiman)

HAIFA.—The problem of the Arab refugees has been festering since the establishment of the Jewish state. It is being exploited by the Arab rulers and the enemies of Israel everywhere as a means of undermining and maligning the young state. If this problem could be settled, peace between Israel and the Arabs would be within easier reach. But although most people today are aware of the Arab refugee problem's importance, only a few senior Israeli officers knew how this problem started.

The secrets of the Arab refugee problem were revealed for the first time by Brig. Gen. Moshe Carmel, Israel Minister of Transport, who commanded the Israeli forces in Haifa during the 1948 war of independence.

Writing in the Israel Army paper, Bamahaneh, General Carmel discloses how his forces liberated Haifa 10 years ago, on April 22, 1948. Haifa's 65,000 Jews were almost completely surrounded by the city's 75,000 Arabs, who dominated all main routes of communication by virtue of living in city-edge slums and other outlaying districts.

Street battles between Israeli and Arab forces raged for 3 months, when the British commanding general of Haifa, Major General Stockwell (who commanded British forces in the 1956 Suez Expedition), decided suddenly to pull out and concentrate all British troops in the harbor, pending their final evacuation from Palestine.

As soon as Stockwell's decision became known, both Jews and Arabs rushed to grab the abandoned British Army camps, forts and other military installations whose possession meant the difference between victory and defeat.

The Jews won and, after a bitter 56-hour battle, broke all Arab resistance by skillful application of modern psychological warfare methods. When the Arabs were sufficiently softened up by 7 hours of continuous explosions, Carmel sent dozens of jeeps, and hired taxicabs with powerful loudspeakers, up and down all battlelines. Wild moans of sirens, Arab funeral music and panic-spreading declarations tape-recorded by Arab prisoners were broadcast continuously. They proved to be the straw which broke the proverbial camel's back.

"A few minutes before noon (April 22, 1948) a special messenger from Mayor Shabtai Levy (the Jewish mayor of Haifa) arrived at our headquarters (hidden in the basement of a Kupat Holim clinic on 9 Geulah Street) with an urgent message from General Stockwell. The Haifa Arab Committee contacted the general, requesting that he arrange the cease-fire. The General requested my presence, but I answered that urgent business kept me at headquarters and sent my chief of operations, Modecai Makleff (later promoted to major general, as Chief of Israeli General Staff, preceding General Dayan) to attend the meeting." General Carmel revealed in the Bamahaneh article.

Stockwell and other British generals of his staff arrived in full dress uniform, with ceremonial swords, ribbons and medals. The six Arab representatives wore formal suits. Makleff arrived wearing an old pair of soiled khaki shorts, and a torn khaki blouse. He returned from the fighting lines and had no time to change. Nor did he care about the impression his clothes made. His troops impressed both the British and the Arabs in a sufficient degree.

The Arab millionaire businessman and industrial tycoon, Victor Khayatt, who owned most of Arab Haifa and who headed the Haifa Arab Committee, asked Makleff if he agreed to a cease-fire. At that time, Israeli forces advanced on all sectors, capturing the final Arab line of resistance and linking up to surround the city and start mopping-up operations.

Therefore, Makleff smiled and said that he could accept only unconditional surrender. However, he hastened to add, since the Jews wanted to continue living in peace with their Arab neighbors, he was authorized to offer general amnesty to all Haifa Arab soldiers, irregulars and guerrillas on three conditions:

That they turn in all their arms, ammunition and equipment and pledge to never fight again in opposition to the Jewish state.

That they surrender, for detention in prisoner stockades, all foreign mercenaries and volunteers, including the German, British, Iraqi, and Yugoslav officers who commanded the Arab forces in Haifa.

That they remain in their homes and go about their business as usual.

In return, Makleff guaranteed fullest personal safety and equality for all Arab inhabitants of Haifa, including those who fought against Jews. He also offered autonomous self-rule in Haifa's Arab districts, including Arab police and administration under overall Jewish supervision.

Makleff concluded by saying that all Arabs who refused to pledge the end of armed resistance would go to prisoner stockades for the duration of hostilities, while all Arabs who broke their pledge will be shot. General Stockwell remarked that these terms were more than generous, for had it been the other way around, the Arabs would have driven all Jews into the sea, amidst unprecedented butchery and slaughter.

"The six Arab representatives agreed that our terms were acceptable," General Carmel continues, "but before signing the act of unconditional surrender, Mr. Khayatt stated that he had to consult with the High Arab Committee for Palestine. At half past 7 in the evening, the Arab representatives reappeared, walking slowly with their heads bent, as if they were being led to their execution. Tears glistened in their eyes, as Mr. Khayatt declared in a broken voice that they could not accept our terms of surrender. Nor, for that matter, were they prepared to negotiate with us at all. Arab resistance will continue till the end, Mr. Khayatt stated, while Haifa's Arab population would be evacuated to the Lebanon."

General Stockwell jumped up from his seat. "Are you crazy?" he shouted, "have you gone out of your minds? How can you reject such generous terms? Are you people contemplating national suicide?"

"That's what it amounts to," Khayatt agreed, "we got in radio contact with Haj. Amin el Husseini (the former pro-Nazi Mufti of Jerusalem, who headed the High Arab Committee) and were ordered to break off all negotiations. The High Arab Committee forbade any dealings with the Jews and threatened to brand as traitor and execute any Arab who negotiated with the Jews, pledged to cease resistance or accept any other form of Jewish rule."

Mayor Shabtai Levy wept as he begged his Arab colleagues to follow sound reason and remain in Haifa. "We shall be brothers again," he cried. Khayatt shook his head sadly. "We can never be brothers again as long as we live," he explained quietly, "the High Arab Committee guaranteed all Arab refugees a triumphant return to Haifa, within 6 weeks, in the wake of victorious Arab armies, scheduled to invade Palestine from Egypt, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon and Trans-Jordan on May 15, 1948. Any Arab who accepted Jewish rule would be shot for treason, while all refugees were promised twice as much property as they left behind, when all that belongs to the Jews will be theirs upon the impending conquest of Palestine by the regular Arab armies."

"Khayatt and his delegation left the building, dragging their feet and wiping the tears which gathered in their eyes," Carmel write, "but as soon as I learned of their crazy decision, I ordered thousands of leaflets to be printed and distributed among the Arab inhabitants of Haifa. We guaranteed their safety and equal rights, we begged them to remain in their homes, we explained how they were being cheated and misled by their fanatical leaders. We sent our loudspeaker jeeps and cabs into all Arab districts to broadcast my personal appeal to the Arabs in which we asked them to remain and live in peace with their Jewish neighbors. To no avail.

"Only about four thousand Haifa Arabs risked being branded as traitors and shot upon the promised return of Arab forces to Haifa. Over seventy thousand Arabs were blinded by false promises or terrorized by armed nationalist agents into leaving everything they owned and going on foot to the harbor, where fishing boats and British ships took them to the Lebanon."

"One final attempt to stem the wild exodus was made by our patrol commanders and officers in charge of the roadblocks. Each head of refugee family was read our proclamation and asked whether he was leaving Haifa of his own free will, or whether he was being intimidated by nationalist agents and fear of future reprisals. Leaflets were widely distributed by our patrols, but few if any Arabs turned back. Most of them were frightened to death by nationalist propaganda which said that we raped all Arab women, forcibly converted all Arab children to Judaism, multilated young men and enslaved the rest. Those who did not believe the propaganda, believed in final Arab victory and did not dare risk their lives by staying in Haifa and accepting our rule. In this way, like a bunch of sheep, Haifa's Arabs went into voluntary exile, from which they were never to return."

Haifa was the first big mixed Arab-Jewish city to be liberated by Israeli forces. The exodus of its Arab population set a pattern which was to be repeated all over Palestine in the weeks to come.

Officials of Israel's Arab Affairs Department believe that, originally there were only some 620,000 Arab refugees from Israel; 70,000 from Haifa; 150,000 from Jaffa and surrounding villages; 110,000 from Tiberias, Acre, Safad, and northern Palestine; 45,000 from the Jerusalem district; 85,000 from the costal belt, Sharon, and Shomron; 30,000 from Lydda and Ramleh; 130,000 from Beersheba, Migdal, the Negev and southern Palestine, plus scattered villages and townships in other parts of the country.

To get extra free rations from United Nations relief agencies, most Arabs registered dead and nonexisting family members as well. Deaths in Arab refugee camps are rarely, if ever, reported, and this boosted the original refugee number to over 800,000. In addition, over 400,000 children were born in refugee camps over the past 10 years. They never saw Israel, but they are registered as refugees. This brings the official refugee figure to more than 1 million souls.

The Arabs committed the greatest mistake when they left Palestine, and history never forgives mistakes of such gigantic magnitude. For they could have remained in their homes in what is now Israel, as the Israeli commanders begged them to.

An Advertising Agency's Concept of Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, in these times of great economic stress, and as a Representative from the State of New York, even though Madison Avenue, United States of America, is out of my constituency, I take great pride in the recent publication of a unique publication created by the advertising agency of Brown & Butcher, Inc., of 630 Fifth Avenue.

It is entitled "A Statement of Standards, Policies, and Practices."

Here is 8 minutes of realistic reading that not only conforms with the energetic affirmative attitude of the administration, but also accepts the necessity for integrity and commonsense that so clearly is a part of the integral reasoning of our own Chief Executive Officer, President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

As one of their key clients, Marshall S. Lachner, president of the B. T. Babbit Co. indicated at that company's recent stockholder's meeting this past Monday, the mere desire to sell at a profit is manifest in all walks of life, but to consistently maintain the respect of not only consumers but one's competitors as well, requires more than the will to expand, since the outstanding success of all American industry and their service organizations sharply reminds us that Abraham Lincoln's words add new luster to the irrefutable logic, "that you can fool some of the people all of the time and all of the people some of the time, but you can never fool all of the people all of the time."

Here then, in Brown & Butcher's booklet is clearly the demonstration that you can succeed even more quickly if you strive to fool none of the people at any time. This is apparent in the quick upturn in sales of the venerable B. T. Babbitt Co. when the new management team brought Brown & Butcher in the first of this year. Here is that philosophy that I commend to my esteemed fellow Congressmen, for while its birth was nurtured in this instance by one commercial segment of the American economic scene, the basic precepts are applicable in all walks of life, be it industry, labor, or the farm:

No matter what a man does to earn his bread, sooner or later under the greatest economic system the world has even seen, in these United States that man must market his goods, produce or services, and in our free competitive system the buyer's market has historically always responded to the extra sales ingredients of ingenuity and product integrity.

This is the story of one advertising agency's concepts of advertising. The concepts are simple because advertising and its objectives are simple.

Advertising is selling. The many complicated, component parts of creating and maintaining advertising plans and making an advertising agency work are not to be referred to here.

The objective of this booklet is to set forth as interestingly as possible to interested people the basic beliefs and principles of Brown & Butcher, Inc.

Here are set down high standards—a credo if you like—upon which this agency was formed and by which it will live.

We do not subscribe to, in fact, we resist in every way, any idea that there are any mysteries or half-hidden secrets to what advertising is all about. Actually, advertising is an extremely simple business. It is concerned only with selling. We in this agency are salesmen, and our responsibility is to help sell more merchandise at a profit.

It is not our job to entertain consumers. Neither is it our job to aim for prizewinning awards. We repeat, our job is selling more merchandise.

While we have learned, through experience, that a sales objective is a simple thing to define, we also know it is not so simple to keep in sight that objective.

Externally, client advertising budgets make an advertising agency an active working business. Internally, nothing makes an advertising agency good or bad except people.

It is an absolute conviction within Brown & Butcher, Inc., that no individual is born with instinctive advertising know-how. Rather do we believe that good advertising men are made by a long, painfully slow process—sweating out tough advertising assignments year after year. But long years and rubbing elbows with difficult problems are valueless unless the man has a high degree of intelligence augmented by practical commonsense. Advertising men are mature only when they have established firmly a record of producing and maintaining advertising that pays off.

These are the kind of men who explore thoroughly all possible solutions to marketing and sales problems. They have acquired the intuitive ability to reject the weak and incorrect way to do a job. They never fail to profit from each and every mistake made along the long road of gaining experience. In fact, they have learned how to do a job right by having first done it wrong. They also see and recognize mistakes made by others and avoid duplicating them. The good ones in the business are honest with themselves and the clients they serve. They have a sincere—almost a devout—belief in advertising done the right way. We repeat again—good advertising men are made, not born. We have learned the advertising business by working at it.

Our conception of advertising copy is fully as simple—and the record proves it to be effective—as are our other beliefs. There is only one motivating reason for a man, a woman, or a child to react favorably to an advertising-copy appeal. This is personal selfishness.

Selfishness is not used here in a cruel sense. Human selfishness to this agency means an individual's desire to be more comfortable, to save work, to be socially advanced, to improve a career, to have one's ego satisfied or inflated, to have one's taste pleased—any one of a variety of highly personal self-pleasures. Therefore, advertising copy must be directed at a known selfish interest on the part of consumers, and it must promise that the product advertised will satisfy one or more of those selfish desires. But, no amount of advertising ingenuity and no amount of sales experience can create repeated consumer buying response, past the initial trial, if the product does not actually justify the advertising promise made. Millions of dollars cannot consistently sell a bad product. Conversely, a few hundred thousand advertising dollars invested correctly can sell millions of dollars worth of a good product.

The first principle of advertising copy must be always to presell the product. The second principle is to sell the product, and forever resell it again and again. By selling we mean simply—constantly and consistently convince people that a specific product provides what they want or need—make them see and understand all the product superiorities, advantages, or differences inherent in it. Give customers more than a mere name by which to remember it—and forever resell it to keep them repurchasing.

This agency, while recognizing the tremendous importance of copy and its presentation, does not believe copy alone to be of the greatest single importance to advertising success. An agency's greatest—indeed its gravest—responsibility is the one of investing the money which a client entrusts to it. No amount of product development and refinement, no amout of ingenuity in the careful development and perfection of a product advertising story can be of much avail if the media funds are invested at the wrong time, or in the wrong manner, or against the wrong people in the wrong markets.

Investing advertising budgets in media is not a job for the agency alone. Such investment must be carefully coordinated with a client's sales and merchandising departments and in full awareness of sales objectives as well as marketing possibilities. There is no such thing as an established formula within an agency to be depended upon when decisions are being made regardng the investment of advertising moneys. Each product for each client represents a wholly separate and distinctly different problem. Being aware of this, and being experienced enough to determine in advance where and how media funds should be invested is of the utmost importance.

After knowing actual consumer marketing problems, it is the belief of this agency that, in selling a low or medium-priced consumer product, the media job in the simplest terms is one of delivering to the right people the largest number of advertising messages at the lowest possible cost.

Impressing only yourself or your friends with your advertising is indeed expensive if your real customers work in your factory or on the farm.

We believe in and expend a considerable portion of our total gross income in research. But research to us is not the overpublicized task of merely ringing doorbells and stopping pedestrians with a lengthy questionnaire. Research for research's sake alone is a complete waste of both time and money. Research is valueless unless it reveals the honest, irrefutable answer or answers to a specific question or questions. In turn, specific answers are valueless unless they solve or help solve equally specific problems.

We believe in research, but we shall always reserve the right to draw our own conclusions. We have learned from experience, statistics cannot replace judgment.

This agency opened with the following publicly announced principles:

1. It will not under any circumstances approach or solicit responsibility from clients above and beyond the number which the group of individuals who run this agency can personally supervise.

2. It will solicit business only from companies or individuals for whom it sincerely believes the agency can render a superior service and prove its value in the most obvious manner—by increasing sales.

In terms of number of accounts served, this agency will be medium in size by intent. No client will ever find reason to criticize agency service or sales results due to any lack on our part of striving for the very closest possible coordinated working conditions between principals on both sides of the job.

Complicated organizational groups, including so-called plans boards, neither have nor will have a part in the operation of Brown & Butcher, Inc. A client worth having is a client worthy of the best we have. We can function best when we work closely with a client.

Experienced advertisers have learned time and again that they receive, from an agency, service and help in almost direct proportion to their ability to command immediate and constant contact with the directing personality of key personnel of any agency. It is too often the case that an agency is chosen because of size, only for the client to discover that there exists a wall of ineffectual, irresponsible persons with whom he must do business almost exclusively.

In this agency we frankly seek a client's criticism and best thinking. We are neither all-seeing nor all-knowing. We have a reputation for exercising the courage of our convictions, but before we have a conviction, we take great care to make absolutely certain, if possible, we are right. We can only do an outstandingly good job when we have a client's help. Advertising dollars work harder when client and agency efforts are combined all the way from the inception of a plan and an idea down to the final point of success or failure—when a customer selects or rejects the product you make and the product we advertise.

Selling more merchandise is too often accomplished by the simple expedient of spending more money. An important part of an agency's responsibility to a client is making certain that sales are increased profitably for the client. This is done only when every advertising dollar works hard.

We do not assume the role of extreme specialists, but our experience has been primarily in the field of low- or medium-priced consumer goods with emphasis on drug and food products. In these fields, we are proud of our record. We know those jobs which we can do extremely well—and how to do them.

One of these days, if not now, you will have cause to be interested in seeking a new advertising agency affiliation. You may want someone to help stop a declining sales trend. You may want to talk to an agency extremely well-grounded in the problems involved in introducing a new product. You may feel that you could work better with an agency different from the one or ones you have at present. When that day comes, this agency would like the opportunity of sitting down and telling in greater detail the whys and wherefores of its stated beliefs and to present proof of its experience.

A union card and a hammer do not necessarily make a good carpenter. Neither can advertising men be adjudged good, strictly because they have kept good company. However, over the past 25 years the directing personnel of this agency has been indeed fortunate in having served an impressive number of successful products for a long line of notable companies. And, in quite a number of cases, the people available to you in Brown & Butcher, Inc., have been directly responsible for the whole advertising job, from initial advertising plans and strategy on through their perfection and their maintenance.

Postal Pay Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more disheartening to our faithful postal employees than the continued

delay on the part of the House-Senate conferees in reporting back a decent pay bill for these Government workers.

It is certainly no secret that these hard-working conscientious public servants have been greatly neglected. As we all know, since 1951, they have received only one salary increase and that was a modest one. They are entitled to and deserving of another pay boost in order to keep pace with the high cost of living.

It is a downright shame that we have failed to give this important legislation speedier action and greater priority.

It is most unfortunate that the pay and rate increases are tied up in one bill. Certainly the merits and demerits of the rate increases should not further delay the passage of a decent living wage for our postal employees.

Mr. Speaker, the urgent need for this long-overdue pay increase bill is a matter of justice and fairness. By holding up passage of a pay bill we are perpetrating the greatest injustice to these Federal workers for which we have no logical explanation.

I urge the conferees to act immediately in bringing out a pay raise bill even if it means separating it from the rate increase measure.

Our postal employees want and need this increase now.

Address by Senator Strom Thurmond at Calhoun County Courthouse, St. Matthews, S. C., During Ceremonies for Unveiling Historical Marker, on Farm Day of Calhoun County's Golden Jubilee Celebration, May 10, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of the Congress an address delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina, Hon. J. STROM THURMOND, during ceremonies for unveiling historical marker on Farm Day of Calhoun, S. C., county's golden jubilee celebration, May 10, 1958.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR STROM THURMOND AT CALHOUN COUNTY COURTHOUSE, ST. MATTHEWS, S. C., DURING CEREMONIES FOR UNVEILING HISTORICAL MARKER, ON FARM DAY OF CALHOUN COUNTY'S GOLDEN JUBILEE CELEBRATION, MAY 10, 1958

Senator Gressette, Representative Nelson, Mayor Houser, county officers, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen of Calhoun County, this is an auspicious occasion. It is a great pleasure for me to be here today to help celebrate the 50th anniversary of the establishment of Calhoun County.

I have been following your golden jubilee activities closely, because of the great enthusiasm and interest which the citizens of Calhoun County and the surrounding areas have taken in this occasion. I do not believe that there is anyone in South Carolina who is not aware of this gigantic celebration and all its attendant festivities.

You have succeeded not only in growing a lot of whiskers, and in producing a period of joy and merriment for yourselves and others, but you have also succeeded in boosting public relations for Calhoun County to a new high. In doing so, you have demonstrated a strong community spirit which is vital to progress and future development.

FARM DAY

I am glad that you have set aside this special day of recognition to your farmers and their families. I know of no group in this country which works harder, renders a greater service, and receives less monetary reward than do our farm families. Having been reared on a farm, having finished Clemson College with a degree in agriculture, having taught agriculture in our schools, and having farmed myself, I believe that I have a pretty good idea of the difficulties which are besetting our farm families today.

They are caught in the tight squeeze of constantly rising production costs and continued low prices for their products. This is all wrapped up in Government redtape and acreage restrictions, which have had adverse effects on our money crops, and made it virtually impossible for some to continue in farming operations.

In view of the fact that other segments of our economy enjoy certain advantages by Government guaranties and subsidies, it is mandatory for our Government to provide some assistance to our farmers. That is why I have been working for price support levels at 90 percent of parity on our basic crops, and for increased acreage allotments instead of further reductions and restrictions.

I believe that the Government should reopen our old world markets, so we can sell and barter our farm products to the other areas of the world that need our food and clothing. Also, the Government should assist by engaging in greater research projects which can foster greater individual initiative and open new doors of opportunity to our farmers, who are willing and ready to engage in new agricultural adventures.

In all my experience in public and private life, I have found no substitute for individual initiative, willingness to work hard and long, and the exercise of good commonsense. The farmers of Calhoun County stand as a living monument to the exercise of these principles.

While acreage restrictions and competition from manmade fibers have reduced the potential of cotton as a money crop in this great farming community, the farmers of Calhoun County have not stood idle and depended solely on Federal assistance from Washington. They have moved to meet the problem through diversification and development of new crops. Calhoun County, which ranks second only to neighboring Orangeburg County in the production of soybeans, is rapidly becoming the soybean center of the United States. Some of your own farmers have done much research in this field. A shatterproof variety has been developed here, which has made the production of soybeans more profitable and valuable to the economy of Calhoun County and South Carolina.

Additionally, I noticed while riding this morning from Creston to Cameron, and then to St. Matthews, that some of the farmers have planted numerous peach trees, and others have turned to the production of barley and other crops that provide better opportunities at the present time.

I am informed also that beef and dairy farming have increased here in recent years. This is the type of initiative and ingenuity that have made it possible for Calhoun County to produce master farmers, and a forward-looking farming community through the years. If such progress continues, it may be necessary to move the Department of Agriculture from Washington to Calhoun County so the bureaucrats can keep in step with true agricultural progress.

INDUSTRIAL PROGRESS

I am also glad to learn that the people of Calhoun County are trying to balance their agricultural economy with industry. When the people of South Carolina elected me to the governorship in 1946, I determined that I would make this one of the primary goals of my administration. At the conclusion of my service, more than $1 billion had been expended or announced for investment in new industries and expansions. This created 60,000 new jobs, with new annual payrolls of approximately $125 million. One of the industries which came to South Carolina at the close of World War II was the Socony plant here in St. Mathews. It has played a vital part in the economy of this community.

New industries have continued to come into South Carolina, and I hope it will not be long before Calhoun County will begin to reap the benefits of your concerted efforts to attract new industry. As a result of the setback which agriculture has suffered in recent years, it is more urgent than ever that we locate more industries in our rural areas.

COUNTY HISTORY

Calhoun County is one of the smallest counties in South Carolina, but what it may lack in quantity is more than made up by the fine quality of its citizens, its fertile farmlands, its abundant resources, its beautiful landscape, its rich heritage, and its colorful history. While Calhoun is also one of the State's youngest counties, the history of this section dates back to 1704, when the first white settlement was established by George Sterling. This was some 72 years before Col. William Thompson, Rebecca Motte, and many other revolutionary patriots from this area made their valuable contributions toward the winning of our fight for independence.

Later in 1862, Col. Laurence M. Keitt and Olin M. Dantzler formed a regiment of volunteers for service in the War Between the States. They were joined by 460 others from this area, many of whom were killed or wounded in service, including those two great leaders of our southern forces. In subsequent conflicts, Calhoun County has also furnished to our country servicemen who have proved on the battlefield to be a great credit to their county, State, and Nation.

The same spirit of courage and determination, which fired patriots of this section to play such an important role in the defense of our country through the years, led such men as Ed Wimberly, Dr. T. H. Dreher, T. A. Amaker, G. A. Baxter, J. E. Wannamaker, J. Skottowe Wannamaker, Martin D. Keller, John Muller, George W. Fairey, John A. Peterkin, Paul Frank Spigener and many others to win their battle for the formulation of a new county in 1908, after two earlier defeats.

JOHN C. CALHOUN

When the county was established, it was named in honor of South Carolina's greatest statesman, John C. Calhoun. That Calhoun was not born, and never lived, in this immediate vicinity, matters not. He was the very embodiment of the principles for which the people of this county fought and gave their all, and for which their descendants are still fighting.

On the occasion of a ceremony held in Calhoun's honor in the United States Capitol nearly half a century ago, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts spoke these words:

"He was the greatest man South Carolina has given to the Nation. That in itself is no slight praise, for from the days of the Laurenses, the Pinckneys, the Rutledges, from the time of Moultrie and Sumter and Marion to the present day, South Carolina has always been conspicuous in peace and war for the force, the ability, and the character of the men who have served her and given to her name its high distinction in our history. But Calhoun was much more even than this. He was one of the most remarkable men, one of the greatest minds that American public life can show. The man remains greatly placed in our history. The unyielding courage, the splendid intellect, the long devotion to the public service, the pure, unspotted private life are all there, are all here with us now, untouched and unimpaired for after ages to admire."

Such was the man for whom this county is named, the man whose life exemplifies the struggle of our State and of our Nation to maintain constitutional liberty. Calhoun was 1 of 5 outstanding Senators of all time selected by a special committee of the United States Senate in 1957, for inclusion in the Senate Hall of Fame. I had the honor of placing his name in nomination before the committee. We are proud that this great South Carolinian was 1 of the 5 chosen for this unique place in history.

PRINCIPLES OF CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

Because this struggle for constitutional government still goes on today; because of the remarkable and startling—one might almost say ominous—parallel between today's events and those of the 1850's; and because of the eternal truth of the principles which Calhoun enunciated, his works are well worth our close attention today. In the words of that great student and champion of liberty, Lord Acton, Calhoun's speeches and writings were characterized by "arguments which are the very perfection of political truth, and which combine with the realities of modern democracy the theory and the securities of medieval freedom."

Calhoun understood the nature of constitutional government, of constitutionalism, as few men did even in his own day, and as woefully few do today. Over the past century we have already seen a grave weakening of the foundation of our constitutional structure; and what remains of it is being steadily eroded away, by relentless Federal encroachment.

Yet the people, due to their failure to understand the nature of constitutionalism, seem blandly unaware of the danger. Apparently, they will not realize that their liberty is in jeopardy, that its necessary supports are being destroyed, until they have actually lost it—when, of course, it will be too late. That is like refusing to become alarmed over the weakening of a dike until it actually bursts and the floods pour in.

Those of us who plead the cause of States' Rights and Separation of Powers of the three branches of government, and who warn of the dangers involved in Federal usurpation, are dismissed by some as alarmists, as men who are fearful of imaginary dangers.

Too many people feel that their freedom is secure because they still have the right to vote. Their mental attitude seems to run like this: What does it matter, after all, if more and more governmental functions are transferred from the States to the Federal Government, which can probably run them more efficiently anyway? What does it matter if one branch of the Federal Government assumes powers and functions which rightfully are supposed to be exercised by a different branch? Who is being hurt by the change? Where can any loss of liberty be shown? After all, are not our liberties perfectly safe, so long as we, the people, have the right to vote, the right of universal suffrage?

This is an easy line of thinking to fall into, but never could there be greater delusion. As Calhoun pointed out, "It would be a great and dangerous mistake to suppose, as many do, that (the right of suffrage) is of itself sufficient to form constitutional governments."

Calhoun well understood that the universal right to vote, alone, without other safeguards, would not save the people from tyranny. He knew that, without constitutional protections, the majority would form a government as absolute as it would be in the hands of irresponsible rulers.

Calhoun saw clearly that the essence of constitutional government lay in the establishment—and the jealous and strict preservation—of some system, some provision, which would act as a secure check against the potential excesses of the Government, against the tyranny of the unrestrained majority. "It is manifest," he said, "that this provision must be of a character calculated to prevent any one interest, or combination of interests, from using the powers of Government to aggrandize itself at the expense of the others."

CHECKS AND BALANCES: THE NEGATIVE POWER

In other words, what was called for was a system of checks and balances, a system which would prevent the building-up of a power-apparatus which could one day suppress the liberties of the people. Calhoun used the term "the negative power" to describe this counterbalance to the force of government.

"It is this negative power," he declared, "the power of preventing or arresting the action of the Government, which in fact forms the Constitution. It is, indeed, the negative power which makes the Constitution, and the positive which makes the Government."

When the framers drew up the Constitution in 1787, they carefully and deliberately provided for the negative power. They devised our famous system of checks and balances. The two principal features of this system, and hence the very pillars on which our liberty rests, are the twin principles known as States rights—that is, the reservation by the States of all powers not delegated to the Federal Government—and separation of powers, that is, the separation of the legislative, judicial, and executive powers into three distinct and independent branches of government.

Our forefathers were quite familiar with despotism, and they knew its forms and its methods. They knew that no man can be trusted with power. As Thomas Jefferson was later to express it:

"In questions of power, then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

That is just what the framers sought to do. By means of these two governmental devices, separation of powers and States' rights, they sought to prevent that concentration of centralized power which they knew would be the death-knell of individual liberty in America. Liberty would be safe so long, and only so long, as these two principles remained intact and were scrupulously upheld.

Ladies and gentlemen, these principles are not being upheld today. In the case of States rights especially, the wisdom and the warnings of the Founding Fathers are being brazenly ignored. Constitutional limitations and restrictions, those at least which purported to restrain the power of the Federal Government, are being brushed aside. The primary and indispensable feature of our checks-and-balances system—States rights—is being eroded away to nothing, as matters which are rightfully the domestic concerns of the States are brought under the sway of Washington.

THE MEANING OF STATES RIGHTS

Just what do we mean, anyway, by this term "State rights?" Is it just a meaningless name that southerners love to prattle about? Is it simply an outworn political tradition? No. States rights is an enduring and valid principle, an ancient and a universal principle—it is the fundamental human right of local self-government.

Local self-government, States rights, home rule, self-determination—call it what you will—they are one and the same. Applied to almost any other land but the South, the United States has always recognized and supported the principle of local self-government.

The United States sympathized with home rule for Ireland. The United States insisted that the peace settlement after World War I be based on the principle of self-determination, as a result of which several national groups in Eastern Europe, formerly subject peoples of the Austro-Hungarian empire, achieved political independence. Since the close of World War II, the United States has supported self-rule for many former colonies of European powers, from Indonesia and Burma to Ghana and Morocco.

THE SOUTH'S STRUGGLE FOR SELF-RULE

In fact, the United States was founded on, and grew out of, the right of local self-government, of home rule—that was what the Revolutionary War achieved for the former colonies. Yet, when the South asserted this identical right, in the 1860's, the right was denied by the United States.

The sense of being a separate and distinct people had been rapidly gaining ground in the South, until finally, with South Carolina taking the lead in 1860, the Southern States declared their independence, and, with the formation of the Confederacy, asserted the existence of the Southern nation. The North's denial of the right of this new nation to exist resulted in the war for southern independence.

That the Southern States had every right to secede from the Union cannot be doubted. As sovereign States, they had voluntarily acceded to the constitutional compact and as sovereign States they had the right to withdraw from it.

Today being Confederate Memorial Day, we honor the memory of those courageous and immortal men in gray who fought for the Southern cause. No words that I could speak would be adequate to express the love, the appreciation, and the gratitude, which we, their descendants, feel for those men, who sacrificed their lives and their all for their beloved homeland.

I would like to say this much, however: I think we make a great mistake when we speak of the cause they fought for as the lost cause. It is far from being a lost cause—a fight for principle is never lost.

True, the South suffered military defeat in the war and failed in its bid for national independence, despite the heroic, almost superhuman, efforts of these men in gray. Yet the fight they waged, by its very heroism, by their own glory and nobility, made the South's sense of separate identity, its unity, its solidarity, stronger than ever.

Moreover, the cause which they upheld is still a living cause today, albeit in modified form. Local self-government in the sense of complete national independence may be no longer an issue; but local self-government in the form of States rights definitely is an issue, and those who battle the States rights today are waging a fight for governmental principles which are founded on the bedrock of the Constitution.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

THE CONSTITUTIONAL STRUGGLE TODAY

This issue of States rights versus Federal usurpation of power is the most important domestic problem facing this country today. Actually, the encroachment of the Federal Government on the rights of the several States has been going on for a long period of time, but over the last 2 decades, and especially since 1954, when the Supreme Court embarked on its new sociological tangent, Federal usurpation has increased to an almost unbelievable extent.

I shall not even attempt here to enumerate the specific usurpations of the Federal Government. To do so would require a great deal of time, and in any event, I think that we are all generally familiar with what has been happening in this respect over the past few years.

Suffice it to say, all three branches of the Federal Government have been guilty of usurpation of power. This is important to remember, because some people have gained the impression that the Supreme Court alone is responsible for the whole debâcle. That is not the case, although it is the Court which has led the attack since 1954. All three branches must share the blame—the Court, the Congress, and the executive. And they have all been at it for a long time. Thomas Jefferson observed as far back as 1825: "It is but too evident that the 3 ruling branches (of the Federal Government) are in combination to strip their colleagues, the State authorities, of the powers reserved by them."

We are indeed at a late hour to defend our liberties. As I have tried to emphasize and re-emphasize, the essential foundations have been perilously weakened. Although there is now much more awareness of the danger than ever before, the people—outside of those in the South, at least—have not yet been sufficiently aroused from their apathy to take effective political action to halt the trend toward Federal totalitarianism.

There has been one hopeful development lately. We seem to be making at least some headway toward devising some method of curbing the excesses of the Supreme Court. The proposals now pending before the Senate would reverse a number of the more flagrant decisions which the Court recently handed down in the internal security field, and in one respect would limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Court.

Frankly, however, despite this one encouraging development, the picture is not a bright one. It may be that the deterioration of our constitutional system has already proceeded so far that we will not be able to bring the ship of state back onto a true course, without first passing through some very stormy seas—that is, through a difficult period of governmental and political chaos which appears to loom ahead.

THE FUTURE OF THE SOUTH

Of one thing we may be sure. No matter how fierce the storms; no matter what changes our form of government may undergo; indeed, whatever the ultimate fate of this Union, come what may, the South is going to maintain its identity and the distinctive values of its way of life. More than that, I really believe that, out of the welter of storm and chaos that lies ahead, the South is going to regain at least a measure of its autonomy, its independence. I know not in what form, but I do believe that the South is going to become in truth, at last, master of its own destiny. We have witnessed over the past few years the beginning of a great historic movement. We have seen a great stirring, a reawakening, of the southern people, on all fronts—political, spiritual, economic, and intellectual. But especially have we seen a rebirth of the southern people's awareness of their own identity and their heritage. And we have seen this reborn awareness give rise to a determination and a spirit that is not going to accept Federal dictation, outside domination, or tyranny in any form.

THE ULTIMATE ISSUE

It should always be borne in mind, however, that the South is not fighting for itself alone; for the South's cause is the Nation's cause. It was on the principle of States' rights that the Nation was founded. States' rights is a principle of vital concern, not only to Southern States, but to all States; for States' rights, or local self-government, is the indispensable element of our checks-and-balances system, the very cornerstone of liberty.

The preservation of liberty is a goal which is—or should be—of as much concern to the people of the North as to those of the South. It should be of equal, and paramount, concern to the people of every State in this Union.

"Liberty," said Lord Acton, "is not a means to a higher political end. It is itself the highest political end." It is the ultimate issue at stake in the present constitutional struggle. On many occasions, men have tried to becloud the clear picture by the injection of extraneous issues; but the fact remains that it is human liberty which is at stake.

The issue is today just what it was in the time of Calhoun; and in conclusion, I should like to turn once more to his words:

"Stripped of all its covering," he declared, "the naked question is, whether ours is a Federal or a consolidated government; a constitutional or absolute one; a government resting ultimately on the solid basis of the sovereignty of the States, or on the unrestrained will of a majority; a form of government, as in all other unlimited ones, in which injustice, and violence and force finally must prevail."

This is the naked question again today, just as Calhoun phrased it more than a century ago. What will be our answer today?

If I know the spirit, the temper, and the courage of the southern people—the people of this county and of this State—their answer will be: Tyranny shall not prevail in this land. Freedom, independence, and constitutional government must, and shall, have the victory.

Ezra the Prophet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the Biblical observation that a prophet is not without honor save in his own country was never more true than when applied to our dedicated Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson. In a recent issue of What's Happening, a release by Prentice-Hall, Inc., the editor has this to say:

BENSON WILL SURVIVE

Beef cattle prices are up 36 percent over a year ago; hogs 21 percent; eggs 33 percent; vegetables 50 percent. Agriculture Secretary Benson, whipping boy for the farm bloc, is smilingly cautious: "For the remainder of 1958 a gain in farm income over last year is indicated." Congressmen report, to their surprise, major support for Benson not only in cities but in rural centers as well. Consequently, Democrats will ease their attacks on the Secretary. Republicans, who had practically written off the farmer, have revised their estimate of GOP congressional defeats in the farm belt in November. Now they think they will hold their own and, perhaps, even gain seats. At any rate, Benson will stay in the Cabinet.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is the way the people in my congressional district have felt all along. They have never accepted the demagogic appeal of the high support boys, and having farmed the good soil of southeastern Pennsylvania for 200 years they know that there is no alternative to a reliance on the will of the Almighty, and that you cannot run counter to the law of supply and demand and stay in business. And because they know that Secretary Benson has been right all along they have resented, as I have, the contemptible fashion in which he has been handled here in Washington and throughout certain areas of the country by people who should and do know better. I admire people of conviction who also have the courage to stick by their beliefs and in that category Mr. Benson is without a peer. May the good Lord, whom he serves both in and out of Government, increase him in courage and strength.

Hoeven on Threshold of Major Assignment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the May 12 issue of the Sioux City Journal, of Sioux City, Iowa, alerts Midwest farmers to the prospect of having an Iowa Representative at the head of the House Committee on Agriculture next year. If the Republican Party wins control of the House, my very able colleague, Hon. CHARLES B. HOEVEN, will become chairman of the committee, and if the Democrats control the House he will be the ranking Republican member. This is very important to our farmers, who long have relied on Mr. HOEVEN to take care of their interests in the committee, a Member of Congress whose influence has been so helpful to agriculture in general.

In this same connection it is interesting to note that Hon. HENRY O. TALLE, of the Second Iowa District, is ranking Republican of the great Banking and Currency Committee.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the editorial from the Sioux City paper.

HOEVEN ON THRESHOLD OF MAJOR ASSIGNMENT

Of considerable importance to the farmers of the Siouxland area and the Midwest in general is a recent development concerning the makeup of the Agriculture Committee of the United States House of Representatives.

Congressman WILLIAM S. HILL, of Colorado, a veteran House Member and presently the top-ranking Republican on the Agriculture Committee, has announced his intention to retire at the end of this year.

This means that Congressman CHARLES B. HOEVEN, of Iowa, our Eighth District Representative, will move into the top GOP spot on that important committee in the next session should he be reelected this fall.

It also means that, if the Republicans were to capture control of the House, Congressman HOEVEN would become chairman of the Agriculture Committee. Such an occurrence would put an Iowan in the chairman's seat of the committee for the first time in about 26 years. The last midwesterner to hold the job was Congressman CLIFFORD HOPE, of Kansas. The one and only Iowan to hold the post was Congressman Gilbert N. Haugen who served as chairman from 1919 to 1931.

And it is of interest for midwestern farmers to note that should the Democrats win the House in this year's elections, the Agriculture Committee chairmanship would continue to be held by a southerner, Congressman HAROLD COOLEY, Democrat of North Carolina. And on the Democratic side of the committee, the ranking Members after Mr. COOLEY are from the following States, in this order: Texas, Alabama, Arkansas, South Carolina, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Virginia, etc.

Thus, a Democratic victory would assure the South's continued tight control over the Agriculture Committee, leaving the midwestern corn-hog-cattle-grain farmers' interests in a secondary position because of the South's major emphasis on a cotton-peanut type of agricultural economy.

Congressman HOEVEN, meanwhile, is chairman of the Republican conference of the House and deputy Republican whip. His stature as a Member of Congress has increased materially in recent years and he now stands on the threshold of a high-level assignment with the House committee that shapes American agricultural policies.

The value of his continued service in Congress should readily be apparent to the voters of Iowa's Eighth District and to all Midwestern States.

Austria: Three Tax Cuts in 4 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Evening Star of May 7, 1958:

AUSTRIA: THREE TAX CUTS IN 4 YEARS
(By Sylvia Porter)

Austria has just put into effect her third tax reduction in 4 years. After each of the previous two tax cuts the Austrian Government's income from taxes increased—and this is the way the trend is going again.

So stimulating to business have been the soundly conceived and timed tax reductions that her treasury has been able to collect more money via low tax rates than via the high ones.

Of all the nations in the Western World, Austria—which regained full political independence only about 3 years ago, is now the most prosperous.

The story of Austria's comeback is sensational, and the tale is particularly pertinent to us right now.

ARGUMENT OUTLINED

No responsible authority in public or private life is opposing a tax cut because he thinks our present tax structure is a good one. Those arguing against tax reductions now are doing so because they honestly believe that any significant tax slash would take so much revenue away from the Government that our already ballooning budget deficit would be swelled to astronomical proportions.

Even without a tax cut we're facing a deficit of eight to ten billions dollars or more in the year starting July 1. This wear of a soaring budget deficit now and devastating inflation later is the heart of the opposition.

But must it turn out this way? Would tax reductions designed to stimulate job-creating spending by consumers and businessmen automatically lead to a great loss in Treasury revenue? Our own experience after recent tax cuts says it wouldn't.

And Austria's record is refutation of the theory—which is the reason I've been digging for details.

In 1954 when Austria put through the first of her series of across-the-board tax cuts—giving both individuals and corporations relief—her total tax take was $729 million.

In 1955 the tax take was up to $791 million. That year she put through the second broad tax reduction. In 1957 the tax take was up to $996 million.

THIRD REDUCTION

Now, the third reduction is in effect. While this year's reduction favors middle and lower income taxpayers and particularly aids working couples, it also includes major relief for corporations and exempts income from stock dividends up to $144.

The forecast is for continuing business boom. Last year production in Austria rose 6 percent while prices and wages held stable. The estimate by the Institute of Economic Research is that production will climb another 6 percent in the first half of 1958.

Admittedly, Austria couldn't have achieved her brilliant recovery without our help; our Marshall plan aid was of crucial importance. Admittedly, she couldn't have done the job without superb, strong financial management; the fabled Austrian school of economists is reemerging and her Finance Minister Kamitz is internationally respected. Admittedly, Austria's economy cannot be compared with our vast, complex economic machine.

Nevertheless, we can learn plenty from Austria's experience—and the least our policymakers should be doing is to be studying it intently.

Air Force Helps Retarded Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege a short time ago to witness a program put on by retarded children from the Rainier and Lakeland Village Schools in the State of Washington. The program included band music, choral singing, square dances, tap dances, and solos. The big event was a basketball game known as the game of the year which climaxed the evening's program. The affair was attended by an estimated 2,500 persons. All were greatly thrilled by the performances of the boys and girls, and were enthused by the training and education which quite evidently had been given by the two schools.

The program was sponsored by the Washington Association for retarded children. Words cannot express the high regard in which I and others hold that organization for the wonderful work it has been doing for retarded youngsters in our State. The members give freely of their time and means, often at considerable sacrifice, in their service to these unfortunate young people.

Great tribute must also be paid to the officers and personnel at McChord Air Force Base at Tacoma for the splendid help and cooperation given to the association in connection with making the game of the year a success. They housed, fed, entertained, and transported the children of the two schools who had come to participate in the program. One could not praise them too highly for their wonderful help.

The Defender, a newspaper published in the interests of the personnel at McChord Air Force Base, carried an article about the game of the year which I include herein. The article follows:

RETARDED CHILDREN SHOW OFF TALENTS AT GAME OF YEAR

McChord personnel and units have given a hand this year to aid the Tacoma Chapter of the Washington Association for Retarded Children stage the children's basketball game of the year tomorrow night.

There will also be exhibitions of band music, choral singing, and square dancing, all by retarded youngsters. The objective of this event is educational rather than fund raising and is designed to inform the general public as well as special groups that mentally retarded youngsters can be helped.

Any funds remaining after expenses are paid will be turned over to the friendship fund of the two participating schools, Lakeland Village of Spokane and Rainier.

Col. Vernon L. Stintzi, base commander, is serving as one of the honorary chairmen for the event to be staged tomorrow night at the CPS Fieldhouse. Ceremonies begin at 7:30 p. m.

Commendations and credit for their assistance on the program are due these organizations and people: Headquarters, 325th Fighter Wing, Commander and Adjutant support; WAF base complement, aid in seating and issue of program; Air Police Squadron, Color Guard; Food Service Squadron, messing facilities for the children while at the base; Air Base Group, housing for children while staying here; Operations Squadron, photographic support; Transportation Squadron, transportation for the children while on the base.

Also furnishing support: 1705th Air Transport Group, MATS, senior NCO's for doormen and ticket takers; NCO Club, ticket sales; NCO Wives' Club, ticket sales at base exchange and commissary, Boy Scout Troop 104 and Pack 104, use of building for after-game party; one Sunday collection for aiding retarded children, and especially Chaplain Richards and Chaplain McElyea for humanitarian relations.

Particular credit must be given to M. Sgt. and Mrs. C. F. Lee for their tremendous job of coordinating the entire proceedings.

Sergeant Lee, maintenance supervisor for 1705th Air Transport Group, was named Washington coordinator for the National Association for Retarded Children and fund-raising chairman for the game of the year by the Washington State director.

He and his wife have coordinated on all arrangements for housing, transportation, entertainment, and the myriad other details involved in such an undertaking.

Sergeant Lee stated: "Everyone should take advantage of this opportunity to see these children perform. It shows what can be accomplished by care and attention."

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Address by Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, Vice Chief of Staff, United States Army, at the Armed Forces Week Celebration, Charleston, S. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I enclose herewith an address made to the citizens of Charleston on May 13, 1958, by Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, Vice Chief of Staff, United States Army.

The occasion was the celebration of Armed Forces Week.

General Lemnitzer is one of the great heroes of his day and age, having excelled in both of our late wars—World Wars II and Korea.

As a tactician he is unsurpassed. As a leader of men he has no superior. His devotion to his country can best be told by the decorations he has earned on the field of battle.

Mr. Speaker, his words of wisdom and counsel I commend to everyone.

The address follows:

OUR ARMED FORCES AND THE THREAT TO THE NATION'S SECURITY

(Address by Gen. Lyman L. Lemnizter, Vice Chief of Staff, U. S. Army, at the Armed Forces Week Celebration, Francis Marion Hotel, Charleston, S. C., May 13, 1958

It is a real pleasure for me to return to Charleston. On this occasion I would like to talk to you about our Armed Forces and the threat that presently faces our country and the other nations of the free world. I served at Fort Moultrie in 1939–40 when, as you will recall, we were working hard to build up our military strength for the test with the forces of Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo in a war which seemed to be bearing down upon us in spite of all our best efforts to prevent it. This morning I had a long overdue opportunity to visit Fort Moultrie and Sullivan's Island again and I can assure you that it brought back very pleasant memories.

For all its peaceful beauty, Charleston has seen considerably more of war than most American cities. Its history as far back as the Revolution is a reminder that peace cannot be taken for granted. It is a reminder that if war strikes, it can strike directly at our homes and lives.

Today, developments in science and technology have made it more feasible than ever before for an enemy to deliver direct attacks upon our own territory here in the United States. Accordingly, it is only sensible for us to make provision to meet and, if possible, to prevent such attacks from taking place. While our political, diplomatic, and economic leaders play a vital role in carrying out this task, a major share of the responsibility falls properly upon the Armed Forces.

The theme of our Armed Forces observance in this year of 1958 is "Power for Peace." In keeping with that theme, my purpose today is in a sense to take stock of the Armed Forces, to assess the contribution which they are making to our national security. In so doing, I shall regard myself as being the spokesman not only for the Army but for all the military services. Because any such stocktaking can have meaning only in the light of the military requirements which the Armed Forces are designed to meet, I shall also discuss the nature of the military threat to the United States. With these points in mind, I have chosen as my subject Our Armed Forces and the Threat to the Nation's Security.

The first purpose of the military strength which the United States maintains is to prevent war. The best way we know to accomplish this aim is to present a convincing capability of being able to fight successfully, should fighting ever again be necessary. The basic premise we work from to preserve peace is the belief that a nation which resorts to cold-blooded aggression—as the nations of the Communist bloc have repeatedly done—is one which will use military force whenever it suits its political purpose. Such a nation, or group of nations, fights not for principle but for gain. Accordingly, it expects a profitable return on its investment. Our aim is to develop that degree of military capability which will convince any would-be aggressor that any gains he might hope to win by military means would not be worth as much as the military price he would have to pay to win them.

If the provisions we make to deter war prove to be inadequate to the task and our best efforts fail, then the purpose of our military strength is to win the war which has been forced upon us. This does not require us to maintain separate military capabilities to accomplish these two purposes. Military strength designed for deterrence is of the same type as that required for winning a war—in fact, by its nature, it can be effective for deterrence only to the extent that it promises to be effective for actual fighting.

To accomplish our purposes, therefore, the Armed Forces must first determine the nature of the existing threat of war and then design forces capable of meeting that threat effectively. We hope thereby to prevent war but, even if we do not succeed in that aim, we are then ready for any threat which materializes.

At this point it might be suggested that, given the existence of a significant menace to our Nation, we should meet it by concentrating the full resources of our economy and our manpower on placing our Armed Forces on a war footing. Such a course, however, is completely unacceptable. Our fundamental military doctrine has always been to maintain in peacetime only those military forces which would be necessary to meet the initial requirements of war and to provide a nucleus around which the expanded forces required for more extended operations could be built. In fact, even apart from the major impact upon our entire way of life which would result from converting our country into an armed camp, it would be ineffective militarily in the light of the problem which confronts us. The danger we face is not a thing of the moment. On the contrary, the Communist bloc gives every indication of being able to perpetuate the cold war indefinitely. Furthermore, the Soviet military threat is only a part of Communist strategy, which also includes economic aggrandizement, propaganda warfare, subversion, infiltration, and the coup d'etat. To concentrate exclusively on meeting merely one aspect of this aggressive strategy would simply be to invite defeat on some other plane, or facet, of the total menace.

The persistence of the determined expansionism of aggressive communism needs no discussion before this audience. It is enough to say that throughout the world there have been 15 wars since World War II and that Communist bloc nations have taken a direct part in no less than 8 of them. If past behavior can be taken as an indication of future intentions, the Communists have left no doubt either of their aims or of the means they are willing to resort to in order to achieve them. In short, no reasonable person can deny that the daily threat of war exists. With an army which by far is the world's largest, with a very real and formidable submarine force, with a substantial atomic stockpile, with a growing fleet of long-range aircraft, and with continued efforts to acquire intercontinental ballistic missiles, the Soviet Union certainly has the capability to launch all-out nuclear warfare on a global scale. Because the Soviet Union's military power includes great strength in all types of forces—land, sea, and air—it also has the capability to wage limited war. By limited war, I mean a war deliberately limited in the geographic area of conflict. Such a war may also be limited in the objectives sought, and it may even be limited by the types of weapons used.

If our efforts to deter war are to be effective, they must provide means to counter military aggression successfully whether it takes either a limited or an unlimited form.

For some years, our primary concern was the possibility of a general war. Accordingly, we concentrated on the development of atomic striking power to retaliate against any blow struck at us, and on defensive forces to reduce the effect of such a blow. The actions which we took in developing the Strategic Air Command, in building up our stockpile of atomic weapons, in establishing alliances such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and in locating elements of our Armed Forces in strategic areas overseas made the price of global war too high and undoubtedly played a significant part in preventing the outbreak of a general conflict.

Today, the U. S. S. R. has reached a point where it possesses a substantial capability in nuclear striking power. Its offensive blows against us could be as devastating as any retaliatory blows we could deliver in return. This development does not mean, however, that the chance of general war has increased. The condition of atomic deterrence to the launching of a general war by the Communists still exists. Referring back to what I said earlier about the calculation with which communism uses military strength to gain an objective, the price of global war is still too high, for nothing the Communists could hope to gain would be worth the almost certain suicide which they would risk.

But the price of global war must be kept so high that a would-be aggressor would not be tempted to employ it as an instrument of national policy. Therefore, our requirement for the maintenance of an atomic capability, to include both a weapons stockpile and the ability to deliver those weapons over long distances, continues unabated. The requirement for maintaining and improving this capability is being met by the Strategic Air Command of the Air Force and by the Navy's strategically located carrier forces. We are advancing toward the development of intercontinental ballistic missiles. At the same time, the capabilities of our defenses against any Soviet air attack upon us are being continually improved. The responsibility for carrying out this task is performed primarily by the potent air defense forces of the Army, now vastly strengthened with guided missiles, and by the interceptor aircraft of the Air Force.

At this point I want to repeat that our strategic nuclear weapons and our ability to deliver them have played and are continuing to play an important part in preventing the Soviets from deliberately initiating a general war. However, it is also true that even when we had atomic superiority—a superiority which at one time was a complete monopoly—the Communist bloc continued to pursue its aggressive aims in limited conflicts. Thus, our strategic atomic capability by itself was not enough even under those conditions to provide the de-

gree of deterrence which was needed. Now, however, the Soviets are moving toward atomic parity. With no apparent reduction in Communist aggressiveness, the U. S. S. R. cannot be expected to be deterred from continued expansion.

As a soldier I do not like to speak of the intentions of a prospective enemy. I prefer to speak of his capabilities. But without trying to look into the minds of the men in the Kremlin, it seems to me that limited war appears to be the most feasible avenue of approach for the Communists to follow in pursuing their aggressive goals. That being the case, it is essential for us to examine limited wars which have been fought if we hope to understand the nature of the problem facing us.

One of the salient characteristics of these conflicts as the Communists have fought them thus far is that they have tended to take place in remote areas. This characteristic alone poses several requirements which must be met by any force designed to deter limited war effectively.

For one thing, since it is necessary to react quickly to aggression, forces to counter an attack must be available on the spot or in nearby areas so that they can be quickly moved to the combat zone. In part, this requirement is being met by the units of the United States Armed Forces which are deployed in or near prospectively critical areas overseas.

Another vitally important part of the free world's capability for meeting this requirement is to be found in the forces provided by our allies on the spot. A significant aspect of this element of the free world's capability to deter local aggression is our mutual security program, in which all the American military services are participating. Through this program our allies are being provided with weapons and equipment, and with training in their use, to permit attainment of the maximum degree of cooperation between their forces and ours.

In addition to the forces of our allies and to our own units stationed overseas, to achieve a capability for deterring limited war effectively, we must have available in the United States forces which are highly trained, fully equipped, and sufficiently mobile to permit their expeditious movement to a trouble spot, wherever it may develop. Such a force is sometimes aptly called a fire brigade. The Army is meeting its share of the responsibility for providing this fire brigade through a force consisting of several divisions and their necessary supporting forces which we call the Strategic Army Corps.

Another requirement for an effective deterrent capability is made up of the air and naval transportation to move the necessary Army forces and the supporting units they require for successful combat operations to the combat zone. In this connection, I want to point out that this is not solely a matter of transportation. It includes the requirement of keeping the sea and air lanes open, not only to move the initial contingents to the battle area, but also to transport the reinforcements and supplies which are essential to sustained military operations.

Finally, an important element of our deterrent capability is our ability to carry out rapid expansion of our military forces in time of emergency. For this, all the armed services rely upon the units of their respective reserve forces. The readiness and availability of the Army, Navy, Air Force, the Marine Corps Reserve, and of the Army and Air Force National Guard organizations play a vital part in our military effectiveness for limited as well as general war. In general war, of course, they would make possible the development of the strength required for large-scale sustained operations. In limited war, too, however, they would have an important responsibility. We must not lose sight of the fact that the outbreak of a limited war would by no means rule out the possibility of global conflict. If we are to have freedom of action to employ our active forces in suppressing a local aggression, we must continue to maintain the strength to deter general war. Accordingly, we look to our reserve forces to take the place in the United States of those organizations deployed overseas to defeat local aggression.

While it is true that what I have said thus far has been based on the nature of those limited wars which have been fought in the past few years, it is also true that the most threatening trouble spots which exist in the world today still tend to be relatively remote. For this reason, I believe that the military considerations which arise from the remoteness of a scene of action from the sources of our military power here in the continental United States continue to be valid and must receive adequate consideration in our planning.

What this all adds up to is that our military resources must be flexible. They must be able to deal effectively with aggression on either a limited or unlimited scale, and to overcome the various military problems posed by either type of threat. And these military resources must be thoroughly integrated. Teamwork is essential. No one type of force is supreme. They are mutually interdependent.

The Armed Forces of the United States are striving to develop their capability not only through flexibility but through quality. Because of the value which, as a Nation, we place on human life, we are doing everything within our power to provide our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines with the finest weapons and equipment which science and technology can supply. Our emphasis is on striking power, not upon the sheer weight of manpower.

To illustrate our efforts along this line, I want to mention some of the steps which have been taken by the Army—since that is the service with which I am most familiar—to meet the conditions which we believe would exist if war should come.

Some of the most striking of the improvements which we have made have been in the field of increased firepower. Developments taken place since World War II which have made it possible for us to achieve with a single weapon a degree of destruction which formerly would have required the massed and sustained fire of a large number of battalions of artillery.

I do not want to suggest that, regardless of the needs of a particular military situation, maximum destruction is necessarily the best. What is particularly significant in the new weapons is not so much the amount of their destructiveness as such, but their destructiveness in proportion to their size. The development of small-yield weapons represents an advance which—although often overlooked—is extremely important militarily. It is important because, for example, it enables us to put into the hands of a frontline squad a degree of firepower equivalent to the capability of a World War II medium artillery unit. Furthermore, these smaller weapons are being developed with several degrees of destructive power.

Our advances in fire power have not been confined solely to atomic weapons. Marked progress has been made in the development or improvement of weapons for our nonatomic arsenal. Through such means, the Army possesses and is increasing a wide range of destructive capability, giving it a flexibility which is particularly valuable for the successful conduct of modern battle. Thus, with the varied weapons now available or whose availability is anticipated in the near future, the commander can select those which are best suited to the requirement of the moment.

Another important area of improvement concerns increases in range capability. With our rockets and guided missiles we have gained an ability to deliver our firepower to targets farther behind an enemy's lines than ever before. We have also gained increased tactical flexibility, since our greater ranges make it possible for us to concentrate the fires of widely separated weapons against a target located anywhere in an extensive area.

As is always true, improvements in weapons impose changes in tactics and in tactical organization. We carry out a continuous program of testing and analysis to determine alterations which should be made to our tactical doctrine. With reference to our organization, we have recently completed the conversion of all the divisions of the active Army to the so-called pentomic structure. In contrast to the old "triangular" division, whose chief elements were three infantry regiments, the pentomic division with five battle groups affords a marked increase in flexibility and striking power. This type of division was designed to meet what we visualize the needs of modern war to be.

With all our improvements in weapons and organization, we must not lose sight of the unchanging fact that no matter how fine the weapons and equipment of any of our Armed Forces, the effectiveness with which they are used depends ultimately on the skill, the intelligence, the courage, and the dedication of the men who use them. Trained, disciplined manpower is still the common denominator of military effectiveness. All the military services are bending every effort to enhance the individual skills of their members. We know, too, that if war should come, we can rely with confidence upon the vast source of ability and patriotism which is furnished by the American people. These qualities, which have never failed our Nation, we count among our major military assets.

In concluding my remarks, I want to repeat that the character of the threat which faces us—its persistence and the various forms it takes—has determined the military steps which we have taken to counter it. To prevent war we must display that type of strength which gives clear evidence of our ability to win, and we must leave no doubt concerning our determination to use it if necessary. If it is to be effective in achieving its purpose, that strength must have the versatility and the flexibility to deal realistically with the dangers which exist and which can be expected to arise. The elements of such strength are the special characteristics and capabilities peculiar to each of our present-day Armed Forces. Their effectiveness is realized through their combination, for each of the elements contributes its essential share to the whole. The goal, then, which your Armed Forces seek is the security of our Nation, achieved through "power for peace."

So All Can Sing It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert the following editorial which appeared in the Galveston (Tex.) News on Sunday, May 11, 1958:

SO ALL CAN SING IT

A lot of people have been waiting a long, long time for Congress to do something about authorizing an official version of our national anthem, the Star-Spangled Banner, whose words, written by Francis Scott Key,

live in our hearts but whose high notes stop the average singer.

The more hopeful among those interested have wanted Congress to sanction musical modifications in the anthem so that its harmony range would fit limitations of our vocal chords.

Now, Congressman ZELENKO, of New York, has a bill in the hopper that would satisfy many Americans and some people in other lands who think this country should do something about its basically fine anthem. The Zelenko proposal would modify Public Law 823 of the 71st Congress which legally designated the anthem by title without authorizing an official version of words and music.

The bill would sanction the lowering of 13 notes by 2 tones in the phrase beginning, "And the rockets' red glare," and also by lowering by 2 tones 5 notes in the phrase, "O'er the land of the free."

Simple enough, and the changes would not break a sheltered tradition by altering the basic harmony of the piece, although the music of the anthem was adapted from an old English folk song, To Anacreon in Heaven.

The new arrangement was worked out by Paul Taubman, American musician. There are no fewer than 271 copyrighted versions of the anthem in the Library of Congress. All are difficult for the average singer to carry through, due to high notes.

Our national anthem is probably the most neglected national song in the world. Congressman ZELENKO reported that a high-fidelity recording of the song is not even available commercially.

It seems important that Congress take time to refurbish our national anthem and authorize an official version of words and music we all should like to be able to sing.

Attack on Nixon Moscow Inspired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following item by Victor Riesel:

WASHINGTON.—I have before me a document proving that the stoning of Vice President NIXON sprang from a network of violent youth squads which the Soviets have been organizing at Peru's University of San Marcos for 23 months.

This document is a 3,500-word series of directives issued by the party's central committee in Lima on June 7, 1956. There were originally 100 copies of it, all carefully numbered and secretly hand delivered to the organization's top officials and undercover operatives.

At the end of these directives, which calls for the infiltration of unions, religious organizations, universities, and political parties, is this warning to the party chiefs:

"Each recipient will have to answer before the central committee for his numbered copy so none falls into public hands."

The document—which makes it abundantly clear that these are Moscow's wishes—first orders penetration of the vital metal-mining unions and then says:

"But our principal battleground on the university front continues to be San Marcos (NOTE: the oldest university in America, founded 1551). There is the heart of the student movement, and through the revolutionary youth of our collaborators and sympathizers, we have made significant gains inside the liberal arts faculty and have had minor success in the law and science fields.

"This penetration program through fractions [small units—V. R.] in university circles must be given our greatest attention. There must be immediate action to comply with the directives of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the U. S. S. R."

It was at this Soviet gathering in Moscow that Khrushchev unburdened himself of the violent attack on Stalin. The Russians' global apparatus was then purged and reorganized. New directives for action everywhere flashed to national Communist Party centers across the world.

The Peruvian Communists' Central Committee then reissued these orders—which pivoted upon the raising of slogans against the United States.

Shortly after the document was issued, student groups were organized around slogans such as "Defend the Soviet Union against the planes and bombs of Yankee capitalism." The document eventually was passed on by someone to Serafino Romualdi, the AFL–CIO's director of Latin American affairs.

To observers, the attack on NIXON proves that the old-fashioned tightly controlled Communist International (Comintern) still exists as it always did.

There is such a thing as Moscow gold after all.

Admit Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, once again this year the Congress will be given the opportunity to extend the status of statehood to Alaska. The people of Alaska have earned and deserved the privileges and responsibilities of statehood and there has been widespread support for statehood from the citizens of the present 48 States. For example, last week the Nashville Banner, one of the South's great newspapers, carried an editorial calling for the admission of Alaska to the Union. Also, the distinguished reporter, Mr. Roscoe Drummond, in his syndicated column presented the case for Alaska.

Under unanimous consent, I include these two articles in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The articles follow:

[From the Nashville Banner of May 6, 1958]

ADMIT ALASKA

If promises mean anything; if party pronouncements mean anything; if individual congressional pledges and expressions of public favor mean anything—then submission of Alaskan statehood to a rollcall in House and Senate would see that Territory swiftly admitted to the Union.

Why not now?

The promise was given, and has been reiterated. Employing the Tennessee plan, Alaska is ready with its State constitution, its congressional representation. The bills for its admission have been drawn, and await only introduction on the floor of House and Senate.

Justice demands that Congress act on it, in justice both to Alaska and to the Nation, whose security and economic interests would be served by the development so long planned. It is pointed out that in article III of the Treaty of Cession, by which we acquired Alaska in 1867, we pledged Alaskans ultimate statehood. That was 91 years ago.

The Senate Interior Committee observed last year that "In all ways Alaska is a dynamic and spectacular land. No area of the world offers a more promising challenge to the man of vision. This waking giant is the essence of America in its sturdiest tradition and constitutes one of the Nation's best investments in the future."

Congress has been reminded, in the words of the Washington Daily News, that "Since the Thirteen Colonies became the United States of America, there have been 35 additions to the Union. And each time a new State has been admitted the national economy has surged ahead."

In Alaska, the United States has potentially a lasting spur to the economy, comparable to the opening of the West. That spur is welcome; it should be used.

The bills are ready. Statehood has been put off too long already—for no good reason. Let Congress act now and fulfill a promise, in the interest of the whole hemisphere.

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

THE CASE FOR ALASKA: REASONS FOR GRANTING STATEHOOD SUMMARIZED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The outlook now is that Alaska will become the 49th State in the Union before the present Congress has run its course. The statehood bill has cleared the committees. An early vote in the House is in sight.

It has been before Congress since 1916 and its supporters are convinced that at last the votes are at hand to make Alaskan statehood a reality. Should Congress again say no:

It would be reneging on the most explicit commitment both parties ever put into their national platforms. In 1956 the Democrats and Republicans pledged immediate statehood for Alaska.

It would violate the manifest wishes of the American people who in a series of public opinion polls running from 1946 to 1958 have increased their support of Alaskan statehood from 5 to 1 to 12 to 1.

It would dishonor the promise of the 91-year-old treaty by which Alaska became an American Territory and in which we pledged to give its inhabitants all the rights, advantages, and immunities of the United States. The right to self-government is one of them. The right to be free from taxation without representation is another.

The more one examines the merits of Alaskan statehood, the more persuasive the case becomes. Obviously there are great advantages to the citizens of Alaska whose elected representatives in the Territorial legislature only last year voted unanimously for statehood. There are also many advantages to the United States, particularly when you consider that on this round earth Alaska is the doorstep to the American Continent and the most strategic outpost of our defenses as the alert flights to the Arctic demonstrate.

All may not be familiar with such basic facts as these: The Alaska people: Eighty-five percent of the Alaskans are of the stock of the American pioneers who trekked across the plains and mountains to build the Western United States. About 15 percent are Eskimos, Aleuts, and Indians. They are a sturdy, worthy, and resourceful people.

The Alaskan population: At present it stands at 212,500. But the most significant fact is the rate of growth. Between 1950 and 1956 the population increased by 53,000, or 48.6 percent. Alaska has shown a greater

percentage population growth than any State in the Union for 17 years.

At least 22 or our States had fewer people when Congress granted them admission.

Alaskan loyalty: Only in Alaska did the enemy invade North America in World War II. No more loyalty, no more patriotism, no more willingness to sacrifice were displayed by any part of our people than by the Alaskans.

Alaskan communism: The last report made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in 1951 stated that there were 10 Communists in Alaska. There is no reason to believe there are any more today, probably fewer. Would that we did as well in continental United States.

The Alaskan land: Business Week puts it this way: "Picture a land mass stretching from Maine to Florida, from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, embracing 20 easternmost States. Wrap around it a coastline greater than that of the United States itself, and you have an image of Alaska, twice the size of Texas and one-fifth as large as all 48 States together."

Alaskan resources: The United States has already gotten back 425 times over the $7 million purchase price it paid to imperial Russia, in metals, minerals, timber and oil. Alaska is rich in resources. Geologists conservatively estimate that Alaska is one of the 4 great petroleum basins in the world. No wonder Alaska isn't developed when you consider that the Federal Government owns 99 percent of the land.

Needed: Modern Truck Licensing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Tuesday, May 6, edition of the Daily Times, of Davenport, Iowa, carried an editorial entitled "Needed: Modern Truck Licensing," which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues.

This need is so obvious to all of us, yet it appears that no effective action is being taken to correct this situation. Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial in the RECORD in the hope that other Members will join me in taking the necessary steps to set up a system of uniform licensing for trucks.

The editorial follows:

NEEDED: MODERN TRUCK LICENSING

A truck rumbles across one of the bridges here and it is plastered with plates because the United States remains provincial in handling licensing for interstate traffic.

Roads now run from coast to coast and border to border and trucks carry an increasingly substantial amount of the Nation's freight.

Yet the States act as if they were separate principalities.

Trucking firms in the Davenport area say licensing and taxing of interstate trucking are notorious for confusion and redtape to which can be added greed and bickering in many States.

"And," says a spokesman for a transport line based in Davenport "the situation is getting worse, not better." Each State is afraid its neighbor is going to get more revenue from trucking and the trucker is caught in the middle.

One firm which covers only a few of the central Midwest States, estimates each of its trucks carries 11 different licenses, permits, registrations and tags of one kind or another.

This array of legal confusion exists even though the States serviced by this company are all covered by reciprocal licensing agreements.

Reciprocal agreements permit trucks to deliver a load or pick up a load in a State other than the one in which its license was purchased. However, even in States covered by these agreements a truck may not pick up and deliver a load in the same State without carrying a license for that State.

There was a time in the earlier days of paved highways when numbers of roads did not correspond from State to State. In fact, many roads were known by their names rather than by numbers—Lincoln Highway and Red Ball Route to name a couple.

Then it was recognized that it was essential that a uniform system of road numbers be established.

Interstate highways under the Federal program will be ready for use within 2 to 5 years and trucks will spin along with drivers scarcely knowing when they cross a State border.

Now is the time when uniform licensing, should be worked out in Federal law with one plate issued and each of the States in which a truck travels receiving its share of the fee.

Certainly matters as complex have been dealt with as States have gotten along with one another since the founding of the Nation. To work this out would be a sign of growing up in the regulation of transportation.

Resolution Memorializing United States Congress To Declare September 17, Constitution Day, a Legal Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to insert the following resolution adopted by the council of the city of Newark, N. J., endorsing the observance of Constitution Day, September 17, as a national legal holiday. At this critical point in history, it is important, as the resolution points out, for our citizens to reflect upon the noble document upon which our great Government is based.

The resolution reads:

Whereas the Constitutiton of the United States is regarded as the finest instrument of its kind ever devised by human skill, and is the oldest Federal Constitution in existence; and

Whereas under it, for more than a century and a half our Nation has enjoyed an unparalleled degree of democratic freedom and liberty never reached by any other country in the history of the world; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States was adopted in constitutional convention assembled on September 17, 1787; and

Whereas it is altogether fitting and proper that our citizens, who enjoy the benefits of freedom and liberty under that great document, should pause on the occasion of the anniversary of its adoptiton, to reflect upon their good fortune and to dedicate themselves in preserving the principles therein enunciated unto themselves and their posterity: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Municipal Council of the city of Newark, N. J., That the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States be and they are hereby requested to concur in the passage of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 41 declaring September 17 of each year to be a national legal holiday; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the municipal clerk to each Member of the present Congress of the United States from New Jersey.

The Facts of Farm Production Damage the Bootstrap Theory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. WATTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to call the attention of the House to an editorial appearing in the May 12, 1958, issue of the Louisville Courier-Journal which gets to the bottom of the so-called increase in the farmers' income.

It is a very pertinent article and one in which all should be interested—the farmer, the consumer, the city folks, and the country folks.

It is a most timely article:

After many months of gloomy reports about the plight of the farmers, the statistics from Washington now show what appears to be an astonishing comeback.

As of mid-April, these reports show, prices received by farmers were 9.8 percent above those of a year ago. Farmers' cash receipts during the first quarter of 1958 were 7 percent above those of last year. And if this trend continues, farm income this year is expected to approach $13 billion, compared with about $11.5 billion last year.

Such reports have brought delight to many farmers and to such publications as the Wall Street Journal and Time which have been quick to point them out as examples of what happens when the Government keeps its hands off farm markets.

Unfortunately, the rosy glow of the present seems to be so bright that some of these publications and even some of the national farm leaders can't see beyond it.

The facts are that the present firmness of some farm markets is but a prelude to another decline. The Department of Agriculture has been at considerable pains to point out this fact.

The Department's April report on the demand and price situation explains that "increased receipts from livestock products were largely responsible for the gain" in farm cash receipts during the first quarter of this year.

Why have livestock prices been so good this year?

This is the department's own explanation:

"Increasingly, 1958 is proving to be a year marked by a considerable withholding of meat animals, with some expansion of inventories in prospect. This seems to be true for all species, cattle, sheep, and hogs, and it is one of the few times that trends for the three have coincided.

"The withholding occurs after 2 years of reduction in numbers of cattle and production of hogs. With slaughter supplies tending downward, and consumer demand for meat weakening only a little, the immediate result of withholding is to create a price boom.

"The boom feeds upon itself; each rise in price stimulates further holding back, to speed the expansion.

"This spiral, so dangerous to future prices, may not build as high as some have done previously, such as that of 1950–51."

The result of this, the department points out, is that livestock prices undoubtedly will decline later this year. It expects prices to be good, but lower. And the significant price effects of any overexpansion in hogs probably would not occur before the fall of 1959.

Behind all this, of course, is the administration's policy of forcing down feed prices. It is a farm axiom that cheap feed means cheap livestock. If there is any doubt about it, farmers and city publishers should refer back to a speech by Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Don Paarlberg at the convention of the American National Cattlemen's Association at Oklahoma City last January 7.

"The overall situation is relatively more favorable than we can expect to continue indefinitely," Paarlberg told the beef cattle producers. "Our tremendous supplies of feed grain must ultimately be translated into heavy supplies of meat, which undoubtedly could depress our markets at some future date."

On the basis of this fuller information, it is hard to buy the story that farmers have pulled themselves out of trouble by their bootstraps, much as we would like to believe it.

Israel Celebrates 10th Anniversary of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 10th anniversary of the independence of Israel. In recognition of this significant event, I wish to extend warm greetings to the people of Israel, Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion, and His Excellency Abba Eban, Ambassador of Israel.

Israel was born out of a long struggle. She fought hard for freedom and self-government, and values them highly. Independence is a precious heritage. It was for freedom that most of our forefathers came to these shores. Ever since its its inception, Israel has been grounded upon democratic principles. The country is going through a period of rapid expansion. Like every growth, this has its pains, and history teaches us that it is natural that it should be so. But, in recent months some observers of the Israeli scene have taken these symptoms as the substance of Israel's life—forgetting the truth expressed in the old adage, "Falling blossoms indicate ripening fruit."

When we look back at our own history in the fitful decade after independence, it is easier to appreciate the problems facing Israel. It is not a small matter for a nation to embark upon the task of spreading prosperity and happiness, of undertaking to assure peace and progress, and of assuming the responsibilities of insuring to its peoples freedom and liberty. Israel is a young nation which has passed through many trials and tribulations during this infancy of her statehood. Israel has reason to be thankful for the many accomplishments that stand to the credit of her people. Nationhood brings responsibility and can only be sustained by self-discipline, hard work, and the spirit of a free people. The progress made in the past decade not only justifies a sense of pride in their achievements, but also the greatest degree of confidence in Israel's future.

Guided by the lessons her history has taught her, Israel has pursued a course which she feels will preserve her national life. This called for nothing less than a comprehensive program of nation building. I applaud the great strides Israel has made in these first 10 years of independence. She has almost doubled her per capita income; educational and social welfare programs receive unstinting support of the Israeli Government. We can all learn from Israel that whatever is spent in education, health, and welfare strengthens a democratic society every bit as much as what is spent on arms. Israel's material progress pays tribute to the resourcefulness and industry of her people and shows their determination to fashion for themselves a permanent and advanced nation. By strengthening their own internal life, by increasing their potential—economic, political, moral—such small nations as Israel can become active forces in the free world.

Israel is facing up to the challenge of nation building. The people are citizens of a great country on the verge of bold advance and are living up to the high standards they have set for themselves. The people of Israel believe in the future of their country for the Israel of the future will serve the welfare of the entire free world through her strength and the wisdom of her leaders.

In these perilous and anxious times there is a deep yearning among men for peace, security, and human dignity. It is clear to almost everyone that America wants peace. I wish it were equally clear that our policies measured up to the new requirements of peace. I salute Israel and again pledge my cooperation in furthering peace, freedom, and democracy. May the bright star of Israel be ever held aloft, undimmed, untarnished, so that its light reaches everywhere bringing faith, hope, and courage.

Need Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Press, St. Marys, Pa., of Thursday, May 8, 1958:

NEED HELP

If any industry in the world needs help it's the railroads, who find themselves mousetrapped by senile Interstate Commerce Commission rules on one hand, a Government on the other that grants tax exemption to private airports that are direct competition to rail travel. There may have been some justification for the ICC at one time in America's railroad life, but there seems no need for its continued existence. This editorial may bring a reply from the Washington institution that will be given due space in this publication.

Suppose the Pennsy wanted to reduce train fares between St. Marys and Erie to 1 cent per mile. How long do you think it would take the ICC to nod its head in approval? Many a mother of today would be a grandmother before final approval or disapproval came through. That's the history of ICC redtape.

Uncle Sam helps pay the bills for practically all forms of transportation that run in direct competition to the railroads. Yet when the chips are down in world wars or other emergencies the same Uncle Sam is down on his knees to have the railroads carry the extra loads shoved over onto them.

At the present time railroad lines are not making enough money to purchase new equipment to place themselves in more competitive position with other common carriers and their appeals for Federal financing, not to cost the public 1 penny, land on deaf ears.

Without railroads this country never would have attained its present growth and greatness.

Today railroads are orphans of the storm.

Republicans Ought To Get a Horn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SID SIMPSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of May 13, 1958:

REPUBLICANS OUGHT TO GET A HORN

Governor Stratton was in a fighting mood at a recent meeting of the Republican State central committee in Springfield. He bawled out the committee's publicity department for failing to tell voters of the accomplishments of the State administration, and cited the first issue of a party newspaper as an example of inep$ promotion of Republicanism.

"It is highly important that we do a better job of talking about such things as fiscal reform and the tremendous advance that has been made in support of elementary schools and institutions of higher learning," the Governor said.

While the point is well taken, it is only fair to add that Mr. Stratton himself is partly to blame. He has been one of the outstanding governors in Illinois history, but because he lacks a flair for publicity he rarely gets credit for his achievements and sometimes he is blamed unfairly for events beyond his control.

The contrast with his predecessor, Adlai Stevenson, is a striking one. Mr. Stevenson's

administration was afflicted by scandal after scandal involving members of his official family, and, though his intentions were generally good, he made no advance in many of the areas crying for progress or reform. Yet somehow he acquired a reputation as a statesman and twice won his party's nomination for the Presidency.

Mr. Stratton, without fanfare, has made enormous strides. He stamped out the cigaret tax counterfeiting which caused the State to lose many millions of dollars in revenue during the Stevenson regime. He engineered the passage by the legislature of the reapportionment amendment and was influential in its adoption by the voters. He persuaded the legislature to approve the judicial amendment, also.

Highway building under Mr. Stratton has been moving at a recordbreaking pace, appropriations for education and public welfare have been greatly increased, and departments under the control of the Governor have been administered with efficiency.

Voters of the Chicago area have particular reasons for being grateful to Mr. Stratton. Every worthy Chicago project has received his sympathetic attention and support, even though much of the credit usually went to the Democratic organization here. He joined Mayor Daley in getting legislative authority for a half-cent municipal sales tax, providing revenue badly needed by the city and many suburbs. He helped win approval of the $225 million Cook County bond issue for expressways, which advanced the planning of these roads before the adoption of the Federal expressway program.

These achievements are rarely mentioned, even by the hired Republican propagandists, but there is constant sniping at the Governor, not only by Democratic press agents but by editors who ought to know better. The Orville Hodge embezzlement was used to smear the Governor, even though the State auditor is, under the constitution, an elected official, entirely independent. Hodge was not even a political associate of the Governor; in the 1956 primary Hodge contributed campaign funds to Mr. Stratton's opponent. Instead of being blamed for Hodge's thefts, the Stratton administration ought to be given credit for the diligent work which resulted in recovery of the stolen funds.

It is no accident that Governor Stratton is the chairman of the National Governors' Conference, the first Illinois chief executive to be so honored. In Washington he is recognized as the leading spokesman for those who oppose further extension of Federal power at the expense of the States.

The Illinois Republican Party has good reason to be proud of the Governor, and should find ways to say so.

Sound Advice From Maj. Gen. Webster Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, today the subject of efficiency and economy in operating our defense activities becomes one of great importance. The tremendous sums of money necessary to be appropriated to meet the challenge of the enemies of the free world requires that every effort be made by us to promote efficiency and economy in every way possible. This is necessary if we are to get the greatest possible use of the money expended in building our defense system.

In this connection it is well to remind ourselves that if we are to successfully meet the challenge with which we are faced, it is necessary to have a high degree of organization that will eliminate waste, promote efficiency, and provide economy without weakening the strength of our defense system. This is the underlying purpose of the President's reorganization plans recently submitted by him. The plan will, if adopted, give more defense at less cost.

As part of my remarks I wish to include a speech delivered by Maj. Gen. Webster Anderson, who is presently Executive Director of the Military Clothing and Textile Supply Agency, located at Philadelphia, Pa.

The speech to which I refer was delivered by Major General Anderson to a large and distinguished assembly in attendance at a dinner given in the city of Philadelphia on Saturday evening, April 19, 1958, by the Central Lions Club of that city.

The views that are expressed by Major General Anderson become more impressive and take on greater importance because of the worthwhile and distinguished service rendered by him in the varied capacities he has filled within the Department of the Quartermaster General of the Army.

The speech as delivered by Major General Anderson reads as follows:

Thank you Mr. Cushing, distinguished guests, members of the Central Lions Club, and your beautiful wives, it is with a deep sense of humility that I appear here to represent our Secretary of the Army, Gov. Wilber M. Brucker. The Secretary had originally asked our good friend and great Philadelphian, Arthur Kaufman, to make this talk. I am sure we all regret the sad incident which prevented his attendance.

You will note I said that Mr. Kaufman was asked by the Secretary. I was not asked—I was told.

I want to start out by complimenting you on your beautiful spring weather. We have endured together a long hard winter and must feel this is just reward. Other parts of the country are not so lucky. I have just finished a 2-week tour, including the Far West and Deep South. I was met by snow, blowing sand, and tornados. This is the best weather I have found anywhere.

Because of this trip I have not had a chance to discover what the Secretary or Mr. Kaufman would have said to you tonight. What I say, therefore, will be my own views and you musn't hold either of the other two gentlemen responsible.

I believe the public today pretty generally expects a soldier or sailor to talk about sputnik or Explorer or Polaris. Certainly these things have captured our imagination as has nothing else during my lifetime. I won't disappoint you entirely but I do propose to approach the subject from a somewhat different angle.

I think it is well agreed that the Russians stole the march on us last fall with sputnik. They certainly won a tremendous propaganda victory. They demonstrated advanced development techniques and possibly superior basic knowledge. But, what is most important, they showed a willingness to expend whatever effort, whatever resources in men, money, and materials were necessary to do the job.

In this country we refer to the gross national product as a measure of our total industrial effort. The GNP is limited by the availability of human and material resources. It is the job of Government to divide these resources between public and private needs. They do this by levying taxes. Remember that the potential gross national product for a specific period is a fixed quantity so the higher the taxes the fewer the private automobiles, cameras, dresses, etc. that can be produced. On the other hand the higher the taxes the more schools, highways and national defense we can have. During periods of war we do not hesitate to trade autos for guns. During periods of peace we have traditionally chosen autos. That to me is the No. 1 reason why the Russians got ahead of us in the matter of space travel. You will recall that as late as last summer the United States public through its representatives in Washington made substantial cuts in the President's military budget, a budget which had already been trimmed to the bone of immediate military necessity.

Let me give you an exaggerated example to illustrate this point. Assume that in 1955 this country decided to trade autos for missiles. The resources of men, money and materials which did go into the production of autos that year would, if applied to the missile program, have produced a Vanguard well ahead of the Russians. We had the knowledge, all we lacked was the determination to do the job.

Russia too is limited by her gross national product. They have chosen to sacrifice personal product for the public good. For them the decision is much easier than for us. One man can make it. Here the decision hinges on the opinion of 170 million. Personally, I think the fact that every worker owns an auto is a much greater, more significant national accomplishment than spinning a dog through space. In these very perilous times, however, we have to weigh most carefully the division of the pie between our personal comfort and the public welfare.

This decision can be a hard one and the cost of making a mistake can be disastrous. A number of years ago when I was a student at the Industrial College of the Armed Forces I made a study of the synthetic rubber production before and during World War II. Prior to December 7, 1941, the resources available for national defense were again limited. Decisions had to be made on the priority of expenditure. Mr. Baruch was pressing for the first synthetic rubber plant, the Navy wanted more battleships. The President was assured that the sealanes to our rubber supply in Singapore could be kept open. The cost of one battleship equaled the cost of a rubber plant. Yet the Navy got 5 or 6 ships while Mr. Baruch got no plant. After December 7, it was 4 years before a surface vessel got back to Singapore. You well remember the very narrow margin by which we solved the rubber problem.

This story is not meant to be critical of President Roosevelt or the United States Navy. It does teach us a lesson which we should not have to relearn by more mistakes. Our available resources must be carefully divided among our many requirements. We cannot have all we want of anything. We must on the other hand be prepared for any eventuality.

This lesson leads to another point about the Russian sputnik victory. To me the primary reason for that victory was the fact that Russia wanted it more than we did. They were willing to sacrifice to attain it. Just so they will limit their personal comfort to put more resources in military-aid and foreign-economic assistance. The stakes in this game are high. The Russians are willing to play it whatever the cost. Their resources are mobilized for war. Our 170 million policymakers don't seem to realize that we are in a kind of war. That success in that

war is going to require sacrifice. We need autos and mink coats and thick steaks all measured in terms of taxes to combat the Russians on the economic, the scientific, the cultural and the military fronts.

That is the real reason for our space travel defeat. A more popular public reason is the alleged chaos within the Department of Defense, the indecision, the interservice rivalries, etc. It is easy for the public which has deprived us the needed funds to find such a scapegoat. Actually the Department of Defense as presently constituted has gone far to solve the problems of the battleships and the rubber plant. Within the quiet cloisters of the Pentagon we are able to weigh objectively the military tools against the multitude of possible military needs. A soldier or marine to guard our world-wide interests, an aircraft carrier to project our flag and prestige into foreign waters, a bomber to deliver an annihilating attack deep in Eurasia. We are providing as best we can for every eventuality.

This is not to say that the Department of Defense is perfect or blameless. It is agreed that the organization needs change. There are those in Washington who would change it by destroying the power of the Secretary of Defense, who would return to the vagrancies and whims and the pressure groups of the public forum, those vital and delicate decisions of battleships versus rubber plants. They would foster interservice rivalries. Objective decisions on the expenditure of our resources would be well-nigh impossible. We have placed in the hands of our President the responsibility for the welfare and safety of the Nation. As in time of hot war we must give him the authority to discharge this sacred responsibility. I am therefore, firmly convinced that we must strengthen rather than weaken the Department of Defense. That is the essence of the President's reorganization plan which is certain to highlight Washington news for the rest of this congressional session.

I think a little story may demonstrate the need for reorganization to speed up and centralize the making of decisions. Down in South Philadelphia at the quartermaster depot I command a small Department of Defense organization about which I will speak a little later. Last year we were having financial and budgetary troubles. To help solve our problems we held a conference of interested Government agencies. There were 11 different offices represented—6 different levels of Government, each with some responsibility for approving my budget. A situation not conducive to the quick action imperative in this jet and missile age.

I am in the supply business—a far cry from the romance of space travel. Yet space travel as well as old-fashioned military operations are dependent on us supply people. We have heard a great deal recently about basic research and applied research or development. The supply and logistic function of the military may be likened to basic research. We produce no artificial moons streaking spectacularly across the sunset skies. But without us, those operational successes would not be possible. Like basic research they cost a tremendous amount of money, which is not reflected directly and immediately in the accomplishments of our Armed Forces. This is the area of the Department of Defense most susceptible to the economies and efficiencies of a businesslike administration. Furthermore, there is so much money involved that small percentage savings would render huge dollar savings. It is in this field that I believe the Department of Defense has made one of its most significant contributions to the national defense. The President's reorganization plan would enhance the authority to continue this good work. It is conceivable that some day even a tax reduction might result.

This brings me to the subject dearest to my heart—my own job. I am the Executive Director of the Military Clothing and Textile Supply Agency. This is an Agency formed by the Secretary of Defense about 2 years ago to supply clothing, textiles, and related items to all the armed services, the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. Our primary purpose in life is to save money for bigger and better missiles. That is, to make the national defense portion of the gross national product pie go further, to give you more defense for the luxuries you forfeit when you pay your income tax. We have four basic objectives, each designed to further the primary goal.

First, we are organizing a single distribution system to eliminate the waste and duplication, the cross-hauling, the back-hauling, and other inefficiencies inherent in the four separate systems. We will reduce our use of depot storage space from 20 million square feet in 46 depots to 11 million square feet in 12 depots at an annual saving of $10 million.

The second objective is to develop an inventory control system sensitive to the demands of our customers. Here we have the job of reducing a $2 billion inventory with a turnover once in 5 or 6 years. If we can bring this to manageable business-like proportions the savings in interest and storage charges will be $50 million per year.

The third objective is to develop modern procurement methods attuned to the industries with which we deal. As we reduce red-tape we speed up the purchasing process. This means less inventory on hand and on order to cover procurement leadtime. We have already effected a million-dollar annual interest saving.

The fourth, last, and in some ways the most interesting objective, is an energized simplification and standardization program. Here the potential saving is almost unlimited. For example, we are modernizing men's trousers by eliminating the obsolete watch pocket which has been costing us $700,000 per year. We have standardized our dress shoes to effect savings of over a million dollars a year.

I have talked about the gross national product as it reflects the availability of our total national resources. Through the medium of taxes these resources are divided between the public and private needs of the Nation. Two pieces of the pie. Unfortunately there is a third piece of the pie. That is the piece that goes into the garbage can through waste and inefficiency in Government, fires, recessions, and a multitude of other causes. This piece produces neither autos nor guns. The weekly cost of the current recession in terms of never-to-be-recovered lost human resources far exceeds the savings I can hope to achieve through the operation of my military clothing Agency. But that does not mean that I should stop trying.

My clothing Agency is an example of what the Department of Defense is doing about waste in Government. The President's reorganization plan will further this work. There will be less garbage. This means more missiles at less cost to you.

But remember that we are competing with a determined foe who is willing to pour any required resources into the economic and space-travel battles. To win this cold war we must not just equal his efforts, we must best them. The Russians beat us with sputnik because we did not have the determination to win. I hope that this can never again be said.

Statements of Policy on Legislation Affecting Real Estate Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statements of policy issued by the Mortgage Bankers Association on March 15, 1958:

I. CREATING A VITAL HOME MORTGAGE CREDIT SYSTEM

The most critical problems in real estate finance center on the financing of housing. Since an ample supply of good dwelling structures is essential to the Nation's social and economic well-being, a candid and dispassionate consideration of the requirements of an efficiently operating housing market is called for.

Experience has demonstrated that, basic to all other requirements, is a system of soundly underwritten mortgage credit which will make funds available with low down-payments and long maturities to a large majority of families in all parts of the country. Experience has also shown that the indispensable ingredients of such a system are: (a) a mortgage instrument that provides for complete amortization in regular monthly payments; (b) a means of pooling unusual risks through mortgage insurance; and (c) a mortgage interest rate that is responsive to prevailing financial conditions.

The first of these requirements, the fully amortizated mortgage, is now universally recognized and accepted. The remaining two have been only partially realized.

THE PLACE OF MORTGAGE INSURANCE

Although the limitations on loan-to-value ratios imposed on their lending institutions by many of the States might be liberalized with safety, sound policy would still dictate that, beyond a point, mortgage institutions should reduce their exposure by pooling risks.

The mortgage-insurance system of the Federal Housing Administration was designed to accomplish this purpose. At its inception in 1934, FHA offered a simple formula for spreading risks, available to all types of lending institutions and accessible to all borrowers with good credit standing and an acceptable dwelling property. Though created and operated by Government, its support, after it was fully established, was to be provided by the borrowers who used the system; and any accumulation beyond adequate reserves was to be repaid to them. It was clearly understood that the interest rate was to be a readily marketable rate, since the purpose of the insurance was to broaden the market rather than impose restrictions upon it.

FHA has long since attained financial self-sufficiency and is today free of all but the most remote liability to the Federal Treasury. Nevertheless, it has more and more been treated as if it were a direct Government operation rather than an instrument for the general advantage of the private home market from which it derives its sole support.

As a consequence of successive amendments, the original concept of a nondiscriminatory, impersonal market mechanism has been much clouded, to the impairment of FHA's efficient operation and its potential

usefulness. Nevertheless, the original concept of FHA remains the best basis on which to recreate a sound and practical mortgage insurance system. What is needed is not a new system nor a supplementary system but a renovation of a system that has developed operating experience, financial strength, and the confidence of industry over nearly a generation.

To the end of restoring and revitalizing the original concept of mortgage insurance, the Mortgage Bankers Association offers these recommendations:

1. That the Federal Housing Administration be reorganized as a federally chartered mutual insurance corporation administered through a Board of Trustees appointed, with staggered terms, by the President, and by officers appointed by the trustees.

2. That FHA be made fully accountable for its operations directly to the President and to the Congress.

3. That FHA continue to be required to provide for its administrative expenses and reserves from its income from fees, charges, and premiums, but that it be freed from specific annual fixed budget authorizations and be permitted flexibility, within its previous year's income, in accommodating its administrative outlays to the varying demands of its services.

4. That a study be made to determine a more effective and equitable method of returning to mortgagors FHA's earnings in excess of expenses and reserve requirements.

5. That the FHA insurance system be revised to consist of 1 simplified formula for 1- to 4-family houses, 1 for rental housing, and 1 for cooperative housing, and that FHA be given wide latitude within each formula to meet the broadest possible economic range of demand.

6. That all special forms of mortgage insurance or guaranty be eliminated or be allowed to end without further extension.

7. That FHA be authorized and directed to adjust its mortgage-insurance premiums in accordance with its estimate of the risk assumed in the various types of mortgage-insurance transactions, taking into consideration the record of its 24 years of experience.

8. That the dollar limits on the FHA insurance authorization be removed and the amount of insurance written be limited only by an appropriate ratio to reserves.

9. That the applicability of the certified agency plan recently put into effect by FHA, or some other plan embodying the same principles, be rapidly extended.

10. That the regulation of interest rates and discounts on FHA loans be discontinued.

The accomplishment of these reforms should provide a mortgage-insurance system of broad usefulness and great flexibility, readily adaptable to the changes in the demand for housing and in the supply of funds, and capable of meeting the challenge imposed by the rapid growth and changing characteristics of our cities.

THE VETERANS' HOME LOAN GUARANTY PROGRAM

In its 1956 statement of policy, the association proposed a 3-year extension of the home loan guaranty program for veterans of World War II in order to allow time for an orderly transition to a single motgage insurance system under FHA. Instead, the Congress enacted a 1-year extension but so rigidly restricted mortgage yields that current market conditions have almost completely nullified the effect of the extension. Meanwhile, the terms for FHA insured mortgages have been sufficiently liberalized to offer an adequate means for meeting the mortgage needs of those who have not yet exercised their privileges under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. The association considers the use of the FHA program to be more desirable than a further extension of benefits for War II veterans. It is recommended:

11. That the VA home loan guaranty program not be extended for veterans of World War II beyond its present termination date.

12. That, with respect to the program for veterans of the Korean war for whom the program does not terminate until January 31, 1965, the regulation of interest rates and discounts be discontinued.

A SPECIAL MEANS FOR BROADENING THE MARKET

Remoteness from the center of mortgage activity has always created difficulty in providing adequate mortgage funds for home buyers in small towns and cities. Difficulty has also frequently attended the efforts of members of minority racial groups, even in larger places, to obtain the consideration generally available to other classes of borrowers.

Not until the voluntary home mortgage credit program was created in 1955 at the instance of the mortgage investing institutions of the country did a practicable method exist for overcoming these difficulties. In spite of the disabilities under which the insured and guaranteed mortgage systems have labored during the intervening years, the usefulness of the program and the advisability of its continuance have been fully demonstrated.

Therefore, in the interest of the broadest possible service to the prospective home buyers throughout the country, the Association recommends:

13. That the voluntary home mortgage credit program be continued as a permanent feature of the Nation's home mortgage system.

THE NEED FOR MODERNIZING STATE LEGISLATION

Supplementary to the establishment of an effective mortgage insurance system, and important to minimizing the risk and cost of the mortgage operation and widening its geographic and economic scope, the Association urges that, unless they have already done so, states modify their laws in accordance with the following recommendations:

14. That less costly mortgage foreclosure procedures be achieved, by (a) the reduction of advertising costs, (b) the simplification of court procedures now involving costly legal expense, and (c) the elimination or reduction of redemption periods for forfeited urban property.

15. That, for fully amortized conventional mortgage loans, higher loan-to-value ratios be authorized than the customary 66⅔ percent to which State supervised institutions are now usually limited.

16. That mortgage investment by out-of-State financial institutions, including pension funds and trusts, be facilitated by providing that the making of mortgage loans, the pursuit of remedies under foreclosure proceedings, and the holding, or selling of property as the result of foreclosure do not constitute doing business in the State under the meaning of statutes relating to foreign corporations.

II. ENCOURAGING EQUITY INVESTMENT IN REAL ESTATE

The unbalanced relationship in the production of dwellings for sale and for rent, the difficulties that have beset the FHA rental housing insurance operation, and the slowness with which urban redevelopment is taking place are all in large measure attributable to the present unattractiveness of equity investment in income-producing property. Nothing could be more helpful in reducing the pressure for unsound mortgage insurance programs and in eliminating the excuse for direct governmental lending for housing purposes than an increase in the availability of true equity investment in rental property.

The cause of the lack of equity funds for rental housing is the relatively low potential yield to be obtained under present circumstances from a rental-housing investment—especially one in a moderate-rental category. At best, a rental property of this character is not likely to throw off a greater return after depreciation (by the straight-line method—and it will rarely earn enough to make any other depreciation formula applicable) than 6 to 7 percent. Unless the property is owned directly by an individual or a partnership, the income will be subject to a tax up to 52 percent, which may reduce the maximum yield to less than 3 percent. This is true whether the ownership is in the form of a corporation or an investment trust. Ownership by individuals or a partnership is not often practical where a large undertaking is involved.

By contrast, the income from capital pooled in security-investment trusts is not subject to an income tax to the trust entity. These trusts, which have had a phenomenal growth during the past 20 years, are able to obtain capital at rates of return well within the earning capacity of moderate-rental apartment property. If security-investment trusts, the assets of which now amount to approximately $10 billion, are so successful in attracting savings, it may be expected that trusts invested in income-producing real property could prove similarly attractive at a comparable rate of return.

However, the Internal Reveue Act discriminates against real-estate investment trusts by refusing to allow the same conduit tax treatment permitted to security investment trusts. Instead, it subjects them to the full corporate income tax. Consequently the trust, as a means of pooling the funds needed for equity capital becomes no more effective than the corporation.

As the one promising means available for breaking through this basic obstacle to a sound expansion of rental housing activity, the association recommends:

17. That the Internal Revenue Act be amended to provide that real-estate investment trusts be permitted to pass through to their beneficiaries income received from real estate equities or mortgages in the same manner that security investment trusts pass through income from stocks and bonds.

Words of Wisdom From the Italian Ambassador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I join with Ambassador Brosio of Italy in his suggestion that the United States avoid trade barriers, particularly during the recession. The Ambassador recently stated, and I thoroughly approve, that up to now the recession in the United States has had no genuinely significant effect on Italian-American foreign trade. But there are already signal warnings. These warnings indicate that any new or additional protective trade measures, particularly tariff increases as against imports from Italy, will slow the international flow of goods. That slowing process would have a dilatorious effect upon the economy of Europe—the economy that we are endeavoring to aid in every reasonable way.

It is significant that in New York City there is being staged an International World Trade Fair. Exhibits have come from all over the world. The countries

sending these exhibits to us hope to inspire Americans to buy their goods. By doing so, these countries can earn dollars with which, in turn, they can buy our goods. Unless they earn that hard currency, they cannot buy our goods. Unless we export 10 percent of our productivity, we are in trouble. It is that 10 percent that we export that keeps us out of the economic doldrums.

Italy and other countries buy from us considerable quantities of our goods. If we put up trade barriers and thereby isolate ourselves economically from Italy and the other countries, the rate of productivity and the rate of expansion in those countries are lessened. When that happens, these countries enter into economic decline. They have recessions. An Italian recession, coupled with our own recession, can create dreadful havoc.

I agree with Ambassador Brosio when he says:

> A decline in the level of internal economic activity in any country will, almost inevitably, lead to changes in its trade policies. When production is stagnant and employment is low, there is a natural and nearly irrepressible tendency to restrict imports by various protective measures, even if the principles of economics and of commonsense demonstrate that an increase in foreign trade is a means of expanding (internal) industrial activity and employment.

Italy's trade with the United States in 1957 shows that she imported from the United States goods to the sum of $651 million and exported goods to the sum of $244 million. It is noteworthy that metals, machinery, and automobiles are the predominating exports from Italy to the United States. This is a dramatic shift from former exports which concentrated on food and beverages. Italian imports from the United States, taken together with its exports to the United States, emphasize how rapidly Italy is industrializing her economy.

Address of Hon. William M. Tuck at a Dinner in Honor of Senator Harry Flood Byrd, at the Washington National Airport on Thursday, May 8, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend the testimonial dinner given Senator HARRY F. BYRD by the people of Alexandria last Thursday evening, May 8.

I am proud of the great services rendered the State and the Nation by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia. He and his family are making a great sacrifice that he might continue to serve the Nation.

The principal speaker at the banquet was the Honorable W. M. TUCK, former Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia and presently a Member of the Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of our great State. It was a privilege for me to be one of the guests along with Congressman TUCK.

Congressman TUCK delivered an outstanding address as he always does. I am in entire accord with his sentiments. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a copy of his address which is as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, Senator BYRD, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, this is indeed a happy occasion. I am pleased and privileged to join this fine group in honoring a great American statesman who is deserving of the highest commendation and praise.

I have been associated with our dear friend, Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, in the public life of Virginia for 35 years. I served in the general assembly with him before he was Governor. Because of his ability, his steadfastness, and his sterling qualities of character, I have respect and unbounded admiration for him. His strength and forte lie in his determination to see straight through a problem and his absolute unwillingness to do wrong. In short, he has the ability to know the right and the courage to do it. He possesses a natural aptitude for governmental service and the fine conditions existing in Virginia today are attributable to him as to no other public figure.

Senator BYRD, although an aristocrat of truly illustrious ancestry, maintains the common touch and, in his daily contact with the public, demonstrates a sincere interest in his fellowman.

At the early age of 15, he assumed duties and responsibilities the average adult would have considered arduous, but soon demonstrated unusual ability and acumen in business and agriculture.

He developed rapidly in politics and while still a young man evinced a rare sagacity for values in that field. His first office was as a member of the city council of Winchester at the age of 21. By the year 1915 he was in Richmond as a State senator and soon gained statewide recognition for his leadership in opposition to the $50 million road-bond proposal and thus became father of Virginia's successful pay-as-you-go system. This was a natural role for the able young senator, who is so deeply and constitutionally opposed to public debt, except under the most extraordinary circumstances.

In January 1926 our guest was inaugurated Governor of the Commonwealth and his administration is vividly remembered. When he assumed office, the State government was topheavy with bureaus and agencies. He recognized the need for reorganization and successfully espoused a plan which brought Virginia to the forefront. He employed the practical and thrifty method of naming a small commission of prominent men to recommend amendments to the State constitution. The amendments were approved by the general assembly and the people, thus revising and modernizing the 1902 constitution. As Governor, among other things, he reduced taxes, lowered the State debt, launched a sound and economical highway program, expanded and improved the State service, and, all in all, gave the Commonwealth a program of progress which was truly an outstanding achievement.

He sponsored a State antilynching bill and there has not been a death by lynching in Virginia since the enactment of that law.

This indefensible crime is all but extinct in the South—the incontrovertible and final answer to continued agitation for Federal laws on this and kindred subjects.

Senator BYRD came to the United States Senate in 1933 firmly dedicated to a program calling for a reduction in Federal expenditures, strict economy in government, and steadfast adherence to the principle of States rights. He has not swerved or faltered and still holds to the time-honored virtues of free enterprise and self-reliance. He has steadfastly opposed the opening of the coffers of the Federal Treasury to the wastrels and squanderers who would debauch our currency and bankrupt our country.

Although it may have appeared at times that his was as a voice crying in the wilderness, be it said to his everlasting credit that he has struggled courageously against the forces of centralization and fought consistently in defense of the powers of the States, and he will continue in that effort.

With regard to party politics, you may recall Senator BYRD's response some years ago when an insistent questioner kept asking: "What kind of Democrat are you?" his reply was:

> "I want to tell you what kind of a Democrat I am. I am not a Republican, I will tell you that. I vote with them when they are right, and against them when they are wrong, but I am not a Republican. The kind of Democrat that I try earnestly to be is that kind of Democrat that two of the greatest Presidents of these United States were, both from Virginia. Thomas Jefferson and Woodrow Wilson. The kind of Democrat I try to be is the kind that Andrew Jackson was, who boasted that the proudest achievement of his administration was to pay off in toto the public debt. That is an opportunity that no one will ever have again. I am the kind of a Democrat that Grover Cleveland was, who said * * * it was the duty of the people to support the Government, and not the Government, the people * * *. The test of my vote in the Senate and my actions elsewhere, now, as they have been in the past, and as they will be in the future, is determined by what I believe to be best for my country."

I was greatly saddened when Senator BYRD announced early this year that he planned to retire and I joined his host of friends and admirers in an earnest appeal that he reconsider.

Thousands of Americans who respect integrity, economy, conservatism, and devotion to sound doctrines, and realized that Senator BYRD symbolizes, practices, and promotes these virtues, were likewise dismayed at the thought of his leaving the Senate.

Our joy was unbounded when he yielded to the unprecedented demand and agreed to serve for another term. His presence there at this critical juncture is imperative.

The name of Senator BYRD is synonymous with the good government with which Virginia is blessed.

Our Virginia government is interested in the well-being and happiness of all for whom government was established. We still believe in the fundamental principles—that all authority is vested in the people, and that government is the servant of the people and not their master.

We have been steadfast and firm in our determination to adhere to the fundamental principles of good government promulgated and established on the soil of Virginia, which we cherish and which have made our Commonwealth and our country great. Virginia has always been in the vanguard of the champions of free democratic government.

We believe that the faithful and impartial enforcement of law is paramount, and we recognize that as the first and foremost function of government. We have always believed in self-reliance, thrift, and hard work. Even during the darkest days of the depression, we still adhered to the principle of balanced budgets and made horizontal cuts in appropriations to the extent of more than one-third in order to wind up each biennium with a balanced budget.

Virginia is free from bonded debt. We have a relatively low rate of per capita taxation. Our expenditures exemplify the wisdom of our adherence to the pay-as-you-go

system and the careful control which has been exercised over State expenditures under the executive budget and unified accounting system. These are such that the Governor at all times may know the financial status of the government, as well as that of each institution or other governmental activity. At the close of each biennium all unexpended appropriations are returned to the general fund and are reappropriated or not, in accordance with the wish and wisdom of the general assembly. In Virginia there is only one appropriation bill, wherein the full financial needs of the State are studied in their relation to each other and acted upon in the same bill and at the same time.

We do not have a State tax on real estate, and the tax imposed on farmlands in Virginia by the localities is lower than all other States in the Union except three.

Despite our relatively low tax rates, we have been able to discharge our governmental functions in a satisfactory and commendable manner. Great improvements in our public-school system have been accomplished during the last 15 or 20 years; and our system of highways, for which the people of Virginia do not owe a penny, is unsurpassed, if indeed equaled, by any other State in the Union. Similar statements could be made with reference to other functions of our government.

Our relations between industry and labor have been exceptionally good. It is a tribute to both that they can examine each side of the picture and enjoy such cordiality in their negotiations. Both know that they can look to the Commonwealth of Virginia for fair treatment and for the protection of their rights. Virginia has an average hourly earning as high as any State in the South, being equaled only by Alabama and Tennessee. During the last year, only 1 State in the Union showed a higher increase in average per capita income than Virginia, and only 1 other State equaled Virginia's per capita income increase.

We have been careful to safeguard the fundamental rights of the individual worker. In 1947 the general assembly, pursuant to my recommendation, enacted Virginia's right-to-work law, declaring it to be the public policy of the Commonwealth that the right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization. The free and untrammeled right of every man to earn an honest living for himself and family, irrespective of membership in any organization, is a fundamental right, and cannot rightfully be abridged.

We have in Virginia the vigor and the determination to preserve our liberties. We will not consort with union racketeers and gangsters. We will not succumb to the venal influences which threaten many other states and the national government.

Virginia has met all of her governmental obligations and duties in a commendable and satisfactory manner, and continues to operate on the basis of a balanced budget.

If we are to avoid fiscal chaos in this country our National Government must return to the same principles and practices. Indeed, this wild and uncontrolled orgy of spending on the part of the Federal Government constitutes a hazard which is itself a grave threat to our national safety.

It is a strange paradox that the Federal Government instead of being the protector and the guardian of our liberty has through its various branches and agencies been the usurper of our freedom, and seeks to deny us the exercise of constitutional rights and privileges which we have enjoyed since the foundation of the Republic.

The Supreme Court of the United States, the very body set up under our Constitution for the protection of our liberties, is the greatest offender. In its school decision of May 17, 1954, and its subsequent decisions in the Illinois case, the two Pennsylvania cases, the New York case, the New Mexico case, the California case, the DuPont case, the FBI case, and a host of others, ignored precedents of long standing and undertook to write the substantive law of the land without regard to the rights of the Congress, the States, or the people. The Supreme Court, as at present constituted, has shown by these decisions great concern for the preservation of the integrity of the 5th amendment to the Constitution and none for the 9th and the 10th.

If these decisions are allowed by the Congress to stand, I can tell you now that our local and State governments will topple over into the abyss of destruction and remain nothing more than the hollow shells of a lost liberty. It is a sad commentary that the Supreme Court, the very instrumentality set up in the Constitution by the Founding Fathers for the protection and preservation of our rights, should use its powers to rob the people of liberties they have enjoyed for hundreds of years.

And now the Federal courts threaten to close our public schools by ordering integration of the races in violation of our constitution and laws and in contravention of our fixed habits and customs extending over the centuries.

Although exposed as no other Southern State to the evil influences emanating from Washington and from other places north of the Potomac, we have successfully resisted these efforts to integrate our schools for 4 long years and as long as we can avoid the faithless and perfidious leadership which has plagued so many other sections, there is no reason why we cannot continue to do so.

The white and Negro races of Virginia have lived together in peace, harmony and understanding for more than 300 years—longer than any other place on the Western Hemisphere. They will continue to do so if left free from the extraneous and unwarranted interference of certain political rapscallions in both our national parties who know nothing of the Negro and his problems and who care less except to use him as a vehicle upon which to ride into high public office.

Strict adherence to the philosophy and principles of our constitutional system is the surest means of conveying to our children and succeeding generations the blessing we have enjoyed as citizens in a free America.

Let us never forget that all power rests with the States and the people, except such as has been expressly delegated by the States to the Federal Government.

With the encouragement and leadership of men like Senator BYRD, a type of leadership which the people of Virginia and America deserve, we can restore to the States their proper and historic role in the government of our country and drive from the structure of our national life, the lingering termites of selfish interest and un-Americanism who for partisan political gain would destroy our Constitution and shatter our Bill of Rights.

I Got My Boy Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to prolong the unpleasant discussion of the stinking mess in the professional boxing ranks where the International Boxing Club must own a fighter "body and soul"—not to be confused with the ballad by the same name—before the fighter can get a crack at a championship. That sordid record is being implemented each day without my help, but I think I should bring this body up to date on the latest developments since I first exposed on this floor the fact that challenger Ralph Dupas had to be "cut up" seven ways in order to get a crack at the lightweight championship.

Dupas had his chance and he demonstrated that his is "a chancy job," as Marshal Matt Dillon describes his law-enforcement job in Gunsmoke. Of course there is no connection between the fight racket and the law. That is what the beefing is all about—no relationship between the two.

If Dupas had won the championship and had not been stopped by a technical knockout in the eighth round, Whitney Esneault, his manager, would have been compelled to manage in name only and would have received a pittance of his legitimate percentage of his fighter's purse. Having been defeated, Dupas is not further subject to the muscle except if he hopes or desires to fight for a title again. Then, of course, the same demands will be made of him and he will be compelled to accept, if he wants another go at the title. No "muscle in," no crack at the title.

But there is always a silver lining—as the poets say—behind every cloud and Whitney Esnealth had his.

Hardly had the fight been stopped when Whitney was heard to say: "Well, anyway I have got my boy back."

Of course Whitney is not expected to admit any of this nor is anybody else connected with the shakedown—either on the receiving or the taking end—expected to confess to the facts and the truth. Such an admission or confession would indeed be the coup de grace to any further working agreement or understanding between the parties involved.

Dan Parker, the famous sports editor of the New York Mirror, had some interesting comments to make the day following the Joe Brown-Ralph Dupas contest, and I pass them along to you with the repeated question:

"When are we, as Members of Congress, going to concern ourselves with the monopolistic practices of the boxing business which turns the pages of history back beyond the gangster rule of the twenties into the likes of slavery and peonage."

CONGRESSMAN HÉBERT GIVES US AN HONEST FIGHT

(By Dan Parker)

If we overlook the facts that Joe Brown had to knock out Ralph Dupas twice, Wednesday night, by courtesy of Referee Jimmy Webb, and that the boys, through no fault of their own, were Goombar stablemates, there was nothing wrong with their fight for the lightweight championship in the Houston Coliseum. In fact, it is amazing how honest boxing can be when the law is on the march after some of the brazen thieves who have all but murdered the sport.

Speaking of which, Referee Webb seemed bent on letting Dupas get murdered, in the eighth round, when he allowed the bout to go on after counting 10 over the New Orleans

jitterbug whom Brown had felled with a lightning left hook as Ralph led once too often with his right. After arising, Dupas was beaten to the canvas again with a shower of blows for which he was a limp target. Getting up at eight, he was wide open for a paralyzing right to the point of the chin that draped him, half conscious, over the middle ring rope. Still, Referee Webb wasn't satisfied. Dupas lifted his weary frame off the hemp and was backed into a neutral corner where Brown was ready to resume the sickening spectacle until reason suddenly penetrated Webb's cranium and he stopped the mayhem.

Even then, sadists in the crowd berated him and the gamest man in the ring came storming out of Dupas' corner, in a hammy pitch for an Oscar for the year's least convincing piece of offstage acting. I refer, of course, to Angelo Dundee, the man who acted as front, in the role of comanager of Dupas, the price Ralph had to pay the mob for the crack at Brown's title. What would have happened in this bout if Congressman EDWARD HÉBERT hadn't exposed the muscling in on Dupas' contract is anyone's guess. But it was obvious to all who saw the honest fight that developed after HÉBERT had turned the blinding glare of publicity on it, that it would have been quite safe for Joe to loan his title to the kid from New Orleans whom Mr. Carbo had tied up to make it 100 percent foolproof, the way he likes it. To date, as champion, Brown hasn't been in a phony defense. He can probably take care of anyone in the division, even though he's 32. Thus, Congressman HÉBERT may have unwittingly brough Dupas a beating that otherwise wouldn't have been his lot until the inevitable return title match. But that dodge was worked to death with Jimmy Carter—and where is he now, with his damaged eyes?

Dupas, like Willie Pastrano, who learned his boxing in the same school, is perpetual motion—most of it wasted. He's a difficult target to hit but give him time to wear himself out, bouncing around like a tennis ball in a vacuum and flailing away as if attacking a stack of barley, and he'll become a sitting dock, who forgets to duck.

Raph is the boy who has been the center of all the agitation in New Orleans as to whether he was eligible to fight Caucasians as one of them. Those who insisted that Dupas had Negro blood couldn't prove their point so Ralph remains in the pale face category which disqualified him from fighting Brown in New Orleans where mixed bouts are banned. On television he shows up as Nordic (and horizontal) as Otto von Porat ("oh, where is the floor at?") to complete the couplet Gene Fowler composed while the collapsible Scandinavian was being counted out one night during Gene's hilarious sports writing career. Ralph delivers a potent enough polthogue but he was in far beyond his depth when he tackled an unshackled Brown. Joey boy can perforate you when he's only half trying.

Getting back to Referee Webb, who seemed all tangled up in himself upstairs when the 8th-round knockdown came, he says he counted only 9 but I'm sure others besides myself heard him toll off 10 as Dupas started to arise. Webb also says Brown didn't stay in a neutral corner during the count. Maybe he was just coming over to help the referee pick up the victim, this being the semi-sacred type of bout that it was, what with the referee giving the boys a "God bless you both" at the outset. His benediction came immediately after he had instructed them as to what procedure would be followed in case of a "con-troe-versy," with the accent on the second syllable. Brother Webb moved around almost as fast as Dupas.

Sadly missing from this nationally televised championship bout was any mention of the name that's now never spoken in IBC circles. James D. Norris didn't get a single call from Big Jack Drees This was merely a bout matched by the International Boxing Club and there was no mention either of Truman Kella Gibson, his successor. But, as Truman remarked in a recent interview, "I won't be able to supply the warm personality that Jim gave to the IBC. Something will be missing." Of course, Jim has nothing more to do with the IBC, beyond owning it from Truman Gibson all the way down to the low man on the totem pole—the character Truman once "told off," whose name is never mentioned now, except in code. Promoter Lou Viscusi also disclaims any connection with the IBC in using his $68,740 gate as bait to con Cus D'Amato into leading his champion, Floyd Patterson, into this spider's parlor for a title defense against Viscusi's Roy Harris. Better Cus and Floyd should drink a hemlock potion in a toast to small-talking Lou's almighty gall.

I am sure that, much as the viewers missed Norris' name, the oratorical style of Buildup Bill Whitmore, the ring announcer, served the purpose of lotus petals, to lull them into sweet forgetfulness. Bill starts out each announcement like an ordinary human being and then, Silky Sullivan (what, that goat again?) builds up speed in the stretch and finishes in a raging fury. He struck the peak of his crescendo on the Dupas introduction screaming "the Native Dancer of the French Quarter of Old New Orleans," which, I understand, prompted Mushky Jackson back in Rumson, N. J., to ask if the gentleman didn't make a mistake in identifying his foreign kerns.

"He means a Franco, which they called a French quarter when I was in the AEF," was Mushky's quote relayed to me by Wawa Taysee, my Rumson spy. In any event I would like to announce, state, and make known the fact that Harry (the Verce) Balogh's honors are not only safe but in no danger or jeopardy whatsoever from this or any other quarter.

Southwest Mississippi Home Demonstration Council Storywriting Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on May 8, 1958, the Port Gibson, Miss., Reveille carried a story announcing the winners of the Southwest Mississippi Home Demonstration Council storywriting contest.

Mrs. Thomas G. Peyton, of Claiborne County, won first prize; Mrs. Mark McCaskill, of Warren County, won second prize; and Mrs. T. B. Stokes, of Pike County, won third prize.

Mrs. Peyton's story is not unique in America. It shows how the Federal, State, and county governments, working cooperatively without domination by the central government, can accomplish worthwhile goals. To paraphrase Thomas Jefferson: It is the diffusion—not the concentration of powers—that will prove the greatness of America.

Inasmuch as Mrs. Peyton's prize-winning story is a tribute to the dedicated employees of the Department of Agriculture Extension Service, as well as being a noteworthy personal triumph, I deem it important enough to bring to the attention of the Congress.

The Reveille article follows:

MY HOME DEMONSTRATION WORK AND WHAT IT HAS MEANT TO ME, FAMILY, COMMUNITY

(By Mrs. Thomas Peyton, Claiborne County)

On a cold February morning 22 years ago, we, my husband and two boys, ages 3 years and 10 months old, came back to the old family home to farm. I felt pretty unsure of my ability to be a first-class farm wife. I had not canned over two dozen jars of food in my life. My sewing, well to say the least, the inspiration I felt within and the lovely mental picture, never reached the finished product. I knew I was starting from "scratch" on almost everything any homemaker needed to know, and a farm wife needs many kinds of knowledge.

Shortly after getting settled my good neighbor incited me to join their home demonstration club "Reganton" (we called it "Midway" at that time) and I soon found I had struck not just a gold mine, but a gold mine of information. Our dear, "Miss Luter" was the home agent at that time and so ably instructed us in all the arts of homemaking. From early morning until late our beloved "Mama Carrie," the baby called her, and I labored gathering fruits and vegetables to be canned over the hot wood stove. The oldest boy quite often acted as our fireman, keeping the sticks of wood in as needed and quite often reminding us that the drippan under the old ice box had run over and water was on the floor. Soon the old-fashioned pantry was fast filling with bright and cheerful jars of not only good food but food that had been prepared by the latest methods of preserving the food value in that food. Those pages of instruction on canning, preserving and cooking that the home agent kept us supplied with, were certainly prized and much used at the Peyton's. Many times when I did not have just the information I needed on hand I called a neighbor. We still have that sharing of information today among all members and nonmembers.

The Home Demonstration Club came to my rescue when we purchased a 25-year-old Singer sewing machine so that I could learn to make clothing for myself and the boys. That way I was sure I could stretch the family funds—and how they needed stretching. Dresses, pajamas, and little boys' pants with elastic went fairly well, but the little boys soon needed man-type shirts and pants and I thought I was finished. My first man shirt came out with the buttonholes and buttons on the wrong sides. The boys didn't know the difference, but when you put improper openings on the pants even a 3-year-old knows it. I took my troubles to the agent and she instructed me in finishing these garments and supplied me with lots of informational material. After many hours of trying to improve my methods I decided to try my first tailoring job and make Easter suits for the boys. An uncle had given me two lovely suits and since the material was a light-weight wool and a suitable color for small boys, light gray and light tan, I was going to make them from those suits. As I ripped the old suits I was careful to note all tailoring details. The week before Easter the suits were finished and pressed with care. With both boys dressed in their Easter finery, mama-made shirts, suits, in fact, everything mama-made except the shoes and socks, we headed for Vicksburg to buy Easter baskets, Easter-egg dye, and the ducks I had promised them, Donald Duck and Minnie. I wasn't too sure how we looked in our homemade clothes, but I felt at least one embarrassment we didn't encounter this trip. When the older boy balked before the door marked "Ladies" and protested in a loud voice that no men went in there, I knew that with zippers, he

and even little brother could enter the portal marked "Men" and be confident men among men. And imagine if you can, the vain pride I felt when I overheard a lady ask the saleslady to show her a suit "like that" and pointed out my oldest. Junior opened his mouth and I swished him out. Outside he said, "Mother, why didn't you let me tell her you would make her one out of Daddy's suit."

We only found one lovely duck in all of Vicksburg so the boys had to form a partnership and they named him the Lone Ranger. As we headed back home over the road that was gravel and rough then, the boys played happily with the Lone Ranger and I was happy too, that I accomplished a little in my sewing.

This is not just my story, but that of my husband as well. Truly the information that he received through the county agent then and now helped him over many rough spots. He wanted to be the very best farmer he could, and I, wanting to be the perfect helpmate, often found I had been praying for rain when he wanted dry weather, and dry weather when everything was thirsty for rain. I told a friend of his that in the future I had better consult Tommy first, then pray. He answered, "Why? Don't you know he is strictly a dry-weather farmer, and if he ever faints, don't you dare try to revive him with water; just throw a little dust in his face." My prayers in 1957 didn't get through too well, did they?

Today as I write this in our new home with every convenience, I am made aware that the home demonstration clubs have come a long way. We had dreams of better things. The club helped keep those dreams alive, and put them into action. We have been informed on the buymanship of furniture and equipment, about proper wiring, how to care for and make the best use of these things. We have been taught many things about interior decorating and landscaping, how to budget our time as well as our money. Gone is the old pantry in our home, and instructions on home freezing has been worn thin with use. All the latest information on running our homes we still receive. We are made aware of State, national, and world news. We know who our lawmakers are, and we go out and vote our convictions. We make ourselves heard on measures we think should be passed. The club promotes and encourages tours both in the State and out of State that we might broaden our views. No longer does the country woman need be behind the times, for if she is, it is of her own choosing.

No short story would suffice when it comes to telling what the work has meant to me. Since no full-length book was asked for, I must leave out many things. I hope I've been a better citizen in my county, community, and State. I have certainly learned to be more aware. I write this not in a spirit of competition, but in humble appreciation to the present, and all the past home agents, and my good neighbors all over the county. God bless you, friends, and thank you for your efforts. I can only hope you feel you have accomplished some degree of success in this member; goodness knows you have tried.

The Monroe Plan for Top Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an able editorial from the Shreveport Times, Shreveport, La., of May 11, 1958, entitled "The Monroe Plan for Top Students":

THE MONROE PLAN FOR TOP STUDENTS

The problem of what the American secondary school system—high schools, public or private—should do about the gifted child (the youngster of extra high intelligence quotient) seems to have been solved by the Monroe plan of high school science instruction, now ending its first year at Neville High School at Monroe, La. It is scheduled to spread into three other Monroe high schools next fall.

The Monroe plan may become nationwide in no great length of time, for Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp., which put up $10,000 to launch the plan this year at Neville and is putting up another $10,000 for next year, operates 56 plants in 27 States. It is now making a survey to see how far it might spread the plan within its own system.

Newsweek magazine has given the Monroe plan some mention. Time and Cosmopolitan sent staff men recently to study it. A Pittsburgh paper has given it a 2-page feature spread. Some Louisiana parish school boards have asked Monroe public school officials to appear before them in person and explain it. Olin Mathieson has prepared a bound kit giving full details of the plan and how it has worked in Monroe—including pictures and examples of study and examinations.

The Monroe plan was conceived by a former Shreveporter, R. H. "Bob" Evans, vice president and general manager of Olin Mathieson in this part of the country. Olin Mathieson absorbed the Shreveport Frost forestry operations several years ago and contributions for "the Monroe plan" are from that division and are described as "Frostkraft grants."

Over a year ago Mr. Evans proposed to his company that it put up $10,000 to hire the best high school chemistry teacher that could be found in the Nation and to put in the best high school chemistry laboratory equipment available, and that teacher and equipment be provided free to a Monroe high school to provide college level chemistry for high school students capable intellectually of handling it. He gained quick company approval, plus a glad O. K. from Monroe and State school authorities.

It is worth noting that Mr. Evans conceived this plan and that it was launched before the Soviet launched its first sputnik and before there was any widespread talk about lags in science education in American high schools. Mr. Evans and Olin Mathieson recognized the lags long before Russia pinpointed them with its earth-orbiting spheres.

The search for a teacher capable of handling the kind of high school chemistry course Olin Mathieson wanted to finance took months—almost up to the opening of school last fall. In the end, a man of nationwide science teaching reputation was obtained—Lon Colborn, who instituted science for high-IQ students in Pittsburgh's Taylor Allerdice High School and retired after teaching there for 33 years.

Still young mentally, physically and even in years, Mr. Colborn was persuaded to come out of retirement and take the Monroe post. More than 300 of his former Allerdice students now are top scientists. More than 100 hold doctorate degrees from top colleges. Many of them have received medals and special awards for science work. He holds a special honorary masters degree in science from Carnegie Tech, one of only 10 honorary degrees in any field awarded by that school in its entire history.

After less than 1 year of operation of the Monroe plan under Mr. Colborn, a Monroe educator said:

"So dramatic has been the influence of this man in Monroe that neither students he has taught, the school, nor even the community will ever be the same again."

Parents' days at the Colborn class, when parents watch the students work, are increasingly popular. The whole city of Monroe is becoming interested.

Paul Neal, Neville principal, asked by The Times if the Monroe plan solved the problem of the gifted child, replied:

"All I know is that it is one solution—one that works; and that before this man Colborn came to us our gifted students rusted away. Now they are really going places."

Van Odom, Ouachita Parish superintendent, said:

"Before Mr. Colborn and the Monroe plan we gave our top students educational soup. Now they get good red meat."

The Monroe plan students at Neville now are the campus heroes. Any boy or girl who can get into the Colborn class and stay there rates (in the eyes of fellow students) above the star football back, the no-hit baseball pitcher or the girl who can win a statewide oratorical contest. It wasn't that way last September, but it is now. A "C" student in the Colborn class rates higher on the campus than one getting straight "A" in regular classes.

The Monroe plan students are not physical misfits with overdeveloped brains. They are redblooded American he-man boys and she-woman girls. They are athletes and leaders in extracurriculum work. Every one of this year's first class is headed for college—such institutions as MIT, Carnegie Tech, Tulane, Rice, Georgia Tech, Cornell, Louisiana Tech, Princeton, and SMU. "The universities are fighting to get these kids," parish superintendent Odom says.

Basically the gifted child is the one with what is called "superior" IQ. The average high school curriculum does not match his or her intellectual capabilities and thus brains are wasted. Some educators have urged pushing such youngsters through 4 years of high school in 2 or 3 years—an illogical plan because it puts the graduate into an intellectual vacuum. Such a student is through high school but not ready for college in age, maturity, or perhaps moral development or common sense.

Monroe plan students at Neville range in IQ rating from 130 to 139—100 being average—and are not in the genius classification. Fifty-five students applied for admission to the first class, 30 were accepted and 5 of these failed to make the grade and were dropped. Of the 25 continuing, 4 are girls. The class meets daily, 2 hours for each session.

The Monroe plan simply adds to the regular high school curriculum special science work which top IQ youngsters can handle but which average IQ students usually cannot handle. It does not interfere with other high school work—in classrooms or on the campus.

The Colborn students take college-level chemistry but all the rest of their classes are high school level and average IQ level.

The Monroe plan at Neville this year covered chemistry. Next year a similar class, but in physics and with a teacher of the type of Mr. Colborn, will be established at West Monroe High School. An interschool transportation system will be set up, enabling students of Ouachita Parish High School and St. Mathews Parish (parochial) School to attend either the Neville or West Monroe class. Students will be permitted to take both classes during their high school term but not at the same time.

Olin Mathieson will put up $10,000 again—a Frostkraft Grant—for the coming year, with $5,000 going to the Monroe city school system (for Neville) and $5,000 to the parish school system for West Monroe. The school boards concerned will pay the salaries of the two teachers and the Frostkraft grants will go for labortaory equipment and other costs.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

In 1959–60 it is planned to add a third course to physics and chemistry—math.

Parish Superintendent Odom describes the work of Bob Evans and Olin Mathieson in the Monroe plan as a shot in the arm for an educator. "Neither ever has tried to dictate anything about administration of the plan," he said.

As for Mr. Colborn and education, here are a few of his utterances:

"It doesn't make sense to try to make a scientist out of every high school student. But it is important that students who want to prepare for science get adequate training in high school."

"Simply increasing the salary for teachers won't do the job. Why not hire teachers with a thorough knowledge of their subject, especially in science and mathematics, and then pay them commensurate with their training."

"There's a lot of talk about bigger and better schools, auditoriums, football teams, but rarely do we hear mention of bigger and better brains."

"We hear a lot about the crying need for school buildings, higher salaries for teachers, and for directing more students into science and mathematics. Woefully limited is the cry for better trained teachers. * * * There is really no shortage of teachers at all—only a shortage of adequately prepared teachers."

Industry all over Louisiana—specifically including Shreveport—and all over the Nation might profit by studying the Monroe plan. School boards all over Louisiana, including Caddo's—and also all over the Nation—might well study the Monroe plan. It's a proven success in a field where nationwide action is needed. It needs to be spread far and wide—as quickly as possible.

Mary Martin Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of April 17, 1958, a young citizen of the New Zion Community, near Tylertown, Miss., brought honor to my State by being acclaimed the winner in the Betty Crocker All American Homemaker of Tomorrow contest.

This attractive 17-year-old farm girl, the daughter of my friends, Mr. and Mrs. Bird Martin, of Route 7, Tylertown, Miss., was selected from an original field of 300,000 senior girls in 11,000 schools throughout the United States.

Miss Martin, valedictorian of her class, an "A" student in the New Zion High School, her church pianist, chapter president and State news letter editor for the Future Homemakers of America, received her award in New York City the day before her scheduled high-school graduation.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Tylertown, Walthall County, and the State of Mississippi are intensely proud of Miss Martin's accomplishment. It gives me an overwhelming sense of pride to join my fellow citizens of our great State in saluting a versatile and genuine queen.

Very properly, Saturday, May 10, was proclaimed Mary Martin Day in Walthall County. State and local officials on that date joined with Miss Martin's friends to pay tribute to this outstanding young lady. General Mills, sponsor of the national contest, had representatives present.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to include an editorial, and Miss Martin's own account of her experiences, which appeared in the Tylertown Times:

NEW ZION'S DAY IN THE SUN

New Zion community has always been an outstanding community in Walthall County.

It has good farms, good people, good churches, and a civic pride that is rarely equaled and probably never surpassed.

It is understandable then, this week, if their feeling of civic pride is bursting at the seams.

For New Zion is the home of a national champion, Miss Mary Martha Martin, refreshing, personable, and talented, was chosen recently as the Betty Crocker 1958 All-American Homemaker of Tomorrow.

Saturday has been declared "Mary Martha Martin Day" in Walthall County, and Walthall countians in every walk of life will join their New Zion neighbors in honoring this 17 year-old high school girl who has distinguished herself among 300,000 entrants of this nationwide contest.

New Zion is proud.

Walthall County is proud.

The state of Mississippi is proud.

And their pride is justified.

Here is a girl raised in a rural farm community of Mississippi, and trained in a rural school.

Her record has made her the winner in the search for the most outstanding young homemaker in the Nation.

The president of General Mills, Inc., which sponsors the national contest wrote in an open letter to Walthall County citizens this week:

"Miss Martin symbolizes the generation that will soon be shaping the homes of tomorrow. And, how those homes are shaped will certainly determine the nature of the world in which our children and our children's children will live."

How right he is.

In a time when juvenile delinquency is taking the headlines, when murder and robbery scream from the front pages, and the Nation's leaders ponder a solution toward the world's apparently unsolvable pell mell race toward possible destruction—it is infinitely refreshing to find a national program dedicated to restoring the dignity and importance of the American home.

General Mills is to be commended on its fine program, and we join our neighbors at New Zion in being proud of Mary Martha Martin, Walthall County's national champion.

STORY OF CINDERELLA TRIP TOLD HERE

(By Mary Martha Martin, Betty Crocker All-American homemaker)

A moment of doubt, a held breath, and then, we're off. Up, up, up, our magic carpet, the Delta DC–7, climbed and began to cruise at a rate of 190 miles an hour and an altitude of 17,000 feet. Yes; the first of many new and exciting experiences had begun for me, 1 of 49 modern-day Cinderellas and advisers.

With her magic wand, our fairy god mother, General Mills, had transported each of us to Washington, D. C., for the beginning of an educational, a historical, and an absolutely fascinating week of touring.

The first day and a half we were on our own. How exciting. But wait. What did we, Mrs. Jones and I, know about the District of Columbia. Sights to see, the place to eat—it was all new to us. Luck was just with us, I suppose, for you see we had a special guide, the delightful, friendly, good-humored W. M. Miller family. We enjoyed dining, worshiping, visiting, and sightseeing with them. Don't you agree we were most fortunate?

Food and friends, somehow, just seem to go together. They're both necessities. And both we had as we acquainted ourselves with the other lucky winners and advisers while consuming a delicious, plentiful buffet luncheon (the first of many) in the Federal Room of the Statler Hotel.

An enormous city built on the Potomac River full of lofty architecture, impressive and beautful sights such as the cherry trees in full bloom, the center of our Nation's Government, was next on our itinerary. Among great erections we toured was our National Capitol, where the two great lawmaking bodies of our Nation assemble; National Archives, where priceless documents and records are kept; Museum of Art, where invaluable and famous paintings are collected; and Smithsonian Institution, where displays are made in the fields of art and science.

Then we toured memorials made to great men who were responsible for a large part in the birth and growth of our Nation. These memorials include the Washington, Lincoln, and Jefferson. Then there is the Iwo Jima Memorial dedicated to marines who raised our flag on Mount Surabachi during World War II. And, of course, the downtown business district was a "must." What would any city be without its fashionable shops, famous restaurants, etc.

Thus ended our first, rather tiring, but nevertheless very interesting tour.

"Early to bed and early to rise" was certainly employed—maybe not the early to bed. But, no matter, every morning at 6 a. m. we were up, all packed and rarin' to go.

All aboard and ready to start the first lap of our tour by bus. A brief stop at historical Mount Vernon, home of Martha and George Washington, to see how people of that day and time lived. Time out for lunch in Richmond, Va., then Williamsburg next stop.

Williamsburg, quiet, old, and peaceful, that is, until we arrived. A moment to unload and mail call—here I became the envy of many, for you see, I received several letters and 13 of the 53 telegrams from you, my considerate and thoughtful friends.

Hurriedly, we left for the Jamestown festival for we were running late and we had no time to spare. There, on the James River was the first permanent English settlement, Jamestown. Its old fort consisting of mud and thatch buildings, its three ships, *Sarah Constant*, *Discovery*, and *Godspeed*, its old stone church, and its statues of John Smith and Pocahontas created an atmosphere which led us back 350 years.

We could almost visualize them landing there, and we were so thankful for such brave and courageous leaders who were willing to endure many hardships. For here the birth of our Nation had its beginning.

Back at Williamsburg we began our interviews with three psychologists. All of us were a wee bit jittery but we soon realized they were human beings, too. Thus, in our group interviews we have lively discussions concerning dating, premarital, and marital problems.

Dressed in costumes of olden days, we hurried down to breakfast eager to see the effect this rarity would have on the tourists. It was just as we expected—oohs and ahs and exclamations. It was truly a lovely sight to behold. There we were, 49 of us, dressed in rich velvets and satins, trimmed with bows and laces, standing out with hoops and panniers, and oh, the many different styles and colors. No wonder the tourists stood, open-mouthed and wide-eyed, snapping pictures all day.

One block of shops, homes, courthouse and jail, inns, and the governor's palace has been restored. How very interesting to visit

these places to see people enacting roles of those in olden days.

The governor's palace with its formal gardens was probably the most magnificent of all sights we beheld. Its furnishings were priceless. Imported pieces and some gifts from such notables as the Queen of England helped compose this palace of splendor. To us, homemakers of tomorrow, the kitchen is a very important part of a home. It was most interesting to see their appliances and equipment. We have come a long way here, too. Another must on our list was the historic college, William and Mary.

Lunches and dinners eaten by candlelight in many famous old inns was certainly an impressive experience. It was even more impressive when served by young men from William and Mary. A string concert at the governor's palace ended our day in the past.

A night in Philadelphia to see the Liberty Bell, Independence Hall, and the Church of Christ, and then on to that great metropolis, the cosmopolitan city, New York.

Here we were at last—in that place we had heard about, read about, and often dreamed about visiting.

Our only complaint was that we had only two eyes. The streets were crowded as usual with people honking their car horns, screeching their brakes, and saying a few friendly words to their neighbor. And the sidewalks were equally as bad with people scurrying back and forth. You might think oh, that was just a bad day or maybe a rush hour, but oh no, that is an everyday sight in New York. There is always a hustle and bustle. Our heads were twisting frantically from one side to another, our eyes were strained as our bus would cruise along and then stop with a sudden jolt. Try as we did we couldn't possibly see it all.

The neon lights, the very fashionable shops on Fifth Avenue, Broadway with its famous shows and stars, Park Avenue with its lavish suites and penthouses, Central Park, Empire State Building, United Nations Building (modern design at its peak), Chinatown, Greenwich Village, Fish Market, Harlem, and the Staten Island Ferry ride making possible a view of that famous skyline, were a few of the things we saw.

Excitement was really in the air as the four of us dressed in our luxurious rooms of that famed hotel, Waldorf-Astoria. Each of us sat at the all-American table there on the heavenly Starlight Roof, dressed in our finery, awaiting with eager anticipation the announcement of the 1958 winner.

Each of us knew it would be a great honor both to be chosen winner out of 49 and to be crowned All-American Homemaker of Tomorrow. Yet, none of us dared hope and dream it would be or could be herself. Certainly not me. Never have I been so surprised.

I could never describe the joy I felt nor the great responsibility I knew I must and would try very hard to assume. The following morning the other Cinderellas left with their advisers. There was a moment of heartbreak at their departure for during the past week we had made bonds of lasting friendships. Too, many of the lovely, youthful hostesses from General Mills were leaving and I can't express the feeling of loss that overcame me. For throughout the week they had worked so cheerfully and untiringly toward making our tour a success and an experience we would never forget.

Each of us sensed a feeling of gratitude to General Mills not just for the tour itself, but for the places the tour took in. For they showed us our heritage, a thing we can justly be proud of our Nation's Capital, where plans and policies are being made for the welfare of our Nation. Seeing all of this brought the realization that we, as tomorrow's citizens, must shoulder the responsibility of our great Nation. We can either build it or kill it.

Additional days in New York was another treat in store for me. There were pictures, interviews, My Fair Lady, nightclub acts, TV appearances, meeting famous personalities, and a shopping spree—it was "the most" and something I'll never forget. But each day, despite all of this, I became homesick just a little more. The hustle and bustle of big-city life doesn't appeal to me—I much prefer the wide-open spaces. Besides, there is no place like home—and, oh, it's wonderful to be back again.

Promote Massachusetts Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the week beginning May 18 has been proclaimed by our distinguished Governor, Foster Furcolo, as Promote Massachusetts Week. This week has been set aside to bring to the attention of the people all over the United States the unique attributes of our State. I am delighted to be able to join with many of the Commonwealth's leaders and organizations in saluting the achievements of the great State of Massachusetts.

New England, as the late Bernard De Voto described it, "is the first American section to be finished, to achieve stability in the conditions of its life. It is the first old civilization, the first permanent civilization in America." Because of its traditions and its illustrious history, most Americans have developed a sympathetic interest in this area that cradled our national development.

Much has been written about the reverses that beset New England, and more particularly Massachusetts, in the postwar years—reverses caused primarily by the decline and exodus of the textile industry, at that time our economic mainstay. Many a gloomy picture was painted about the future of Massachusetts. But our economy has proven itself to be resilient and dynamic. The people of Massachusetts—a determined, energetic, frugal, intelligent lot—have rallied to support the Commonwealth through a thoroughgoing change in its economic base. An economy once dominated by the textile and shoe industries is now experiencing the ascendency of industries keyed to the electronic and atomic age. Massachusetts, utilizing its scientific and research resources and supported by its Yankee know-how, has pioneered a whole new way of economic life, geared to the needs of America's future. In large part due to the innate character and tradition of our New England citizenry, the future of Massachusetts now holds promise of sound economic growth and stability.

Massachusetts' available pool of scientific and engineering talent is undoubtedly one of its most vital assets. The State's leading educational institutions have become the natural partners of the highly technical industries that have migrated in recent years to Massachusetts. With these resources of intellect and scientific experimentation, the Commonwealth is equipped to meet our civilization's new challenges. Its future rests squarely on the expansion of its various scientific research and development programs.

People who have had the chance to live in Massachusetts can readily vouch for the good life our State offers. Massachusetts has distinguished itself as an educational, medical, cultural, shipping, and financial center. Even in the face of growing competition from the Western States, Massachusetts and its capital, Boston, have remained the hub for much of American life. Surrounded by the Commonwealth's scenic beauties, such as the Berkshires and Cape Cod, the monuments to its illustrious past, and an extraordinary variety of cultural and recreational facilities, the opportunities for Massachusetts citizens are unlimited.

We citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts can be rightfully proud of our State's recent achievements. Through all-out drives to promote our State, such as the one which will begin on May 18, we can demonstrate to our fellow Americans that the courage, pioneer resourcefulness, and determination which characterized the colonial days in New England is still very much alive today, and that our State is ready and able to contribute as much to America's future as it has to her past.

Plan for a Pan-American Parliamentary Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the stoning and the jeering of Vice President NIXON in several Latin American countries during his goodwill tour were not spontaneous demonstrations against him, nor were they directed against him personally. There is no doubt that this antagonism was engineered by known Communists and it was directed against the United States. This is part and parcel of the worldwide Communist hate America propaganda campaign which is hitting us one day in Peru, the next day in Lebanon, and so forth.

As in other parts of the world, the Kremlin has two objectives in Latin America:

First. To engender hostility toward the United States.

Second. To create chaotic conditions among our neighbors south of the border which might pave the way for a Communist takeover, such as was done for a time in Guatemala.

A number of circumstances are particularly propitious for the promotion of Communist objectives. Nationalism, which is shaking the Middle East and Asia, is also a powerful element in

Latin America psychology. In some of these countries the people harbor bitter memories of United States manifest destiny and dollar diplomacy, which have never been eradicated despite our good-neighbor policy of the last quarter of a century. The Latin American republics, poor and discontented with their rate of economic growth, are dissatisfied with United States policy toward them. Occasionally, responsible Latin American leaders have given us a friendly warning that, unless the expectations of the people for a higher standard of living can be achieved by democratic methods, they may seek other means to meet these demands.

All of this has proved useful to the Communists. Moscow capitalizes on the bitterness and the envy of the Latin American people, on their dissatisfaction and their eagerness for progress. The Communists seek to discredit the United States by associating it with imperialism, colonialism, and warmongering, while Russia is depicted as the harbinger of peace, progress, and the hope of the downtrodden.

Meanwhile, Russia is exerting allout efforts to expand its diplomatic, economic, and cultural relations with the Latin American countries, it is sending commercial missions to these countries which are offering to purchase their surplus products while selling them Communist-made goods on very attractive terms, and it is encouraging the exchange of scientists, educators, students, and others.

On the other side of the ledger, we have taken a number of steps in recent years to counter Soviet subversion in Latin America. There is the resolution adopted at the Caracas Conference in March 1954 which declares that, if international communism should come to dominate any of the American states, it would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and independence of all American states, endangering the peace of the Western Hemisphere and calling for immediate consultations regarding appropriate action. The resolution also calls for the exchange of information between the American republics, in order to counteract the subversive activities of the Communist conspiracy.

In addition, the United States has extended certain limited financial aid to the Latin American countries in the form of loans, grants, technical assistance, and the like. But various difficulties have arisen, over the types of loans, or refusal of Government loans where private investment funds are available, or lack of sufficient funds for long-term loans. Aside from loans made by the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, we have given very little under our foreign-aid program to these countries. In recent years it has generally been around one hundred million dollars annually to all 20 Latin American republics, and that includes military, economic, and technical assistance.

By comparison with what we have spent in other parts of the world, I believe that Latin America is being all but ignored by the United States at a time when these countries merit closer attention than ever before. While we are ignoring Latin America, Russia is working overtime there seeking to gain favor and to convince those countries to remain neutral on the Soviet side. No wonder Vice President NIXON has found during his tour that there is a very considerable lack of understanding there about United States policies and motives. No wonder there seems to be a good deal of anti-American feeling there and growing resentment against us.

Perhaps the time has come for us to examine our relations with Latin America more closely. There seems to be a crying need for improvement. This should be done at once, before the situation in some of those countries deteriorates beyond the point of repair.

While I am not ready to prescribe any specific programs at this time, I should like to propose a plan which, if put into practice, could result in greater unity of purpose and action. We have at the present time the Organization of American States, which brings together periodically the representatives of the American governments for cooperation in various activities. We also have the Inter-American Defense Board, composed of high-ranking military officers of all 21 Republics, to plan the defense of the Western Hemisphere.

I would suggest the establishment of a third inter-American body to be made up of parliamentary representatives, who as spokesmen of the people can establish a closer relationship on a people-to-people basis. It may be called the Pan-American Parliamentary Association—PAPA—which is to meet annually or as often as deemed necessary in the different capitals of the Western Hemisphere.

The purposes of this organization should be to create better understanding among the peoples of the hemisphere, expansion of educational and scientific exchange programs, closer cultural relations, improvement in trade relations, encouragement of large-scale tourism between North and South America, help to provide relief in times of disaster, seek means to dispose of surplus commodities in the various countries to help their economies, and so forth.

I believe that if the representatives of the people of all 21 American republics could meet to discuss pressing economic, technical, social, educational, and similar problems—but not political or military matters—there would result not only more and better understanding, but also greater cooperation and definite achievements from which all the countries concerned would benefit. In view of the current developments in connection with the Nixon tour, I would suggest that this Pan-American parliamentary conference be called at once.

Let us not delude ourselves about the true situation in Latin America. Let us draw from it the definite but very painful conclusion that our neighbors in some of the Latin American countries are falling prey to Communist propaganda and are allowing themselves to be stirred up against their traditional and logical friend and neighbor, the United States. The young students and the others who are participants in the riots in Peru and Venezuela do not realize that they are being exploited by the Communists to the detriment of their own people. They do not speak for the people of Peru or Venezuela but against them.

For us there is also the further lesson that we have taken the Latin Americans for granted, while pouring our aid to other parts of the world. A positive people-to-people approach in our dealings with our neighbors has been lacking. We must restore such relationship by spreading good will now, if we are not to become bankrupt later in attempting to attain it by force.

World Science-Pan Pacific Exposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a year ago the 1957 session of the Washington State Legislature set in motion what I believe will be the greatest promotion effort ever undertaken in the Pacific Northwest. The legislature, in approving legislation creating a world exposition at Seattle, Wash., in 1961, also passed a separate measure to provide financing.

Since the passage of this legislation, tremendous strides have been made. On March 27 I had the privilege of authoring H. R. 11733, for legislative and other purposes titled "World Science-Pan Pacific Exposition"; also H. R. 11734, designed to admit foreign exhibits duty free.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to review the steps that have been taken by the Washington State World Fair Commission to provide an outline of its future course, by including the commission's report to the State legislature as of May 1, 1958, and I urge that members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee consider H. R. 11733 with all deliberate speed in reporting this legislation to the floor for action.

WORLD SCIENCE-PAN PACIFIC EXPOSITION, 1961: REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE, MAY 1958

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Plans for an international exposition were initiated in 1955 by the State legislature at which time a 7-man World Fair Commission was appointed by Gov. Arthur B. Langlie. The bipartisan commission was continued and enlarged by Gov. Albert D. Rosellini and the 1957 legislature.

TESTING SENTIMENT

During 1955 and 1956 a survey of key civic leaders was conducted by the University of Washington College of Business Administration, including a statewide mail canvass of 400 representatives of business, labor government, education, and civic leaders. Ninety-eight percent favored holding an exposition as a trade and tourism stimulant.

SITE SURVEYS

The present site, adjacent to the Seattle Civic Auditorium, was adopted after a survey conducted by the Washington State chapter, American Institute of Architects, American Institute of Planners, and others.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

CITY-STATE RELATIONSHIP

A working agreement with the city of Seattle was adopted to take advantage of the many exposition facilities available in the auditorium area (i. e.: Auditorium, ice arena, State armory, and stadium); in addition to additional facilities to be constructed under Seattle's $7,500,000 civil center bond issue.

FINANCING

Following passage in 1957 of a bill creating the exposition a separate measure was passed to provide financing. The measure, which did not preempt existing revenue, matched Seattle's $7,500,000 civic center fund with an equal amount from the State. The department of commerce and economic development was assigned as fund administrator. Funds were earmarked for land acquisition and site development only.

THE CORPORATION

To provide operational funds and leadership, Governor Rosellini, in October 1957, appointed a 56-man statewide board of trustees to the newly formed World Fair Corp., of Washington. This group, which meets periodically to review exposition planning and provide financial counsel and aid, was expanded to a total of 72 members in March 1958. Further additions from throughout the State will bring it to its ultimate composition of 100 members.

PLANNING

The complexity of reducing ideas to blueprints is progressing under a 7-man design standards advisory board, comprised of this area's best architects and planners, working with 2 nationally recognized authorities on design and lanscape architecture. Their activities are closely merged with volunteer planning groups comprised of experts in such diverse fields as sports, engineering, landscaping, financing, science, foreign trade, publicity, State development, and others. Indicative of the broad public interest in your State's 1961 exposition is the fact that approximately 200 experts in their field are donating valuable time in technical and planning activities.

STAFF

The salaried staff of the World Fair Commission includes Ewen C. Dingwall, project director, whose salary costs are shared by the city of Seattle and the State; Clayton Young, coordinating architect, and an assistant, and an office staff of two. Frank Ward, business manager, and Jim Faber, public relations director, are employed by the World Fair Corp. The Stanford Research Institute, whose planning helped make Disneyland a success, has been retained to provide attendance surveys and other technical advice.

CONDEMNATION

Condemnation is proceeding under joint city-State operation with equal distribution of costs. The State has won its initial test case in King County superior court. An appeal will be heard by the State supreme court in June. Appraisal work is on schedule. Careful attention is being given to amount of total land acquisition within original estimates. From 70 to 90 acres will be acquired by city and State. Eighty percent of the site occupied by substandard residences, with more expensive property on fringe. First groundbreaking estimated for early 1959.

TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING

Suggested locations for parking areas away from the crowded downtown business area have been provided. One such area, the Interbay fill area north of the exposition site, could accommodate 6,000 cars. Monorail, Inc., of Houston, Tex., will begin an engineering survey early this summer to determine feasibility of constructing a 6-mile monorail line to link the parking area with the exposition grounds, and thence to downtown Seattle.

COLOMBO CONFERENCE

The example of what a coordinated effort can produce in benefits to the State is illustrated in the successful campaign to bring the 21-nation Colombo Plan Conference to Seattle this October. Governor Rosellini, the Department of Commerce and Economic Development, our congressional delegation, the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, the World Fair Commission, Seattle's Mayor Clinton, and other united forces to make this possible. The 400 participants, who will be from countries we will be hosting in 1961, will be provided tours to Grand Coulee Dam, the Hanford Works, and other State areas.

PARTICIPATION SCIENCE

The world's first space age science fair, representing exhibits from throughout the world will provide the dramatic focal point of the exposition. This section, which will include premiere of International Geophysical Year discoveries, is being planned under outstanding national leadership, including Dr. Dael Wolfle, executive officer, American Association for Advancement of Science; Dr. James Mitchell, associate director, National Science Foundation, and Dr. Leonard Carmichael, secretary, Smithsonian Institution, representing the National Academy of Sciences.

PACIFIC RIM

To provide the drama and pageantry for the exposition and at the same time demonstrate our friendship for our neighbors, other planning includes a colorful Pan-Pacific section, embracing lands from the Orient to the South Seas, and from Latin America to Alaska. These areas include this State's best export customers.

OTHER PHASES

Cultural events. Seattle's new 3,000-seat concert hall, equipped with one of the Nation's largest stages, and its companion multipurpose auditorium will be the setting for international music festivals and art events.

Sports. A 30-man statewide committee is developing a program of international sports events to provide other attractions for the 1961 visitor.

Amusements. The fair fun zone is being planned by the men who made Disneyland a household word for family fun.

State exhibits. Designed to display Washington's recreational and economic advantages. Among exhibits proposed is a forest products building designed to last a century, a huge working model of the Grand Coulee Dam and Columbia Basin irrigation project, and statewide display of tourist attractions.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

The celebration of the university's centennial year in 1961 provides an ideal theme for extensive participation. President Schmitz has named eight science department heads to assist in planning the university's participation in this area. Dr. George Taylor, internationally known head of the university's Far East department also is providing planning aid. Other educational institutions throughout the State will be asked to participate in the science section.

LEGISLATION

Legislation to provide full-scale Federal participation in the 1961 exposition was introduced in the United States House of Representatives March 27 by Congressmen DON MAGNUSON and THOMAS PELLY. Similar legislation was introduced in the Senate April 23 by Senators MAGNUSON and JACKSON. The major piece of legislation creates a Federal Fair Commission and three salaried Fair Commissioners. The Commission is empowered to utilize all Government planning services and exposition exhibit material created under the Department of Commerce; to survey exhibit material at Brussels that can be utilized; and to provide the next session of Congress with detailed recommendations and amounts necessary to be appropriated for full-scale Federal participation, with heavy science emphasis. For purposes of legislation, the exposition has been titled "The World Science-Pan Pacific Exposition."

OTHER FINANCING

The World Fair Commission is confident that the impetus the exposition has gained through enthusiastic efforts of the national science community and through other national factors will provide sufficient finances to create an outstanding international exposition in 1961. These added funds can be drawn from Federal departments, from private foundations, industry, exhibitors, and concessionaires.

Arthur Eugene Wood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished citizen of Mississippi, Dr. Arthur Eugene Wood, a senior member of the faculty of Mississippi College at Clinton, has recently received well-deserved recognition of a lifetime of inspirational teaching of chemistry. Because he has been personally responsible over a period of years for inspiring students in the field of chemistry, Dr. Wood is to receive a $1,000 cash award and a gold medal for being 1 of the 6 outstanding teachers of college chemistry in the United States. This award will be made next month by the Manufacturing Chemists' Association, the major trade organization of American chemical manufacturing companies.

Dr. Wood has played an important role in helping Mississippi College to rank first among the institutions of the Southwestern States in the output of doctors of philosophy in chemistry, and high up the list of all United States institutions in chemical doctor of philosophy turned out.

In 1953, the Florida section of the American Chemical Society paid tribute to Dr. Wood in recognition of his inspirational teaching in chemistry. I am delighted that his great public service as a teacher is to be rewarded again.

Dr. Wood was 1 of 6 outstanding teachers selected this year by a group of distinguished educators and scientists to receive this award from the Manufacturing Chemists' Association. Gen. John E. Hull, United States Army, retired, president of that association, upon announcing the recipients of the 1958 award, said:

Sound teaching is fundamental to the training of our Nation's scientists and engineers of the future. Through this program we seek particularly to honor those working with undergraduate college chemistry stu-

dents; at the same time, however, we wish to call public attention to the essential work of all teachers in the science fields.

I agree with General Hull, and I commend his organization for paying this well-deserved tribute to Dr. Arthur Eugene Wood.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a brief biograph and an editorial from the Jackson State Times May 7, 1958, edition lauding Dr. Wood's noteworthy achievement.

ARTHUR EUGENE WOOD

Born-Twiggs County, Ga., 1886; bachelor of science, Mercer University; master of science, Vanderbilt University; doctor of philosophy, University of Pittsburgh. Teaching service: State Teachers College, Florence, Ala., 5 years; A. & M. College of Texas, 3 years; Mississippi College, 1920. Mississippi College ranks No. 1 in chemistry. Doctor of philosophy among Southwestern States, No. 43, among 719 United States institutions in chemistry doctors of philosophy. Wood's work largely accountable for industry's liberal support of department. In 1953, awarded citation by Florida section American Chemical Society in recognition of lifetime of inspirational teaching of chemistry. During his tenure, Mississippi College has awarded degrees to 495 chemistry majors.

DR. WOOD LIKE BEACON OUT OF NIGHT

At a time when most Americans seem unhappily motivated by desire for material wealth and cheap entertainment, Dr. A. E. Wood, beloved chemistry professor at Mississippi College, shines forth like a beacon out of the night.

His latest honor is all the more evidence of Dr. Wood's fulfillment as a selfless educator who loves his students and the society they serve. Of all the Nation's chemistry teachers, Dr. Wood was 1 of 6 picked for a $1,000 award of the Manufacturing Chemists' Association. And in all the South no other was chosen.

Distinguishing himself, he has distinguished his college and State.

Typical of many in the field of education, Dr. Wood regards his calling properly as one of the finest of mankind. Often he has remarked that he would not swap jobs with someone making three times his salary.

The campus of Mississippi College has known the teaching of Dr. Wood since 1920. Thousands have come to know the atomic weight tables, qualitative analysis charts and all the other wonders of the laboratory from Dr. Wood.

A man whose vision probes beyond the limits of most, Dr. Wood has steered many hundreds of students into scientific careers invaluable to the Nation's economic and military security. Grants and other honors have singled out Mississippi College's service in this respect. They bear witness to the untiring hand of Dr. Wood whose newest acclaim brings joy to thousands the Nation over.

The Fight Over the Defense Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the most persuasive and perceptive editorial that I have read supporting President Eisenhower's proposal to reorganize the Defense Department appeared last Sunday in the Springfield (Mass.) Republican, a newspaper whose views on domestic and world affairs have been held in great esteem by those in and out of public office for generations. The editorial writer certainly is well versed with the problems of the military and he has given profound thought to the reorganization proposals of the President.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD this editorial from the Springfield Republican entitled "The Fight Over the Defense Department":

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Republican of May 11, 1958]

THE FIGHT OVER THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

The hearings on President Eisenhower's plan for the very necessary reorganization of the Department of Defense which have been in progress before the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, have revealed varying emotions. There has been, in fact, altogether too much emotion and too little objective thinking by the committee and the protesting witnesses. One writer, apparently influenced by his previous close association with the Navy, where most of the protest has been concentrated, has made the surprising comment that the hearings have been in accordance with the finest tradition of the House of Representatives. The hearings have certainly been in accordance with a tradition of the House but, unfortunately, the tradition in question is very far from its finest.

There is an extraordinary resemblance between what has recently been going on and what went on in the House of Representatives when Elihu Root, remembered as one of our wiser statesmen, was Secretary of War more than 50 years ago. Then, after the ghastly exposures of incompetent Army functioning and the fatal supply of our troops with embalmed beef in the war with Spain, Root finally succeeded, over the objections of ignorant Congressmen and jealous Army officers, in securing the creation by act of Congress of an Army staff, evolved after much study of the German general staff which, however, it did not too closely copy. If there are members of the present Armed Services Committee and numerous officers of the Navy and the Marine Corps who know too little of what went on then, they might profitably study it now. The story is available in condensed form in Philip C. Jessup's admirable biography of Root. It is available in more detail in Root's official reports as Secretary of War.

The unchallengeable historical value of what Root then accomplished, under conditions basically similar to those with which, although in far more complex and aggravated form, President Eisenhower is now forced to contend in behalf of our national safety, is to be found in a single statement of two sentences, made years after Root's work had been done by a secretary of war of the opposite political party. Reviewing our experience in World War I, Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War under President Wilson, declared that Root's creation of the Army staff was not only his outstanding contribution to the defense of the country, but the outstanding contribution made by any secretary of war from the beginning of history. Without that contribution from him, the participation of the United States in the world war would necessarily have been a confused, ineffective and discreditable episode. Yet it was a contribution which Root had been forced to make, if he was to make it at all, over just such opposition as President Eisenhower and Neil McElroy, our present able Secretary of Defense, are now encountering.

Root's reorganization, dealt, of course, only with the Army and the War Department. There was then no Air Force, no military plane, in existence. The need of amphibious operations with the Navy was less developed, by the art of war as it was then, than today. The weapons available for making war were less varied, less numerous and far less destructive. It has been estimated that in recent years their number has increased from 250 to over 1,500. Even such a numerical comparison is hardly to be relied on. Yet it reflects something of the complexity of modern warfare and the necessity of unified command if, for the safety of the Nation, the right weapons are to be employed at the right moment, and by whatever segment of the armed services can employ them most effectively at the moment.

What Root went through is indicated by what he wrote to General Otis. "The bill," Root told Otis, "has been frightfully carved up already and I do not know that I shall be able to recognize it when it comes out of Congress." In more detail Root wrote to General Wood:

"I suppose we will have some Army legislation within a few weeks but no one can tell yet what it is going to be. The Senate committee has reported pretty nearly the bill that I sent to them. The House has cut out all the good things that they understood, and put in all the bad things they could think of. Whether in the result the Lord will protect the right, or the Devil take the hindmost I cannot tell."

In spite of all that Chairman VINSON, of the House committee, has had to say against copying the German general staff system, which he perhaps does not fully understand, the fact is established that Root benefited in a large degree from study of that system. The outstanding analyst of the German general staff was Spenser Wilkinson, the distinguished English military critic who afterwards became the Chichele professor of military history at Oxford University and who, around the turn of the century, occasionally contributed valuable letters on military and other topics to this newspaper.

Looking back on our experience in World War I, just as Newton Baker did, Root wrote to Professor Wilkinson in 1919:

"Plainly it would have been impossible, both for England and for America, to play the roles they had in saving us all from German domination but for the existence of general staffs whose business it was to plan and think and secure information. I do not forget, although I dare say a great many people do, what a great part your little book, The Brain of an Army, played in bringing it to pass that both countries had some sort of an institution of that kind already in existence when the sudden emergency came."

If neither Mr. VINSON nor his reportedly enslaved committee colleagues have studied Root's reports and The Brain of an Army they should. They would find in The Brain of an Army a letter from Field Marshal von Moltke himself, the famous creator of the German staff with which he won the war of 1866 against Austria and the war of 1870 against France. In this letter, printed in the second edition of The Brain of an Army, Moltke expressed the opinion that the German staff system might not be suitable to the constitution of other nations, an opinion in which Professor Wilkinson concurred, although Wilkinson argued strongly for a powerful chief of staff.

So Mr. VINSON and his colleagues might finally be convinced that when they talk about President Eisenhower's trying to "Prussianize" the Defense Department they are talking nonsense. Yet they would find that the essence of efficient and economical national defense on which Wilkinson insisted, as Eisenhower and McElroy are insisting today, under far more dangerous and therefore

more imperative conditions, is the avoidance of wasteful confusion by the clear allocation of different functions; the unified command which is made possible only by the quick, streamlined passage of orders from one level to another; and above all, the unified, strategic planning by which alone the enormous sums we spend on national defense can be used with the highest possible effectiveness.

After careful study of the President's plan as set forth in the bill introduced by Representative MARTIN, the wise conclusion seems to be this: The bill, now wholeheartedly supported by the powerful Democratic chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Representative CANNON, of Missouri, represents the very minimum needed to bring order into the Department of Defense and to bring security to all of us who together make a free Nation.

A Globe Guide to the Nation's Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives, a series of articles which appeared in the Boston Globe entitled "A Globe Guide to the Nation's Capital."

It is a most interesting series and I am sure will be of great aid to Members of Congress in describing for the visitors from their home districts the many places of historical interest in the city of Washington.

The author is my very good friend, John G. Harris, who is now the political editor of the Boston Globe. John has covered for that newspaper practically every major political story—local, State, and national—over the last quarter century. For years, during national campaigns, he has traveled the country with Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, and Dwight D. Eisenhower, as well as with candidates Dewey, Stevenson, and Nixon.

Born March 7, 1908, the son of George and Mary Winifred (Casey), John was graduated from the Boston Public Latin School and from Harvard College. While at Harvard, he earned his tuition working nights in the Globe sports department, and after graduation continued with the Globe as a staff reporter while studying law. Fortunately for the newspaper, he decided to stick to reporting.

I had the pleasure of first meeting John when I was in the Massachusetts State Legislature and he was assigned as the Globe's statehouse reporter. We have had a long and enduring friendship throughout the years I served as a State representative and as speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives. When I was elected to the Congress of the United States in 1952, John was then serving as the Globe's Washington correspondent.

I hold John in very high regard as a newspaperman of great ability, a fine husband and father, and as a valued and trusted friend. I am more than happy to be able to share with you the following articles which he has written:

1. PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE—THE MAIN STREET OF AMERICA

WASHINGTON.—By bus, by auto, by train and plane, in large groups with teachers, in small family parties, young America will fill the hotels and motels, these coming weeks, to look for history made and in the making in Washington, a city which is in itself a mamouth museum.

If I could walk around the city with you, as I should love to, here are some of the things we should see.

The White House, most famous dwelling in the land, where has lived every President since John Adams, with Abigail, was the first to move in. The city where George Washington, in his masonic apron, laid the cornerstone of the House of Congress. Where Lincoln, wearing his shawl, paced the streets. And where John Wilkes Booth aimed his pistol.

But, first, let us look at the way our Capital was laid out, a city planned as no other city in the world.

It is, indeed, a planned city, a sort of grid of streets placed over bisecting diagonals. The diagonals are the spacious, main thoroughfares, avenues proudly named after the various States. At most of the intersections there are parks and circles and in these are statues and memorials to famous Americans.

Capitol Street, running north-south and east-west, divides the city into four zones, northeast, northwest, southeast, and southwest. When Washingtonians refer to Washington they usually mean the northwest section, northward of the Mall, and out toward Rock Creek where the foreign embassies are located, that a visitor spends most of his time.

Major L'Enfant, who came from France with Lafayette and became George Washington's chief engineer, designed the plan. You can still see it at the Congressional Library. L'Enfant, and other leaders of his day, believed the new Federal city would grow to the eastward and that is why the front of the Capitol, where inaugurations are held, faces to the east.

Instead, the new city grew to the westward—now the northwest section. Men like Robert Morris, financier of the Revolution, who invested in land to the eastward lost their fortunes.

Take another look, and you will observe that the principal buildings and memorials are located in such a fashion they form a cross. At the intersection is the Washington Monument. At the bottom is the Capitol on the Hill, and at the top is the Lincoln Memorial beside the Potomac. (Beyond the latter now, in a direct line, is the Iwo Jima memorial on the opposite side of the river.)

On the north arm of the cross is the White House. On the south arm, beside the Tidal Basin—a breathtaking sight when the cherry trees surrounding it are in bloom—is the Jefferson Memorial.

Massachusetts Avenue, center of fashion in the northwest zone, is the Capital's longest thoroughfare, running clear across the District and even beyond.

Pennsylvania Avenue, though, is the Capital's most famous street. It is usually the place a visitor begins his tour. The mile and a half section between the Capitol and the White House, whose locations were suggested to L'Enfant by Thomas Jefferson, is considered the Main Street of America. Jefferson called it America's Appian Way.

Jefferson was being visionary. Today it is a boulevard of splendor, flanked by monumental Government buildings, especially along the south side, which is called the Federal Triangle. In Jefferson's day it was mostly a marshland. There was a path through it that George Washington often traveled, and Jefferson, when he was President, planted some poplars.

But it was often called a quagmire, especially after heavy rains. We have the tale how Daniel Webster's carriage became mired in it, and he was carried piggyback by his coachman to the sidewalk. Paving was still meager in Lincoln's day. Now it is the avenue of heroes and statesmen, the Nation's route of triumph.

The Treasury Building interrupts the direct view from the White House to the Capitol. Blame that on Andy Jackson. After he had won his great struggle with Biddle and smashed Biddle's bank, Jackson needed a treasury. "Put it there where I can keep my eye on it," directed Jackson, looking out a White House window.

The view from the Treasury Building to the Capitol is uninterrupted and is among Washington's most famous views. Along this route have moved the inaugural parades, some led by Presidents on foot, some on horseback (Andy Jackson rode that way), some in carriages (Lincoln insisted upon an open carriage despite the risk to his life), and later some in automobiles.

Along this avenue have moved the victory parades after each of our wars, save the first.

Here our Nation's heroes have been welcomed.

Here all its greatest statesmen have rode and walked.

There is no more thrilling sight than to look along the avenue toward the great dome of the Capitol, crowned with the statue of Columbia. At night it blazes with illumination, a gleaming jewel. It is the symbol of a free nation and of freemen's faith in their institutions. For Columbia was placed aloft in 1863 when the Nation was in the midst of the Civil War.

Roughly midway along this stretch is the beautiful Archives building. Here are now housed the birth records of our Nation—the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

This avenue has many tales to tell. Most striking and poignant of these is one that reminds us that the Presidency of our Republic is not alone a position of power such as no other constitutional office in all history has ever wielded. It can also be a position of danger.

At both ends of this avenue attempts were made on the lives of Presidents. Right on the steps of the Capitol, an insane man, in the first assassination attempt in our history, fired upon Andy Jackson in 1835, but missed. And just a few years ago, in 1950, when President Truman was living in the Blair House across the street from the White House, which was being renovated, assassins tried to gain entrance. A plaque there tells how a White House guard was killed.

Just off the avenue, two of our Presidents were mortally wounded. Look up 10th Street from Pennsylvania Avenue and you can see the red-brick front of Ford's Theater where Lincoln was shot. And at Sixth Street, where the National Gallery of Art is now located, there was once a railroad station. There, while waiting to entrain for Massachusetts to deliver a speech at Williams College, Garfield was shot in the back.

2. WHY IT IS CALLED THE WHITE HOUSE

Visitors (10 a. m. to noon, Tuesday through Saturday) form long lines outside the White House grounds. No tickets are needed. White House guides show visitors through what are known as the public rooms on the lobby and ground floors.

Rooms on the second floor comprise the living quarters of the Presidential family and are not open to the public. In one of these second-floor rooms is the best-known piece of White House furniture, the Lincoln bed, with its spread crocheted by Mrs. Calvin Coolidge.

Inside and out the White House is gleaming and stately. It has been so closely connected with this Nation's destiny that in

walking through it you cannot fail to feel both thrilled and awed.

On the first floor a visitor sees the magnificent reception rooms, the Green Room; the elliptical Blue Room, opening on the semi-circular south porch; the Red Room, the State Dining Room, and the long corridor leading to the East Room.

Downstairs, on the ground floor, may be seen the oval diplomatic room leading to the rose garden and F. D.'s swimming pool. Most exciting for the women visitors is the China Room with dinner ware from administration all the way back to the first White House mistress, Abigail Adams. Everywhere are presidential portraits and gifts from foreign rulers.

The East Room, a huge ballroom, has been the setting for brilliant, gay receptions and moments of national bereavement. William Henry Harrison, first President to die in office, lay in state here. So did Lincoln. Deranged by grief, Mary Todd Lincoln, saddest of White House occupants, did not leave her upstairs room for five weeks—not even to attend her martyred husband's funeral.

James Hoban, an Irishman (he got a $500 prize), designed the White House and George Washington laid the cornerstone. It was the new capital's first public building. There is a wistful tale that shortly before his death George, accompanied only by Martha, visited the still unfinished White House. When Abigail Adams moved in, it was still unfinished, and she used the East Room to dry her laundry.

Hoban rebuilt the White House after it was burned by the British in the War of 1812. He had the burned exterior walls painted white, and hence the name. Before fleeing, Dolly Madison, the White House's most famous hostess, saved china, silver, and the portrait of Washington still to be seen in the East Room. She had this painting cut from the frame.

Many changes have been made in the original building. Andrew Jackson added the square portico at what is now the front entrance and the south portico to which Harry Truman later added a balcony. Teddy Roosevelt added the executive wings, following a plan of Jefferson's. Coolidge raised the roof and added a third floor. Franklin Roosevelt added an underground bomb shelter.

Biggest remodeling was under Truman. The entire interior (all but the shell) was redone at a cost exceeding $5 million. By this time the public so loved the building no one complained. Quite a contrast with the early days, for when John Quincy Adams spent only $36 of Government funds for a White House mirror, there was such a hue and cry about extravagance, he decided to pay for it himself.

---

3. Famous People of Lafayette Square

Lafayette Square, Washington's most famous park, is located directly across Pennsylvania Avenue from the White House grounds. George Washington gave it its name.

In the center is the first equestrian statue in this country, and it was made from captured cannon. Andy Jackson, his military hat held high, rides a charger as the hero of the Battle of New Orleans. Replicas of this statue stand at the site of Jackson's victory and on the statehouse grounds in Nashville, Tenn., a few miles from the Hermitage.

At each corner of the park are memorials to foreign patriots who helped at the birth of this Nation—Rochambeau, Von Steuben, Kosciuszko, and Lafayette.

Time is slowly eroding the charm of this square. For its attraction has been the private homes and the tales of famous people who have lived around the square. These homes are being steadily replaced by Government buildings, and the old houses, once centers of high social life, are disappearing.

At the close of the War of 1812, St. John's Church—cream-colored stucco—was erected on the north side of the square. This church, looking like a Greek temple, is known as the Church of the Presidents. There is a presidential pew and all Presidents since Madison have visited or worshiped there.

The site of the Hay-Adams Hotel was once occupied by the homes of John Hay, personal secretary and biographer of Lincoln, and by Henry Adams, Yankee author, descendant of Presidents, friend of many Presidents. On the corner, where now stands the National Chamber of Commerce, was the home of Daniel Webster.

Drop into the Chamber of Commerce building and you may see the desk Divine Daniel used when Secretary of State. Webster's house was a gift from admirers. Here he loved to feast, for to Webster a splendid meal was the "climax of civilization." And here Henry Clay, on a stormy night, came and made the deal with Webster which postponed the Civil War for a decade.

Clay lived at the opposite corner in what is known as the Decatur House. Commodore Decatur, naval hero, left a gay party there one night without telling his wife and fought a duel. He returned mortally wounded and Mrs. Decatur fainted dead away in the arms of Dolly Madison. Dolly, arbiter of Washington society for years, lived on the square.

Her house was later the Cosmos Club, a scientific and social club, now displaced by the National Science Foundation. At times Mrs. Madison's funds were so low that she pawned her silver. Webster's servant used to bring her gifts of food. Next to her house, still standing, is a house where Clay also lived. He won it at cards. Here, too, lived Secretary of State Seward, who was stabbed there by a conspirator the same night Lincoln was shot.

On the site of the adjoining USO (Belasco) Theater was once the home of Mark Hanna, the first national political boss. Here he held his famous corned-beef hash breakfasts and maneuvered national policy. There was a club here earlier, and General Sickles, then a Congressman, saw something from the club window that led to a tragedy.

Sickles' home was on the opposite side of the square. From one of its windows Sickles saw his wife signal to her lover, the son of the author of the Star-Spangled Banner. Sickles marched out of the club and shot and killed Key beneath trees still standing in the park. Sickles, later a hero at Antietam and Gettysburg, won the Congressional Medal of Honor.

---

4. The Capitol, Heart of the Nation

Washington, with its southern background, is a metropolis of courtliness and etiquette. So it is part of the code of courtesy for those about to visit the Capitol to go first to the offices of their Senators and Congressmen to obtain passes to the House and Senate galleries.

Courtesy also has advantages.

You may travel on the toy-like underground subway to the Senate office buildings. You get to see the places our lawmakers have their offices and the big, ornate chambers in which they have held famous public hearings, often TV'd to the Nation.

By walking along New Jersey Avenue between the old and new House Office Buildings, you can cover ground that shatters a myth. According to an old tale, Thomas Jefferson, first President to be inaugurated at the new Capitol, rode up alone on horseback and hitched his horse to a post.

Actually Jefferson was living in Mrs. Conrad's boarding house near the site of the present Congressional Hotel. He walked to the Capitol that first inauguration day accompanied by friends, by partisans waving banners, bands playing and walking into the old Senate Chamber to be sworn in by the great Chief Justice John Marshal.

The plaza in front of the east side of the Capitol, sunshine or storm, has been used for Presidential inaugurations since 1817. Henry Clay, then Speaker, feared the House Chamber could not safely accommodate a throng. The Capitol had been burned at the same time the British set fire to the White House. Sketches of that day show Monroe being sworn in with ruins of the Capitol in the background.

Most Capitol tours begin as one enters the rotunda where experienced guides are available to groups at a small fee.

It is breathtaking to throw your head back and glance up to the dome, 180 feet from the marble floor to the canopy with Brumidi's masterpiece, the circular painting of the Apotheosis of Washington.

Brumidi, who had done frescoes in the Vatican and European palaces, spent many years of his life adorning the walls and ceilings of the Capitol. While painting the frieze of the rotunda he suffered an accident that led to his death. The murals here of another artist, John Trumbull, are most celebrated because the likenesses of the Founding Fathers—Franklin, Washington, Jefferson, others—were made from life.

Statuary Hall, to the south, was originally the House of Representatives. Here ex-President John Quincy Adams, who served for years as a Congressman, was fatally stricken and died in the adjoining clerk's office.

Each State is entitled to send two statues. All cannot fit in this hall. Sam Adams is there, but the other from Massachusetts, John Winthrop's, is on the floor below.

Beyond this hall is the House of Representatives.

Going southward from the rotunda you come first to the old Supreme Court chamber, originally (until 1895) the Senate Chamber.

It was here that Webster delivered his famous reply to Hayne, "Liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable." Beyond is the modern Senate Chamber, roguishly known to some as the Cave of the Winds.

Throughout the building are murals, paintings, statues associated with our history and the Congress. Vice Presidents are all shown because they presided over the Senate, not because some of them became President. Do not miss seeing the cloak rooms, the lobbies, the ornate Presidential Room and the ceremonial room for the Vice President, where a now forgotten Vice President from Massachusetts, named Wilson, was fatally stricken.

At the lowest level beneath the rotunda you may see a crypt which was intended as the last resting place for George Washington. But he was placed in a crypt at Mount Vernon.

Instead, now a visitor can see a catafalque with black drape on which martyred Presidents and national heroes, including Lincoln, have laid in state in the rotunda.

---

5. Supreme Court's Marble Temple

The statue of our greatest Chief Justice, John Marshall, is on the west terrace of the Capitol, facing the Washington Monument, and quite a walk from the resplendent white Vermont marble temple which is now the abode of the Supreme Court.

Marshall, Chief Justice for more than 3 decades, foresaw the powerful role of the Court as guardian and interpreter of the Constitution.

It was he who asserted the Court's coequal rank with the executive and legislative branches of our Government, and its authority to rule acts of Congress or President unconstitutional.

It was not until 1935 that the Supreme Court moved into its present quarters across the plaza from the Capitol. This $10 million structure, with its own terraces, gardens, statuary and Corinthian columns like those

of the Capitol, at last provided a setting suitable to the majesty of our supreme bench.

Quite a change from the earlier days.

Marshall was Thomas Jefferson's cousin, but Jefferson had little regard for him, called him a "Federal bulldog." When Marshall, in the *Marbury* v. *Madison* decision, asserted the Court's right to rule a Federal statute unconstitutional, Jefferson expressed the dread that the Constitution had become mere "wax in the hands of the judiciary."

Andy Jackson's angry retort to one of Marshall's rulings was:

"John Marshall has made his decision. Now let him enforce it!"

The marble exterior gleams so brilliantly in the full sunlight a visitor is well-advised to wear sun glasses. But do not let these hinder you when studying the pediment over the main entrance. It is quite unusual.

It looks, with its classical figures, like most other pediments. But on this one the faces of the statues bear famous likenesses.

The three figures on the left, reading left to right, bear the likenesses of Chief Justice (ex-President) William Howard Taft, Secretary of State Elihu Root, and Cass Gilbert, architect of the building.

The three on the right end, reading left to right, are Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, Robert Aiken, the pediment's sculptor, and John Marshall as a boy. (A little Alfred Hitchcock touch?)

As you enter, observe the panels on the bronze door which mark great moments in the development of law, the Justinian Code, Magna Carta, Westminster Statute, and, in the upper right panel there is Marshall delivering the *Marbury* v. *Madison* opinion.

The Supreme Court room is at the end of the spacious main corridor. It is so awesome a room, with its beautifully veined marbles, high ceiling of classic design, columns, draperies, one feels as though he has entered a cathedral.

The guards caution: "Quiet."

The Justices, each in a chair to his own liking, sit in a single row. Despite the grandeur, the acoustics are far from perfect.

Elsewhere in the templelike structure are the private offices of the Justices, their conference chambers, studies, libraries, and rooms for the many clerks and attendants.

These are open to the public only by appointment. But you can ask to be shown the delightful spiraling marble staircase.

While in the vicinity of the Supreme Court, walk one block along East Capitol Street to the white marble Folger Shakespeare Library. Here, inspired by Ralph Waldo Emerson, is one of the greatest Shakespearean collections in the world. You will delight in sitting in a theater which faithfully reproduces a London theater of Shakespeare's day.

---

6. Four Hundred Miles of Library Shelves

The Congressional Library, a palatial Italian Renaissance building across the plaza from the Capitol and on the same street as the Supreme Court, is today just about the largest library in the world. It has 400 miles of shelves and a collection of more than 11 million books.

Its beginnings in 1800, though, were quite humble. Then it occupied but a single room in the new Capitol. When the British invaders, who entered Washington by Maryland Avenue alongside the Supreme Court site, set fire to the Capitol and the White House, the library went up in flames.

Thomas Jefferson's financial difficulties gave the Library a new start. The liberality with which Jefferson entertained guests both at the White House and Monticello dissipated his great fortune.

Faced with bankruptcy, the sage of Monticello parted with his beloved library and it was purchased by Congress.

By the time the Library was moved into its present building in 1897 it was already considered among the greatest collections in world history.

Through purchase and gift it acquired the papers of most of our Presidents and statesmen.

It has 95 percent of all extant papers of George Washington.

These and other rare Americana can be seen in the rare-book division along with illuminated medieval manuscripts, thousands of books printed before 1500, a Gutenberg Bible printed on vellum, early documents, papers, and broadsides telling firsthand the history of this Nation. There are Lincoln's first two drafts of the Gettysburg Address.

As you approach the building observe the fountain at the foot of the main staircase. It is called Neptune's Court with its nymphs and seahorses.

Pick out the granite busts of Emerson, Hawthorne and Franklin among those on the facade. Observe the many carved heads over the windows which represent all the races of man.

The central stair hall inside the vestibule and the many-sided reading room in the rotunda beneath the great dome have been called the building's foremost architectural attraction. The former, with double staircases, arcades, statuary, paintings, ornamentation lavishly done, has been likened to a vision in polished stone.

Since this is basically a library to serve Congress, and in it is a vast legislative research division and reading rooms for both House and Senate, it is curious to find among the murals in the reading room lobby one whose subject is Corrupt Legislation. Beside the figure of the briber is a strongbox filled with coins.

The reading room, surrounded with galleries of stacks, is quite a marvel.

Despite the enromous size of the collection, books requested at the central desk seem to arrive with incredible speed.

The public and scholars are welcome to use the Library but material can only be taken out by Congressmen, Government officials, and the White House.

The Library, under the copyright laws, receives two copies of every book published in this country. Not all these are retained. There simply isn't room despite the big annex built at the rear of the Library in 1939.

Copies of all newspapers are sent to the Library and there are files for these.

There are many special collections. The largest music collection in America is in the Library. Its periodical collection and map collection are unsurpassed.

And if you think visitors to the reading room can get material fast, this is nothing compared to the speed of service for Congressmen. How is that accomplished? By an underground transmission tunnel that runs under the plaza over to the Capitol.

---

7. Car Ride Cost Mellon $15-Million Gallery

As one walks along the Mall, going from the Capitol toward the Washington Monument, on the right is one of the largest marble buildings in the world, a building preeminent for its beauty in a city literally abounding with magnificent structures. This is the National Gallery of Art.

The gallery's collection, valued in the hundreds of millions of dollars, ranks with those of the great treasure temples of Europe and often it is called the Louvre of the Western Hemisphere.

How it came to be built of pink-white marble, making it an architectural gem, is itself fascinating.

The story has to do with the American multimillionaire Andrew W. Mellon, who gave the gallery to the Nation, and with the most spectacular art salesman in all history, Lord Duveen.

Duveen, a fabulous collector, for years sold immortality to American millionaires in the form of the paintings and sculpture of the old masters.

On one occasion Mellon paid Duveen $21 million for art objects Duveen conveniently assembled in an apartment near Mellon's home at Dupont Circle, just north of the White House.

It originally was Duveen's dream to house these and other treasures he had sold Mellon in a national art gallery.

The plans went ahead secretly, with Duveen engaging Architect John Russell Pope. Mellon originally wanted a limestone building. As Secretary of the Treasury under three Presidents, Mellon had practically rebuilt Washington with one limestone structure after another.

But limestone was not good enough for Duveen.

One day he got Mellon to take a ride with him around the city. Duveen kept pointing to limestone buildings, many of them Mellon's projects, and noted how the stone had become stained and looked shabby.

Finally Mellon asked how much it would cost to build the gallery of marble. He was told an extra $5 million. Mellon agreed.

When, getting out of the automobile, Duveen mentioned what a splendid trip it had been, Mellon remarked, "Yes; but it has been the most expensive ride of my life."

None of the gallery's creators saw it completed.

Mellon and Pope died 2 months after the construction started.

Duveen died in 1939.

In 1941, on behalf of the Nation, President Franklin D. Roosevelt accepted the building at the dedication.

Mellon, in giving his own $50 million collection as well as the $15 million for the building, expressed the hope others would also make gifts.

That hope has been lavishly fulfilled

Samuel H. Kress (Duveen, on one occasion alone, sold Kress $20 million worth of paintings), Joseph E. Widener, Chester Dale, Lessing J. Rosenwald, and many others, have made seemingly priceless contributions.

Each year brings more treasures (there were 650 gifts last year), making this a matchless gallery in less than 2 decades.

Everything about the building is spacious and beautiful—the central rotunda with its dark-green Italian marble pillars, Bologna's Mercury on the rotunda fountain, the two garden courts with their fountains, greenery, and flowers, and concerts, too; the statuary and parade of masterpieces in one gallery after another.

All the masters are represented. In gallery 8 is Raphael's Alba Madonna for which Mellon paid $1.1 million, highest price ever paid for a single canvas.

In that gallery, too, are Raphael's St. George and the Dragon (Mellon paid $840,000) and the Earl of Cowper Madonna ($836,000). There are Titians, Van Dycks, Giorgiones, El Grecos, Rembrandts galore. Look for Raphael's Portrait of a Young Man. It's so lifelike you know at once you're looking at the work of a master.

Dictatorships have contributed, strangely, to the building of this artistic treasure trove.

The Soviets in need of cash in the early depression 1930's, sold famous art works from the Hermitage (winter palace) collection started by Catherine the Great. The Alba Madonna came from there.

And Hitler, spurning Italian art, permitted it to leave Nazi Germany. Art-wise Duveen snapped it up.

---

8. Smithsonian Institution, Gift From Briton

The shadowy figure of James Smithson is among the most curious things about the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

strange-looking, red sandstone, nine-towered, Romanesque structure on the Mall, the Smithsonian Institution, which has been a landmark and magnet for tourists since it was erected in 1852.

Smithson, an Englishman who never saw America, believed himself to be the son of the proud Duke of Northumberland. That would make him the half-brother of haughty Earl Percy, who, riding a traditional white horse which drew the heavy fire of the minutemen, led British reinforcements to the battle of Lexington and Concord.

Smithson, who used many names in his life, finally settled on the family name of the Northumberlands. A shy man, he exiled himself to Italy and devoted himself to science.

When the Royal Society of London declined to publish one of his scientific papers, Smithson left his then immense fortune to the United States, saying his name would live when the titles of the Northumberlands and the Percys are extinct and forgotten.

The Smithsonian Institution, with the main 1852 structure now chiefly an administration building, embraces a complex of enterprises.

Just behind it on the Mall are three of these—the odd-looking Arts and Industries Building, packed to overflowing with Americana; the Aircraft Building with its planes displaying the history of flight; the Freer Gallery with gems of oriental art and the incredibly beautiful Peacock Room the artist Whistler created for a London residence.

Directly across the Mall is the massive, white granite, four-storied Natural History Building, an especial lure to youngsters, with its dinosaurs and meteorites, lifelike exhibits of American Indians and primitive peoples, totem poles, animals shot by Teddy Roosevelt on safari, American art, precious stones, California's first gold nugget and an old apothecary shop.

Many other attractions come under the Institution, which sends out exploring expeditions and is a world exchange for research.

Out in Rock Creek is the Institution's National Zoological Park, which grew from the desire to save the American bison from extinction. Today it is among the world's greatest zoos. It has acquired two white rhinoceros never before seen in this country.

Biggest attraction, though, is the Arts and Industrial Building, first used for Garfield's inaugural ball. It is so packed with items relating to our history it is often called the Nation's Attic.

Here one finds the plane flown at Kitty Hawk by the Wright brothers, Lindbergh's plane, The Spirit of St. Louis.

Here are the tattered flag that inspired Francis Scott Key to write The Star-Spangled Banner, the field equipment and uniform of George Washington, Lincoln's death mask, the table at which Jefferson penned drafts of the Declaration of Independence, a display of the inaugural gowns of all the wives of our Presidents.

All sorts of historic devices, Whitney's cotton gin, Howe's sewing machine, early coaches, locomotives, first automobiles, Bell's telephone, Morse's telegraph, the first typewriter, Franklin's printing press, the Nation's stamp and coin collection. Exhibitions by the thousands until the eyes and feet weary.

Indeed, there is so much, the Institution is about to build a new, most modern, vast Museum of History and Technology located between 12th and 14th Streets, next on the Mall to the National History Building. And, just think, all this collecting started only a century ago as a result of the Institution's scientific field trips and exploration of a railroad route to the Pacific undertaken for the War Department.

While in this area, plan to visit the National Archives Building, an impressive structure with four Corinthian facades conceived by the same architect who devised the National Art Gallery, John Russell Pope. It is along the Mall near the apex of the Federal Triangle.

Here, among our priceless documents are the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, which, for safety, are lowered each night into a 50-ton underground safe.

9. Washington Monument Setbacks

The noble, white-marble shaft of the Washington Monument, rising abruptly from the Mall to a height exceeding 555 feet, today dominates the entire Washington landscape and bespeaks our national veneration for a patriot "first in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his countrymen."

Few might imagine that tragedy and discord could ever have been linked with this greatest obelisk in the world. Yet they were.

On July 4, 1850, a gala celebration was held at the monument, then barely begun. President Zachary Taylor, "Old Rough and Ready," only 16 months in office, was there for the occasion and some took it as a hint the 65-year-old hero would seek another term to try to stop the North and South from rushing into civil war.

It was a fiercely hot day. The orator, George Washington Parke Custis, then 69, adopted son of George Washington, went on at great length. Taylor, to quench his thirst, took long draughts of ice water. When he got back to the White House he nibbled cherries, drank more ice water and iced milk, all against doctor's orders.

That night he took ill. Five days later he died in a fever.

The discord, a blend of intensifying hard feelings between North and South and of bitterness produced by the Know-Nothing movement (a sort of Ku Klux Klan of its day), brought a halt to construction in 1855 and it was not resumed for a quarter of a century.

The marble, though taken from the same Maryland quarry, weathered differently and that is why the monument above and below the 153-foot height, is of different shades.

A monument to Washington had been discussed even during the Revolution. The Continental Congress, in 1783, talked about one and Washington himself is said to have favored the present site.

But nothing was done until the Washington National Monument Society was formed in 1833 and solicited public contributions.

Robert Mills, who designed the Treasury Building for Andy Jackson, conceived the plan to have an obelisk. Fortunately his further plan to have a sort of circular, colonnade pantheon at the base with horse-drawn chariots and statues was abandoned when the cornerstone was laid July 4, 1848. Dolly Madison, at 81 years a chief fund-raiser, and Alexander Hamilton's widow, who lived to 97, attended.

When construction was resumed in 1880, the Army engineers were placed in charge and public funds were used.

In 1884 the capstone was put in place on top of which are the words "Laus Deo" (Praise to God).

A new dedication was held in 1885.

The orator was the Bostonian Robert C. Winthrop, one time Speaker of the National House, who had also been the orator at the laying of the cornerstone. He was Daniel Webster's pupil.

One of the glories of the monument is the way it reflects the color moods of the sky, sunrises, sunsets, moonlight, and storms.

You may ride up the monument in an elevator or walk the 900 steps and thus better observe the inscribed, worldwide gifts of stones built inside the shaft.

The view at the top, from all four sides, is awesome.

George Washington never lived in Washington. Indeed though it was named after him, he always called it the Federal City. Still he knew it well, owned lots, laid the cornerstones of the White House and Capitol.

There's a quaint tavern in Georgetown (3049 M St.) where Washington, Jefferson, and L'Enfant chewed over plans for the Capital City.

Historic Alexandria, 6 miles south and once a rival port to Boston, was often visited by Washington. You can see his pew there in Christ Church, where he was a vestryman, and see the memorial built to him by the Masonic lodge of which he was worshipful master.

But to feel the presence of Washington you must travel 16 miles south of the Capital, along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway, to the colonial mansion and estate the Mount Vernon Ladies Association started restoring just a century ago.

There you see the grounds, the dwelling and belongings as they were when Washington lived there.

And at the foot of a sloping hill, beside the Potomac, is the vault in which George and Martha were buried.

10. Two Other Lincoln Memorials

Abraham Lincoln, bidding a sad farewell to his neighbors in Springfield, Ill., as he started for Washington to be sworn in as President, told them he did not know "whether ever I may return." He never did, for Washington, focal point of the Civil War's agony, was to be the city of his martyrdom.

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt once said that if ever a ghost walked the White House it was Lincoln's.

The tall, gaunt, dark-haired man, prone in public to tell jokes to protect his sanity, used to pace his office on the second floor of the White House and glance across the Potomac to the rebellious Virginia shore as he, alone, pondered ways to save our Republic.

Almost daily, often late at night, he would walk along the long corridor, tramp down the westside staircase now no longer there, and out across the open grounds to what is now the Passport Office Building on 17th Street. It was then the War Department.

There he pored over messages from the front. There he wrote the compassionate letter to Mrs. Bixby whose five sons were lost in battle.

Now beside the Potomac, encircled by the Capital and the Virginia hills is the Nation's shrine to the martyred President, the Lincoln Memorial. To millions of visitors, coming in an endless stream, a pause here is an emotional experience. The eyes of many fill freely with tears, remembering Lincoln's greatness, his humility, his sacrifice.

"In this temple as in the hearts of people for whom he saved the Union, the memory of Abraham Lincoln is enshrined forever."

Such is the perfect tribute.

The white marble structure, designed by Henry Bacon, was started on Lincoln's birthday, 1914. Eight years later, on Memorial Day, 1922, it was dedicated and opened to the public. Its Doric colonade, one column for each State in the Union in Lincoln's day, resembles the finest temple of ancient Athens, the Parthenon.

The name of Massachusetts, among those of all the 48 States, is over the center of the entrance to the inner chamber.

Dominating this sanctuary is the colossal, 19-foot-high, seated statue of Lincoln that Daniel Chester French, a Bay State artist, carved from white Georgia marble. It represents Lincoln as war President and is the glory of the memorial.

There are two smaller chambers separated by rows of Ionic columns. Carved in stone in the south chamber is the high resolve of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. In the north chamber, likewise carved in stone, is Lincoln's immortal second inaugural address, "With

malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right."

This exquisite building, with its graceful surroundings, vistas, and reflecting pool is not the only memorial in Washington associated with memories of Lincoln.

There is the cottage on the grounds of the Soldiers' Home, out North Capitol Street way, where President Lincoln summered. Here he wrote the first draft of the Emancipation Proclamation.

Northwest from here, on 13th Street, is Fort Stevens. When Confederate Gen. Jubal Early threatened to take the capital Lincoln, deeply worried, rushed out to watch the fighting.

He stood there, his tall figure a fine target, until a young officer yelled, "Get down, you fool."

The advice came from Lt. Col. Oliver Wendell Holmes just as a bullet whizzed by and killed a surgeon 2 feet away from Lincoln.

The night before he was assassinated Lincoln had a dream of people mourning over him in the East Room. Ford's Theater, where he was shot on Good Friday, April 14, 1865, is now a museum on 10th Street. You can trace Booth's footsteps and see the derringer he used.

Across the street is Petersen House and the incredibly small bed in which Lincoln died.

---

11. LEE'S MANSION, CIVIL WAR HOSPITAL

Robert E. Lee, a West Pointer, a hero of the Mexican War, must have recognized that if he joined the Confederacy that one of the first places to be seized by the North would be his magnificent family home, Arlington House, and its more than 1,000 surrounding acres now the Arlington National Cemetery.

Yet Lee's sense of duty forced him to say "No" to Lincoln's request that he take command of the Northern troops.

Lincoln's go-between was Francis P. Blair, then 70. Blair, who had been a member of the "kitchen cabinet" of Andy Jackson, summoned Lee on a spring morning, April 18, 1861, to the small front study in Blair House, just across from the White House. After all, old General Scott had figured Lee in command would be worth 50,000 soldiers.

Blair was the right man to make the attempt. His granddaughter had married the cousin and boyhood chum of Lee, a naval officer who would remain devoted to the Union and later head the successful blockade of the Confederacy. And it was Jackson who had secured Lee's appointment to West Point, honoring the son of the Revolutionary hero "Light Horse Harry" Lee.

But Lee's mind was made up.

He later wrote how he declined Blair's offer from Lincoln. "Though opposed to secession and deprecating war," Lee added, "I could take no part in the invasion of the southern States."

Events moved fast.

Lee recrossed the Potomac to Arlington House and wrote his resignation as a Federal cavalry colonel. Three days later he went off to Richmond and became Confederate commander-in-chief in Virginia.

His wife, Mary Custis, great granddaughter of Martha Washington, hurriedly began sending the family belongings to a safer place. Among them were heirlooms from George and Martha Washington, silver, china, household and personal furnishings, the bed (now at Mt. Vernon) in which George Washington died.

But some of these were lost forever because on May 24, on the heels of the flight of Mary Custis and her children, the Federal troops moved in.

The North had no other course, for Arlington, as a visitor quickly realizes, has strategic command of the city of Washington.

Arlington House's location and views are so splendid, Lafayette, when a visitor there, proclaimed them the best he had ever seen. The mansion, with its eight massive Doric columns and pediment designed after the Temple of Theseus in Athens, was built in 1802 by Mary Custis' father, an adopted son of George Washington.

In the family parlor, where visitors now sign their names, Mary in 1831 was married to Robert E. Lee, then two years out of West Point. From here Lee, while Mary raised their seven youngsters, periodically went off to military duty, the Mexican War in which he was wounded, and the capture of abolitionist John Brown at Harpers Ferry.

After the Federal troops moved in, Robert and Mary never again saw their estate. The dismantled home was converted into a hospital. The wounded from the Civil War's first battle, Bull Run, were brought there.

In 1864 the Federal Government acquired the estate for unpaid taxes and started a national cemetery. Near the mansion is a monument which marks the grave of 2111 unknown dead found on Civil War battlefields.

Lee's oldest son, George Washington Custis Lee, tried for years to recover the estate. Finally, in 1882, the Supreme Court awarded him the title and he promptly agreed to sell to the Federal Government.

The mansion, however, remained an empty shell until the Army, then caretaker began restoration in 1925. Two years ago it officially became a national memorial to Lee.

Now a visitor to the refurnished mansion, the adjoining building with their former slave quarters, the wisteria-covered bandstand on the terrace, the gardens, and trees, can see first-hand how pleasant was life for Virginia's tideland aristocracy. And the rejected Major L'Enfant, planner of Washington seen in the distance, has now a matchless burial place in front of Arlington House.

---

12. HOW UNKNOWN SOLDIER PICKED

On the morning of October 24, 1921, American and French soldiers stood at ceremonial attention outside the city hall at Chalons-sur-Marne, provincial capital east of Paris and on the road to Verdun. The body of an American hero, 1 of 5,000 unidentified Americans who gave their lives in World War I, was about to be chosen as the Unknown Soldier.

A sergeant from our occupation forces, himself wounded in battle, entered a makeshift, dimly lighted chapel in the hall. He was 1 of 6 selected as pallbearers. In his hand was a bouquet of white roses, the gift of a Frenchman who had lost two sons in the war.

In the chapel were four flag-draped coffins. They had been taken from the four American cemeteries, Meuse-Argonne, St. Mihiel, Somme, Aisne-Marne.

The sergeant walked three times around the coffins. Then, as he later said, "in response to a mysterious but irresistible urge," he placed the flowers on the coffin second to the right as he entered. He then stood and saluted.

Now the world poured out its heartfelt homage.

With tears and highest honors France already had enshrined her Unknown Soldier beneath the Arch of Triumph and Britain hers in Westminster Abbey.

America's revered object of every possible military honor was taken to Le Havre and placed aboard the cruiser *Olympia*, Dewey's flagship in the Battle of Manila Bay. Guns saluted as the cruiser left the harbor.

On arrival at the navy yard in Washington, the casket was borne to the rotunda in the Capitol and there the Unknown Soldier lay in state on the same catafalque that had borne our martyred Presidents, Lincoln, Garfield, and McKinley.

On Armistice Day, November 11, in the most solemn procession, the casket was taken along Pennsylvania Avenue, across Key Bridge, along the road to Fort Myer, where the minute guns boomed a continuous requiem.

The magnificent white-marble amphitheater was crowded with the highest civic and military dignitaries of this and other lands.

Ailing Woodrow Wilson, World War I commander-in-chief, had, at the risk of his life, come in a carriage.

The military chief of World War I, General Pershing, wore only the victory medal.

Ex-President Taft, then the new Chief Justice and now buried near the entrance to the cemetery, was in the throng.

President Harding delivered the eulogy.

For 2 minutes at noon, as the casket was lowered into a crypt, the Nation observed silent prayer. Church bells, which had tolled for 15 minutes, ceased. Traffic halted, street cars stopped, telephone service was suspended.

As the cannon fire gave its final echoes among the trees, the bugle notes of taps, soldier's farewell, spoke their message, clear and sad.

The tomb was completed in 1930 with the emplacement of the sarcophagus, one of the largest blocks of marble ever quarried, taken from the same white marble as that of Lincoln's Memorial.

Engraved on it are the precious dozen words: "Here rests in honored glory an American soldier known but to God."

Perpetual honor guard is maintained by soldiers of the Third Infantry, "The Old Guard," which has fought in all our Nation's wars.

The Defense Department, with necessary work already underway, plans to inter two more unknown servicemen beside the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. The crypts are now being made and the dedication will be held this coming Memorial Day. The memorial slabs, at ground level, will pay tribute to a World War II, and Korean War Unknown.

Arlington, once the estate of Robert E. Lee, is the Nation's largest national cemetery. It is a cemetery of heroes, and buried among its trees, row on row, along its 10 miles of paved road, you will find many illustrious names.

Visit the trophy room of the Unknown Soldier, the nearby burial place and shrine of the heroes of the Battleship *Maine*, the "Temple of Fame," once Lee's summer house, and, in back of the cemetery, the Confederate monument.

Legend tells us that the first burial was of a Confederate prisoner who died in 1864 in the Lee mansion, then converted to a field hospital.

A short distance further along the Potomac is the nerve center of our worldwide defense, the fabulous Pentagon.

Built in wartime rush, opened in 1943, it is the largest office building on earth, 18 miles of corridor, 1 mile around its outer edge.

It is fascinating to visit and observe how its city-size 33,000 inhabitants function as they chart this Nation's military course in the space age.

---

13. JEFFERSON MEMORIAL VERSUS THE BLOSSOMS

As one observes the delightful Tidal Basin surroundings of the $3 million white Vermont marble temple, now the Nation's shrine to Thomas Jefferson, it is difficult to believe that women once chained themselves to trees on this site to prevent the workmen from starting the memorial. That was called the "Battle of the Cherry Blossom Trees."

Now, the memorial is the center for the annual Cherry Blossom Festival. The number of the cherry trees, just as President Franklin D. Roosevelt promised when he laid the cornerstone in 1939, has been increased. Here, 2 weeks ago, the pageant was

held and the Cherry Blossom Queen received her $400,000 crown of gold and pearls.

The erection of the memorial, which Roosevelt had urged upon Congress, was to pay a debt of gratitude "long overdue" to the philosopher-patriot who was the author of our Declaration of Independence.

F. D. R., in his old naval cloak, presided at the dedication on April 13, 1943, in the midst of World War II. He called the memorial a "shrine to freedom."

That day was the 200th anniversary of Jefferson's birth. Jefferson's noblest words, said F. D. R., are those inscribed inside the rotunda, taken from a pledge Jefferson made to his old friend, Dr. Benjamin Rush:

"I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

As you enter by the main stairway, coming up from the Tidal Basin, observe the sculptural group over the portico.

It represents Jefferson, already well known for his literary ability, being named chairman of the committee to draft the Declaration. With omissions rather than changes in his text, it was the one promulgated to the world July 4, 1776.

The heroic bronze figure of Jefferson, by the New York artist Rudolph Evans, stands 19 feet above its pedestal in the center of the rotunda. Jefferson, in life, was a tall, rangy man, with sandy red hair and hazel eyes.

The four panels on the interior walls contain excerpts from Jefferson, breathing his sentiments on freedom, political and religious, education and human progress.

Placing of the memorial at this site, on a line with the Washington Monument and the White House, completed the cross arrangement envisioned by Maj L'Enfant, the man who planned the city. The architect was John Russell Pope, creator of several other Washington masterpieces, among them the National Art Gallery and National Archives Building.

The true creator, though, was Jefferson himself. He was America's first great architect. He loved the central rotunda scheme of the Pantheon, temple to the Roman gods, and this memorial embodies it.

A similar domed rotunda is the main feature of Monticello, the University of Virginia, and the capitol at Richmond, all of which he designed.

Jefferson, like his contemporary Ben Franklin, was a most versatile man. Everything interested him; science, literature, art, farming, music, botany.

Monticello is filled with his inventions, 7-day clocks to bifocals. He submitted a plan for the White House, and its extensions follow that plan. Even food got his attention, and it was he who introduced ice cream to America.

A true Democrat despite his aristocratic background, it was he who discarded the courtly bow and introduced the Presidential handshake.

Above all he was a philosopher, a champion of freedom of man. Curiously he did not even care to mention that he had been President when he designed his gravestone down the slope from Monticello. He mentioned on it only that he was author of the Declaration, author of the Virginia statute of religious freedom and, his final great work, founder of the University of Virginia a few miles from Monticello.

While in this vicinity, notice how the cherry blossom trees have been extended along the walks and drives of Potomac Park.

These trees were started by Mrs. William Howard Taft when she was in the White House, the idea coming from her years in the Orient while her husband was on missions there before he became President.

Across the southern tip of the park you can see the National War College on the point where the Anacostia River enters the Potomac.

Off here, in 1844, occurred the tragedy of the U. S. S. *Princeton*. An experimental gun, called the Peacemaker, exploded, killing two Cabinet members and other statesmen. President Tyler, who was talking to his future bride, narrowly escaped.

---

14. EMBASSY—and CHURCH—ROW

Washington, capital of the free world, is a celebrated center of diplomatic life. The embassies, legations and missions of virtually all the nations are to be found along lower 16th Street and especially along Massachusetts Avenue, from Scott Circle to Rock Creek and beyond, which is known as Embassy Row.

These two thoroughfares of magnificent buildings likewise have a spiritual eminence. On the streets are located many of the 1,200 churches, of 27 denominations, that make Washington a religious capital. Along the seven miles of 16th Street, north from the White House, are 25 churches.

This is more than in any like distance in this country and has led to 16th Street being called The Street of Churches.

Just about every denomination has built or plans to build a religious center in the Nation's Capital.

Most recently the Moslems built a mosque with graceful minaret, near Rock Creek.

Beyond the impressive residence of the Papal delegate, going out Massachusetts Avenue, is the new Greek Orthodox Church of St. Sophia with its great white dome.

Along 16th Street are the new synanogue of the Washington Hebrew Congregation, the expanding Methodist Church, Temple Baptist Church, Russian Orthodox Church of St. Nicholas, Church of Latter-day Saints, Christian Scientist Church, All Souls' Unitarian which looks like London's St. Martin-in-the-Fields, and many more.

The Gothic, 14th century grandeur of the still incomplete Washington Cathedral, the Church of SS. Peter and Paul, with its flying buttresses and stained-glass windows, crowns Mt. St. Alban beyond the Naval Observatory on Massachusetts Avenue.

In it are St. John's Chapel with a statue of Norman Prince, founder of the Lafayette Escadrille, and Chapel of St. Mary given by Larz Anderson.

Thousands annually come in pilgrimage to this cathedral—beautiful as any in Europe—for, in a bay off the cathedral nave, is the tomb of our World War I President Woodrow Wilson.

Another area of Washington which annually attracts thousands of visitors is the section called Brookland, or "Little Rome."

This is in Northeast Washington, beyond the old Soldiers' Home where Lincoln summered. Here are the Catholic University, the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception and the Franciscan Monastery.

The shrine, on the campus of the university, was started in 1920 with the late Cardinal O'Connell presiding at the laying of the cornerstone.

It is to be a huge Byzantine-Romanesque structure rivaling any in the Old World. Its crypt, in use since 1926, is of surpassing beauty with its chapels and mosaics, and is the largest in the world—bigger than St. Paul's in London, and Chartres, largest of French medieval churches.

The Franciscan Monastery, called the Memorial Church of the Holy Land, is among the Capital's greatest attractions. While the church's architecture is Byzantine, the golden yellow brick and red tile, with the surrounding beautifully kept gardens, give it the appearance of an early Franciscan mission in California.

The Franciscans, who have for years maintained the holy shrines of the Christian world, have reproduced many of them here both on the monastery grounds and within the church.

On the grounds is a replica of the renowned Portiuncula shrine in Assisi where St. Francis founded his order. Around the church is a cloister with 15 chapels called the Rosary in Stone.

Outdoor shrines, on the hillside, include reproductions of the Grotto of Lourdes, the home of the Holy Family in Egypt, the Chapel of the Ascension like the one the Crusaders built on Mount Olivet, the Tomb of the Blessed Virgin as it now is in the Valley of Gethsemane, and the Grotto of Our Lord's Agony on the eve of His crucifixion.

Inside the monastery are reproductions of shrines in the Holy Land—among them the Shrine of the Annunciation as it is now in Nazareth, the Grotto of the Nativity in Bethlehem, the altar over the Crucifixion on Calvary, the Holy Sepulchre as it is in Jerusalem. And beneath the monastery, open to visitors, is a reproduction of the catacombs as they are today in Rome.

---

15. IF THERE'S TIME LEFT—

Even after a visitor has seen what are called the "main points" of interest in the Nation's Capital, there is still an almost endless list of fascinating things to see and places to go.

Even a puff of smoke can tell a curious tale. Notice it coming, sometimes in puffs and sometimes in a stream, from roof chimneys of the Annex Building across the street from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing as you head along 14th Street back toward downtown Washington after leaving the Jefferson Memorial.

Reason for the smoke?

In the cellar of this Annex Building are huge incinerators and into those nearly every day of the week goes $4 million in paper bills, $1's, $5's, $10's, and so forth. This is worn-out money being removed from circulation.

The big Bureau of Engraving and Printing on the opposite side of 14th Street at C Street SW., is the world's largest engraving plant.

Here roughly $35 million a day in paper money, bonds, Government securities, and stamps are printed.

Free of charge, you may walk along special ramps over the printing presses and see the money being turned out in sheets. There is quite an exhibit of money, too, including the largest gold note ever issued.

In the Federal Triangle of departmental buildings, between 9th and 10th Streets on Pennsylvania Avenue, is the Department of Justice where the FBI has its headquarters. Monday through Friday there are tours every half hour.

You can see crime laboratories, the biggest fingerprint collection in the world, detection methods and a display of weapons taken from notorious criminals.

A block further along Pennsylvania Avenue at 12th Street, is the huge Postoffice Department, said to be the biggest single business in the world. Stamp fans will be interested in the stamp exhibit (going back to 1847) which has been assembled in the department's Philatelic Agency, located in new ground-floor quarters on the 12th Street side near Pennsylvania Avenue.

Near the base of the Federal Triangle are the enormous buildings of the Departments of Labor and Commerce. Uncle Sam's strongbox, the Treasury, is located nearby on 15th Street. Counting money by the millions is a daily activity. In the cellar are old money vaults, for this is the third oldest Government building in Washington.

While at the Treasury Building, visit the document room in the attic and downstairs see the collection of contraband seized by the Coast Guard.

You can see the draft for buying Alaska (Price $15 million—Seward's folly); warrants

for buying the Panama Canal Zone; and the flag which draped Lincoln's box at Ford's Theater, the one on which Booth tripped and broke his leg.

This department, by the way, was the first to hire women Government employees. This was during the Civil War, and officials found that the women could count money better than the men.

The Corcoran Art Gallery, on 17th Street at New York Avenue, gift of a Georgetown banker, was the Nation's greatest prior to the National Art Gallery being given by Mellon. It is a beautiful building with famous exhibits.

A block away at 18th Street, is the unusual Octogon House. This is where Dolly and James Madison lived (and the peace treaty was signed for the War of 1812) after the British burned down the White House.

Returning to 17th Street, you pass the American Red Cross headquarters and Continental Hall, and at the corner of Constitution Avenue, you will find one of Washington's most beautiful buildings, the Pan-American Union.

This white marble structure, sometimes called the capital of the American Republics, cost $1 million, contributed by Andrew Carnegie and the republics of the two Americas, which form the Pan-American Union. On the facade, above the heroic statuary groups, are the figures of George Washington and two liberators of Latin America, Bolivar and San Martin.

The vestibule opens into a Spanish-style patio filled with exotic shrubs, trees and flowers, and paved with tiles as in the palaces of early Latin America.

Beautiful staircases, besides the patio, lead upstairs to the mammoth Hall of the Americas, considered one of the most magnificent in the world.

At the rear of the building is an open Aztec garden with strange floral displays and Aztec relics.

A Rare "Pro" Leaves White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1958

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in a recent issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Its title gives it away. "A Rare 'Pro' Leaves White House" could only refer to the imminent departure of a gentleman known to us all as a remarkably able politician, Mr. Maxwell M. Rabb.

The author of the article, Mr. William S. White, is known as a man who sees Washington through a pair of the shrewdest and knowingest eyes around. His appraisal of Mr. Rabb's work should carry special weight.

There are rumors, Mr. Speaker, that Max Rabb may decide to live in New Jersey even though he will have his office in New York City. Should he locate his home somewhere in Union County—certainly one of the most pleasant and convenient parts of the metropolitan area—I can assure him that our people will welcome him and his family generously and enthusiastically.

The article follows:

A RARE "PRO" LEAVES WHITE HOUSE

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—The legend of the able and unselfish second-tier man who really runs the Government for the very top people is an old favorite. Regrettably, it is almost as full of moonshine as it is of amiability.

Long Washington experience suggests that the great majority of second-tier men are just that—usually expendable without vast damage to the public interest. Nevertheless, once in a while an official turns up who lends more than a trace of truth to what is only a hardy cliché. Such a man is now leaving the Eisenhower administration. He is Maxwell M. Rabb. Rabb is secretary to the Cabinet—the first such official in history in a post that was set up at his own suggestion.

He is also associate counsel to President Eisenhower. Less officially, he has been the President's chief adviser on minority group problems—civil rights and the like. Now he has resigned, effective in mid-May, to enter a New York law firm.

COMPETENCE NOT WANTED

Parenthetically, Rabb himself has long been in a tiny minority. He is a member, along with Press Secretary Jim Hagerty, of that minute group in the White House that really knows something about practical politics.

Rabb came in, as an ex-Senate staff man, in those brave old days of the businessman's Government when knowledge in politics was held suspect by the new crusaders. In their eyes, Senator Robert A. Taft's great handicap was his tactless and unashamed pursuit of what had been his lifelong profession—politics.

Rabb, a professional politician, too, discreetly bore and played down his dangerous competence. And from his position of anonymity he served with great effectiveness.

PEACE IN THE CABINET

Many will argue that the Eisenhower administration's accomplishments could be adequately reported without using up a great deal of paper. In any case, at least two solid achievements seem to this observer to stand out.

For one thing, the Eisenhower Cabinet has been run without the prolonged, and thus destructive, in-fighting that has wounded many other Cabinets.

Score this to Rabb. His system of Cabinet briefings and Cabinet responsibility for action will be seen as a genuine contribution to political science.

Secondly, the White House itself—if not always the rest of the administration—has handled the harsh complications of the racial crisis with restraint and commonsense. And on these infinitely tricky matters the watchword at the White House has usually been, "Give it to Max."

It is here, most of all, that being a good politician has paid off for Max Rabb.

CIVIL RIGHTS NOT CIVIL WAR

He has fought the southern civil rights opposition with devotion and skill—but without bitterness or passion. He has supported the civil-rights pressure groups where he has thought them wise; he has told them off where he has thought them wrong.

Always, of course, he has battled the anti-civil-rights pressure groups. But even these he has treated as though they had a right to a point of view.

He encouraged the President in refusing to take that form of leadership which so many urged upon him—the calling of a White House conference on civil rights that would have given an incomparable sounding board to every thin-lipped extremist on both sides.

In a word, Rabb always declined to treat civil rights as though it were civil war.

RESPECTED BY ALL

He was unwilling, of course, to dignify suggestions that the Supreme Court was unconstitutional, or perhaps un-American, in its antisegregation policy.

Equally, however, he was unwilling to act as though the thing to do was to send dive bombers to Alabama and Arkansas.

This position he took not as a do-gooder but because he knew that good politics—which is usually decent politics—demanded a solution and not mere screaming.

He was a professional doing a job, and all the other professionals—Democratic and Republican, right, left, and center—appreciated him.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Small-Business Forum of the American Management Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered on the subject Partners in Business, at the small-business forum of the American Management Association, in New York City, on May 14, 1958.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTNERS IN BUSINESS

(An address by Senator EDWARD J. THYE, Republican, of Minnesota, before the American Management Association Small-Business Forum, New York City, N. Y., May 14, 1958)

Gentlemen, I consider it a real privilege to participate with you in this first small-business forum of the American Management Association. It is most appropriate that the problems of the small-business firm in our economy should receive your careful and extensive study and investigation.

Doing business today is a challenge which demands the best of everything a business has to offer. Doing business today as a small firm is something which demands the utmost in energy, skill and initiative.

MAIN STREET

I have always thought of small, independent business in terms of Main Street—the thousands upon thousands of Main Streets which run through every city, town and village of our country. It is here that we find the majority of the Nation's retail outlets and service establishments. They represent a large portion of our business population which numbers approximately 4,300,000. These outlets serve a nation of 170 million consumers. These business firms along our Main Street constitute the arteries of commerce in the blood stream of our free-enterprise system.

Just a stones' throw away from the Main streets are the warehouses of wholesalers and distributors and the small manufacturing plants of America. Thus we can see that within a radius of a few blocks in any city we find endlessly reproduced the American economy in miniature.

Ours is an economy founded upon the principle that honorable men should be free to compete with one another in the area of commerce and manufacturing. It was founded by men such as yourselves who rejected the principle that Government should write all the rules and regulate men's every action. They likewise rejected the principle of cartel control of all business enterprise. These men believed that a free economy, with healthy competition, would produce the type of ingenuity and accomplishment which would give to our society a standard of living greater than that of any other nation.

Today, private enterprise is spending $5.5 billion for research and development in new products which promise to further improve our standard of living. Translating this fact into a phrase, it means that new frontiers are opening up each day and that there are endless horizons for those who participate in our free enterprise economy. There is no other nation in the world today that enjoys the benefits of such a system.

HUMBLE BEGINNINGS

The present wonders of our economic system had humble beginnings. It all began in small establishments along our Main Streets. As time went on, some of these small business firms grew and today we classify them as large business. Throughout the early stages of our economic development, there was no attempt made to distinguish between large and small business. People spoke in terms of business regardless of size. There was no recognition of any basic conflict of interest among business concerns of different sizes. Essentially big business and small business became partners in the task of supplying the needs of a constantly expanding population. Most reasonable observers accept this time-honored partnership as being the cornerstone of our dynamic growth. The shelves of the smallest merchant on Main Street are stocked with the products manufactured by large corporations. The interdependence of all business is demonstrated by the fact that our laregst mass production industries obtain necessary supplies and services from thousands of small suppliers and subcontractors.

During this period of industrial and commercial expansion, our Government laid down certain ground rules when it became apparent that such action was necessary. The Sherman Antitrust Act, the Clayton Act, and the enforcement of these laws was necessary to preserve the element of free competition in a fast-growing economy.

WORLD WAR II IMPACT

Perhaps the most significant turning point in our economic development was World War II. This all-out war effort called for an unprecedented productive effort; it inspired inventions, new products, and a productive philosophy which was climaxed by the innovation of atomic energy. It was during this period that certain business firms grew to the point where they became known as industrial giants. As an aftermath, people began to think in terms of large business and small business.

During the past 10 years, a premium has been placed on technology and research. Competition has become more keen in all areas of business. At the same time, taxes have steadily increased, costs of doing business have risen sharply, the need for credit has increased, and the American public has developed buying habits and tastes which demand the utmost in supplier resourcesfulness and imagination.

The factors I have just mentioned can be termed business problems to business progress and success. They fall most heavily upon the small business man in our economy who cannot employ the high-priced business technician or scientist or business expert.

OUR DILEMMA

At this point, we can begin to see the dilemma we are faced with. On the one hand we recognize that the strength of our economy, to a large degree, depends upon a healthy small business community. On the other hand, the progress we have made and which we hail as a great accomplishment has created serious problems to the small business firms.

TIME FOR ACTION

The time has come when we must recognize that there is need for constructive action if we are to maintain the highly successful free competitive system which we have come to admire and respect.

This must be accomplished through the utilization of a dedicated partnership. The partnership in such a venture must be the small-business man, the large business firms, and the Government.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

The Government is already at work assuming its rightful role and responsibility. That is being accomplished on many fronts. You are all acquainted with the activities of the Small Business Administration which was established in 1953. I had the pleasure of authoring the legislation which established this agency. Through March 31 of this year, the SBA had approved 9,542 business loans, totaling $445,992,000 and 7,105 disaster loans in the amount of $73,910,000. The agency has a constructive record of accomplishment in the field of procurement assistance and managerial and technical assistance.

The Small Business Administration has proved itself to be an effective partner within our economy. The time has come when it must be established as a permanent agency. I have introduced a bill which would accomplish this, as have other Members of the Senate and House of Representatives. It is imperative that SBA gain permanent status for three main reasons. First, the agency would be able to attract more competent personnel; second, our banking institutions would be more apt to participate in the SBA loan program; and third, the SBA would be able to work more effectively in the area of procurement assistance.

ACTION TAKEN

The President has established a Cabinet Committee on Small Business to recommend directly to him those measures which would be of constructive help to small business. This action is unprecedented in our history.

The Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission are at work every day to give vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws. This is essential if our system of competitive enterprise is to survive.

Every agency of Government has established a program designed to channel a fair share of Government contracts to small business.

Both the House and the Senate have a Small Business Committee working in the interests of small firms.

The Congress and the executive agencies are working to eliminate government competition with private enterprise.

It is apparent to any objective observer that the Government is attempting to maintain a climate within which small business can grow and expand.

Business and associations such as yours are also already at work in an attempt to

solve the problems which confront our small firms today.

THYE PROGRAM

In addition, there are certain specific things which must be done. They must have your support in order to succeed.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION

You are all interested in what proposals are now before the Congress and the Senate which affect the small-business firms of the Nation. It would be impossible for me to enumerate all of the bills now in committee. However, let us examine what proposals we have which deal with the three main problems facing small business today, namely:

1. Availability of credit.
2. Availability of equity capital.
3. Tax reduction.

I am convinced that if we are successful in passing constructive legislation in the above categories that the future for small business will be bright, indeed.

CREDIT

1. Credit: Here I have already outlined the necessity for legislation extending the life of the Small Business Administration. This is a necessity if the full credit needs of small business are to be met. Also pending before Congress is an amendment to the 1953 act, which I have prepared, extending the period of time for loans to 15 years.

EQUITY CAPITAL

2. Equity capital: There is no question about the need for sources of equity capital today. There is some difference of opinion as to what Federal legislation is needed to accomplish this purpose. First, I wish to make clear that some system for providing long-term financing for small firms is urgently needed. I will support any reasonable bill recommended by the proper committees. Only secondarily am I concerned with the form which may be established to do the job.

The bills presently before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee propose different systems. I have introduced a bill which would incorporate the existing structure of the Small Business Administration to administer a long-term equity program. The other bills would establish another independent agency to do this job.

I favor the utilization of the SBA because it has acquired intimate familiarity with the equity capital needs of the small business in the operation of its lending program. In considering loan applications, an examination is made by the trained examiners of sufficiency or insufficiency of equitable capital. A listing is made of those cases where additional equity capital is required. I would also like to call to your attention that the Small Business Administration has been concerning itself within the past few years with ways and means of promoting more equity capital for small business. In conjunction with the Investment Bankers Association of America, it has discussed the problem and the IBA has formed a small business committee. Meetings have been held with the SBA, SEC and members of the private business world, both businessmen and investment bankers. The SBA has backed legislation to loosen the requirements in the Securities Act of 1933 so that it will be possible for small businesses to float securities and comply with registration requirements with less cost.

One of the basic differences between my bill and other proposals lies in the character of aid provided to small business investment associations. In my bill, as well as in the other measures, the Government has power to make loans evidenced by debentures of small business associations. Some bills, however, attempt to facilitate the establishment of small business investment companies in which the Government invests its stock in the companies in the amount not more than $250,000. I submit that the soundest opinion of experts in the field of private investment companies is that if there is lack of sufficient interest in a small business investment association, so that it cannot obtain its basic paid-in capital from private sources, it will, in the end, prove a failure in its administration.

Once a small business investment association has been launched with its paid-in capital acquired from private sources, I contemplate that, on the basis of debentures and that in return for debentures, the SBA shall lend capital funds for lending purposes. I think that this is a sound and fundamental distinction between Government ownership and Government assistance.

There is also a fundamental difference in the provisions for aid to State and local development corporations. The bill I contemplate provides that the SBA will be able to make loans to a State or local development corporation "to existing indentifiable small business concerns and for a sound business purpose approved by the Administration." There are various restrictions imposed on such loans. I would like to call to your attention that SBA has been making loans of this character with a limitation which would be removed by this legislation. If you will examine the studies made on the lending features of State and local development corporations (7 State loan corporations now operating, and as many as 2,200 local organizations identified by the Department of Commerce) you will find that most of the activities of these corporations are in the lending field, rather than equity purchases. The Small Business Administration's experience in dealing with and evaluating identifiable concerns should be preserved.

Other proposals would provide that in the case of some State and local development corporations, the Government will make loans to enable them to supply the equity capital for small business concerns and the funds will be given in exchange for obligations of such institutions. Students of local development corporations can advise you that most of them are not set up in such a manner that they would be able to obligate themselves in this manner.

TAX RELIEF

3. Tax Relief: I believe that some tax reduction measures will pass the current session of Congress. There is little argument that tax adjustment is needed. I support the following tax adjustment bill for small business:

(a) An allowance for reinvestment in the form of a tax deduction for a business which increases its investment in inventory or depreciable assets out of income. This allowance would be permitted on a graduated scale which would require the taxpayer to assume full responsibility for a portion of the expansion. The amount of investment permitted as allowance would be as follows:

Fifty percent on first $10,000 eligible investment.

Thirty percent of $10,000 to $20,000 eligible investment.

Twenty percent of $20,000 to $30,000 eligible investment.

The maximum allowance in a year would be $30,000.

This proposal would provide much-needed equity capital for small firms.

(b) A retirement deduction to be allowed for sole owners or proprietors. Each taxpayer would be permitted a deduction for an amount up to 10 percent of his taxable income, or $1,000 whichever is the lesser, if invested in a prescribed manner. This retirement deduction would eliminate present discrimination which exists in the Revenue Code.

(c) Payment of estate taxes over a 10-year period. An extension of payment over 20 years would be made in cases of emergency.

(d) Accelerated depreciation on used equipment and machinery. There would be a limit of $50,000 for each tax year of such purposes.

(e) Permission for small corporations having only one class of stock to be taxed as partnerships.

(f) Easing restriction of unreasonable accumulation of earnings section by raising $60,000 exemption to $100,000.

This is a program which I have been advocating for some time. Some of the provisions have been before the Senate in the form of legislation since early 1957. Such a program would not only give assistance in the near future, but it would also provide for the strengthening and growth of small-business firms.

I am confident that legislation will be enacted in the next 3 months which will alleviate the financial pressures upon small-business firms.

THE NEXT STEP

The next step will be for all of us to preserve a business climate and atmosphere which will stimulate small business growth and expansion. To do this we must:

1. Call for strict enforcement of our antitrust laws as a safeguard to our free economy.
2. The administration's premerger notice legislation must be passed in order to give our Justice Department and Federal Trade Commission the opportunity to examine the impact upon competition of corporate mergers.
3. Businessmen must enter into a period of self-analysis in order to improve their efficiency and capability of competing in today's complex industrial expansion.
4. Business organizations and associations such as yours must provide assistance and guidance to small firms who cannot afford full-time technical advisers. Research and the development of new methods are to be found. Technical fields are the new frontiers of this era. The early history of America was an ever-advancing frontier. Virgin prairies, as well as the timberland, awaited the courageous pioneer to develop it. But following this pioneer, was the equally courageous businessman with the opportunity to establish businesses that did not have the competitive economic system that the smaller businessman is confronted with today.

I am confident that these aims will be accomplished. No one can deny that new frontiers open up every day in the business life of our Nation. These frontiers lead to horizons which are exciting and which will stimulate the inventive genius which has become a hallmark of American progress. In our day, there can be no sympathy with pessimism. There can be no surrender of free enterprise to crippling controls by government.

We must rededicate ourselves to a system of free enterprise which has made our Nation great.

Work Opportunities for Graduates of Colleges and High Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared on the subject, Creating More Job Opportunities for Individuals

Leaving the Farms and for the New Graduates of Our Colleges and High Schools.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CREATING MORE JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDIVIDUALS LEAVING THE FARMS AND FOR THE NEW GRADUATES OF OUR COLLEGES AND HIGH SCHOOLS

A grassroots effort on the part of the citizens of North Dakota to meet the problems of a changing economy in the United States and in the world which is altering the way of life in North Dakota is sufficiently important, I believe, to be brought to the attention of Congress. North Dakota, as an agricultural State, is not alone in facing this problem. This is a further reason I feel it important to call to the attention of Congress the excellent progress of the relatively new North Dakota Economic Development Commission.

This commission was created in 1957 by the North Dakota Legislature and consists of the governor and eight members appointed by him. The first meeting was held in the governor's office in July 1957. Present, in addition to Gov. John E. Davis, were all eight members, comprising as representative and capable a group of citizens as could be found anywhere to analyze and do something about the economic problems and opportunities of our State. The commission members are: Richard H. Barry, of Fargo; John R. Bernabucci, of Jamestown; Andrew L. Freeman, of Grand Forks; Harold Hofstrand, of Leeds; Wesley Keller, of Minot; Harold Kelly, of Devils Lake; James A. O'Brien, of Dickinson; and Harold Shafer, of Bismarck.

The first order of business at this first meeting was to adopt certain principles and to select an initial list of objectives. Among these were the following:

(a) To go to the grassroots and encourage every community in the State to analyze its opportunities and economic problems. The commission felt that 90 citizens might be 10 times as effective as the 9 commission members working alone and that 900 citizens might be 100 times as effective. They felt that since ideas and suggestions are often born in unusual and surprising ways, the more people working with the commission, the better its chances of steady, if not spectacular, progress.

(b) To segregate and identify the problems which cannot be solved on a community level, such as certain inequities in the Federal income tax laws, and to establish subcommittees to explore the practical steps to be taken.

(c) To keep constantly in mind that the largest source of income in North Dakota is from agriculture and that agriculture serves as the foundation upon which a substantial part of the entire State's economy rests.

By September the commission had the good fortune of finding a capable full time executive director with the experience and the aptitude to stimulate the grassroots action, as well as possessing the imagination and coordinating ability to keep other phases of the commission's program rolling. This director, Lawrence A. Schneider, and the members of the commission have in recent months been planting seed, so to speak, in the minds of farmers and community leaders in every section of North Dakota. Progress from this type of activity is not immediate, but when it appears it is usually sound.

A couple of weeks ago, the North Dakota Economic Development Commission brought to my attention a problem which cannot be solved at the community level. I presented their proposal to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business. In a letter to me dated April 22, the Senator from Alabama stated: "It appears to me that all the points made by the commission are valid. I am asking the staff of the committee to determine to what extent these additional provisions should be prepared as amendments to our omnibus small business tax relief bill." The points to which the Senator from Alabama referred are contained in the following resolution adopted by the North Dakota Economic Development Commission at a meeting held on April 7, 1958, in Gwinner, N. Dak., in the plant of the Melroe Manufacturing Co., which incidentally is one of the most inspirational examples of grassroots endeavor in North Dakota, or for that matter, in the entire United States.

"Whereas investment capital and long-term capital for: (a) The development of this State's natural resources; (b) the growth of small locally owned industries; and (c) risk capital for new inventions is in short supply in North Dakota; and

"Whereas North Dakota is confronted with a serious and complex problem to provide within its borders more job opportunities for individuals leaving the farms and for the new graduates each year of our colleges and high schools; and

"Whereas the Internal Revenue Code of the United States contributes to the previously mentioned short supply of local capital because of certain inequities in the code; and

"Whereas North Dakota should join with other States with similar problems and conceivably leadership can be crystallized by the commissions similar to the North Dakota Economic Development Commission which exist in most of the other 47 States: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Governor of North Dakota send to the Members of Congress from North Dakota and to the governors in the other 47 States for the attention and support of their economic development or similar commissions the following recommendations related to the Internal Revenue Code of the United States:

"1. That the present $1,000 limitation which may be taken in any 1 year as a capital loss by the investor in the stock of a small- or medium-sized business be increased from $1,000 to a more realistic amount.

"2. Permit the costs of selling capital stock in small- or medium-sized companies with net worths below $1 million to be treated as an operating expense not to exceed 10 percent of the amount of the issue to correspond with the principle permitted by the code in connection with expenses created in raising long-term loans.

"3. Permit the costs in the form of dividends on temporary capital such as preferred stock callable in less than 10 annual installments to be treated as an operating expense the same as interest, recognizing that there is already at least two precedents in the code for the treatment of dividends on preferred stock as an operating expense.

"4. Permit companies with net worths below $1 million and which are not subsidiaries or affiliates of other corporations to have a 10-year period to build up their capital from earnings by having the surtax rate on annual profits start at $50,000 instead of $25,000.

"5. That Congress study ways and means of permitting private enterprise to deal with certain blighted areas of local communities including the creation of increased automobile parking space by permitting the owners to treat as an operating expense or capital loss the expense of demolishing old commercial and dwelling structures.

"6. That support be given to United States Senate bill 3194 known as the small business tax-adjustment bill of 1958, cosponsored by 36 Senators as of March 21, 1958, and providing in part for the installment payment of estate taxes, permitting farmers and businesses alternative methods of depreciation on used as well as new machinery and equipment."

Armed Forces Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, this week has been designated as Armed Forces Week in recognition of the role which our military services play in maintaining the strength and security of America. The State of Maine, which is one of the Nation's key strategic areas, is deeply honored that the able and distinguished Secretary of the Army, the Honorable Wilber Brucker, is the principal speaker at the Armed Forces Week dinner being held tonight in Portland, Maine. Mr. Brucker has prepared a very fine address for this occasion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared on Armed Forces Day and the speech of the Secretary of the Army to be delivered at the Armed Forces Week dinner in Portland, Maine, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON ARMED FORCES DAY BY SENATOR PAYNE

On Armed Forces Day 1958, we find ourselves on the threshold of a complete revolution in military technology. We have long since passed the era of the dashing horse cavalry of the Civil War, and the demoralizing trench warfare of World War I. Yes, we have even progressed far beyond the artillery, the blockbusters, the propeller-driven bombers, and the battleships of World War II and the Korean war. Today, we are entering the age of guided missiles with atomic warheads, antimissile missiles, supersonic bombers, hydrogen bombs, atomic-powered ships and aircraft, and hundreds of other devices which permit man to destroy his enemies by the thousands and hundreds of thousands.

But with all of these weapons of mass destruction, the basic strength of our military power lies not in its technology, however destructive it may be, but in its personnel. Because of the very destructiveness of the offensive and defensive weapons surrounding him, the fighting man today is no longer concerned with military matters of limited scope. By firing 1 atomic shell, by releasing 1 bomb, by launching 1 missile, he is capable of destroying entire cities and countless lives.

On the defensive his responsibilities and capabilities are even greater. The one enemy airplane or missile he succeeds in destroying can save an entire Nation. The radar screen he watches can be the key to our Nation's survival.

The individual military man, therefore, can be in many ways the deciding factor in a modern war. He must understand the technology of the most complex military devices ever created. He must understand the psychology of his enemy. He must be able to discern in an instant whether or not the speck on his radar screen is an enemy invader. In short, he must possess enough

foresight, enough intelligence, enough ability, and enough competence to protect an entire Nation.

He is the balance of power in the world. No number of missiles, no number of hydrogen bombs can protect our country without the military man who understands the technology and use of these weapons.

To repeat, warfare is undergoing revolutionary change. We must not make the error of believing that this change is one from an age of men pitted against men to machines against machines. The change in warfare today is one to an era in which man assumes an even greater role in matters of judgment and responsibility.

In this age of supertechnology, therefore, the need for highly trained, stable, responsible servicemen is infinitely greater than it has ever been before. More than ever we need a large steady core in our armed services of competent, responsible individuals who can understand both the capabilities of our superweapons and the implications of their use. In our military program we must put at least as much emphasis on securing and retaining such personnel as we do in improving weapons.

On Armed Forces Day, when the implements of modern warfare are usually stressed it is even more vital to recognize the man behind the gun. Without him these implements would be useless. With him they make us the best defended Nation in the world.

ADDRESS BY HON. WILBER M. BRUCKER, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, AT ARMED FORCES WEEK DINNER, GREATER PORTLAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, PORTLAND, MAINE, MAY 15, 1958

It is a pleasure for me to be here this evening. I consider it a privilege indeed to have this opportunity to meet and talk with so many civic-minded citizens of dynamic Portland.

This afternoon, as I visited many of your historic sites, I was forcefully reminded of the rich and courageous past of this city, thrice risen from the ashes, active participant for nearly 3 centuries in the building of the American tradition, the home of countless brave and hardy men who fought in all our country's wars on land and sea. I was particularly impressed with your harbor, the port of call for ships of many nations. It is only natural that a city which has played such a long and continuous role in international commerce, and the development of the United States, should have an abiding interest in world affairs and the security of our Nation.

Our attention is focused today upon the most important material aspect of our security, the impressive military strength of America, arrayed in the cause of peace and justice. When we consider the clearly visible evidence that the Communist conspiracy, which has already seized control of 15 nations and one-third of all the people on earth, is still belligerently on the march toward its announced goal of world domination, we have good reason to be very thankful every hour of every day for our Armed Forces, the sturdy guardians of our freedom and our national integrity.

America is confronted with a world situation fraught with graver peril than any she has ever before faced in all her history. Let there be no shadow of a doubt about that in any of our minds. No amount of Soviet sophistry can obscure the plain fact that our own beloved United States, leader of the nations of the free world in the mortal struggle against Communist aggression, the most formidable obstacle athwart the Communist path to global conquest, is the ultimate target of every Soviet plot and action.

The dangerous tensions and fundamental conflicts which exist in so many parts of the world today underscore our imperative need to be prepared for every eventuality. It is the combined strength and versatility of our Armed Forces, our Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, integrated in a great defense team, the sustaining power of a worldwide system of collective defense linking the United States and 45 other nations, which deters the Soviets from unleashing the might of the largest mobilized military forces in the world in an effort to achieve their goal.

The essence of our military strength is unity. Anyone who participated in the global campaigns of World War II, or has studied them, must recognize the complete interdependence of ground, sea, and air fighting elements in this modern era. The inexorable advance of science and technology has wiped out for all time the conditions which in years long past made possible the successful waging of war by separate forces. When we consider the lightning pace and the complex nature of a future war, which might involve on both sides tactical and strategic nuclear weapons of vast power, extremely accurate long-range ballistic missiles with thermonuclear warheads, antimissile missiles, and even such things as space vehicles and space platforms, it becomes clearly evident that nothing less will suffice for our national security than welding the various specialized capabilities of our military services into a fighting instrument able to respond instantaneously with all appropriate force in any emergency.

Our present military organization was created on that concept, and it has been progressively improved as experience dictated in order to keep up with the swift progress of technology and the march of world events. Our Commander in Chief, President Eisenhower, has recently taken steps to effect a further reorganization of the Defense Department designed to achieve even greater unity and effectiveness in military planning and operations both in peace and war. I need hardly say to you that the Army wholeheartedly supports the President in his effort to insure that America's strategic requirements are fully satisfied. Certainly no service partisanship which stands in the way of forging the strongest possible defense for our Nation could be tolerable in this age of constant peril. Your Army has always been a team player, and it will continue to discharge its full responsibilities as a member of our mighty defense team under all circumstances.

I do not see anything in the President's plan which threatens to wipe out the individual characters and capabilities of the several services, to destroy their indispensable esprit de corps, or stifle that healthy spirit of competition which is the driving force of all real progress. It will not create a military czardom or a Prussian-type military staff. It will not undermine the constitutional authority of the Congress. It will, however, serve to further enhance the flexibility of our military organization, and increase the speed and effectiveness of our response to any challenge. It is just good, hard, American commonsense.

The Sino-Soviet bloc has more than 8 million men under arms at this very moment. Communist forces include over 400 ground divisions, 500 far-ranging submarines, and more than 25,000 modern aircraft. These figures are particularly significant when we realize that at the high point of World War II Germany, Austria, and Italy had less than 400 divisions, and that a German force of only 100 U-boats nearly succeeded in severing the ocean lifelines of the Western allies. The mere number of divisions, ships, and planes tells only part of the story. We must also take into account the fact that today the Soviets possess powerful nuclear weapons and efficient means of long-range delivery which dwarf into insignificance anything which was in the hands of the Axis powers. Tremendous improvements have been made in other weapons and equipment during the last decade which vastly enhance the capability of ground forces. Furthermore, the Soviets are concentrating almost all of their best scientific and engineering talent on the frenzied development and production of ultra-modern weapons and other technological devices in an all-out effort to place in the hands of the plotters of the Kremlin the power to dominate the land, the sea, the air, and even outer space.

Certainly we must recognize that in a time of peace, the Soviet Union is on a war footing. Its military might is the clenched fist with which Communist leaders have promised to smash us. They are ready and waiting to move in swiftly for the kill if they should ever catch us with our guard down.

The twin questions certainly uppermost in the minds of most Americans are: "How can we expect the Soviets to use their power?" and "How can we best defend ourselves against it?"

Because of the growth of atomic stockpiles, general nuclear war, fought to its inevitable conclusion, could result in nothing short of disaster for all participants. In the present situation, with an abundance of powerful retaliatory weapons on both sides of the line, it is illogical to believe that the Soviet Russians, who obviously covet the palpable rewards of world mastery rather than the charred remnants of civilization, would irrationally abandon all hopes of profit, and invite the almost certain destruction of their own country, by intentionally launching a suicidal nuclear conflict. Therefore, we must regard limited aggression, with a succession of limited, attainable, profitable objectives, as by far the most likely form in which the Soviets will employ their military power to carry forward their ruthless program of conquest.

Local wars, fomented civil strife, military intimidation, and similar forms of limited operations are all down in the Soviet book as very practical methods by which they might achieve their ultimate purpose without ever challenging our nuclear retaliatory power. The Soviet Union has been employing this strategy for over a decade, and we see on every hand ample evidence that they are pursuing it today with unabated zeal.

In the few short years since the end of World War II, the Soviets and their allies have engaged in 8 local wars and military actions designed to advance their interests, and ever-increasing military, economic, political, and psychological pressures are being used to divide, confuse, and weaken the free world.

In Asia and Africa, the Soviet Union is strenuously fomenting unrest, and attempting to corrupt nationalistic aspirations in order to create situations which lend themselves to Soviet aggrandizement. We have seen it at work maliciously meddling in the Middle East in the hope of gaining a solid foothold in that area of tremendous economic and strategic importance.

By every kind of sordid chicanery the Soviets are attempting to soften up and destroy the North Atlantic Treaty Organization because they know that they cannot seize and profitably exploit the rich prize of Western Europe, stepping stone to the conquest of America, as long as the nations of the Atlantic community maintain their interlocking military strength and their moral cohesion.

For a long time, dedicated statesmen of the free world have labored incessantly but fruitlessly to negotiate with the Soviet Union some sound basis for the limitation of armaments, and the permanent reduction of the nuclear peril which hangs over the world. Now, after stubbornly refusing to

try to work out any agreement which might lead even to a first step toward genuine disarmament, the Soviets have come forth with the announcement, cunningly calculated to prey upon the prejudice and fear of millions of people, that they are unilaterally suspending nuclear tests. They make abundantly clear that this is a blackmailing scheme by pointing out that they, and they alone, will decide when and if such testing should be resumed.

We can hardly consider this move as anything but a cynical attempt to turn the tremendously serious business of armament control, and the easing of world tensions, into a cheap propaganda farce which the Soviet Union can exploit to its own advantage. It serves in no way to advance the cause of peace and justice, but only to confuse the issue and obstruct real progress toward a settlement of nuclear issues.

In order to judge the sincerity of the Soviets, we have only to consider their long record of broken covenants and completely sterile promises, and the utter moral bankruptcy of their system. We have only to remember that they still refuse to allow one positive step to be taken toward the reunification of Germany, Vietnam, or Korea. We have only to contemplate the spectacle of Khrushchev speaking unctuously of peace, and appealing to America to follow the example of Soviet Russia, as he stood on the violated soil of Hungary, soil soaked with the blood of patriots who were massacred by his troops only a year and a half ago when they sought to throw off the unbearable yoke of Soviet brutality. Hungary remains a constant and explicit warning to all free nations. We forget Hungary at our mortal peril.

In order to distract attention from its plots and counterplots, and the increasing menace of its military power, the Kremlin trumpets the diabolical charge that Americans advocate preventive war. However, the whole world outside the Iron Curtain has good reason to know that, on the contrary, America stands forthrightly for peace, and the peaceful triumph of the highest principles of our Christian civilization. Our constitutional form of government with its built-in guaranties against the sudden initiation of war, our history of moral idealism, and the ingrained habits of mind which underlie the American way of life furnish compelling evidence that we could never resort to aggression.

If war comes, it will not be of our choosing. We stand before the world with clean hands and a clear conscience, clothed not only in the mantle of moral sincerity, but also in the armor of material strength. The best guarantee of peace, the surest deterrent to war, is a degree of strength which discourages any potential enemy from launching aggression.

The concept that we might safely rely upon a single type of defensive capability, such as massive retaliation, is completely invalid. It is entirely unresponsive to the requirement for balanced forces which make available the specific type, degree, and distribution of power required to cope with any conceivable situation without destroying the fabric of our civilization.

It is significant that the Soviets have enthusiastically embraced the balanced force concept; that they are building and maintaining huge, modern, well-equipped, and well-trained ground forces capable of effectively participating either in a massive assault, or in local military operations designed to drag one country after another behind the Iron Curtain should we give them the opportunity.

It would be tragic indeed if we were less well prepared for limited war than we are for the far less likely contingency of all-out nuclear war. If that were the case, only two courses of action would be open to us in the event of the communists launched limited aggression: We would either have to let them get away with conquest on the installment plan, would would be disastrous to us in the long run; or we would have to pursue the course of desperation by precipitating the suicidal nuclear holocaust we are striving by every means to prevent.

No amount of talk about the vast power of strategic nuclear weapons can obscure the pressing necessity for the balanced forces which are required to face the Soviet troops ranged against our own and those of our allies in the frontlines all along the Iron and the Bamboo Curtains. Furthermore, advanced weapons systems, strategic missiles, and manned bombers, although absolutely essential to the effectiveness of our combined forces, and thus to the deterrence of aggression, will never be able to win any war alone. No final decision can be obtained by remote control. Ever since the first crude machines of war were contrived to extend the capabilities of man, all down through the years to the age of nuclear weapons and guided missiles, there have always been those who have needed to be shown again and again that it is the fighting man on the ground who is the fundamental element of warfare, the only ultimate weapon. In this nuclear era, strong and efficient Army forces, able to cope with any foe, any time, any place, and on any terms as part of a unified land, sea, and air command, are more essential to our national security than they ever have been in the past.

Our modern Army is characterized by balance and versatility. It is new in weapons, equipment, and organization, a new, streamlined force prepared to meet the requirements of the entire spectrum of war from an all-out nuclear conflict throughout the whole wide range of lesser enemy operations which are possible, and which would pose a grave and direct threat to the security of the United States. Our Army today has a new dual capability, a one-two punch, the ability to fight effectively with either atomic or nonatomic weapons, which is the key factor of our national power to apply military pressure with precise discrimination in order to deter aggression on the spot, anywhere in the world. Moreover, in any kind of war we might have to fight, large or small, that one-two punch would be indispensable to victory.

Our new pentomic division organization, consisting of five powerful battle groups, has been carefully taliored to the exacting requirements of atomic warfare. The pentomic airborne division with current equipment is completely air transportable across oceans and continents to any possible area of combat by swift strategic airlift, and within a battle area by tactical airlift, all in types of aircraft which are available today. The battle groups of the pentomic infantry division can similarly be moved by strategic or tactical airlift.

Through its dynamic research and development programs, the Army has kept fully abreast of all the tremendous advances of science and technology, and is putting them to practical use in every field to enhance its power and flexibility. For example, its years of pioneering experience in rocketry are paying handsome dividends in the development of guided missiles and rockets for military purposes, and are also helping America to push back the frontiers of space.

The Army's arsenal contains more than 10 types of missiles and rockets precisely adapted to the accomplishment of its varied tasks. Tactical surface-to-surface missiles range in size from the mighty Redstone, which can deliver a nuclear warhead more than 200 miles, to the relatively tiny Dart, which is capable of destroying the heaviest tank. The Army's Nike Ajax is capable of knocking down any known type of high-level plane at any altitude and speed at which it can fly. It will soon be replaced by an even better surface-to-air weapon, Nike Hercules, which is much faster, has much greater range, and a considerably greater altitude capability. Armed with an atomic warhead, Hercules would be able to destroy whole formations of enemy bombers.

An outstanding example of the achievement of the Army's excellent military-civilian team of missile scientists, engineers, and technologists is the great 1,500-mile intermediate range ballistic missile Jupiter, which is now in production and will soon take its place in the line of America's defense. The Army Jupiter-C missile, so called because similar vehicles were used to test components of the Jupiter during the course of its development at the Army Ballistic Missile Agency in Alabama, lifted the United States into the space age on January 31 of this year when it hurled Explorer I, America's first earth satellite, into orbit. Less than 2 months later, the Jupiter-C orbited Explorer III.

All in all—counting our experience with the modified Redstone which preceded Jupiter-C as a test vehicle, the Jupiter-C, and the Jupiter itself—the Army has attempted 37 launchings of the big missiles in its Jupiter program. Twenty-eight were successful, completely successful, shots. They accomplished everything planned. Seven were partially successful—they all had good launchings, but then, for various reasons, did not entirely meet the scientific requirements which had been set up. Only two did not score at all. This record stands up against even the most wildly optimistic Soviet claims.

Although our Armed Forces provide America with a stout and durable shield of military strength on land, at sea, and in the air, it would be the grossest folly for us to conclude that we could do without the support of dependable allies. We cannot afford to allow the foundations of collective defense to crumble, because in the final analysis our own safety rests upon them.

The United States could hardly be expected to defend the whole free world alone, yet the defense of the free world as a whole is vital to the defense of America. This fact spells out the transcendent importance of our mutual security program. Through it we multiply our strength by assisting our friends to build and maintain their own military forces which mutually contribute as much to our protection as to their own. We are currently helping to maintain approximately 200 foreign allied ground divisions, involving 5 million soldiers; 2,500 combat vessels, and 32,000 planes, of which about 14,000 are jets. We must recognize that these divisions, ships, and planes are as truly a part of America's military shield as those within our own Armed Forces.

If America should succumb to the perennial fever for the abandonment or substantial reduction of our mutual security program, we would be faced with some very serious consequences.

1. The essential power of the free world to resist aggression would rapidly deteriorate, since a majority of our allies, particularly those in Asia, would not be able to maintain their forces without our help.

2. In view of the fact that many of our indispensable overseas outposts occupy foreign territory, and are available to us only so long as our allies can maintain their independence, we would inevitably be forced back, step by step, to our own shores as one after another of our partners went down under Communist pressures.

3. It would be necessary for us to increase our expenditures for defense by an amount incomparably more than we spent for mutual security in order to make up in some degree for the loss of overseas positions and, as far

as possible, replace the support of allied forces with additional forces of our own. In this connection it should be remembered that while we have spent $20 billion over a 7-year period to support those 200 divisions, 2,500 ships, and 32,000 planes, our allies have contributed 6 times as much, $122 billion.

4. The number of American young men drafted into military service would have to be raised by many hundreds of thousands a year to provide for the necessarily tremendous increase in the size of our standing Armed Forces.

5. Even if we did expend billions more on defense, and committed to military service a proportion of our limited manpower unprecedented in peacetime and possibly disastrous to our economy, America might well ultimately find herself a beleaguered island in a sea of Communist tyranny, shorn of friends, cut off from many materials essential to the production of military hardware, and faced with slow but sure extinction.

Far from being a giveaway program, as many sincere people have called it, mutual security is the most productive investment in our own future which we could possibly make. The only giveaway involved would be the result of discontinuing or seriously curtailing these essential programs. If we did that, we would give away many of our friends to aggressive Communist imperialism. We would give away many of our most vital military bases overseas. We would give away our conscience and our ideals. We would, indeed, give away our own security.

It is particularly fitting on Armed Forces Day that we give solemn consideration to the responsibility for the security of the United States which rests upon all segments of the American community. No one can truthfully say, "I have no part to play, no obligation to discharge." The man in uniform is only the military spear point of our defense. If we forget that, we lose all perspective as to what makes American strong and able to resist successfully the manifold Communist threat.

Soviet scientific advances, dramatized by their success in launching earth satellites, have been more effective than millions of words in bringing home to the American people the fact that we cannot afford to take our security, or our world position, for granted. We Americans have had a rude awakening to the fact that our vaunted world leadership in science and technology is being menacingly challenged by the Communist dictatorship. We had fallen for the attractive fallacy that there is some easy way to maintain and enhance our national strength, and preserve our freedom, which does not entail real personal effort and inconvenience on the part of every one of us. We had turned away from the hard disciplines in favor of the softer ways of life because we believed that the triumph of American principles was inevitable. We had come to the conclusion that it was no longer necessary to roll up our sleeves and work and fight to keep America strong. Perhaps we have learned our lesson in time.

There is no easy, pleasant way to protect our freedom, and insure our national survival, in this atomic age of peril. Our security is not to be found in armaments alone, but rather in the willingness of all our people to sacrifice in a common cause, in the toughness of our moral fiber and the steel-hardness of our spirit, in the quality of our self-discipline, in our readiness to shoulder responsibility manfully, and to put our hands to the plow with no thought of turning back.

Success of the Rambler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one striking exception to the generally depressed conditions in the automobile industry is the success of Wisconsin's American Motors Corp. The Milwaukee Journal of May 12 had an editorial suggesting the reasons for the success of this company in spite of the recession.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "AMC Finds a Market," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMC FINDS A MARKET

Despite the bad slump in automobile sales, Wisconsin's American Motors Corp. is well on its way to its best year since the present corporation was formed. After several years of losses, AMC showed a comfortable profit for the first 4 months of 1958.

The other day the company boosted its production of Rambler cars and added employees for the third time since April 10. Employees in Milwaukee and Kinosha now total about 11,000, compared with 7,600 a year ago. April sales totaled 15,418 Ramblers, compared with 8,074 in April a year ago.

Rambler is the only United States small car that has been selling well. AMC's advertising has been geared to attract the customer who wants a small, relatively undecorated car and a car that is less expensive to buy and operate than the major brands. The company has found a good market.

Rambler sales, however, still represent only a fraction of the total automobile picture. AMC president, George Romney, set a 1958 sales goal last fall of 150,000 cars. Total sales of all makes this year are expected to be at least 4,200,000. Rambler, in other words, would represent less than 4 percent of the market.

And the Big Three—General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler—are far from convinced that there is a serious swing to smaller cars. The designs for their 1959 models were decided upon early in 1957 and they call for even wider, longer, lower and more chromy models than the present ones. Chances are the 1960 lines won't be much different.

Why is Rambler selling so well? Probably the recession has been a factor. Buying a cheaper car is an easy way of spending less money. But that is not the whole answer, because the vast majority of purchasers are still willing to invest in more expensive models.

There is also a reverse psychology involved. It is fashionable in some circles now to be different and buy a small, economical car such as Rambler or one of the foreign imports. For some it is the smart thing to do, even though they can afford bigger cars.

Lastly, there is a small, hard core of car buyers who don't believe in excessive horsepower, length and width. They don't want the chrome and the frills that run up the cost, but add little to the utility.

Wisconsin has a big stake in the entire automobile industry. Many of our factories are suppliers of parts—locks, ignition systems, frames, etc. Trucks are made in the State. General Motors employed 10,000 persons in 1957 in the AC Spark Plug division here and in the Fisher body and Chevrolet plants at Janesville.

Wisconsin wants to see a prosperous automobile industry and certainly hopes that AMC will continue to be part of it.

The Fight on Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on April 28, 1958, the magazine Steel published an editorial entitled "Fight on Recession: Will You Join Us?" written by Walter J. Campbell, the editor.

The editorial is the forerunner and the spearhead of a short and long term depreciation reform, something which is not only aptly pointed out in the editorial, but also in the article to which it refers.

I commend the editorial to the reading of all my colleagues. During this period of recession, its practical approach to this very important problem can be of great help to us.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIGHT ON RECESSION: WILL YOU JOIN US?

(By Walter J. Campbell)

A bold yet simple program to correct the recession and to halt the march of inflation is proposed by the editors of Steel on the following pages. It is based on these facts:

The recession got its start (and has its deepest roots) in the capital goods industries.

Capital goods dollars have more bounce than soft goods and service dollars.

The quickest, surest way to correct the recession is to stimulate spending for capital goods, spending for reequipment and, where needed, spending for new plants.

The most direct method to encourage spending for tools is to free industry from our straitjacket depreciation laws.

Steel's program has only two steps:

For the short term, allow any equipment, building, or land acquired from January 1, 1958, until June 30, 1959, to be amortized for tax purposes in 5 years if the owner elects to do so.

For the long pull, set up an industry-Government commission to modernize the depreciation setup on a permanent basis.

The program has its genesis in letters and conversations with our readers. Scores of you who are participating in this publication's cost crisis competition (its aim: the updating of capacity and equipment to lower unit production costs) have suggested

that deprecation reform is essential to keeping our industrial machine modern.

You have said that investment triggered by liberalized depreciation will do more to regain high-level employment and output than any stopgap measure aimed at putting more dollars into the consumer's pockets. You have pointed out that the updating of our industrial machines (as opposed to outright expansion) is an immediate need in slenderizing costs, boosting output per man-hour of labor input, and holding down prices.

We realize that 1 publication alone—or 1 company or 1 industry alone—cannot overcome the inertia that is blocking depreciation reform. Pleas made in the past by industry and publications—in editorials, in speeches, in corporate reports, in testimony before congressional committees—have been like drops of water falling on the desert. They have evaporated before they could form a reservoir to build up enough pressure to get action.

With the Nation groping anxiously for a way to stem the recession, we believe the time for concerted action is now.

In the weeks ahead, the editors of Steel will continue to spearhead the drive for short- and long-term depreciation reform. Our voice will reach all Congressmen and appropriate Government officials.

Will you join us in the fight?

Outstanding Citizen of the Year, Rotan, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, recently the citizens of Rotan, Tex., honored Mrs. R. R. Gray as outstanding citizen of the year. It is not unusual for the women of Texas to play an active and constructive role in the affairs of their communities, but I think that the community which recognizes and rewards these noble women is to be commended.

The citizens of Rotan are fortunate in having a civic worker with the creative sense of obligation of Mrs. R. R. Gray. Texas is fortunate in having a community as generous in its recognition of the contributions of its citizens. The people of Rotan, and especially the Rotan Chamber of Commerce, which presented the award, are deserving of commendation.

This is another first, another frontier crossed by the women of America. Mrs. R. R. Gray was not merely the first woman to receive the Rotan Chamber of Commerce's Outstanding Citizen award, she was the recipient of the first award which the chamber made.

Tom Reynolds, a staff writer for the Abilene Texas Reporter-News, in May 10, 1958, issue of that newspaper wrote an excellent story on the award which Mrs. Gray received.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this account printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOMAN IS TOP CITIZEN OF ROTAN
(By Tom Reynolds)

ROTAN.—Boys, ain't you ashamed? A woman did the most work in town last year.

She is Mrs. R. R. Gray, female extraordinary, named Friday night as Rotan's outstanding citizen of the year, in recognition of her civic role in 1957.

The first woman member of the Rotan city council, the energetic widow is the consignee for Magnolia Petroleum here. Chosen by a chamber of commerce committee, she received a plaque from retiring president Floyd Clifton, at the annual May Day banquet. Dr. Sterling Price, pastor of the Abilene University Baptist Church, was the main speaker.

The award was the Rotan chamber's first.

In addition to running a gasoline business full time, Mrs. Gray holds these jobs: She is executive secretary-treasurer of the Rotan chamber, is a leader in the Fisher County chapter of American Red Cross, city council member, member of the First Baptist Church, 6-year secretary of the Lions Club and—says Clifton—she is ever willing to help with almost all civic activities.

Mamie Lois (Mim) Gray probably is the only grandmother-consignee for Magnolia in the United States, said new chamber president Mac Weathersbee. The Gray family has been in business here since the town started in 1907. Mrs. Gray took over the business entirely upon her husband's death in 1949. She formerly taught in Rotan for 7 years and holds a speech degree from North Texas State Teachers College.

She has a son, John, in the Army, and one daughter, Mrs. Will Levens of San Antonio.

Some 125 guests watched as she received the plaque.

Groping a little breathlessly for comment, she said, "I'd have to borrow a phrase from Elvis and our teen-agers—I'm all shook up." She added, "I hope I can justify your choice."

Dr. Price, the speaker, pounded out a link between civic and church work for his listeners, at the same time leveling a blast at prejudice.

He urged cooperation of all on all civic drives. "Work with people that you don't have too much affection for personally, but work for the community for which you do have affection."

He said, "I urge you to seek more diminishing prejudices. I hate prejudices—denominational or religious" and he indicated racial prejudice. "Prejudice is an affront to God's image." He warned that a community "can kill itself as dead as four o'clock by denominational fighting."

Among his warmup jokes, Dr. Price defined the new chemise dresses: "They remind one of prohibition. The joints are there—they're just harder to find."

President Mac Weathersbee introduced new officers. Charlie Woods is vice president; Mrs. Gray secretary-treasurer.

Directors are H. T. Fillingim, Jr., Kenneth Kelly, Wendell McWhirter, J. D. Burk, Lloyd Hurst, Ray Brown, Roy Kingsfield, Juston Morrow, Floyd Clifton, Wayland Gray.

The Rev. J. A. Cooley, pastor of the First Methodist Church here, was master of ceremonies. County Superintendent C. J. Dalton gave the invocation. The banquet was held in the Rotan High School cafeteria.

Wade Burroughs, high school band teacher, and his wife, sang at the affair.

Measures To Promote Air Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the people of the United States demand increased measures to assure safety in the air.

The recent series of shocking collisions between planes has highlighted the growing problem of modernizing airport and technical navigation facilities so as to cut to an irreducible minimum the hazards of flight.

The crash of 2 airliners over the Grand Canyon in 1956, the crash, last month, of an Air Force jet and a United Air Lines transport in the Nevada area, the tremendous number of near misses recorded over major metropolitan centers—all these point up the problem.

Virtually every Member of Congress finds, at one time or another, that he must use the facilities of National Airport. This overcrowded airport will handle 4½ million passenger movements alone, in 1958.

It is the hope of all Washingtonians, public officials and private citizens alike, that plans for the new airport at Chantilly, Va., will proceed carefully, but with dispatch.

It is essential that the civil aeronautics authorities incorporate in the plans for the Chantilly Airport as many modern facilities and devices as will be necessary; not simply as of the time of completion, but for an extended period beyond.

Time after time we have seen how an airport, or an air navigation system, becomes obsolete practically the day it opens.

The safety of countless people is involved in making sure that every possible device which human ingenuity can install shall be used at Chantilly.

So, too, it is essential that elsewhere in the United States, in the crowded air corridors around Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, and other regional centers, men think ahead, plan ahead, and act ahead, so as to reduce the toll which, all too frequently, has been taken.

The jet age is upon us; jets cannot be stacked up in the air the way today's conventional aircraft can be stacked up—circling literally for hours over airports, awaiting landing instructions.

The speed of jets, the huge fuel consumption of jets, the runway problem of jets—all these and other factors make it imperative that we plan adequately for the jet age.

We dare not be pennywise and pound-foolish. We dare not risk an incalculable number of human lives because we are not sufficiently mindful of the problems of tomorrow.

Coming as I do from an air-minded State—a State with rising air traffic of

its own—I feel particularly strongly on the importance of modernizing navigation and relaxed systems, both automatic and man-controlled, so as to conform to tomorrow's needs.

I send to the desk two articles, both Associated Press dispatches from the past few weeks, which reflect the problems of the crowded skies. I ask unanimous consent that both be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with an article from the May 11 issue of the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Too Many Near Misses."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CROWDED SKY GETS BLAME

WASHINGTON, D. C.—With all that sky up there, why do airplanes ever collide?

A Government study of air accidents, published Sunday, puts most of the blame on two factors:

1. Crowded skies near airports.

2. Very limited visibility from the pilot's seat of the average plane.

The findings were based on investigations of 50 collisions—90 percent of which occurred within 5 miles of an airport.

In many of the accidents, the report said, 1 or both of the pilots involved simply couldn't see the other craft, although 92 percent of the accidents were in clear weather.

The report, published by the Commerce Department, was written by R. Byron Fisher and Wayne D. Howell of the Civil Aeronautics Administration's technical development center at Indianapolis.

Fisher and Howell studied 50 accident reports culled from investigations of 92 collisions from 1949 through 1954. They selected only those mishaps in which investigators determined the angles at which the colliding planes approached each other.

They found that head-on collisions were a rarity, which isn't surprising since cockpit visibility is best straight ahead. Only 8 percent of the colliding planes met nose to nose.

About 80 percent of the accidents involved one plane overtaking another from the rear. Fisher and Howell noted that it is almost impossible for a pilot to see what's going on behind him.

Why couldn't the pilot of the plane behind see the fellow ahead? They had an explanation for this, too.

Since most of the mishaps were near airports, the planes involved generally were taking off or landing.

Take the case of two planes slowly descending for a landing. One may be ahead of the other, but at a lower altitude. The pilot of the rear plane can see straight ahead, but he can't see what's below him with the nose of his plane sticking out ahead of him. So perhaps he overtakes the plane ahead and glides right down into it.

Fisher and Howell said that more than 50 percent of air accidents might be prevented if airports could be equipped with some sort of anticollision equipment, even if it were effective for only a few miles.

While 90 percent of the studied accidents occurred within 5 miles of an airport, 25 percent took place directly over airports.

More than half of the collisions were at an altitude of 500 feet or less.

Of the 100 planes involved, 75 were private craft, 14 were airliners, and 11 were military.

AUTHORITIES LEARN NEW LESSONS FROM AIRLINER TRAGEDIES—BUT TOO LATE

LOS ANGELES.—The big silver airliner purred smoothly between cloud layers at 17,000 feet.

Suddenly, near Nellis Air Force Base, Nev.—but let airline pilot Bob Fox tell it:

"A flight of 3 jets dived from above right across our nose, missing us by about 150 feet.

"They were going so fast that there was no time to execute any maneuver at all."

This happened in January 1957 and Fox lived to tell about it—to the Civil Aeronautics Board. Others haven't been so lucky.

Last Monday in the same area an Air Force jet and a United Air Lines transport collided, killing 49 persons. Last February a Navy bomber and an Air Force transport collided over Norwalk, Calif., killing 48. Last year a jet and a transport collided and the big plane fell like a bomb into a Pacoima, Calif., schoolyard. Only 8 persons died—there could have been hundreds. Two airliners collided over the Grand Canyon in 1956, killing 128.

These accidents tragically point up the growing danger of aerial collision in the crowded skies over the United States. And the problem is probably more acute in southern California than anywhere else in the country.

Southern California—with its vast desert reaches and good flying weather—is ideal for military air training. Huge aircraft plants build and launch thousands of aircraft annually. Los Angeles is a tourist and business capital of the West.

All this makes for heavy aerial traffic.

For instance, last year more than 2,800,000 commercial, private, and military aircraft jammed the 10-mile-wide airways of California, the Las Vegas area of Nevada and the Phoenix-Tucson section of Arizona.

What's the answer?

From each disastrous collision officials have learned—belatedly, they admit—new lessons. After the Pacoima crash, the testing of aircraft was restricted to ocean and desert areas and all jet craft were banned from Lockheed Air Terminal. New flight procedures came out of the Norwalk crash, which still is under study. More lessons will be learned from the Las Vegas disaster.

Military pilots are warned about stunting or firing sonic booms in populated areas. Often their diving and rolling are only testing but mistaken by civilians as stunting, officials said.

Later this year when the jet airliners take to the air officials expect more headaches. Said one airline pilot: "Man, we're using Wright brothers rules and regulations and airways for supersonic planes."

Some airline pilots want military planes restricted to altitudes and areas where commercial planes don't operate. But an Air Force colonel answers: "We're all in this together because we all use Civil Aeronautics Administration facilities. We'll have to solve it together."

And pilot Fox concluded: "In the Las Vegas crash, both pilots were strictly legal—but it killed a bunch of people."

TOO MANY NEAR MISSES

An important factor in the problem of air safety is use of air space near busy airports by commercial liners, military planes, and private fliers all at the same time. This point is brought out by a digest of testimony taken before a congressional subcommittee looking into the collision between a large passenger liner and a jet training plane near Las Vegas, Nev., on April 21.

The picture of air traffic congestion is one which may well astonish if not alarm many laymen. Within the last 2 years, it was testified, there have been 2,000 near misses—or an average of about 3 a day—between planes on the Nation's airways.

So long as weather conditions permit operation under visual flight rules it is normal for numbers of military craft to penetrate commercial air lanes, as did the jet from Nellis Field, without notice to the civilian flight controllers on the ground. No specific regulations have been placed on the books to apply to the super-high-speed planes.

Offhand it might be assumed that the only way to separate military flying sufficiently from the commercial airways would be to relocate a number of fields whose approaches cross the flight lanes of nearby airports. But no one wants to handicap defense, and there are less drastic remedies.

The Government's Airways Modernization Board is at work on a program by which eventually all flying above 20,000 feet will be placed under instrument control no matter how bright the weather. This would apply to military and private aircraft as well as airliners. Probably instrument control would have to be brought down to lower levels at landing fields. And military planes, it would seem, should certainly obtain civil as well as military ground control clearance before entering commercial airway levels.

The work already under way toward equipping United States airways for fully controlled flight must be pressed forward with all speed if America is to keep ahead of the demands of the jet air age.

Sputnik and the Educational Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Miss Malvina Lindsay calls attention to the discouraging fact that the public's interest in education, which was white hot after sputnik went up, has proved to be short-lived. Once we had successfully launched our own Explorer, the interest in crash programs and massive reconstruction swiftly waned.

Perhaps it is just as well that this is true. The real needs of American education do not depend on the missile race for their validity. We must get genuine, continuous public support for building an educational system that will meet all the needs of our society.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Miss Lindsay's column, entitled "In Sputnik's Wake: School Apathy", which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on May 15.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

IN SPUTNIK'S WAKE: SCHOOL APATHY

(By Malvina Lindsay)

The public, which so recently was aroused over sputnik and eager to mass-produce scientists and start crash programs in education generally, now is showing waning interest in this undramatic and long-range activity.

Bills providing aid to school construction seem to be bogged down in congressional committees by partisan wrangling. And Members of Congress are receiving relatively little mail concerning them. Yet their mail was heavy when legislation relating to pay television was before Congress.

Also in many communities the drive to counteract this Nation's lag in education has

been stalled or detoured by indifference or by group controversy.

Is it that American grassroots sentiment responds only to acute crisis? Is our emphasis on material values so great that only legislation relating to things moves us? Are we incapable of interest in long-range goals?

Excitement over sputnik could not have been expected to continue at fever pitch. Nor could all the earnest resolves that grew out of that fright retain their burning zeal. But more follow-through was to be counted on from a people that had been fully informed about the weakness of their educational ramparts.

Meanwhile the need for action grows. A study of school overcrowding made public yesterday by the National Education Association shows that about 300,000 city grade-school children are on half-day schedules, compared with around 250,000 2 years ago. More than half of urban grade-school children are in overcrowded classes. Testimony before a House education subcommittee showed that about 800,000 children in all grades were on half-day schedules.

Oversized classes are one of the major handicaps to discovery and development of talent, to maintaining of discipline, and to helping each child realize his potentialities.

If the public is unmoved by educational lacks under its nose, small wonder it is even more unmoved by what those lacks are piling up on the the horizon, namely, loss to the totalitarian world of the battle of productivity.

Not only scientists, but persons highly trained in all walks of life will be urgently needed if the economy of tomorrow is to expand rapidly enough. By 1956 a 35-percent increase in numbers of workers in professional and technical fields will be required, the United States Department of Labor estimates.

Two House education subcommittees have just approved a $240 million, 4-year aid program to improve science and language training in elementary and high schools. A $260 million program of scholarships and loans for science and mathematics students has also been approved. But the basis for such programs must be laid in all-around improved teaching and facilities in elementary schools.

Controversy over feudal domain in one form or another is largely responsible for slowing up educational defense. The bogey of Federal interference with State educational affairs causes some opposition to proposed legislation. Meanwhile, many States are not able or willing to step up adequately their own expenditures for education. But the effects of a lag in education in any region soon permeate the whole national economy, since the fruits of ignorance, like those of talent, cannot be confined within State borders.

While many parents now are deeply concerned about half-day schedules, overcrowded classes and deteriorating instruction in the schools their children attend, they do not seem to be able to take the political steps that would promote action to change this. Then, too, educational legislation lacks highly paid lobbyists and well-organized pressure forces. It lacks glamour, tangibility and attention-getteing devices. It faces the same problem as American foreign policy—that of getting public support for its long-range needs.

The more discouraged proponents of a bold, dynamic educational offensive say that the best hope for it would be for the Russians to put a man on the moon or to announce that as a result of Soviet productivity every man, woman and child would receive a big Zil car. There may be danger of such salvation coming too late.

Plight of the Rural Electric Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the April 1958, issue of Rural Electrification, the publication of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, contained an extremely illuminating editorial dealing with one aspect of the REA co-op problem.

This editorial underscores the interrelationship of the income and welfare of the small-family farmer and the financial stability of the REA co-ops throughout the country.

The REA co-ops have entered into area coverage covenants with the Rural Electrification Administration by which they pledge themselves to provide electricity to all those in the area of each co-op who are not served by other distributors of electricity. However, because of the ever-expanding size of the American farm, caused by the hundreds of thousands of small farmers who are leaving for the cities each year, and other factors resulting from the Eisenhower-Benson administration's farm policy, the rural electric co-ops are faced with 325,000 idle services on their systems.

Many of the problems of the REA are caused by the lowered income of the small-family farmer and the fact that many of them have been forced off the farms.

The article also delineates the services being rendered by the REA. Guarantees for lines and services have not declined one iota, despite the large decline in population.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial entitled "Idle Services: Plight of the Rural Electrics," which appeared in the April 1958 issue of Rural Electrification.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IDLE SERVICES: PLIGHT OF THE RURAL ELECTRICS

Today the rural electric cooperatives have a gigantic problem with some 325,000 idle services on their systems.

When the rural electrics entered into the area coverage covenant with their Government, it was done without any reluctance on their part, for it was the cooperative members' strong wish and desire to offer electricity to all those unserved who wanted it. The combination of this unselfish attitude and the generosity of the Government's social decision in requiring it has now come to plague the feasibility of many rural electric cooperative systems.

Due to a number of reasons—the original economic unfeasibility in some areas of providing area coverage, the increase in size of farms, the soil-bank program, the reforestation program, low farm income, etc.—the rural electrics now find themselves with these 325,000 nonrevenue producing services, and many other connected services that do not pay their way. This is a staggering nonrevenue producing investment amounting to about $100 million which must, nevertheless, be repaid by the other remaining rural users, with interest.

To force the rural electric cooperatives into the private market to borrow their funds, with interest rates and service charges probably totaling 6 percent, as proposed by the administration, would be like cutting the jugular vein of the patient while he is undergoing a serious operation; the patient could not hope to survive.

And this is precisely what the administration's Wall Street anti-REA proposal would do—cut the rural electrics' jugular vein.

The rural electrics are successful—but barely so—despite their burdensome area coverage and the 325,000 idle services, and they will continue to be if they are not crippled by the administration.

The President's Press Conference on May 14, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the transcripts of the press conferences held by the President of the United States are printed in their entirety by very few newspapers throughout the Nation. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on the other hand, is accessible to, and is read by, hundreds of thousands of our citizens who attempt to keep themselves informed of happenings in our national and international affairs.

Because I think these persons should have ready access to the complete transcripts of the President's news conferences, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the press conference of Wednesday, May 14, 1958, as printed in the New York Times of Thursday, May 15, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 15, 1958]

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PRESIDENT'S NEWS CONFERENCE ON FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

President EISENHOWER. Good morning. Please sit down. This morning I have one short announcement. You people know that there are very delicate situations now in Lebanon and Algeria. These situations can well be very grave as they develop. We are watching them closely, and that is all I can say about the matter, because I believe any words now when emotions are so stirred and extremism can be voiced all around the world, that it is best for the moment to say nothing about them. So I will have nothing to say. This is not usual; I assure you. It is not my custom to do this, but that is what I think should be done this morning.

1

MARVIN L. ARROWSMITH, of the Associated Press. Mr. President, how do you assess the current wave of anti-American demonstrations in South America against the Vice

President? Do you see any pattern of Communist inspiration, or could it also be a case of genuine resentment against United States policies?

Answer.—Well, you have raised a very interesting but a very complex picture. I don't think there is any single cause. There is always—there are economic causes.

For example, in Uruguay, you may know about the difficulties there have been about these packing plants that were originally owned by United States firms and which can no longer make a living, and they—where they want to get rid of them. There is the—in Bolivia, you have always the tin problem.

In Peru, you have the very low prices of, current prices of lead, zinc, copper, and so on.

And in Venezuela, on the economic side, you have had these rumors that the United States was ready to—was trying to impose quotas upon a country, quotas on the oil-producing countries; and, of course, there is no truth to this last one at all.

But there have been economic difficulties, and it's—one reason that we are so certain with these developing countries and with many of them dependent on raw materials for their living, they have got to have trade. They have got to trade with us. They have got to have some aid, and the economic aid programs of this country today, and trade programs, in my opinion, are as vital to our security as any defensive measure we take.

Now, as to whether or not there are Communists in all these, there is a habit, as we know, of the Communists to try to exploit and take leadership in any unrest that is latent or developing, and if they can bring it out in the open as a real riot, why, that seems to be a practice of theirs and there has been sort of a pattern around the world: in Burma, Jakarta, in South America, other places, that looks like there is some kind of concerted idea and plan that is followed.

So, while I think no one would be so bold as to make direct accusation, the fact is that it looks like a lot of case, a case of where there is a lot of smoke; and, therefore, there is probably some fire.

2

RAY L. SCHERER, of National Broadcasting Co. Mr. President, could you discuss the considerations which led to the dispatch of troops to the Caribbean?

Answer. Well, it is the most—it is the simplest precautionary type of measure in the world. You—we had reports yesterday that were serious. We knew nothing of the facts. We could get no reports from the outside, other than telephone calls from the Embassy; and not knowing what was happening, and not knowing whether the Peruvian (Venezuelan) Government might not want some aid from us, we simply put it at places where it would be available, in reasonable amounts, and in bases that were well within the American zone; and that is all there was to it. There was no——

(There was a chorus of "Mr. President.")

Answer. There was no—no—even no offer was made to the Peruvians (Venezuelans). The idea was only in the case they would want to ask it, would we even think of it.

(The President conferred with his press secretary, James C. Hagerty.)

Answer. I kept saying Peruvians; I mean Venezuelans.

3

PETER LISAGOR, of the Chicago Daily News. Mr. President, I would like to ask whether we anticipated these demonstrations would be as violent and furious as they were and whether, in the light of that any thought was ever given to canceling out a part of the Vice President's schedule to prevent them?

Answer. No. These things were discussed, but there was no thought given to canceling Mr. NIXON's visits to these countries.

In each case he was invited by the Government and, as you know, many of these state leaders or Presidents-elect have come to visit this Government.

It is a courtesy to return their call when you can, and, moreover, it was because of his ability to discuss with leaders down there some of the problems that I just referred to, some of your economic problems, and in the hope that we could reach better understanding, that such a trip as that is undertaken.

Now, no one, I think, anticipated the violence of—particularly this last riot, and I think possibly everybody there was a bit caught by surprise.

4

LLOYD M. SCHWARTZ, of Fairchild Publications. Mr. President, some members of the Commerce Department's Business Advisory Council have just recommended that you ask for a moratorium on price and wage increases. I wonder whether this strikes you as a practical approach to the recession problems?

Answer. Well, this asking a moratorium, I think that is merely trying to use persuasive powers to get them to avoid both price and wage increases. Now, some of them, I think, already are scheduled, and I don't know, I would have to take a look at that as a feasible suggestion. I have constantly urged that both business and labor leaders take a very long look at this problem, and to see whether the persistent wage-price spiral is not a thing that we must get away from in the long run or we are going to suffer for it.

5

Mrs. MAY CRAIG, of the Portland (Maine) Press Herald. Mr. President, Governor (Leroy) Collins, of Florida, in a recent article in Look magazine, surveys the segregation system in the South, and what he says he is determined to see in Florida, point 2, is this:

"Segregation of the races in public schools and recreational facilities will continue in any community where its abandonment would cause deep and dangerous hostility."

My question is: Do you intend to follow the Little Rock pattern in other States where there is hostility to it?

Answer. Well, what do you mean by the "Little Rock pattern"?

Question. Sending in the Federal troops.

Answer. For what?

Question. As you said, to obey a court order.

Answer. That is right, to obey a court order; and that is the point. I did not send troops anywhere because of an argument or a statement by a Governor about segregation. There was a court order, and there was not only mob interference with the execution of that order, but there was a statement by the Governor that he would not intervene to see that the court order would be exercised. That is exactly what I did.

Now, I don't know, I am not going to try to predict what the exact circumstances in any other case will be.

But I do say this: I deplore the need or the use of troops anywhere to get American citizens to obey orders of constituted courts; because I want to point this one thing out: There is no person in this room whose basic rights are not involved in any successful defiance to the carrying out of court orders.

For example, let us assume one of you was arrested and you were arrested by a sheriff who didn't—who was—didn't think what you were doing in the particular town was correct, and the town was inflamed against you but the Federal judge says—this being, let's say, taking place on some Federal property, the Federal judge comes in and says he will issue a writ of habeas corpus and you are in jail, unjustly, illegally, unconstitutionally.

But there is now power there, no one—the Governor won't intervene; the marshal of the court is powerless, no one can do anything.

Now, what is a President going to do? Now that is a question you people answer for yourselves. I answered it for myself.

6

CHALMERS M. ROBERTS, of the Washington Post and Times Herald. Mr. President, you said a few moments ago that these anti-American demonstrations or outbursts of one kind or another around the world appeared to look like some kind of a plan or concerted idea by the Communists.

Answer.—Well, I said no one thing could be, have—take the full blame for any of these, but I did say that there did look, in this particular case, that there was a pattern.

Question.—What I wanted to ask, Sir, was do you see this as an effort to provoke these incidents or to exploit incidents arising for other reasons?

Answer.—Well, I think that a large part of it would be exploitation. As a matter of fact, I have been through this myself. In 19— in January 1951, the President (Truman) sent me to 12 capitals, I believe it was, in 14 days, 18 days.

It was a very difficult trip, I assure you, in midwinter, and that both in 2, and I think 3, of the big European cities, there was placards from one end to the other that they were going to—there was going to be a demonstration here that would chase the Americans, and particularly the old general back to the United States.

Well, they fizzled out because, fortunately for me, I still have a name over there as being sort of the liberator of the country, so that the Communist papers, which, in possibly 1945 were saying I was a very great fellow, had a hard time now to say I was a villain.

And so—but I do know something of, I experienced some of, these things, and when you are living in a house where the fences around are all painted "Go Home Ike", and all that, why, you feel it. But I think that they are largely efforts to exploit situations rather than to by, you might say, de novo create them.

Question. Would it violate your initial admonition to us to ask whether in this group of situations that you were talking about you do include the French Algerian and Lebanese situations?

Answer. Well, I would say I really can't talk about them because they are not necessarily the same kind.

7

PAT MUNROE of the Chicago American. Mr. President, several months ago, Senator (EVERETT M.) DIRKSEN, Republican of Illinois, recommended Robert Teakin for the United States court of appeals in Chicago. Teakin is now being investigated by a House subcommittee. I wonder if you intend to nominate him, sir?

Answer. Why, I have never made such a—I never indicated in any way a decision about the possibility of appointing him. There are all sorts of investigations of numbers of people before an important appointment is made, and I haven't in this case anything to say at all.

8

MCLELLAN SMITH, of the York (Pa.) Dispatch. Mr. President, the day before Mr. NIXON arrived in Montevideo, Uruguay, the government seized that private plant down there financed by American capital. They did that at a time when this administration is trying to get private capital to invest more money abroad in foreign countries. Now, my question is this: If we permit this thing to occur, isn't it going to damage this

program of sending of private capital abroad? Are we going to make any representations to the Uruguayan Government, or are we just—let them take the plant?

Answer. Well, I am not going to discuss this thing in the great—in the detail that it would require, if you were going into all the differing situations. But you must admit that Uruguay was suddenly facing a very emergency situation, because the American parties wanting to get out of this business, they no longer could make any money, and they were trying to find purchasers; and, therefore, it looked like there was going to be no meatpacking taking place for the Uruguayan population.

And remember this: There is no country in the world that is precluded from seizing property as long as it is ready to give just compensation. In our own country, right here, a State can take—a State, any State, can take private property from you. It does have to give just compensation.

Now, to say we are ignoring the situation is, of course, beside the point. We, of course—we are keeping in close touch with it. But there are, as I say—this isn't a usual thing, and you cannot generalize that this is Uruguayan practice. They have not done this before.

9

GARNETT D. HORNER, of the Washington Star. The Washington Star is urging in a frontpage editorial today, sir, that the people of Washington turn out in force when Mr. NIXON returns tomorrow to show him that there are some people around who like him [Laughter.]

Answer. I am one of them.

Question. I am asked to ask you, Sir, if you plan to meet him at the airport and if you think it would be a good idea for all Government workers to be let out [Laughter]. So they can do likewise?

Answer. Well, as a matter of fact, while normally it would—while it would be creating a precedent, because of my admiration for his calmness and fortitude and his courage in very trying circumstances, I would like to make some special gesture.

Now, just exactly what my morning schedule will permit, I am not sure; because I don't know what time he is coming yet, and I certainly won't know until after his evening's program in Venezuela is completed.

But as far as—if it were feasible, if it is feasible and you could take the governmental workers that are on the line of march, and you found out the time or the route of entry in the city, if in a half-hour's time we could give them out 45 minutes or an hour, why I would be all in favor of it, but I haven't yet seen any scheme for doing it. But I would go along with your spirit of your editorial, anyway.

10

JOHN SCALI, of the Associated Press. Mr. President, Vice President NIXON was tentatively planning to visit Europe on a goodwill visit sometime this fall. In view of the demonstrations that he has encountered in Peru and in Venezuela, do you see any need for him to reconsider his trip?

Answer. I wouldn't think so. If I were making it, I wouldn't reconsider; and I don't think he would think of it for a second.

[There was a chorus of "Mr. President."]

Answer. This lady right here. You.

11

MARY PHILAMENE VON HERBERG, of the Pacific Shipper. During the Senate hearing yesterday——

Answer. You will have to speak a little louder.

Question. If I have to tell you my whole name, it is kind of hard. During the Senate hearing yesterday on a bill to construct the superliner passenger vessel for the Pacific, and one for the Atlantic, this bill passed the House by an almost 3 to 1 vote, a controversy arose between the Defense and Commerce Departments. The Defense Department says it desperately needs these ships in operation now, so that in time of an emergency they would be able to carry troops. The Commerce Department says they want the ships for trade, but they are kind of against the financing, the only financing on which the operators say they can buy these ships. Do you have any comment on that?

Answer. Well, they brought the thing to me yesterday, but it has not been—I have not been given an analysis which yet makes me—give he yet the right to make a judgment. I will take a look at it.

12

WILLIAM MCGAFFIN, of the Chicago Daily News. Mr. President, Congress will have to take a look at taxes no later than June or otherwise certain taxes will expire. And there is a feeling in doing so Congress may decide to cut the income taxes. If they do, will you go along with them or will you veto the measure?

Answer. Well, again you are asking me to always prophesy, and I really——

Question. The tax cut, Mr. President, is very much in the news.

Answer. Well it may be, but I still don't see any reason to say anything more about the tax, and I have told you people time and again that the Secretary of the Treasury (Robert B. Anderson), the leaders of the Senate and the leaders of the House are watching this every day, when is the time to take it up, and exactly what the measure should be. So, I'm——

Question. Do you agree you will have to——

Answer. What is that?

Question. Do you agree, sir, that a decision will have to be made before the end of June?

Answer. A decision is going to have to be made soon.

13

EDWARD P. MORGAN, of American Broadcasting Co. Two questions relating to civil rights, Mr. President.

Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, is boasting that he is going to get reelected by blocking your civil-rights program.

Your nomination of Mr. Wilson White as Assistant Attorney General has been bottled up in his Judiciary Committee for months. Do you plan to push for his confirmation?

Item No. 2. Virginia schools, several of them are under Federal Court order to desegregate in September. What is the Federal Government doing now, if anything, say, by quiet FBI investigations, informal talks with civil leaders to prevent in advance a recurrence in, say, Arlington, of the Little Rock incident?

Answer. Well, I don't believe that you can start a gestapo around here, Mr. Morgan, and have secret police going down into every place they can to worm out of people what their evil intentions can be.

Now, what I think is this: Everything we say, everything we do must be to support the law of the land, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, whether or not we always individually approve it.

Now, so far as getting Mr. White approved by the Senate, you do what you can. But if a Senate chairman wants to bottle that appointment up for a long time, you have a very difficult situation; and I, for one, have not yet found a really good way to get it out of there.

14

RAYMOND P. BRANDT, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. The latest reports show the gross national product still going down. Have you any plans to revive your ideas about public works to increase employment and expenditures?

Answer. Mr. Brandt, I don't believe for 1 second that any—except without—I will put it this way: With minor exceptions that there is any additional public works to be decided upon, brought into the appropriations picture and finally built that will do anything for this present recession.

I don't believe that, I don't believe that anything beyond small things in the agricultural field or upper—upstream things where workmen can go to work very quickly, and acceleration of programs already started, for example, your post office and all that sort of thing. That is the kind of thing that will bring some people to work. But to start new plans, it will be 2 years before they will be actually in construction.

15

JOHN HERLING, of Editors Syndicate. This is on the extension of unemployment insurance. In your message to Congress, you asked us to act promptly, energetically, and broadly, to temper the hardship of workers.

Answer. That is right.

Question. Whose unemployment has been exhausted or prolonged, rather, and, under the current bill having administration support, governors of about 24 States said they can't act without special legislation or even constitutional amendment.

Now, most State legislatures are not in session or have just adjourned. It means a lot of delay. In view of this, will you continue to support the current measure?

Answer. Are you speaking——

Question. If not, sir, do you have alternative measures in mind?

Answer. Are you speaking of the amendment that was accepted in the House that the States themselves would have to show their——

Question. Yes, sir.

Answer (continuing). Readiness?

Question. Yes, sir; so-called Herlong amendment.

Answer. Yes. No, I can't say anything further on the thing at the moment. I better would have to see the bill come out as it was finally written, and then to determine exactly whether the States can do it or can they not. I, personally, thing they can.

16

ROD MACLEISH, of Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. Mr. President, sir, we talked a lot this morning about demonstrations and anti-Americanism around the world. Do you think, sir, that there is a failure in articulation on the part of our country to make its intentions and philosophies well known to people, a failure to articulate clearly the things we really believe in, and the policies we hope to enact?

Answer. Well, I tell you, I think that is, that attempt is made, that is sure, and I think that a very great deal of it goes out. But you must simply—here is one thing we must not forget: Among equals, the greatest and the richest and the strongest is bound to create some envy, and when you have any incident, therefore, that incites or brings to the surface this latent dislike or envy, well then, there is trouble.

But, by and large, we have spokesmen all over this country, we have our own press associations that are sending out news all the time. I think that so far as people want the news and the truth and the facts, including the intentions of this country and its—and the underlying basic peacefulness of our people, I think they can get it just as easily as they can get news of their own country.

17

FRANK VAN DER LINDEN, of the Nashville Banner. Sir, do you think that the need of the Marines and the airborne troops in the Venezuelan situation would imply that we should have an increase of strength of the Marine Corps and the airborne or certainly no further cuts in strength?

Answer. I don't say any such thing. We took 2 companies of troops of 2 types to put them at little stations where they could go somewhere. Now, you are going to make out of that a great big program for [laughter] for revising the entire defense establishment, that is a little far-fetched. [Laughter.]

FRANK HOLEMAN, New York Daily News. Mr. President——

18

JOHN M. HIGHTOWER, of the Associated Press. Premier Khrushchev within the last few days has accepted, or so it appears, a proposal of yours to hold some technical talks on test control measures. Do you expect now to go forward with these talks and send him a new letter in a short time?

Answer. I didn't understand the last part.

Question. Do you expect to go forward with these talks, and will you be replying to his letter shortly?

Answer. Well, of course, we will be replying to his letter shortly. Right—at the meantime we are discussing with our allies their ideas on the way this could be done, and we would certainly expect some kind of agreement very soon, and a substantive answer made to Mr. Khrushchev.

19

SARAH MCCLENDON, of the Camden (N. J.) Courier Post. Sir, we hope to build that superliner in Camden and I wanted to ask you another question about it.

Answer. Yes.

Question. I didn't quite understand. I take it you would not insist on private financing of this big vessel or these two vessels?

Answer. I say that the two questions brought up, I haven't heard of this argument until a few days ago, because I didn't know it had arisen, in the way it is—it has—and I will have to decide between the two as far as the administration system, the administration part is concerned.

Now, for my part, let's make no mistake I believe in private financing; but, if we have got to have this, these ships, because of defense purposes, which, and I just have a letter, I think, last evening on a—a very persuasive letter on it—if we have to do that, well, of course, the Government has to pick up some more of the tab.

But, to my mind, it is really—when we go beyond the ratios and the formula set down by the Maritime Act, then we ought to have a very clear, definite need and that is the thing that has to be decided.

20

CARLETON KENT, of the Chicago Sun-Times. Mr. President, has Admiral (Lewis L.) Strauss indicated to you whether he will accept reappointment (as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission)?

Answer. I don't know for sure that he will or will not, I don't know yet.

21

Mr. HOLEMAN. Sir, on May 26 the Navy plans to rebury the selected, the unselected, unknown World War II at sea. Do you approve of that, sir, or do you think there are enough unknowns in the ocean already?

Answer. Well, I will tell you, this is a delicate question, and I believe if any great service believes that the deep sentiment of orphans and widows would be, would be benefited by some kind of ceremony that symbolized the sacrifices of our seamen, then I would be in favor of it.

Now, this—of course, we have lots of unknowns. There is no question about it. Maybe the mere ceremony of another kind would do it. But these people have thought and studied and certainly have inquired from those that are the most deeply affected, and I would go along with it for that reason.

22

SPENCER DAVIS, of the Associated Press. Mr. President, you spoke a little while ago, sir, about the trade and aid program being as vital as any defense measures.

Answer. That is right.

Question. Are you satisfied that the programs that you have before Congress are proceeding in a manner which will be compatible with your wishes?

Answer. Well, now, let's make very clear the administration's first duty is to work out a program is any important subject, in these two we are talking about, MSA (mutual security) and world trade, and you have—you do it after long prolonged study with all the departments and many civilians invited to contribute their knowledge and opinions, and finally you put before the Congress a program, you believe in it. It is the program that you think should be done, should be enacted.

But, after all, the legislative process is largely not in the hands of the President, except for the—his recommendations to them, and finally his part in approval or disapproval of the legislation.

Now, I am the last one, therefore, to say that everything I want to is be done by—on a rubberstamp basis, and without the Congress taking the kind of reaction that will show their considered opinion of what they think about the thing.

Now, I will do my very best to persuade them I am right, because I think I am, but that doesn't mean that in any detail I could find it difficult to—some detail of procedure or any other things of that kind, that I couldn't accept it cheerfully.

23

ROBERT ROTH of the Philadelphia Bulletin. Mr. President, are you going to Gettysburg on Tuesday to vote in the primaries, and if so, will you tell us for which Republican candidate for governor [laughter] you will cast your ballot?

Answer. Well, you must have asked the last part of the question for a laugh. [Laughter.] I am going to, if I possibly can make the arrangements. It is not too easy because, among other things, I have got a big engagement in New York Tuseday night, and we have got things around here these days that are on sort of an hour-by-hour basis. But if I possibly can, I will be up in Gettysburg to vote in the primaries.

Mr. ARROWSMITH. Thank you, Mr. President.

Reciprocal Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently there appeared in the Kansas City Star an excellent editorial entitled "This Area Has a Huge Dollar Stake in Trade." The editorial strongly supports the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act. It supports this extension not on the basis of academic theory or political philosophy. This support is based on solid economics—economics which reveal the importance of trade to the Midwest.

This same theme and argument was stated in a persuasive and convincing manner by the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, in his address on the occasion of the Minnesota centennial celebration in the University of Minnesota Stadium.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and a newspaper article concerning the speech of Secretary Dulles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kansas City Star of May 12, 1958]

THIS AREA HAS A HUGE DOLLAR STAKE IN TRADE

The overshadowing reason for reciprocal trade is national survival in a world trade war with Soviet Russia. But many Congressmen seem to be more affected by the immediate pocketbook interest than the long future of the United States.

So, we submit, this dollars-and-cents motive also supports reciprocal trade. This is particularly true of the agricultural areas, notably the Kansas City trade territory. Without foreign trade the farm problem would be far worse than it is today. We can't expect the people of other countries to buy wheat from us unless we buy something from them.

The United States exports goods and services valued at $19 billion a year. Take another look at that figure—19 billion. It is about half the prodigious outlay for national defense. The supporters of reciprocal trade have figured that these products sold abroad account for 5 million jobs. The protectionists disagree, but we have yet to see a clear answer to the claim of 5 million.

Now look at the specific interests of agricultural America and the States of Missouri and Kansas.

The United States is the world's largest exporter of agricultural commodities, supplying 22 percent of the world agricultural exports. The proportionate share of wheat exports for Kansas alone exceeded $180 million in 1956–57. The State's sorghum exports were valued at $6,219,000. In addition:

Kansas dairy product exports: $3½ million.

Kansas corn exports: $3.2 million.

Kansas livestock and livestock product exports: $18 million.

That adds up to an impressive foreign market for the Kansas farmer. To little Switzerland alone Kansas, in 1956–57, exported grain, meat products, machinery, and chemicals valued at more than $4 million. And Switzerland is not one of America's chief customers. Part of this—actually less than half—was sent abroad under Public Law 480, a program which was devised to move agricultural surpluses. But 480 is a temporary setup. The abundance of American farms proves the need for permanent, long-term markets. Without such markets, it is easy to visualize a crushing farm surplus problem.

Another Department of Commerce survey shows the effect of reciprocal trade on Jackson County. Sixty percent of the country's workers are employed by industries which have large foreign markets. It is estimated that in 1956 Jackson County's share in exports by those industries exceeded $51 million. Industrial production of that amount can mean a lot of jobs.

Advocates of reciprocal trade admit that certain industries have been hurt by foreign imports. For the Missouri-Kansas area, mining is the chief example. Definite efforts are being made in Washington to provide some sort of help for America's mines.

But on the other side of the coin are the millions of jobs, industrial and farm, that result directly from reciprocal trade. That is the hard-headed economic case for the program. Yet in Washington there is still little enthusiasm for reciprocal trade, even among the lawmakers from States that have a vital economic interest.

Among some Kansas Congressmen—not all—this lack of enthusiasm is particularly evident. Apparently they have listened to the oil interests from their State, and the oil lobby, hurt by cheaper foreign imports has become particularly vociferous. The Farm Bureau and other large farm organizations support reciprocal trade but the farm interests aren't as active as the oil lobby.

It's up to the individual voters to remember that this area's pocketbook interests are on the side of reciprocal trade.

Any of its Congressmen who vote against reciprocal trade are voting openly against the farmers and a majority of manufacturers and workers of the area. More important, they are voting against the Nation that is engaged in a desperate world trade war with Russia.

DULLES URGES RECIPROCAL TRADE PACTS FOR PEACE

MINNEAPOLIS.—Secretary of States John Foster Dulles called Sunday for a renewal of the reciprocal trade agreements program as necessary both for the Nation's economic welfare and for international peace.

Dulles, who returned from Europe Sunday, spoke at a Minnesota centennial celebration in the University of Minnesota Stadium. He came here from Paris after attending a meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization council of ministers in Copenhagen, Denmark.

The world cannot survive in peaceful prosperity, Dulles said, if each nation emphasizes only its independence and neglects interdependence.

The United Nation stands for interdependence, he said, but it has weaknesses in certain areas. It has great influence on countries that have a decent respect for the opinions of men, but little influence with nations that lack such a respect, he said.

THE CHEAPER WAY

Dulles said it has been necessary to supplement the U. N. with other security measures, such as NATO, Southeast Asian Treaty Organization, the Baghdad Pact, the Pan-American Union, and the Organization of American States.

"By United States participation in such regional defense groupings," he said, "we supplement the United Nations where it is weak."

It is far cheaper for the United States to get its security through foreign mutual-aid programs, he said, than to raise and maintain the additional military forces it would need if it stood alone.

Among the dignitaries on the platform to hear Dulles speak were Princess Astrid of Norway, Prince Bertil of Sweden, Prime Minister Einar Gerhardsen of Norway, Prime Minister H. C. Hansen of Denmark, Prime Minister Reino Kuuskoski of Finland, and Gen. Lauris Norstad, supreme commender of NATO forces. Diplomats representing 25 countries also were present.

AN ALL-OUT EFFORT

Dulles' appeal was part of an all-out effort by the administration to get through the hostile House Ways and Means Committee its bill to extend the reciprocal-trade program for 5 years.

Several committee members have said the measure will not be approved unless the administration agrees to key changes. The administration has refused to compromise.

Dulles said the embattled program provides United States farmers and industrial workers with assured markets throughout the world. He warned against a reversion to the high tariffs of the early 1930's which he said helped drive Germany and Japan to extreme nationalism and did nothing to pull this country out of the depression.

Hospitalized Veterans Aided by UAW Local 72 Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a report has just come to my attention of the splendid service which members of United Auto Workers Local 72 in Kenosha are giving to hospitalized veterans. This is a wonderful story of compassion and genuine humanity. Members of this union—headed by a group of union members who are themselves war veterans—perform many personal kindnesses for hospitalized veterans in Veterans' Administration Resthaven Hospital at Waukesha.

Surely everyone concerned in this heart-warming enterprise deserves the warmest commendations of all of us. This includes officials of American Motors Co., and of the Kenosha Evening News for the fine recognition which it has given to this activity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this report, which appeared in the Kenosha Evening News, of Kenosha, Wis., on April 24, 1958, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOSPITALIZED VETERANS AIDED BY UAW LOCAL 72 PROGRAM

One of the lesser known programs sponsored by UAW Local 72 is the outstanding service rendered to hospitalized veterans.

The activity is conducted by the veterans committee of the city's largest union and it's probably the only organized group visiting veterans at the Resthaven Hospital at Waukesha on a monthly basis. In addition to regular visits on the third Thursday of each month, the union has adopted between 24 to 30 patients in 5 wards as their special charges.

Personal items including shaving cream, toothpaste, brushes, candy, gum, cigarettes, stamps, stationery, pens, pencils, and cookies are given to the veterans on the regular monthly trips. The visiting committee is usually composed of 2 members and 2 members of the union's auxiliary.

Last year the committee spent a total of $1,530. This included gifts not only at Resthaven but occasional trips to veterans hospitals at King, Tomah, and Wood, Wis.

The committee was established in 1942, and since this program was started the Kenosha union has spent more than $18,000 for veteran hospital activities.

When Christmas time rolls around, local 72 gives in addition to its Christmas goodies a $5 bill to each of its adopted veterans.

Last week the union committee went a step further and presented the hospital with fishing equipment for the vets. Committeemen are also planning on sponsoring fishing trips to a commercial fishing pond located near Waukesha.

Financial aid to help supply the Woods veterans hospital with an organ and remodel its auditorium is another local 72 project.

The veterans committee and local 72 also remember others who have made contributions to this Nation's defense.

If a veteran obtains a job at American Motors within 90 days after his discharge and works at AMC for a year, he may add his service time in computing seniority and other union benefits.

On the legislative scene, local 72 has sponsored the State law which gave an additional auto license tag to disabled veterans. Other committee functions include attendance at hearings in Madison on bills of interest to veterans.

The entire local 72 vets committee is comprised of veterans of military service. The group includes Raymond Gerl, chairman; Ronald Broesch, vice chairman; Theresa Van Der Wee, secretary; Louis Greenwald, Edward Raiman, Robert Spence, Stanley Jensen, and Walter Vaughn, board members.

Brannan Farm Plan Applied to Metals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Brannan Farm Plan Applied to Metals." The article was written by Mr. Leland DuVall, of the staff of the Arkansas Gazette, and published on May 7, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRANNAN FARM PLAN APPLIED TO METALS

(By Leland DuVall)

The Eisenhower administration has revived the provisions of the Brannan farm plan and has appealed to Congress to provide the necessary appropriations for the price-supporting operation.

But there is one small catch to the maneuver, so far as farmers are concerned: The renamed and revamped Brannan plan would be applied to the prices of copper, lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar and tungsten.

The administration—and particularly Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson—has chided leftover supporters of the farm pricing system, except as it is applied to wool. The wool program is in operation, with Benson's blessings.

For the benefit of those who may not remember 1949, the Brannan plan called for a price support system for perishable farm commodities that would allow the price to move freely according to supply and demand. If the price fell below the level at which producers could make a living, the Government would provide supplemental payments. Charles F. Brannan, Agriculture Secretary for President Truman, argued that the free price would assure full consumption while the Government payments would provide

farmers with an income that would provide for an adequate standard of living. The plan was rejected, despite the fact that it was offered only in connection with the sale of perishable products. John Foster Dulles, campaigning for the United States Senate, denounced it as an "economic jabberwocky" and other critics referred to the proposal as a sinister form of socialism.

There have been few expressions of surprise at the fact that the Eisenhower administration has made the Brannan plan provisions the backbone of its program for the price support of the five metals. Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton proposed the set market price floors and the subsidy plan at a hearing of a subcommittee of the Senate Interior Committee. The chief difference between the Seaton plan and the Brannon plan is that Brannan proposed to support only the prices of perishable commodities. Seaton would support the price of the nonperishable metals. Brannan said the support should be used only if the commodity were not easily storable, and in this connection the Seaton plan is even more radical than the original proposal. Secretary Seaton said the plan had the support of President Eisenhower.

FOREIGN COMPETITION

The prices of the five key metals have been following the same path taken by farm prices in recent years and have been declining. Behind this, of course, is the fact that large quantities of foreign-produced lead, copper, zinc, fluorspar, and tungsten have been finding their way into the United States market and the competition has beat down the price. Companies that produce these metals have argued that they could not be expected to compete on an even basis with the foreign producers and that they should be protected by a new tariff schedule. Last week the Tariff Commission recommended higher duties on lead and zinc, but the Eisenhower administration is committed to a policy of reciprocal trade agreements.

The Seaton plan calls for supports of the following amounts and levels:

Copper, 1 million tons a year at 27.5 cents a pound while the current price is around 23.75 cents; lead, 350,000 tons at 14.75 cents, compared with a price of about 12 cents; zinc, 250,000 tons at 12.75, well above the present 10-cent market; 180,000 tons of fluorspar at $48 a ton; and $375,000 short-tons of tungsten at $36.

The Government has supported the prices of several metals in the past through its stockpiling program (somewhat similar to the ever-normal granary as applied to the farm commodities a few years ago) but this can no longer be justified on the ground of national defense. The amounts of each metal on which price supports would be paid under the Seaton plan is close to the normal annual production.

Seaton proposed that the metals be sold on the open market at whatever price they would bring and that the Government pay the producers enough on each sale to bring the price up to the support level. Producers would prefer to have price protection in the form of tariffs, since the subsidy payment would depend on a new appropriation each year by Congress.

No one argues that the metals companies are not feeling the pinch of foreign competition and very few people are surprised at the fact that an American producer is unable to meet a competitive situation created by cheap labor. As it applies to industry, this is easily understood.

WHAT ABOUT FARMER?

The strange fact is that the people who know that domestic metal is more expensive to prduce than foreign metal cannot understand why the American farmer faces the same problem when he sells his cotton or wheat. Of course, the farmer is at another disadvantage since he is expected to sell his surplus on the foreign markets while the domestic metals cannot even hold their home markets and stay in business. The farmer is often roundly criticized because he cannot sell his cotton near the producing areas in other parts of the world and absorb the transportation costs.

Perhaps the most common solution offered to the cost-price squeeze of the cotton farmer is a "price reduction that will enable the farmer to recapture his lost markets or his traditional share of the world market." The arguments of the metals producers and of Secretary Seaton could be used—with cotton substituted for copper—to explain why this is a difficult job.

The Annual Forum of the National Conference on Social Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the many professional groups which makes an increased contribution to the well-being of the American people consists of the social workers of our land. In the decades from the 1930's onward, this profession has come increasingly to the fore in helping to meet the needs of the American people; especially in this urban age, with its many stresses and strains on the family and on other units of society.

From the University of Wisconsin and other leading institutions of higher learning in the land there comes an increased number of specialists in this field, and from many members of the profession in my State, I am glad to receive a wide variety of messages on problems in Wisconsin and elsewhere.

I noted with interest, therefore, the annual forum of the National Convention on Social Welfare in Chicago. The forum heard a frank discussion on many issues. There was controversy and free exchange of views between leading experts; problems as to the degree and financing of welfare work; problems of the relations between public and private work. These and other questions engaged the attention of the forum.

One need not agree with the major points stressed by the speakers who feel that it is good to have such a forum at which, openly and candidly, problems may be raised and thinking stimulated.

If we are to be adequate to the challenges facing this country, particularly the challenges facing our youngsters, our teen-agers especially, then we must mobilize the best judgment of expert men and women who are willing and able to speak their minds, voice their convictions, and advance their remedies as they see them.

The tremendous problem of financing programs by public and/or private means requires particularly careful thinking by our citizens.

I send to the desk two articles written by Ellen Gibson, of the staff of the Milwaukee Journal, describing the forum. I ask unanimous consent that both be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL WORKERS TOLD THEY'RE GROWING SOFT

(By Ellen Gibson)

CHICAGO, ILL.—The Nation's social workers Monday were roundly chastised for nestling in comfortable cocoons instead of leading the fight for improved welfare services.

Dr. Eveline M. Burns, New York City, in an address prepared for the 85th annual forum of the National Conference on Social Welfare, contended that social work should be a commitment, not just an interesting way of earning a living or filling leisure time. She is the conference president, a social economist on the faculty of the New York School of Social Work, and an authority on social security.

As social work becomes more professionalized, its focus narrows, Mrs. Burns said. Trained workers have shunned public-welfare jobs for the comfortable and protected environments of private agencies, where they feel they can develop under better supervision.

DOORS ARE CLOSED

The public agencies, which spend 90 percent of all welfare funds and serve an even larger proportion of all clients, have been denied their fair share of the limited supply of trained personnel, she said.

Social agencies, likewise, have tended to close their doors to the groups whose needs are greatest—problem youth, disorganized families, unwed mothers with several children, she said.

A half century ago, Mrs. Burns pointed out, social workers made their greatest contribution in seeking solutions for poverty. But recently they have lagged behind lawyers and economists in crusading for social insurance, and are cool to proposals for children's allowances or a public assistance program that drops the offensive and costly process of determining need in favor of a standard pension approach.

If the climate is hostile to improved welfare programs, "I suspect the fault is largely ours, for we have not challenged it," Mrs. Burns said.

MANY DON'T SHARE

The enormous increase in national productivity has done more for the well-being of people than almost all our social welfare programs, Mrs. Burns said, but many groups do not share this rising standard of living.

She mentioned 4 million families with cash incomes under $1,000 a year, the plight of low-income migrant workers in often intolerable living conditions, racial discrimination in jobs, housing and education, the concentrations of minority and low-income groups in city centers, the bad housing that millions endure, the high costs of medical care, the miserable record in rehabilitation, and low unemployment and assistance grants.

The forum, expected to draw more than 6,000 persons active in health, welfare, and recreation fields, opened Sunday at 3 Loop hotels and the Civic Opera House.

SOCIAL WORKERS SEE WELFARE OUTLAY RISE

(By Ellen Gibson)

CHICAGO, ILL.—Spending for health, education, and welfare will show a startling rise in the next decade and most of the money will come through taxes. Donations to private philanthropy are shamefully low and unlikely to increase markedly.

These and other conclusions were presented Monday by speakers at the 85th an-

nual forum of the National Conference on Social Welfare here.

The idea of a state of welfare for all the people is firmly rooted in America by now, although many persons are reluctant to admit it "for fear of being charged with a belief in the welfare state, whatever that is," said Wilbur J. Cohen, social research professor at the University of Michigan, and former Director of Research for the Social Security Administration.

SIXTY BILLION HEALTH BILL

He noted that legislators, for example, were acting increasingly in a socially conscious manner even when denying any similarity of objective with social workers. The only controversies today, he said, swirl around complexities of administration and cost sharing.

The Nation now spends $60 billion a year on all phases of health, education, and welfare, said Cohen. Two-thirds is spent by public agencies out of taxes. Three-fourths of the private expenditures are on health and medical care. Spending is still substantially below needs, said Cohen, and a healthy and growing economy can afford doubled public expenditures.

One of the most likely developments in the near future will be the addition of hospital insurance to social security to meet the special problems of the aged, Cohen said.

AGREES ON GIVING

F. Emerson Andrews, New York, director of the Foundation Library Center and author of several books on philanthropic giving, agreed that voluntary giving was not a substantial part of total spending in welfare fields. All the health agencies together—from the older polio and cancer groups to the newer associations combating muscular dystrophy and multiple sclerosis—have never collected in any year as much as $1 per person. Taxes spent on public health services amount to $2 per person per year, he said.

But Andrews argued that private philanthropy was still a vital characteristic of America. Private agencies are still in the best position to experiment, Andrews said.

WELFARE WAR STILL ON

The welfare war raging for some 9 years between advocates of Community Chest and other forms of united appeals and the supporters of separate fund drives is by no means ended, Andrews said. The Red Cross, National Society for Crippled Children, and other groups traditionally favoring independent campaigns have stiffened their attitudes in recent months. Advocates of federated drives retaliate by denying plant solicitations and corporate or foundation gifts to groups that refuse to join hands.

But neither method, Andrews said, raises enough money.

He suggested compromise approaches. Independent agencies might combine their drives to gain access to plant payroll deduction systems. Chests might permit donors to earmark half their contributions for the 2 or 3 agencies they particularly like, he said. In small towns, with plenty of volunteers with time to give, there is little reason why numerous separate drives cannot go on, he said.

SEES BIGGER FEDERAL ROLE

Emphasis on national defense is increasing the need for the Federal Government to take responsibility in many such related areas as health, education, science, natural resources, highways, and social welfare, according to Herman N. Somers, Haverford, Pa., political scientist.

"Those who speak of a return of functions to the States overlook the fact that the States never exercised the functions in question until Federal assistance made it possible," he said. "Those who ask that the Federal Government turn over some of its tax jurisdiction overlook the fact that many States are not now fully using their tax resources. One-third of the States, by their own decision, have no personal income taxes."

Formulas for financing social welfare may be improved or changed, Somers said, but the Nation will not advance by drawing rigid lines between governmental units or by pretending that one level of government belongs more to the people than another.

FEARS SCHOOL DROPOUTS

The loss of young abilities by school dropouts, based frequently on personality problems, is wasteful and a greater problem than juvenile delinquency, according to Solomon O. Lichter, a Milwaukee native, now director of the Chicago Scholarship and Guidance Association.

An alarming 40 percent of all pupils who start high school do not finish, he said. He called them "educational casualties."

The same problems that caused them to leave school will keep them from getting and keeping a job, he said.

Their problems show up in school but are usually emotional in origin and should be treated, individually, by some outside agency, Lichter said. From a 3-year study of 110 adolescents, capable of high-school work but ready to quit school or already out of school, the association found these causes of serious maladjustment.

High school coincides with puberty and a sudden increase in sexual and aggressive impulses that teen-agers cannot always control or understand.

Parental pressures for social or academic achievement may actually evoke passive resistance.

Undisciplined family backgrounds may lead to troublemaking in class.

Overstrict homes can produce rebels outside.

The current emphasis on enriching the curriculum for gifted child, on the theory he doesn't do well because he is bored, is wrong, Lichter believes. When this child has unrecognized personality problems, making life harder for him will not help. Lichter favors a school structure that meets the needs of the majority of pupils with special help for the casualties.

Nixon: An Example for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, this morning in the Philadelphia Inquirer there was published a very good editorial on the subject "NIXON: An Example for the United States."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, because I feel it is an excellent comment on the situation now confronting us.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIXON: AN EXAMPLE FOR THE UNITED STATES

As a result of the shocking and unprecedented attacks on Vice President NIXON and his wife in Venezuela, American troops have been sent to Puerto Rico and Cuba, only a few hours flying time from Caracas, the Venezuelan capital.

These American paratroopers and marines were not sent as a threat, to interfere with any foreign government or country. They had no orders to go to Venezuela, and would get none unless the Venezuelan Government asked for assistance.

But the American forces rightly stood for two things: Their presence at American bases in the Caribbean reflected American indignation at the insulting and wholly unwarranted treatment of the second highest official in our land, and American determination to assure his safety—with our own forces, if necessary.

Even after the situation in Caracas has quieted down and the Government there seems to have reasserted the control it so obviously lacked when Mr. and Mrs. NIXON were stoned, spat upon and jeered by howling mobs, it is difficult for Americans to take a calm view of this affair.

We might try to follow the example set by Mr. NIXON, however, whose cool courage and self-control under the most trying circumstances were matched only by the calm bravery displayed by his wife.

For the Vice President, indignant as he had every right to be, was also understanding. He did not underestimate the part undoubtedly played by Communists in stirring up the vicious mob attacks in Caracas and at the airport. But he judiciously weighed these disgraceful occurrences against the broader background of Venezuela's recent emergence from dictatorship, the violence bred by that kind of rule, and the danger that this violence in turn could lead to another dictatorship, this time from the left.

And, within hours after being subjected to treatment without parallel in the history of the high office he holds, Mr. NIXON could say: "I came as a friend and I go as a friend. All of us as Americans must work together as friends and partners to abolish poverty and misery and to achieve freedom for all."

President Eisenhower took a similarly broad view at his press conference. His attitude of anger at the treatment of the Vice President and determination to insure his safety had been shown in the dispatch of troops. Mr. Eisenhower also recognized the hand of the Communists in the uprisings, both in Venezuela and Peru and he, too, saw that economic conditions were an additional factor.

These things should be remembered by all of us, as Americans in every part of the country join today, in spirit at least, in the huge welcome being planned in Washington for Vice President and Mrs. Nixon.

But there is also the problem of good will tours, such as that undertaken by the Vice President, which seem to be poorly planned in advance. If our Embassies in South America did not know of the anti-American feelings in some places, they weren't doing their jobs. If the weakness of governments and their inability to cope with lawless mobs was a surprise, there was failure somewhere along the line in intelligence.

We are fortunate that the United States was represented on this tour of the vital South American area by Mr. NIXON, whose conduct arouses pride in every American.

There should be no occasion for coolness and courage under fire, however, when anyone representing this great Nation is on a diplomatic visit. Before any more good will tours are scheduled for Vice President NIXON or any other official, there should be solid assurance that he will not be exposed to incidents which imperil his life and affront the dignity of the United States.

Nineteen Hundred and Fifty-eight Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, each Congress I have made it a practice to send out a questionnaire to my constituents, seeking their views on major national issues. I have found this a most valuable method of keeping abreast of opinion in my area, and of affording the residents of my district an opportunity of registering their feelings on major problems confronting their National Legislature.

Believing the results of this questionnaire might be of interest to my colleagues, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include the following figures:

1958 questionnaire

[Total questionnaires, 5,873]

Question	Yes	Percent	No	Percent	No opinion	Percent
1. Do you believe that recent evidences of Soviet technological achievements indicate the need for greater Federal expenditures for national defense?	3,469	59.1	1,922	32.7	482	8.2
2. Do you believe a need is indicated for greater Federal expenditures to improve the American education system?	3,990	67.9	1,623	27.6	260	4.5
3. Do you believe Congress should press for greater unification of the armed services in the Defense Department?	5,027	85.6	541	9.2	305	5.2
4. Would you favor complete unification of the armed services, putting all servicemen in a single uniform and reorganizing the Department on the basis of strategic mission assignments?	2,411	41.1	2,799	47.7	663	11.2
5. Do you favor cuts in nondefense Federal programs such as agriculture, water resource development, etc., in order to permit larger expenditures for national defense and scientific development?	2,362	40.2	3,036	51.7	475	8.1
6. Do you consider the mutual security program an essential part of our national defense effort?	4,223	71.9	522	8.9	1,128	19.2
7. Do you favor enactment of President Eisenhower's reciprocal trade program?	3,945	67.2	594	10.1	1,334	22.7
8. If a choice had to be made between retaining a balanced budget and providing adequate funds for national security, do you believe 1st priority should be given to national security?	5,161	87.9	412	7.0	300	5.1
9. Do you favor Federal legislation aimed at preventing the misuse of labor-management welfare and pension funds?	5,412	92.2	305	5.2	156	2.6
10. Do you believe Congress should go beyond welfare-fund legislation and attempt to police general union finances, election procedures, etc.?	3,615	61.6	1,839	31.3	419	7.1

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as the ranking Republican member of the United States Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, I have taken an active part in the hearings and reports submitted by the subcommittee on the various factors relating to juvenile delinquency. With the problems of juvenile delinquency continuing to be of great concern to the people throughout the country, it becomes more apparent that increased efforts must be made to curtail this rising tide of juvenile delinquency and juvenile crime.

Last week, I inserted in the RECORD some remarks by Peter Chumbris relating to the role of the church and the community in rearing youth, which can be found on page 7363 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 7, 1958. Today, I would like to insert in the RECORD an article entitled, "Could Your Child Become a Delinquent?" written by Joseph Kahn, published in the Parade section of the Washington Post and Times Herald for May 11, 1958. This is an informative article and contains 25 questions a parent is asked to answer honestly, and from those answers, the parent can gain some effective knowledge as to whether his boy or girl is safe from delinquency.

It has been brought out in some of our hearings that national advertising councils and other public service announcements have been very effective in curtailing traffic deaths, in alerting people to diseases such as cancer and other illnesses, building better schools, and so forth. For example, in an Albuquerque, N. Mex., newspaper several years back, during a polio epidemic, the newspaper, on the front page, warned the parents to be careful of seven items in order to protect their child from polio. This front-page announcement was carried as a public service for the duration of the polio epidemic. There was no question that many parents heeded the warning and many children were saved from polio. Constant reminders to parents and community leaders stressing things to watch in children to protect them from delinquency and keep them on the road to juvenile decency could be as effective as these public service announcements in traffic, health, schools, and so forth.

Therefore, Mr. President, I should like to have printed in the RECORD the full text of the article by Mr. Joseph Kahn and the very pertinent 25 questions each parent should honestly answer to be sure that his child will grow into manhood without the harmful lifetime effects of being a juvenile delinquent.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COULD YOUR CHILD BECOME A DELINQUENT?
(By Joseph Kahn)

Could your child become a delinquent?

If you are an average American parent, you have been shocked by the recurring headlines about troubled teen-agers, the gang battles, the vandalism, the trials, the inevitable sentences—and the tragic waste of youthful promise. Probably you have asked yourself that ominous question.

Now there is a way to get the answer with remarkable accuracy. Presented here for the first time is a proved self-examination to measure your child's delinquency potential by measuring you, his parent.

The test on the opposite page, developed by Parade, is based on a scientific yardstick devised by the New York City Youth Board. Using it for the past 6 years, the board has predicted delinquent behavior months, even years before it occurs.

Among one group of 220 youngsters, youth board predictions of delinquency proved accurate in 195 cases. Overall the predictions have been 80 to 90 percent accurate. Among children rated as potential nondelinquents, the predictions have been about 90 percent accurate.

Above all, the board has learned that if predelinquent symptoms can be spotted, something can be done about them.

FIVE KEYS TO DELINQUENCY

The self-test offered here evolves from research launched more than a decade ago. Drs. Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, of the Harvard University Law School, worked out the original formula.

Comparing 500 delinquent boys with 500 nondelinquents over a 10-year period, the Gluecks found that such factors as poverty, poor housing, and broken homes were not necessarily crucial in producing delinquent youngsters.

They did find 5 factors which differentiated the 2 groups. They are:

(1) Discipline by father, (2) supervision by mother, (3) affection of father, (4) affection of mother and (5) cohesiveness of family.

In determining the delinquency potential of a given youngster, each of these qualities is graded and scored. Thus, according to the Gluecks and the Youth Board, parental attitudes and actions in themselves provide the key to delinquency.

An overstrict, harsh, unreasoning father—in contrast to a firm, kindly one—is scored low. A careless mother who allows her child to roam the streets is rated poor. Hostile, indifferent, rejecting parents get no-passing grades.

This formula has served as the basis of an 8-year experiment started by Ralph Whelan, energetic director of the Youth Board. Having worked with the Gluecks in Boston, Whelan figured that their findings could be used to predict potential delinquency. He and other Youth Board staffers then adapted the Glueck research to their own needs.

The Board has found that future delinquency best can be predicted when a boy (or girl) is between 4 and 7, the years when long-range behavior patterns begin to emerge. However, Parade's self-test can be valuable to any parent and any child.

Are there actual predelinquent symptoms to watch for? The Youth Board says yes. They may include anxiety, fear, lying, stealing, even muscular tics. Note the word may. All these may indicate emotional disturbance, but they also may be routine among young children and soon outgrown. The key still seems to be: How do parents treat their children?

Delinquent behavior itself has various definitions, but authorities consulted by Parade agreed on a simple working description. A child is delinquent, they said, if his actions repeatedly bring him to the attention of the police. This rules out most pranksters

and practical jokers, most children saddled with excess nervous energy.

Delinquency is marked by repeated, active rebellion against authority. The child usually is extroverted and lacks remorse feelings. Often he is so defiant that he will not take discipline at home, in school or from outside agencies. He usually steers away from supervised activities, even athletics.

To collect data about a specific child, Youth Board interviewers see the child's parents. The child himself is never interviewed. Based solely on parental attitudes and actions, plus information from social agencies, the Youth Board rates the probability of delinquency.

YOUR JOB AS YOU SEE IT

Success in making the predictions has been so stunning to date that Whelan believes that agencies which deal with problem children might focus their major preventive programs on the family rather than on the child.

The test offered here gages the major areas of a child's relationship with his parents, as seen through the parents' eyes. In taking the test, you can measure your effectiveness as a parent as well as learn what direction your child is heading.

The value of the test depends largely on how honest you are with yourself. You must answer the questions honestly, not as you think they should be answered, if you expect to wind up with accurate information.

If you have more than one child, test yourself separately for each one, since relationships differ between parents and individual children.

Remember, too, that this test measures delinquency potential. If you get a low score, pay special attention to the section following the test. That will tell you what you can do to decrease your child's delinquency potential.

Either parent can answer questions 1 through 23. However, the remaining questions are designed specifically for the father and mother.

PARENTS, ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS HONESTLY

1. Do you know most of your child's friends? Yes ☐ No ☐

2. Are they welcome in your home? Yes ☐ No ☐

3. Are you active in encouraging your child's activities, interests, hobbies? Yes ☐ No ☐

4. Do you frequently arrange to spend short periods of time alone with your child? Yes ☐ No ☐

5. Do you offer to spend time answering your child's questions about school problems? Yes ☐ No ☐

6. Are you generous in praising your child for trying and accomplishing? Yes ☐ No ☐

7. Does your child carry out assigned household responsibilities? Yes ☐ No ☐

8. When you are not at home, do you provide responsible supervision for your child? Yes ☐ No ☐

9. Do you encourage your child to join in organized activities suited to his age? Yes ☐ No ☐

10. Are you careful not to favor one child over another? Yes ☐ No ☐

11. Do you really have confidence in the character and capabilities of your child? Yes ☐ No ☐

12. Do you show affection for your child by holding him, hugging him, kissing him good night? Yes ☐ No ☐

13. Do you really enjoy your child's company for lengthy periods? Yes ☐ No ☐

14. Within reason, do you keep your promises to your child? Yes ☐ No ☐

15. Are you consistent in disciplining your child rather than harsh one moment and easygoing the next? Yes ☐ No ☐

16. When you punish your child, does he understand the reasons and think you are fair? Yes ☐ No ☐

17. Do you avoid dwelling on an unpleasant incident after it's over? Yes ☐ No ☐

18. Do you really try to understand your child's fears, tempers, letdowns, so that you can help him work them out? Yes ☐ No ☐

19. Does your family do things together often—play games, plan parties, take trips, share hobbies? Yes ☐ No ☐

20. Does your family eat at least one meal a day together? Yes ☐ No ☐

21. Does your family attend religious services together? Yes ☐ No ☐

22. Do you plan ahead for your child's future education, vacations, etc.? Yes ☐ No ☐

23. Do you believe that your husband (wife) is setting a good example? Yes ☐ No ☐

For mothers only

24. Do you always know where your child is? Yes ☐ No ☐

25. Is there an established home routine for eating, bathing, and bedtime? Yes ☐ No ☐

For fathers only

24. Do you share responsibility for discipline instead of leaving it all to mother? Yes ☐ No ☐

25. Do you arrange to get home from work early enough to spend some time with your child before he goes to bed? Yes ☐ No ☐

THE SCORING AND MEANING OF YOUR ANSWERS

The more questions you answered "Yes," the less chance your child has of becoming a delinquent. Each "Yes" answer rates 1 point. A score of 18 or above indicates that your child has a very low delinquency potential. That is, he is very unlikely to go astray.

A score of 13 to 17 means he has a better than average chance of turning into a good, wholesome citizen.

A score of 9 to 12 calls for some serious self-analysis on your part.

A score of 8 or less means that you would be wise to seek outside help in reshaping your attitudes toward child-rearing.

Don't let a few "No" answers alarm you. They turn up in just about every family. But do analyze your "No" answers. Talk them over with your spouse. Don't approach the subject with a chip on your shoulder. Admit your faults. Talk them out. Remember: Most "No's" can be changed with some effort, a revised attitude or routine.

Look at question 4, for example. If household chores preclude alone-time with the child, reevaluate your routine. Something can be done. Children rarely need (or want) an hour or even a half-hour. A few minutes extra attention can do the trick.

A "No" to question 16 may require some investigation on your part. Why doesn't the child think you are fair? Are you too severe? If necessary, talk to the youngster himself. Does he feel that the only attention you give him involves punishment? Draw him out.

It is desirable—and logical—to give all the questions such thoughtful analysis. Further, the Youth Board advises:

If solutions cannot be found around the family table and you honestly believe you are doing everything possible, talk out your problems with other parents, school officials, your minister, doctor, or family service agency. Don't be afraid to go to them. They stand ready to help.

Above all, don't be content to let a "No" answer stand. If you do, you are admitting failure—either your own or some other family member's. And failure can contribute to the very thing this article is designed to help avert—delinquency in your home.

How One School System Is Meeting the Challenge of This Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, there is much discussion about the educational needs of this Nation in an era that is demanding more and more of our educational system.

There have been many studies and many articles prepared on this subject, but I call the Senate's attention to one which appeared in the May issue of the Ladies Home Journal, entitled "How One School System Is Meeting the Challenge of This Century," and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW ONE SCHOOL SYSTEM IS MEETING THE CHALLENGE OF THIS CENTURY

(By Glenn Matthew White)

"What am I to do with Johnny?" a teacher asked. "All he wants to do is read the college textbooks his father wrote." "Should Sally spend all her time reading Shakespeare?" another wanted to know. "She's only 9."

What to do with unusually intelligent children in public-school classrooms has always been a puzzle for teachers. They are not always the best behaved, nor do they do consistently superior work. There is a legend among teachers of gifted children that one bright child on his very first day in school turned on his teacher and snarled, "Get away from me with that pusillanimous primer." Probably no child ever said it in quite that way, but every teacher knows a book that might hold the interest of average children in a classroom is a bore to some and impenetrable to others in the same classroom. What is one to do with the child who can read well but is just too bored to do so?

In 1953 Lucille Nixon, a consultant in elementary education for the Palo Alto, Calif., public schools, found herself swamped with such questions. She took them to the superintendent, Dr. Henry M. Gunn. "We should have a program," she said, "for exceptionally able children throughout our entire school system." He agreed. He appointed a committee to plan such a program; 2 years later it was approved by the schoolboard and put into action. Since its inception, every possible evaluation, study and test of the Palo Alto program shows that—

The creation of a snob or elite group of children—a fear often mentioned when any proposal is made to single out those with high I. Q.'s for special attention—did not occur in practice. Children can be grouped in special classes for a portion of the day, or offered special opportunities in other ways, without the slightest damage to their relationships with others.

Children not included in the program are generally not jealous or envious of those who are. (This finding is based not merely upon expressed opinions, but upon special social distance tests.)

Many more children than previously supposed can profitably skip a grade in elementary school. They compete successfully with

older children without developing social or emotional problems.

When exceptionally able children are grouped in a special class for only one subject, their work improves, not only in that class but in all their regular classes as well.

The community generally approves of special provisions for the most able when it is informed and aware of what is at stake in public education.

The Palo Alto plan is comprehensive, involving all the schools in the system—20 elementary, 2 junior and 2 senior high schools. It directly involves about 1,000 children in the secondary schools and 500 in the elementary. From the start, care was taken to avoid creating a little snob class, although actually, as assistant superintendent Jack Rand points out, the danger of good students becoming a clique of snobs is not very great. The opposite extreme is more likely—and more common. In most schools smart youngsters assume the attitude expressed by their less able classmates—"Don't be a D. A. R.," meaning "Don't be a damned average raiser." Those who violate this edict are called queers. Palo Alto's cradle to college program for exceptionally able children is an additional effort to raise academic standards in a university town where the standards are already comparatively high.

At Stanford Elementary School for example, fourth, fifth, and sixth graders are getting a taste of such heady subjects as physics, chemistry, geology, philology, and logic. A tape recording of 9-, 10-, and 11-year-olds discussing their interest groups seems the more incredible for an occasional lisp among the childish voices: "Well, in chemistry we made this model of a battwy, we filled it with a solution of sulfuric acid." "Sulfuric acid is very dangerous—the formula is H_2FO_4." "Then we used an elec-electron pump and charged it for 3 or 4 minutes." "Susan's hair was supposed to stand on end, but it didn't because hair is not a very good conducer of electricity." "Our teacher brought in an electroscope. Besides telling us what an electroscope was he showed us how to make our own."

The nonscientists are also vocal. In philology (word study): "We had lots of fun. We learned a lot of Latin and Greek—prefixes, roots, and suffixes. It was lots of fun." "You felt kinda like you've got something, kinda secure." In art: "We learned a lot of words we didn't know too. We went to a stable and drew a horse." "We also had a real kitten for a model." "I didn't know you started with shapes—I thought it was faces." In modern dance: "I had never seen it and never taken any part in it. What I liked best was the composition, making up dances just as you felt like to music." In storytelling: "You can tell stories to younger children—and that's good." "Storytelling is a lot like acting." "Most people don't think it takes much to tell a story—but it does."

As this last child said, it takes something—probably the glow of bright young faces and sparkling eyes—to tell the story of Palo Alto's gifted-child program. The interest groups, which in most of the elementary schools meet twice a week for 12 weeks during the winter months, are led by teachers who themselves have special interest and training in a particular subject, or by other adults in the community who volunteer.

Some of the group leaders are from the faculty of Stanford University or are employed by research or engineering firms located in Palo Alto. These experts, many of them renowned in their fields, share with very young children knowledge most people assume belongs only in higher education. Parents with years of practical experience in less erudite occupations also lead interest groups.

The children love it. "I hardly knew anything about physics before I started," one blue-eyed 9-year-old girl confided. "It's fun—you get out of schoolwork and you learn things you didn't know before," said another. The purpose of the interest groups is to give direction to a child's natural curiosity and, incidentally, to help him understand why reading, writing and arithmetic are so important. Without mastery of these tools, he soon discovers, he can't find out what he wants to know. "The idea," said one boy, "is not to teach a great deal about a certain subject but to open new doors."

Group leaders are equally enthusiastic. Albert Robinson, a semiretired electronics engineer and father of 5 children under 12, led a group in the study of electricity at Barron Park Elementary School. He entertained the children by constructing motors and other devices out of bits of tin, wire and nails. "I wanted to see how simple I could make things to show some of the fundamental and universal concepts of physics," he said. He made a small car powered by a battery and the starter motor from a junked automobile in which each child could have a ride when he was able to explain how an electric motor works. One boy brought his father to the Robinson home and asked him to repeat the experiments he had performed in class "so dad can understand them." The rudiments of physics, Mr. Robinson believes, can be taught to children as soon as they can talk.

Elena Greene, a young mother who speaks Spanish, conducted a group in the study of that language at Green Gables Elementary School. She used no textbook—"Most Spanish textbooks have not been revised since the year 1." She began by teaching her group to sing simple Spanish folk songs while she accompanied them on her guitar. She had no discipline problems and feels the children got a basic feeling for the Spanish language during the short time she had with them. "Children listen with their whole selves, even when they appear not to be," she said, "and that is the way to learn a foreign language—to give yourself to it without thinking about it. Very young children are able to do this best."

The success of such a program depends largely upon the support of parents. "Without the help of men and women in the community who volunteered their services, our interest-group program would have been impossible," said John Bracken, principal of the Barron Park School. In the support of parents, the Palo Alto school system is fortunate. The town has more than a normal share of well-educated, able, and energetic citizens—people who value learning highly. Parent-Teacher Association meetings are invariably packed and the discussion more often deals with fundamental matters of education than how to get new equipment. At the school administration offices there is a card file of more than 500 community resource persons who have indicated a willingness to appear before school groups. The topics cover a wide range of human activities: Business and industry, cattle raising ("will show a small group branding at my ranch"), community and government service, dance, drama, electronics (30 cards under this heading), health, hobbies and collections, travel, transportation, music (1 card, that of a former symphony conductor, noted, "will describe the evolution of symphonic music"), the United Nations, vocations—and many others. The Palo Alto Times publishes a daily column of the writing of schoolchildren called Youth Said It.

The gifted child committee, made up of 17 teachers, principals, parents, and special consultants, met for the first time in the fall of 1953 and spent 2 years in study and discussion. Preceding this the California Congress of Parents and Teachers had sponsored a study of the education of gifted children and published a report. A large section of the Palo Alto chapter of the American Association of University Women devoted all its meetings to the topic in 1954.

"There was some danger," one member of the committee noted, "that the program would be expected out of existence by those who looked for miracles before it even got started." Nevertheless, when the school board approved the formation of a gifted-child program and an expenditure of $20,000 for the first year of its existence, it came as a surprise to almost no one. Dr. Kenneth Martyn, now associate dean of Los Angeles City College, was appointed director of research.

The Gifted Child Committee set as its goal the grade acceleration of at least 25 percent of the students with I. Q.'s of 140 or above. Screening to identify the gifted child, on the basis of tests and teacher evaluations, was established as a continuing process beginning with third grade. (Some 6 percent of the children in Palo Alto were found to have such high I. Q.'s, as compared with about 1 in 400 in the general population.)

Contrary to the myth that "bright kids don't need help—they'll find their way," many children with high intelligence quotients do not do especially well in their schoolwork. They are often bored and literally shut their minds to unchallenging material. To undiscerning teachers, some of them might appear to be stupid.

There are two types of specially grouped classes in the Palo Alto junior and senior high schools. The so-called research classes, of which there are 10, are for children with I. Q.'s of 140 or above, even though some of them did not do outstanding work in their regular classes. These students get a broader, deeper presentation of the same material given ordinary classes. There are 25 advanced standing classes for students who have done superior work, even though their ability may be only slightly above average. Candidates for the advanced standing classes are selected on the basis of ability, achievement and aptitude, as determined by tests and consultation with teachers and parents. These students proceed with advanced work in 1 or 2 subjects usually at least a year ahead of their normal-age group. Both research and advanced standing students attend other classes with the normal assortment of good bad, and indifferent students their age. They are not cut off from the crowd and many of them are leaders in student government, athletics, dramatics, and other extracurricular activities.

Most of the research and advanced standing classes are small, ranging from 17 to 25 students, although 1 biology class at Jordan Junior High has more than 30. At Cubberly High School there is one 11th-grade advanced standing English class of 25 students which has 2 full-time teachers. They alternate in the classroom and both keep busy because of the amount of preparation needed. The head of the department, Wade Robinson, looks forward to the day when he will have at least 3 teachers for every 2 classes. This arrangement he can show is most efficient, although for most high-school department heads it must remain only a dream.

Jean White, teacher of a ninth-grade research class in English at Jordan Junior High, said, "Small classes give the teacher a chance to move around, to have various students working on different projects at the same time. We had book discussions and it turned out that we had two space-fiction addicts. They were always talking about space fiction in terms none of us could understand. Other members of the class pinned them down, and it turned out they weren't sure what they were talking about either. No student can get away with much when the rest of the class is right up with him. It was a great chance for me to show how important it is to know how to write, say,

think what you mean, without hiding behind blurry jargon."

"When you first have a class like this," Robert Leon said (he has a research class in 10th-grade English at Palo Alto Senior High), "you think the kids are somehow different from others, special—but they're not. You soon find they behave about like the rest. They are often challenging and, of course, alert, but as a group it's just like any other class."

Even a casual observer will note some differences, however. The exceptionally able youngsters tend to drift into the classroom early—and like normal groups, they talk. But then they linger after class and talk some more, the chief difference being they talk about something. They seem to be thinking and, blessing of blessings, they have others to talk to.

For example, in Clyde Parrish's senior science seminar, an advanced standing class at Cubberly High School, class began long before he entered the room. One boy had drawn a design for a perpetual-motion machine on the blackboard and was challenging others to tell him why it wouldn't run forever. "I know it won't," he was saying "but why won't it?"

"Because 'forever' is too long a time," another boy informed him.

By the time the teacher arrived the small group was warmed up for an avid discussion of friction, the perpetual motion of a pendulum, forms of energy and why some machines will run forever—if it is not too long. Mr. Parrish concluded the discussion by suggesting that the boy actually try to build a perpetual-motion machine instead of endless theorizing about it. "One of the things I've learned," he said, "is that—in science, at least—some of the highest I. Q.'s don't like actual work. It may be that they haven't had a chance before and never got into the habit."

In Henry Martin's science seminar at the Palo Alto Senior High, students choose whatever excites their interest and explore it to the fullest. His students are engaged individual research projects dealing with such matters as rocket fuel, rare earth elements, and automation. One boy is working on a plan for a computer which he hopes will be able to calculate the possible matchings of biological characteristics in parents and give the odds on their having a made-to-order offspring. Two boys took a day off to visit an elementary school and explain to a second-grade class, with appropriate demonstrations, why and how sputnik stays up there.

Much of their work is directed toward competition in various science contests such as the Westinghouse scholarship contest and the National Science Fair (a local science fair as the first step to the final which is held in Washington, D. C., and the prizes include money and college scholarships). Five of the gifted students from Palo Alto High School have spent the summer at the University of Nevada for an intensive program called the Junior Engineers' and Scientists' Summer Institute. Eight students have been placed during the summer in research laboratories at Stanford and nearby research firms.

Mr. Martin pointed out that colleges are overloaded with information that did not exist 10 or 20 years ago and that high schools have got to provide more of the fundamentals in each science. To accomplish this, some subjects must be stepped down to the earlier grades. He laments the lockstep in secondary science teaching. "Many students can learn the fundamentals much earlier than they do now," he insisted. "Instead of how to cook and social adjustment, youngsters need to meet the vistas of knowledge much earlier.

"I'm also interested in seeing that they get a sense of the history of science. In this age, it's easy for students to get the idea that a lot of things—telephone, radio, TV, and the great industrial and medical advances—grew on trees, because they have been around all of their short lives. I keep trying to show the sacrifices, the years of defeat, and plain hard work, that went into them."

Since advanced standing classes are hard work and take much of a student's time, not all who are selected as eligible choose to take them. Some already have a heavy schedule of activities; others prefer not to work so hard. They are not required to do so and may proceed with their regular classes. Those who do so, however, may complete during their senior year in high school as much as a year of college English, mathematics, sicence, or social science. If they pass standardized tests and meet requirements, many colleges will give them advanced standing and credit for the work.

According to Robert Shutes, coordinator for the Palo Alto program, the "little snob" question seldom rears its ugly head. He recalled an incident of one little girl who went home from school in tears because she thought she was not eligible to take a difficult mathematics test. But it turned out she was eligible, and along with 70 other junior-high students who completed 7th-grade math in the 6th grade, she is now happily at work on algebra in the 8th grade.

Most students in the special classes are too busy keeping up with the others to feel boastful about their accomplishments; students in the ordinary classes have little reason to envy their labors. Since the plan covers all schools in town, from the early grades through high school, it is accepted by most as merely another aspect of busy school life. Evaluations based upon the classroom social distance scale—a kind of opinion survey among students in a class to determine how they rate one another as persons—show that the students selected for the special classes remain as friendly and are chosen as friends as widely as before.

Parents agree. The comment of Mrs. Ira Thatcher, whose daughter has been in several English research classes, is typical: "There was some worry it might make for a bad attitude, but it certainly hasn't. Members of the class do not have any feeling of superiority, because they have to work so hard to keep up with the others." Mrs. Arthur Ellis, whose son, Hugh, has been in research classes in junior and senior high school, said: "At the start people worried about the kids becoming snobbish, but in actual practice nothing like that has happened. I think that it has done a great deal of good for children who seemed to be lone wolves."

The cost of such a program is hard to separate from general school expenses. The biggest investment is probably in the time of teachers and that of the psychological testing service. The total budget allotted specifically to the project in Palo Alto last year was $52,050. The budget for the program for the mentally retarded was $57,530. The program for the mentally retarded directly affects only 75 children. The gifted-child program, exclusive of the interest groups which are for all, directly affects 1,500 children of the total school enrollment of about 10,000.

Superintendent Gunn is satisfied that the program has demonstrated its worth in the 3 years in which it has been operating. "Tests show that children in the program are achieving more," he said.

Even so, according to Lucille Nixon, the administrative consultant whose suggestions started the program, it is far from a completed accomplishment at the present time. "Don't tell people we have all the answers," she begged. "They'll write and ask us how it is done—and we don't know."

A Scientific Approach to Learning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, ever since the launching of sputnik we have been aware of the necessity of training more scientists and engineers. Important research work is now being conducted in many countries, and the results of this work can only be appraised and understood by students who can read and understand foreign languages.

Science and the new devices it has made possible, including television and film techniques, have enabled our better teachers to influence and inspire many more students. Dr. Howard L. Bevis, president emeritus of Ohio State University and chairman of the President's Committee on Engineers and Scientists, reviewed some of the advances regarding education in an address before the 46th annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States here in Washington last month.

All of us are concerned with the problem of increasing the quantity and improving the quality of our scientists and engineers. This address is an important contribution to the solution of this critical problem. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SCIENTIFIC APPROACH TO LEARNING

(By Dr. Howard L. Bevis, president emeritus, Ohio State University, and Chairman of the President's Committee on Engineers and Scientists)

Some months ago, shortly after becoming Chairman of the President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers, I made the statement during a discussion with some newspapers reporters that what America needed was a technological revolution in the educational system, putting science to work for itself in producing more scientists, engineers, and teachers.

Pointing to forecasts that enrollment in the Nation's schools and colleges would double by 1970, I hazarded this statement:

"The demand for scientists and engineers in our growing technological economy and the shortage of qualified teachers to train them requires a new look at the whole system of education for the modern world."

Looking back over events in the field of education since that time, this statement doesn't seem quite revolutionary today as it did then. We have only to look around us at the equipment on display in this room, and to recall some of the newer techniques that are now in use. They demonstrate a vast potential, the opportunity for their universal application in the schools and classrooms of America that still lies ahead for our educational system.

As an educator and a former teacher, let me make clear that I do not believe modern scientific devices can replace the teacher. But I do believe that they can bring the teacher's knowledge to more students, multiply his hands, and put him in many places at once.

We are entering a vastly speeded-up scientific age, and it is up to the scientists and the educators to get together on new, imaginative uses for television, sound films, microfilms, tape recorders and the many other aids which will free the teacher to function more importantly as planner and overseer of the student's progress.

The development and use of these new devices and techniques for intensifying the learning process have moved through the experimental stage, since our bureau of educational research started its work at Ohio State University. Exploration and experimentation are still going on, and will continue to do so. But the use of educational television, films, and other audiovisual equipment has been thoroughly tried and tested.

Just a week ago, the United States Office of Education announced that modern mechanical and electronic devices are promoting a revolution in the teaching of modern foreign languages.

Language laboratories are now in use in more than 200 colleges and universities, and nearly 50 high schools have special language rooms. These special facilities enable capable instructors to reach a greater number of students. They help compensate for the teacher shortage, since much of the drill can be done outside class time. They provide a stimulating approach to language study, emphasizing the ability to speak a foreign language. Individual tape recorders and film strip machines enable the students of greater ability and aptitude to progress at a maximum rate. At the same time, they help less able students to make real progress at the rate their abilities permit.

There are many other examples of the application of scientific methods and equipment to teaching.

At the University of Oregon, an instructor can teach a course simultaneously on his own campus and three others in the State, thanks to a television link. Pennsylvania State University has worked with television for 3 years, and has discovered that in some cases TV students do better than their counterparts who see their instructors in the flesh.

The State of Alabama has operated for more than 5 years the only statewide educational television network in the country. Teachers are drawn from the two State universities and from the metropolitan school district of Birmingham. The Alabama network provides statewide classroom instruction at elementary and secondary levels. It provides adult education. And it gives the people stimulating discussion and cultural programs.

A number of city school systems are using educational television for citywide instruction—physics in Pittsburgh, shorthand in Washington, Russian in Schenectady. A project in color television, sponsored by the National Academy of Sciences, the University of Maryland, and the Army Signal Corps, is testing instruction in calculus.

Only a few days ago, Radio Corporation of America announced establishment of a $100,000 workshop at New York University for further exploration into teaching methods on closed-circuit television.

Many of you are familiar with the film series produced by Encyclopaedia Britannica which offers a complete course in high school physics on film.

There is also the Zacharias project at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, supported by the National Science Foundation, which is exploring the whole learning process as it may be intensified and strengthened by the use of television, films, three-dimensional aids and many other applications of the scientific approach to learning.

There are dangers in assembly-line education. We must be alert against simply using the new devices as gadgets which grind out more graduates. But this must not deter us from pressing forward on this new frontier of teaching—giving new opportunities and adding new capacities for our imaginative, dedicated teachers.

The application of scientific methods and equipment in the teaching of all subjects—the scientific approach to learning—is a part of the broader meaning of science education and the scientific attitude. It is giving us new knowledge about how people actually learn—and new devices to help them learn. It is giving us new insight into motivation—the key to learning.

The appropriate role of science in education is not necessarily to interest the student in being a scientist, but to interest the student in the process of scientific investigation. Thus science in education produces not only scientists; it produces nonscientists better trained for life in a scientific age.

Subsidy Limits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Congress an editorial from the Journal of Commerce of May 9 relative to the recommendation by the Bureau of the Budget that a limitation of 2,000 be placed on the number of subsidized voyages for the coming fiscal year.

As pointed out clearly in this editorial, one practical effect of such a limitation would be to preclude the 136 to 176 sailings of United States flag vessels which the Federal Maritime Administration has determined as essential in the public interest on the Great Lakes routes to be opened next year.

As Mr. Tastron, the Journal of Commerce shipping writer, points out, the limitation to 2,000 voyages which the Bureau of the Budget has urged would bar all United States flagships from the Great Lakes overseas trades, a development which I am sure the Congress never envisioned when it approved the expenditure of funds for the St. Lawrence seaway.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBSIDY LIMITS
(By Edward P. Tastrom)

The recommendation of the Budget Bureau to Congress that a limitation of 2,000 be placed on the number of subsidized voyages for the coming fiscal year is entirely unrealistic in the light of what has been happening recently in the field of American flag shipping.

Either this division of the Government is unaware of the existence of the Federal Maritime Board or is deliberately ignoring the work of the maritime supervisory agency during the past several months in carrying out its duties under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

As of last January there were 1,897 subsidized sailings, leaving 103 open under the proposed 2,000 ceiling. Since then, the FMB has placed additional voyages under subsidy, reducing the number of open sailings to an estimated 30 trips.

Against this small total, applications are pending for an estimated additional 613 voyages. About 25 percent of this figure represents requests for increased sailings by presently subsidized lines. The balance represents applications for operating aid by American lines which do not presently hold subsidy contracts. Several of these seem certain of approval by FMB before Congress adjourns this year.

According to our calculations, we thus have applications for 20 sailings for each one that would be available under the Budget Bureau's system of reckoning.

Obviously, this situation calls for adjustment, particularly so in view of the fact that each of the approved applications will have achieved that status after having been carefully screened by the FMB to determine whether a subsidy is justified under the terms of the Merchant Marine Act.

Unless this ceiling is adjusted upward, a bundle of money will have been wasted by both ship lines and the Government on lawyer's fees, hearings, and reports, and the FMB will find itself stymied in carrying out a key segment of its legal mandate.

The major immediate danger lies in the Great Lakes trades where four American operators, seeking subsidy aid for service when the St. Lawrence seaway opens next year, are "shut out" by the appropriations bill as it now stands.

The FMB after lengthy hearings has determined that from 136 to 176 American-flag sailings a year on this route are "essential in the public interest." However, even if the Maritime Administration could find the money elsewhere, it could not contract for these sailings because of the 2,000 voyage limit set by the Budget Bureau.

The urgent need for readjustment in this ceiling has been pointed out to the Appropriations Committee by Senator CHARLES POTTER, of Michigan; Arthur Tarantino, representing Great Lakes shipping interests; and John J. O'Connor, representing the Isbrandtsen Co., a subsidy applicant.

As pointed out to the House committee, the voyage limitation is, in effect, an amendment to the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and constitutes "legislation" by control of the purse strings.

Unless we are building the St. Lawrence seaway for the exclusive use of foreign-flag shipping, which is highly improbable in view of the millions of dollars of taxpayers' money being spent on this development, prompt action is needed in providing the subsidy aid which will permit American ships to engage in this service next year when the waterway opens.

It can be stated without fear of challenge, that lacking such aid, not a single American flag ship will be in the Great Lakes overseas business next year. We will be out of the ball game before the first inning starts.

Marquette Graduates in 1956–57

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently I placed in the RECORD a statement concerning the program for the future adopted by the officers of the Jesuit colleges and universities at a meet-

ing in January at Georgetown University. The statement appeared in the alumni publication of Marquette University. On that occasion I expressed appreciation for the fine contribution Marquette University has made to the State of Wisconsin and to the Nation.

Today I have a letter from the Reverend E. J. Drummond, S. J., the academic vice president of Marquette, who gives some figures on the graduating classes of 1956–57. I think this impressive contribution should be widely publicized.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Father Drummond's letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY,
Milwaukee, Wis., May 13, 1958.

The Honorable WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: Thank you for sending me a clipping about the statement concerning Jesuit colleges and universities which you had recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 28. In its beginning nearly every one of the private colleges and universities in the United States was, as the phrase goes, "church related." And as you have noted, these private schools have made a very considerable contribution in our pluralistic society.

Using merely figures to illustrate something of the contribution Marquette makes, within the school year of 1956–57 the university graduated 100 doctors, 64 people trained professionally in fields such as medical technology and physical therapy, 107 doctors of dental surgery, 77 nurses, 227 engineers, 290 in the several fields of business administration, 48 lawyers, 71 from the college of journalism, 49 from the school of speech, 379 from the various departments of the college of liberal arts, and 168 with graduate degrees in various fields. Along with the professional education given these students we have also striven to provide them with principles so that they might be able to direct themselves in later life as freemen and responsible citizens.

Today all of higher education requires a much fuller understanding on the part of the general public, and in particular, perhaps does private education and especially that under ecclesiastical auspices. So we shall rely on you to assist all of us in making clear what we are attempting to do and gain understanding and support as well.

Along with this goes, of course, my very good wish to you in all phases of your important work.

Cordially yours,
E. J. DRUMMOND, S. J.,
Academic Vice President.

Stan Musial's 3,000th Major League Hit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, as an inspiration to American youth no figure in public life could possibly outshine Stan Musial, the great star of the St. Louis Cardinals baseball club. Adding to the list of records that stamp him as one of the alltime greats of the game, on Tuesday afternoon at Wrigley Field in Chicago, Stan Musial smashed out his 3,000th hit of his major league career.

Musial achieved his 3,000th hit, placing him in a select circle of 8 baseball greats, at an earlier date in his career than was the case with the 7 others.

But Stan Musial's contributions to the record book are not his most important contribution to the American way of life. We cannot measure the good he does through the inspiration he gives to the millions of American youth. Of strong character, good morals, and sincere religious beliefs, Stan Musial is a monument to American manhood. Respected and honored in his native community of Donora, Pa., and his adopted city of St. Louis, Stan is singled out as an example of the kind of a man whose leadership tends to instill in the young people of our country an ambition to follow in his footstep.

I saw Stan Musial play his first major league baseball game. I have had the pleasure of being personally well acquainted with him ever since that time 16 years ago. Everyone who has had that pleasure will agree with me that Stan Musial today, after having been acclaimed annually since as one of the game's greatest stars, is still the same Stan Musial he was when he entered the National League. No amount of fame and fortune has been able to destroy those fine traits of manhood which his parents developed in him as a boy in Donora.

My vocabulary is not adequate to permit to express my high regard for Stan Musial, either as Stan the ballplayer or for Stan the man. Suffice it is for me to say as everyone does—Stan Musial is a perfect gentleman.

Under leave to extend my remarks I enclose herewith newspaper accounts of Stan Musial's 3,000th hit:

[From the New York Times of May 14, 1958]

MUSIAL'S 3,000TH MAJOR LEAGUE HIT HELPS CARDS TOP CUBS—REDBIRDS CAPTURE SIXTH IN ROW, 5 TO 3—MUSIAL'S PINCH DOUBLE IN SIXTH SPARKS CARDINALS TO FOUR-TALLIES AT CHICAGO

CHICAGO, May 13.—Stan (The Man) Musial, hastily summoned as a pinch-hitter despite a well-advertised day off, joined 7 other baseball greats today by smashing a key double for his 3,000th major league hit and a 5 to 3 victory for his St. Louis Cardinals over the Chicago Cubs.

Musial was supposed to have been benched today so he could hit No. 3,000 in St. Louis tomorrow night. He was called from the Card bullpen in the sixth inning and belted his 2-bagger to start a 4-run Card rally.

It was the sixth victory in a row for St. Louis over the error-plagued Cubs, who lost their seventh straight.

MUSIAL LEAVES GAME

Musial had a 2–2 count, fouling off 3 pitches, before he tagged Chicago's Moe Drabowsky for a long drive into deep left field. After a swarm of photographers besieged Stan on second base, he was replaced by Frank Barnes a pinch-runner.

Musial batted for Sam Jones, the Cardinal starter, after Gene Green had led off the St. Louis sixth with a double and Hal Smith had grounded out. Green scored on Musial's hit. Before the inning ended, a walk, Don Blasingame's single, an infield out and Wally Moon's double scored 3 more runs.

The Cubs had fashioned a 3 to 1 lead after 5 innings, 1 run scoring on Lee Walls' 10th homer in the third. The Cubs' 12th and 13th errors in 4 games gave an unearned run to the Cards in the third.

A crowd of 5,692 in Wrigley Field cheered Musial's big hit. The previous players who made 3,000 or more major league hits were Ty Cobb, 4,191; Tris Speaker, 3,515; Honus Wagner, 3,430; Eddie Collins, 3,313; Nap Lajoie, 3,251; Paul Waner, 3,152, and Adrian Anson 3,081.

DAY OFF INTERRUPTED

Musial had been slumped nonchalantly on the Card bullpen, enjoying the sun beyond the dugout. Suddenly, Manager Freddie Hutchinson called for him. Stan jumped up briskly, strode for the dugout, grabbed a bat and moved up to bat.

Drabowsky's first pitch was outside for a ball. Stan fouled the next delivery against the screen. He fouled another off to the left. The fourth pitch was low for ball two. A long foul followed into the left field stands.

Then Stan measured Drabowsky's sixth pitch and boomed it out to deep left, far to the right of Walt Moryn, the leftfielder.

LIST OF MUSIAL'S RECORDS

These are the records Stan Musial established or equaled before reaching the 3,000-hit milestone yesterday:

MAJOR LEAGUE RECORDS

All-star games, 13.
Home runs, doubleheaders, 5.

MAJOR LEAGUE RECORDS TIED

Year's 300 or more total bases, 13.
Year's most two-base hits, 8.
Year's most three-base hits, 5.

NATIONAL LEAGUE RECORDS

Total bases, lifetime, 5,042.
Consecutive games, 895.
Year's 100 or more runs batted in, 10.
Extra bases, lifetime, 1,156.
Slugging percentage, lifetime, 580.
Batting championships, left-handed hitter, 7.
Year's leading in games played, 4.
Year's scoring 100 or more runs, 11.
Year's leading league in hits, 6.

NATIONAL LEAGUE RECORDS TIED

Year's playing 150 or more games, 10.
Year's leading in runs scored, 5.
Year's 50 or more two-base hits, 3.
Consecutive year's leading in hits, 3.
Named most valuable player, 1943, 1946, and 1948. His 7 batting titles are 1 behind Honus Wagner's record.
Led league in total bases 6 years.
Led in slugging percentage 5 years.
Led league in walks in 1953. Club leader in nine departments—at bat, runs, hits, singles, doubles, triples, home runs, total bases, and extra base hits. Named Player of Decade in the Sporting News poll, 1956.

National Defense Transportation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is National Defense Transportation Day, set aside by Presidential proclamation and congressional resolution to focus public attention on the indispensable role all forms of transportation perform

in national defense. The event is being observed throughout the United States with parades and other special events and ceremonies. A radio program is being broadcast by stations across the Nation tomorrow which, among other things, describes the many important contributions of the Nation's independent airline industry to national defense in time of war and in time of peace. It is narrated by the noted TV and radio commentator, Mr. Joseph McCaffrey, who is well known on Capitol Hill where he has spent over 10 years covering Congress. The program opens with a foreword by Col. Francis W. Crary, United States Army, retired, executive vice president of the National Defense Transportation Association, the organization which sponsors tomorrow's observance. Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the remarks of Colonel Crary and Mr. McCaffrey:

REMARKS OF COL. FRANCIS W. CRARY, UNITED STATES ARMY, RETIRED, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION, ON RADIO PROGRAM MARKING NATIONAL DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION DAY, MAY 16, 1958

The third Friday in May of each year is National Defense Transportation Day—an occasion designated by the President of the United States to give full recognition to the importance of our Nation's transportation industry.

Sponsored by the National Defense Transportation Association and established as an annual national observance by public law of the 85th Congress, the day will be keynoted by the slogan "Transportation protects the Nation" to enable the Nation to become more familiar with the part transportation plays in our common defense.

The purpose of National Defense Transportation Day is not merely to display to the public the vast transportation system the Nation now possesses. It seeks, also, to bring about a broader understanding of the problems we face in maintaining our security and integrity in a troubled world, and the necessity for constant improvement and expansion of our land, sea and air transportation facilities.

In passing public law designating National Defense Transportation Day, the Congress of the United States declared, and I quote:

"Whereas this great transportation system, by land, by sea, and in the air, has been so expansive and comprehensive as to become somewhat commonplace in its acceptability, and the true importance and significance of this great transportation system in the community life and security of all our people, and as a bulwark in support of the armed services in a national emergency or preparedness in the defense of our country, is not given the full recognition to which this national development is entitled; and

"Whereas without effective transportation, all logistic effort collapses, and without effective logistics, all defense collapses."

REMARKS OF MR. JOSEPH W. MCCAFFREY

When the military needed extra airlift in past emergencies, the independent airline industry was there to do the job.

In 1948, on almost a moment's notice, the independent airline industry mobilized a fleet to support the Berlin airlift. Representing only 5 percent of the Nation's air transport, independent airlines moved 25 percent of the passengers and 57 percent of the cargo tons carried by commercial airlines in this strategic operation.

Again in 1950 the industry answered the nation's call to service and in support of the Korean airlift supplied over half the capacity called for by the military.

When refugees streamed out of Hungary following the abortive revolt in 1956, independent airlines flew the first airplanes from this country to airlift refugees from Vienna to the United States and elsewhere. They continued to support the Air Force's "Mercy Lift" of refugees.

This country's outer air warning network, The DEW line, has been supplied in substantial part by the independent carriers.

Not only have the independent airlines stepped into the airlift gap for the military during emergencies, they have, since 1951, supplied a continuous service in domestic movements of military personnel and cargo. In 1957, for example, independent airlines operated 4,971 commercial air movements of 218,856 military passengers.

Use of independent airlines for troop movements represents a substantial savings to American taxpayers because military personnel are kept on the job, not on the way. Independent airline service has saved over 50 million valuable man-hours for the military since 1951, in addition to millions of military dollars which otherwise would have had to be spent in unnecessary expense allowances and pay dollars. The record shows that the transportation service rendered the Defense Department by the nation's independent airlines is Uncle Sam's best buy.

Use of independent airlines to transport military passengers and cargo in peacetime further enhances the industry's value as a reserve airlift of the military in event of a national emergency. It enables the pilots and other crew members employed by the industry to keep alert their proficiency in military air operations. Not only are crews kept in a constant state of readiness, but the planes operated by the independent airlines are already equipped for military airlift work.

In cooperation with the Department of Defense, the Independent Airlines Association has set up machinery whereby it can mobilize the entire industry to meet any military emergency on a moment's notice. To facilitate Defense Department use of independent airline service, the association has offices on key military installations in the United States. These field offices, and IAA's member airline, are linked to the association's aircraft control center in Washington by a nationwide teletype network which operates on a 24-hour per day, 7-day week, alert basis.

The unique capability of the independent airline industry to serve the Armed Forces stands out as one of the finest examples of an effective military-industry partnership working together in peacetime to achieve maximum economy in travel within the Defense Department, and to assure an important ready reserve airlift capability in event of a national emergency.

While independent airlines are dedicated to national defense, they are dedicated also to providing the advantages of air transportation to the maximum public at the lowest possible cost.

In 1955 the Civil Aeronautics Board authorized the independent airline industry to extend its world-wide experience in military charter work to the field of civilian passenger groups. This enabled the industry which pioneered and developed low-fare air coach to contribute another significant first to air transportation when it established the only Government-approved air charter clearinghouse operating in the United States. Through the Independent Airlines Association's Air Exchange, civilian groups can arrange custom-made air travel tailored to fit their needs and desires.

In granting independent airlines permission to activate the Air Exchange, the Civil Aeronautics Board pointed out that the future ability of the industry to serve the military depends upon their ability to operate their fleet in commercial activities when not engaged in military work. The CAB said it felt that the independent airline industry possesses the inherent flexibility to meet the unique demands for charter and special-service flights.

Independent airlines are proud of their record of service to the public and to the Nation. The industry stands prepared to answer the Nation's call to duty wherever and whenever called.

Hope for Educational Legislation in 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, many of us in the Senate still hope fervently for effective educational legislation at this final session of the 85th Congress. These hopes occupy two major fields—scholarships for outstanding college students, and aid to school construction and teachers' salaries in all 48 States for elementary and high schools.

An informative article on this vital topic appeared in the Washington (D. C.) Sunday Star of May 11, 1958, under the byline of George W. Oakes, who has specialized in writing in the realm of education. I am particularly pleased that Mr. Oakes has discussed not only the scholarship question but also the continuing urgent need for school-construction aid at the Federal level.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Mr. Oakes' article from the Sunday Star may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Sunday Star of May 11, 1958]

FRIENDS OF AID TO EDUCATION SEE HOPE FOR SCHOLARSHIP BILL

(By George W. Oakes)

As Congress faces the last 3 months of its session, indications are that major education legislation will be enacted before adjournment. This year's big battle over Federal aid to education is underway in the House, the scene of past education defeats.

The sputniks, wide discussion of our educational deficiencies and the business recession, highlighting the need for increased Government spending, have left their mark on the legislators. As a result, the outlook for Federal funds to increase college scholarships and other related administration proposals looks favorable.

AN IMPORTANT STEP

The House General Education Subcommittee, spurred on particularly by Democrats METCALF and THOMPSON, recently has taken the first important action in this session by reporting out a 3-year $1.5 billion school construction bill. It is expected that the full House Education Committee will approve a similar measure soon. A year ago the administration's school-building program would have been enacted but for five votes.

Members of the House Education Committee are now trying to reach agreement on a scholarship bill—a compromise between the

administration's proposal and the more extensive and expensive Hill-Elitt bill. The scholarship bill is expected to reach the House floor before a school construction measure because it has the best chance of passage and it may be enacted possibly before the end of June.

Such action would encourage the Senate's leader in education, LISTER HILL, to bring his scholarship bill out of committee to the floor. Then it would appear likely that the two Houses will have little difficulty in agreeing on similar scholarship legislation. Present indications suggest that President Eisenhower would give his approval even though the cost might be substantially greater than the administration originally proposed.

One of the main issues to be decided when the House Education Committee meets shortly to report out scholarship legislation is the preference for science and mathematics in both the administration and the Hill-Elliott bills. Democratic and Republican members of the committee wish to remove any such bias in the legislation on the grounds that a broad training in the humanities is fundamental whether the purpose is to produce top scientists or well-rounded leaders. In fact, outstanding scientists have testified for aid to both humanities and science even if the aim is only to produce eminent scientists. Those who hold this view are convinced that they can get these ideas accepted by the committee.

FEDERAL AID OPPONENTS

The reason why a scholarship bill is likely to be enacted is that administration backing can insure enough votes especially in the House to offset the hard-core opponents of Federal aid among the southerners and Republicans. In addition, the defense angle will have a significant influence in lining up wavering supporters for scholarship aid at the college level even if the sciences and mathematics are not given special preference in the House bill.

There is considerable danger that any school construction bill may be bottled up in the Rules Committee or, if it emerges, once again meet defeat on the House floor.

Congressmen fighting for school buildings agree that considerable further impetus will be required to jump the hurdles of southern Democrats and many Republicans who for years have opposed Federal aid for this purpose. Mindful of last year's defeat, Speaker RAYBURN is understood to oppose taking a school-construction bill to the floor unless he is convinced that he can get it passed.

MIGHT CHANGE VIEWS

A deepening of the business depression or further disappointment during the next month in the expected upturn would be perhaps the only development that could enlist the necessary votes. It would also provide the best reason for the administration to endorse again its 1957 school-construction program as well as this year's scholarship proposals. Under these condition enough of those who have been mildly opposed to Federal funds for classrooms might find an excuse to change their view in order to pass the legislation.

Unless this situation occurs, it is extremely doubtful if school construction will have a chance on the House floor this session. Even though there has been widespread public discussion and interest in greater Federal aid for new schools, Members of Congress who for years have fought this battle do not notice a significant rise in popular demand for legislative action. Some believe that the educational world itself is too divided between those who urge more stress on quantity—more facilities for the rapidly increasing school population—and those who advocate greater emphasis on quality in the present school systems.

The Wonders of Radio Recording Tape

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, one of my fellow citizens of Omaha, Nebr., has written me about a program which I think worthy of attention.

We have heard a great deal about the wonders of radio recording tape and how it has almost revolutionized the broadcasting and recording industries. Now, recording tape is at work in another vital field—the improving of international understanding.

Some 2,000 people—in all 48 States as well as in more than 60 foreign nations—are exchanging ideas, discussions, music, and a better understanding of each other through World Tape Pals, Inc. They are to be commended for their interest and work in this venture.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to me by Mr. Charles W. Madden, public relations committeeman for World Tape Pals in the Omaha, Nebr., area be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OMAHA, NEBR., *April 23, 1958.*

Hon. ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: I am writing you on behalf of World Tape Pals, Inc., a service organization of nearly 2,000 members from all 48 States as well as from more than 60 foreign countries. It is our firm belief that world peace is simply a matter of understanding, and we are endeavoring to bring about this universal understanding through the medium of recorded tape. In response to President Eisenhower's people-to-people program, the members in the United States, consisting of well over half the total membership, are cooperating fully to make this peace program a success.

To quote President Eisenhower: "If our American ideology is eventually to win out in the great struggle being waged between opposing ways of life, it must have the active support of thousands of independent private groups and institutions and millions of individual Americans acting through person-to-person communications in foreign lands."

We of World Tape Pals are working toward world peace in several ways. First, through individual tape contact the members can teach and learn about others' countries, ideals, and ways of life, and can likewise discuss international problems from different points of view and offer intelligent, understandable proposals for easement and solution. How better can we learn than from our friends at home and abroad. I myself have friends in Germany, England, Gibraltar, Africa, Australia, and Japan. From them I learn about their lives and problems, and in turn I teach them about democracy and the American way of life.

Our world tapes for education project is a far-reaching venture which enables schools all over the world to participate in group tape exchanges of mutual interest, and to have access to an extensive tape library of cultural and educational material collected from all parts of the globe. As a teacher I can well appreciate the great value and potential of a project of the scope of world tapes for education.

World Tape Pals is now in its fifth year. We are presently planning an extensive expansion campaign and membership drive. In order to enlarge our scope of activities it will be necessary for us to solicit the aid of the various local civic, social, and philanthropic organizations throughout the country. In order to interest foundations and internationally minded people in the importance of World Tape Pals and our cooperation in the people-to-people program, we are endeavoring to obtain from each Senator and Congressman from all the States a letter of approval and support for tape recording as a means of aiding international relations.

Your consideration of this request for your seal of approval will be greatly appreciated and be of great value to the continuance of tape recording as an instrument in achieving world peace through understanding.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. MADDEN,
Public Relations Committeeman for World Tape Pals in the Omaha Area.

Small Business Investment Corporation, H. R. 10980

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, 1958, it was my privilege to appear before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Subcommittee on Small Business, in support of my bill H. R. 10980. My testimony was as follows:

STATEMENT OF ABRAHAM J. MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Senator CLARK. Congressman MULTER, will you give us the benefit of your thinking. We are very happy to welcome you here to give us your help on this very complicated matter. We know of your wide experience in this field and of your interest as a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee in seeing that the thoughts of the two Houses are brought together with effective legislation.

I see that you have a very elaborate and, I am sure, a most helpful statement here. My suggestion would be that we place it in the record in full at this point, and ask you to hit the highlights, appreciating the inconvenience which we are causing you by keeping you here when you want to get back to the House.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee and Members of the Senate. I appreciate the courtesies extended to me, and I am sorry that Mr. COFFIN has shortened his presentation to make room for me. I appreciate that and I also appreciate that Mr. MCCORMICK stepped aside so that I could present my statement.

I will follow your suggestion, Mr. Chairman, which is a good one, that the statement be made part of the record, and I will highlight some of the important features.

Senator CLARK. The complete prepared statement of Congressman MULTER will appear in the record at the conclusion of his oral statement.

Mr. MULTER. I join with Mr. COFFIN in urging that the Small Business Administration be continued as a permanent agency, and that your committee then take action on H. R. 7963, which passed the House by an overwhelming vote of 393 to 2 last year. It is implicit at least in some of the bills before you that you will continue that agency. I have elaborated in my statement upon the reasons why it is important that it be a permanent agency.

Many people will ask why should there be two agencies. If we are going to continue the Small Business Administration as a permanent agency, or even as a temporary agency, why set up a new agency for small-business investments or long-term loans? Of course, these definitions change very quickly.

When I first entered a bank as an employee in 1918, a long-term loan was a 1-year loan. Today the Small Business Administration is authorized to make loans up to 10 years, and we are now talking about the 10-year loan being a short-term loan.

There is not any doubt but that small business, if it is to be helped effectively, in addition to the lending facilities that the Government must extend to it, that we must make some means available to it to get capital which they need on a long-term basis.

My bill, H. R. 10980, was prompted in part at least by the thinking of Mr. MCCORMICK, who just testified here, and I want to give public credit to him for having stimulated the idea that is presented by my bill.

I would like also, if the principle of my bill is enacted, actually to test out whether or not the American public will participate in this kind of venture. I think we should do that before we have the Government step in and say, "We are going to do this because private enterprise will not do it." We know that private enterprise will not make long-term loans to small business. We do not know whether or not they will participate in a venture like this of long-term permanent risk capital investment. Let us try it. Let us test it, I say, and see if we can get them to do that.

The reason why I say there must be 2 agencies rather than 1 is important. I think Mr. MCCORMICK will bear me out on this, as will any banker, I am sure, who will come before this committee. The philosophy of lending is quite different from the philosophy of investing. The investment is intended to remain more or less permanently. There is no guaranty of return; there is no fixed amount of return by way of dividends or interest, but if the venture succeeds and prospers, the invested capital will be returned by way of profits earned which will be paid out in dividends, and even after the initial capital is all paid back the investment remains and continues to earn.

The loan, on the other hand, as we all understand it, is made for a definite length of time, agreed upon at the time the loan was advanced, to bear a fixed interest or return. There is always an assurance or guaranty, or there should be reasonable assurance, with necessary guaranties when available, for the return of the money. Even though it may be for a 10-year or a 20-year term, it nevertheless contemplates at all times that the money will come back out of the business and be returned, while venture capital and risk capital and investing capital is intended to remain there more or less indefinitely. As long as the business operates, the money stays there. Upon liquidation it will be paid back in proportion to what assets are available after liabilities.

So I say that basic difference in the philosophy of the approach of the men who must appraise where the investing money will go, or appraise the value of the loan and the assurance of repayment, is the reason why we need two different agencies to do the job. Eventually we may want to combine the two agencies. I doubt it.

I think, in addition to these important basic reasons, that the Small Business Administration is presently doing a good job, and filling a very real need. I do not think we will ever be able to do without it. I hope someday we can, but in the meantime with this new venture going into this new field, full of so many complexities and so many pitfalls, let us not risk that if it goes bad, it will give a black eye to the Small Business Administration and possibly cause that to fold up.

I have in mind specifically, as I am sure you have, that the RFC would not have been closed up when it was doing such a good job for small business, except for the fact that some of the big-business loans it had made gave it a black eye. Let us try to avoid that happening with this new agency.

Senator CLARK. Let me interrupt you to say that I personally agree with you, but what would be your answer to the contention that some of our friends make that by creating a new agency we are setting up another vast Federal bureaucracy which will have branch offices in every city and county and which is quite unnecessary. You know the general objections to the Government interjecting itself to that extent.

Mr. MULTER. If this agency is needed then all those arguments obviously fall to the ground. But my approach is slightly different than that of S. 3651, which was introduced by Senator JOHNSON and many others.

S. 3651 does appear to set up a permanent agency, and while it talks about letting private enterprise eventually take over, it has no provision, in the bill at least, for private enterprise taking over the main or mother organization. You do provide for the small investment company being helped by the mother agency, eventually to be completely privately owned. My approach is different from that.

In H. R. 10980 I set up an agency of Government with provisions which are self-executing and mandatory that small business eventually take it over. If the enterprise fails, and collapses, we will close it up. We would be among the first to do so if it did not succeed. But, if it succeeds I provide with every investment, that the company that is being helped must make a 10 percent investment in the Government agency or corporation that is set up, and eventually small business will own this agency that we are setting up and the Government will be out completely. It may take 10 years, but eventually the Government will get out.

If in the meantime it does not succeed and does not do the job intended, we can wind it up at any time.

I think that is a complete answer to those who say let us not set up another bureau or another agency of Government.

In that connection I cannot too vigorously urge upon you that in your approach please do not set up a policy board as part of the agency or part of the corporation which is going to include in its membership anybody in other Government agencies, whether it be the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary of Commerce, or the Small Business Administrator. Please keep them out of the policy-making organization or division of the corporation or agency.

Senator CLARK. Why do you say that?

Mr. MULTER. Because experience has shown with the Small Business Administration, where we have a loan policy board consisting of the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Small Business Administrator, that the Small Business Administrator is under the domination of those two other agencies. The two other men are big business representatives traditionally. In fact, their views have prevailed rather than the views of the Congress, and the intent of the Congress. The views of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce have been running the agency so far as loan policy is concerned, and I say that is bad.

Senator CLARK. Do you think that would be true regardless of who controls the White House? My own view is, that is a reflection of current political philosophy of the party that won the election in 1952 and 1956, and it would change very rapidly if the party to which we both belong would acquire the Presidency.

Mr. MULTER. I believe you are right, that personalities will change and we will get better public servants who are more responsive to the will of the Congress and to the will and needs of the people.

Senator CLARK. In other words, you think that this agency should not be a part of the executive arm?

Mr. MULTER. Definitely not. And let me say in fairness to the Republicans, the Democrats too have called on big business for representation in Commerce and in Treasury. Commerce is supposed to be the agency taking care of all business, big and small, but traditionally, no matter who is in the White House, Democrat or Republican, the Commerce Department looked after big business and Treasury leaned toward big business rather than small business. The only small business agency we have today in Government is the Small Business Administration, and we should make it independent as called for in H. R. 7963. I hope you do the same thing here.

If we set up an agency, of course, we are inclined to say, let us have an administrator, one person running the agency or department. That is all right in most instances and I go for it in most departments. But in setting up a new agency of this kind which is actually going to be exploring new paths of enterprise, let us in the first instance, whether it be an agency or corporation, set up a board of at least 3 men, or a commission of at least 3 men, and call in 3 people from outside the Government, and let them explore and develop the policies and program and administration of this agency.

Let them be responsible for the making of the policy and the implementation of the policy. Where we are going into such a new field as this, I do not think we can find anyone man who will be able to do the full job. There too, we may fail because we do not have the right person or persons in control. If we can get three people from business and banking and investment to come in and do this job and set up this new agency or corporation, I think we can do a better job in the first instance. Maybe after 3 or 4 or 5 years we will go back to the idea of 1 man running it, but in the beginning we need that diversification of opinion and experience.

There are many good provisions in S. 3651 which I did not incorporate in my bill, and which I think should be incorporated in any bill that you bring out. I have indicated them in my statement and I will not take the time to mention them. There is one other provision which is neither in those bills nor in my bill, which I think we should not overlook putting in. That is the provision that the General Accounting Office have the right to go in and audit and report to the Congress. In these bills we call for reports to the Congress. Let us not make the mistake of not saying in the bill we enact that the General Accounting Office should have the right to go in and review and report to the Congress as to all of the operations of any agency or corporation we do set up.

The question of definition always give us considerable trouble—the definition of small business. I do not think the complete answer is found in my bill. I do not think it is found in the Senate bill. My suggestion is

we add to whatever language we take, whether it be that in the existing statute or that in any of the bills—that we add a provision which would give the administrator, or the board, or the commission that is in control of this new organization, discretion so that it does not arbitrarily exclude anyone. If his definition says 250 employees in this particular indutry is small business, do not permit the exclusion of one with 254 employees. Give that additional latitude and discretion so that we can bring a genuinely small business concern into this program, where the facts warrant it.

I think, sir, I have covered most of the important features of the legislation before you and, of course, as has already been indicated, they are elaborated on in my statement.

Senator CLARK. Thank you very much, Congressman MULTER, for your most helpful testimony, and particularly for calling to our attention your own bill, H. R. 10980. I see that you have a section-by-section analysis of it in your prepared statement, and I am going to ask the staff to familiarize themselves with it. I shall read it with great care myself before we go into executive session to mark up a bill for final action.

I really do appreciate your taking this time. I know you want to go back so I will not hold you any longer. Thank you ever so much, Congressman MULTER.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you.

(Congressman MULTER's prepared statement follows:)

"STATEMENT OF ABRAHAM J. MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

"Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the privilege of appearing before you today in an effort to help in some small way in your deliberations on a very complex problem confronting the American public and the Congress.

"I, like many Members of the Senate and the House, have introduced bills to provide financial aid and assistance to small business.

"Need for a new legislative approach

"If the 4 million small-business concerns so vital to our free-enterprise system are to continue to exist, we here in Congress must find, as quickly as possible, a method whereby the financing so necessary to the life of a small-business concern will be made more readily available. Not only must we address ourselves to the problem of loans to small business but we must also establish methods of making available risk capital, now almost nonexistent, for these small businesses.

"My bill, H. R. 10980, is known by the title of 'Small Business Investment Corporation.' Its purpose is to furnish needed equity capital to small-business concerns in the United States.

"Today, we can all agree (1) that the growth and development of small business is essential to the continuing vitality and expansion of a sound national economy; (2) that small-business concerns in the United States are increasingly in need of equity-capital money with which to finance their growth and development; (3) that such money must come from either loans or risk capital or both; (4) equity-risk capital is unfortunately rarely available for this purpose; and (5) until private enterprise adequately performs this task, the Federal Government must fill the void.

"The Small Business Administration

"There is now pending before this committee H. R. 7963. That bill passed the House last year by an overwhelming vote of 393 to 2. It represents the clear and unequivocable attitude of the House that the Small Business Administration should be a permanent agency. The financial assistance program of the Small Business Administration covers only the loan feature—both for business loans and disaster loans. But unless and until this agency is made permanent by Congress, it cannot and it will not fully accomplish the mission for which it was created.

"There are many who urge that the authority of SBA is too limited and too restricted. Some urge the maximum amount of the loans is too low. Others say 10 years is too short a term. If a majority of this committee endorses either or both of those suggestions, then I say amend H. R. 7963 so as to accomplish those additional lending functions.

"But I beg of you, do not create a new lending agency for that purpose. There are those of our colleagues who rightfully complain that SBA has not in all respects implemented the intent of Congress. Some of those complaints are properly laid at the door of poor administration. The blame for others is ours, that of the Congress, because of the provisions we wrote into the law.

"On the administration end, SBA has learned and is learning from experience and is doing, and I believe will continue to do, a better job. We can help them.

"If we eliminate the loan policy board, we will at once make the agency more amenable to the legislative will and intent and, at the same time, eliminate the big-business views and influence of the Treasury and Commerce Departments. If we make SBA permanent, the agency will be able to retain experienced personnel. Because of its temporary nature, as fast as SBA trains good men they move on to other positions that give assurance of permanent tenure. In addition, SBA will get more and better cooperation from private industry and private banks if it has permanent status.

"A most important reason for continuing SBA is the important Government procurement role it plays for small business. There is no other agency set up to do that job. No other agency has ever really tried to do it. None of the other bills before the Congress seeks to set up an agency to assume that task.

"This phase of my testimony is fortified by the opinions of the small independent bankers of our country as made known by them to the National Federation of Independent Business.

"I therefore urge this committee to immediately report to the Senate H. R. 7963 with or without amendments.

"A new agency to supply equity capital

"I also urge that you report to the Senate for its consideration a bill which can be expeditiously adopted by Congress to supply the long-needed risk capital for small business.

"I have no pride of authorship; and I am confident that no Member of either body insists that his own bill is the only answer or the complete answer. We are all concerned with attaining one goal and that is enactment of legislation which is in the best public interest of the country at large.

"H. R. 10980, introduced by me in the House, was based upon extensive hearings held by the House Small Business Committee, of which I am privileged to be a member, and chaired by our able colleague from Texas, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN. At those hearings we received testimony from representatives of small and large business, as well as from economists and experts in the field of financing.

"The Honorable Edward T. McCormick, president of the American Stock Exchange, in his statement recommended to the House Small Business Committee on November 22, 1957, that Congress should set up a closed-end investment trust with both the Government and private investors participating in the initial capitalization to provide equity capital for small business.

"There emerged from these hearings several important conclusions.

"Small-business concerns require permanent capital which can be kept invested without the need to meet frequent interest payments. The most logical source for such funds is investment capital. However, it is apparent that small-business concerns, though they have good records and bright prospects, cannot compete for such money with the well-known large firms. Big business enjoys a near monopoly of currently available investment funds.

"Equity capital will permit greater flexibility in the business operation of the firm. Expansion to increase production and develop new ideas becomes possible. The credit base is expanded, permitting borrowing from the commercial banks and easing relations with suppliers and customers.

"H. R. 10980 establishes a mechanism which may well be the solution to a permanent problem of small business.

"It provides its own procedure for removing Government from the investment business.

"The corporation will eventually become a wholly privately owned institution.

"This is the most simple direct way of meeting the problem; and the agency will not be in competition with any existing Government agency.

"On February 3, 1958, I introduced a bill, H. R. 10453, which is the same as H. R. 10345, that of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], and of many others, and which is referred to as the small business capital bank bill.

"I am still in favor of the general principle of that bill. I offered my bill, H. R. 10980, as another approach to the same problem.

"Why 2 agencies instead of 1

"My bill, H. R. 10980, differs from the others, H. R. 10345 and H. R. 10453, in two important respects.

"First, it provides for immediate participation in this financing by the general public.

"Secondly, it omits the lending function found in those bills and instead provides only for supplying investment capital.

"I am firmly convinced that the 2 functions cannot be operated successfully in 1 institution or in 1 organization.

"The lending officer must be schooled in the philosophy of advancing money, for a limited time, for a fee—interest—fixed at the time of the advance, and conditioned on a reasonable assurance of repayment.

"The investing officer must be schooled in a philosophy which is almost the direct opposite, to wit, appraising the risk probabilities that will warrant advancing money for an indefinite time with no promise of refund but with reasonable assurance that profits will be earned sufficient to return the advance in varying installments—dividends—which continue even after the original capital has been repaid out of profits.

"The business and banking world has long recognized that those two functions should be kept separate and distinct.

"The great majority leader of the Senate, the Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON, has introduced S. 3651 which has been cosponsored by many Senators and is another approach to this important problem. A similar bill has been introduced in the House by the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN. The able majority leader stated before the Senate on April 21, when he introduced his new bill, S. 3651, that this is a new approach to the problem and that he is confident that the committee will select the best and most workable features of the various bills now being considered by your committee. What we all want is a good law which will successfully supply the long-term equity capital needs of small business.

"A policy board dilutes control

"I have read Senator JOHNSON'S bill and I reluctantly find that I must disagree with at least one important feature of it—the creation of a Small Business Policy Board.

"Since the enactment of the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, attempts have been made in both Houses of Congress to eliminate the Loan Policy Board, created by section 204 (d) of the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended. H. R. 7963 accomplishes that end. The SBA Loan Policy Board has hampered and impeded its operations.

"The Loan Policy Board called for by S. 3651 adds an additional official to the Board, namely, the Administrator of the new Small Business Investment Administration. That provision will not remedy but rather perpetuate a bad situation. The Cabinet officers, the big-business representatives in Government will continue to dominate, and I am afraid will stifle, what should be the friend and sponser and helper of small business. In 1955, in a report issued by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Small Business, House Report 1045 of the 84th Congress, 1st session, of which I have the honor to be chairman, we unanimously agreed that:

" '* * * the procedure of the Loan Policy Board appears to delay important decisions and hampers efficient administration rather than serving to expedite the important lending functions of the act. In view of the foregoing experience, this subcommittee recommends that section 204 (d) of the act be repealed. The subcommittee feels that the responsibility and jurisdiction for the policies, as well as the operations, of the Small Business Administration should lie solely within the administration of the agency. It is clearly the intent of the Congress that the Administrator be responsible for the activities and functions of the agency and that the agency be wholly independent and unaffiliated. * * *'

"That report was unanimously adopted by the full committee.

"Experience has also taught us some of the shortcomings of the Small Business Administration. Despite the fact that it has been created as an independent agency, it has failed to act as an independent agency and has been under the thumb of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce.

"Section 201 of S. 3651 establishes the Policy Board. Its functions are outlined in section 202 (b) as the coordination of the activities between the Small Business Administration and the Small Business Investment Administration. The Board is to establish under section 202 (a) the general policy governing the approval and disapproval of applications for financial assistance for both the Small Business Administration and the Small Business Investment Administration.

"As I have previously stated, I am firmly convinced that both the lending functions and the financial functions cannot be blended successfully in 1 institution or 1 organization. One is based upon the philosophy of advancing money for a fee or interest with a definite guaranteed promise of repayment at a fixed time or times—the other upon the philosophy of investing money based upon the risk probabilities, which warrant putting the money out for an indefinite period of time with no guaranty of return.

"Unless we have independent, unaffiliated agencies, both for lending and investment purposes, with responsibility resting with the agency itself, we must expect the thinking of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce to prevail. That is not to say that they may not confer and consult and in appropriate fields even cooperate. But the responsibility should be that of the operating head of the agency and not shared with some other official of the executive department of the Government.

"The SBA lending function is a successful program, even if not broad enough. This new and untried investment program may or may not succeed. We hope it will. But until it does, let us not risk losing the benefits of a good program because of any deficiencies or losses that may occur in the new on.

"Analysis of H. R. 10980

"At this point, I would like to present a section-by-section analysis of my bill.

"Section 1. The act is to be cited as 'Small Business Investment Corporation.'

"Section 2. The policy of the Congress and the purpose of the act are to provide small-business concerns of the United States with an adequate source of equity capital and thereby promote their growth and development in the interest of a sound, vital, and expanding national economy.

"Section 3 defines various terms used in the act.

"Section 4 (a) creates the Small Business Investment Corporation; (b) declares that the objective of the Corporation is to carry out the purposes of the act by supplying needed equity capital.

"Section 5 (a) creates a Board of Directors to administer the Corporation; (b) establishes the method of appointment of the Board while the Government still owns capital stock in the Corporation; (c) establishes the term of office of the Board of Directors; (d) sets the rate of compensation for the Board; (e) establishes travel allowances; (f) sets the method of electing officers of the Board with a rotating chairmanship and fixes a quorum as three members of the Board; (g) gives the Board power to adopt rules and regulations; (h) establishes procedures for selection and election of members of the Board at such time when the Government ceases to own any capital stock.

"Section 6 (a) sets forth the method of appointing an Executive Director of the Corporation; (b) establishes the compensation for the Executive Director along with allowances for travel; (c) fixes the duties of the Executive Director; (d) enumerates the general powers of the Executive Director (such as the hiring of employees and the acquiring and disposal of property in connection with the functions of the act).

"Section 7 provides the powers of the Corporation, including—

"(1) establishment of bylaws consistent with the act and the manner in which business is to be conducted both before and after the time when all capital stock subscribed for by the Secretary of the Treasury has been retired;

"(2) the adoption and use of a corporate seal;

"(3) the right of succession;

"(4) the making of contracts;

"(5) the right to sue and be sued;

"(6) the right to acquire, hold, and dispose of property (real, personal, or mixed);

"(7) the delegation of incidental powers to the Board in order to carry out the functions vested in it by the act.

"Section 8 (a), initial capitalization of the Corporation of $20 million, one-half of which shall be subscribed for and paid in by the Secretary of the Treasury immediately upon the establishment of the Corporation, and which shall be retired in full at the earliest practicable time, the other one-half shall be offered for sale to the general public at par. The stock shall have a par value of $100 per share.

"Section 8 (b) provides for additional funds by issuance of bonds to carry out the purposes of the act with a maximum ceiling of $500 million including the purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury of $250 million. The obligations sold to private investors shall not be guaranteed by the United States nor constitute a debt or obligation of the United States.

"Section 9 (a) gives power to the Board to promulgate standards to determine the eligibility of small-business concerns for assistance under the act; (b) grants powers to the Board to hold interests in unincorporated small-business concerns which meet the standard established by the Board; (c) requires as a condition for the obtaining of any assistance that the applicant invest in the Corporation's stock a sum equal to at least 10 percent of the amount advanced by the Corporation to such small business; (d) grants powers to the Board to sell the stock of the small-business concerns on the open market (after first giving the issuing small-business concern an opportunity to repurchase or retire such stock).

"Section 10 provides for the payment of expenses and distribution of earnings and esatblishes a priority by which such distribution shall be made.

"(1) Provides for the retirement of the capital stock subscribed for by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 8 (a).

"(2) Provides for the retirement of the obligations issued to and purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 8 (b).

"(3) Provides for distribution of earnings to the holders of obligations issued to private investors under section 8 (b).

"(4) Provides for payment of dividends on its capital stock.

"Section 11 provides for the administration of the Corporation when all money invested by the Secretary of the Treasury under sections 8 (a) and 8 (b) has been repaid.

"Section 12 provides for annual reports to Congress during such time as any capital stock is owned by the Secretary of the Treasury.

"Section 13 provides for the publication of regulations by the Corporation.

"Getting the Government out of the business

"Mr. Chairman, the bill which I introduced, H. R. 10980, attempts in as simple fashion as possible, to provide the needed equity capital for small business. It should be noted that although initially there is an investment of Government funds, provision has been made to retire such Government funds and return this important function to private capital. The bill introduced by Senator JOHNSON and the other sponsors creates a new agency and makes no provisions for its eventual ownership by private enterprise.

"My bill, H. R. 10980, does contain a mandatory provision which will eventually cause private enterprise to own this corporation and carry on its operations, if they prove successful.

"The provision in the Johnson bill, S. 3191, section 404, provides for compulsory investment by the small concern in the private investment company but not in the overall agency which will finance the investment company.

"Miscellaneous provisions

"The provisions in S. 3191, section 304 (deposit of funds and contributions to retirement and disability funds); section 408 (tax treatment of losses and gains); sections 701 and 702 (repeal of sec. 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, capital loan provisions); section 703 (purchase of the new obligations by Federal Reserve banks); and sections 801-805 (criminal provisions) are not in my bill but should be in any bill that is enacted.

"Conclusion

"One final word about the board of directors called for by my bill (H. R. 10980) and the administrator called for by the Johnson bill (S. 3191), to point up a fundamental difference.

"If the new instrumentality we create to do this job is to be an agency then, of course, an administrator is called for; if a corporation, then a board of directors is necessary.

"If it is an agency, we may expect it will remain for all time a part of the Government. If, eventually, it is to be privately owned, a corporation is indicated as the more proper method of operation.

"Quite apart from that, however, we are here embarking upon a new and untried field of Government endeavor. Its pitfalls will be many. Its complexities are very great.

"Ordinarily, I favor one-man responsibility in Government departments. Eventually, that may make for more efficiency even here. But, at the start, I believe, whether agency, bureau, department, or corporation, we should enlist the services of at least three outstanding, experienced persons who will devote their full time to setting up and attempting to make work effectively and efficiently this new facility.

"That is a far cry, however, from having a policy board do the job. The board I refer to is one which will be charged with making and implementing policy and which will have no outside duties or conflicting interests.

"If we truly believe in free enterprise and competition, we must enact an equity risk capital bill immediately. We must take this action now and breathe life into what remains of free and fair competition. The responsibility is ours. Let us reassert our faith in our way of life and fulfill our pledges and responsibilities by enacting the programs which we know are necessary to maintain a healthy, competitive economy."

Senator CLARK. Mr. McCormick, will you come back now? I certainly appreciate your courtesy in stepping aside to give us time with the Congressmen, and we will try not to detain you too long.

Before I ask you any questions, I wonder if there is anything you want to add, yourself, to your testimony.

Recession With Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, many economists are disturbed that the consumers price index continues to rise even though there is a recession in the level of business. Some of the factors responsible for this unusual phenomena were described in an address by Mr. Robert C. Tyson, chairman of the finance committee of the United States Steel Corp., before the Executive Club of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce on April 18, 1958. Steeply progressive personal income taxes, high corporate taxes, and unrealistic depreciation allowances are deterring the maintenance of present job opportunities. They make it extremely difficult to provide the necessary tools and equipment to provide additional jobs for a growing population.

I believe all of my colleagues will profit from reading Mr. Tyson's statement. Accordingly, I am including it as an extension of my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

RECESSION WITH INFLATION

(A talk by Robert C. Tyson, chairman, finance committee, United States Steel Corp., before the Executives' Club of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, Boston, Mass., April 18, 1958)

It is a pleasure to meet with you today and to participate in your modern management conference. I sometimes think that there is no end to the list of problems with which management is confronted day after day. And, as all of us know, almost every management has problems which are peculiar to its own company or to the particular industry within which it functions. Such problems can run the gamut from raw-material acquirement, through the processes of manufacture or fabrication, to the distribution into specialized markets of the given goods or services. At all stages there are the recurring matters of organization, planning, financing, control, and auditing to be dealt with. It is a tremendous tribute to American management as such and to the American system of competitive production and distribution that, by and large, up and down the length and breadth of our land, myriads of such problems have been solved with sufficient success to produce a national scale of living that is incomparably superior to those of other times and places.

But I have not felt that I could be particularly helpful to you in attempting to deal with the specialized problems of any one company or industry, even my own. It seems, instead, that since over the years certain problems have been gradually arising with respect to our economy as a whole, matters which affect all companies, big or little, and wherever located, I might more helpfully discuss some of them with you today.

I have especially in mind the fact that over the past year the volume of industrial production has been seriously decreasing and unemployment has been increasing. But at the very same time we have been experiencing inflation in basic employment costs and in prices. This simultaneous decline in production with the rise in costs and prices is a relatively new and disturbing thing in our history. It has ominous connotations. Certainly it needs analysis and understanding if suitable remedies are to be sought and applied. Otherwise there is always the danger that some hastily concocted panacea may be adopted which will aggravate rather than improve the situation. And, I am sorry to say, such danger is not a matter of mere academic fancy in view of some of the proposals being advanced.

FRAMEWORK FACTORS

I think then that we would be well advised to discover just how we got into this situation if it is to be dealt with in an appropriate manner. This is not easy for management people as such to do because we will have to think in terms quite different from those in which most management problems are approached. Ordinarily a management problem is analyzed within a framework of social and legal assumptions that are not to be questioned. We assume, for example, competitive markets, a given monetary system, the sanctity of contracts, the privacy of property, the freedom of individual choice, the system of taxation—whatever it is—a given body of Federal and State law. These are the kinds of things we may think of as the framework factors within which economic life functions. The framework factors are the rules of the game arising out of the morals, customs and attitudes of the people which have been hardened into usage and codified into law backed by the great power of government.

I mention these framework factors because I am convinced that we can never fully understand our present economic predicament except in terms of an evolution in some of these framework factors. They have been changing slowly but cumulatively over the decades, and the cumulative consequence is as dramatic as it is little recognized by most people. For example, history discloses no instance in which a nation has escaped inflation if it persistently multiplies its money supply. We have reenacted the gruesome record. In 20 years our money supply has been quadrupled against a population increase of only one-third and the buying power of the dollar has been more than cut in half. As another framework change we may note that over these same years great industrywide labor unions have arisen. They represent great power that is political in origin but whose exercise has consequences that are economic and far reaching. And Federal taxation has risen to the point where it takes over 90 percent of the higher bracket income earned by our most productive citizens. Such rates have truly reached confiscatory levels.

Meanwhile the Nation has been through a great and terrible war and through an historically typical decade-long reconstruction boom. It is my belief that the big problem we now face and which, for lack of better terminology, I call "recession with inflation" is a convergence into a critical focus of certain war consequences and certain ominous trends in the framework factors. It is to the explanation of this attitude that I will devote the remainder of these remarks.

THE WAR CONSEQUENCES

Consider first the war consequences. War, as you know, fearfully wrenches the economy. It is a period of great activity spurred by a concentrated effort to survive as a nation. But it is simultaneously a period of great postponement, postponement of production of all those peacetime durable goods we can for the time being do without while we use up and patch up those we already have to make them last a little longer. In the meantime the Nation—as assumed to be required by the war exigencies—becomes flooded with what amounts to printing-press money, the natural effects of which are sought to be repressed by price controls and rationing.

When the war comes to an end I suppose we would all agree that it is the most natural thing in the world for the Nation to turn its hands to catching up on the production of things postponed while the war was on. So one highly abnormal situation replaces a preceding one. The war period's deeply subnormal production of peacetime durable goods of all kinds—producers', consumers', and public—finds its offsetting counterpart in their postwar highly supranormal production. But the catchingup job cannot be done in a day, a month or a year. It takes a long time, and the record of history shows that it normally takes 10 or a dozen years for the great postwar booms to run their course. Most all of you here can verify that out of your own experience, since most of you have lived through 2 such periods, the great boom of the 1920's following World War I and the great boom just behind us following World War II. If you delve into the records of the past you will find analogous periods following the Civil War and the War of 1812.

I suppose next that we would all agree that when the catchingup job is finally done,

then the need to be further busily engaged in such catching up has, by definition, vanished. The Nation has then earned the right to leisure, and since the catching up job can easily be overdone, the period of leisure can be correspondingly extended. Why the postwar reconstruction booms are overdone is not absolutely clear. Partly it may be due to the longlasting power of the backlog demand stimulus. Partly it is because they are fueled by soft money policies accepted in wartime and perpetuated through public habituation to this dire economic drug. But that the periods of leisure are extended can be readily verified by reference to the record. All of the great postwar booms of the past have been followed by what economists call secondary postwar depressions, ranging from about 4 years to a little over 10 years in length. The trouble with this long leisure is that in our complicated economy it takes the awful form of involuntary unemployment of a pronounced and prolonged sort. To avoid such an outcome this time is one of the most serious economic problems with which management and, indeed, the entire citizenry has ever been confronted. And this brings me to the changes going on in the framework factors.

THE CREATING OF NEW JOBS

But first I think the problem can be narrowed down a bit and brought into still sharper focus. Thus I think all of us would agre that if old jobs have to come to an end and idleness is to be avoided, then there is only one answer that makes any sense at all, and that is to stimulate, or at least not hamper by law, the natural and normal creation of new self-sustaining productive jobs. If we cannot find within ourselves the wisdom and courage to establish or reestablish a political and economic framework conducive to the creation of new self-sustaining jobs, then we are self-condemned to chronic unemployment akin to that which prevailed throughout the 1930's and from which we only finally escaped when we went to war, a solution that nobody ever wants to repeat. This is a harsh statement. But time is running out too fast to be spent in dodging the unpleasant realities.

So let us get a still sharper focus on how new jobs come into existence. Far too few people ever meditate on that fundamental matter and so I am going to issue you a challenge: Think as long and hard as you will, but a new, self-sustaining, productive job comes into existence only when someone somewhere invests savings in tools of production and thereby creates the environment in which men can go to work producing the marketable values to cover their continuing wages and the investor's profit. There is no other way. And here is the central and basic truth through reference to which we may judge the effectiveness of any public or private policy in solving today's problem of recession. Will it create new jobs—or at the very least recreate old jobs as though they were new ones?

TAXATION

With these matters in mind let us now look at the trends in that often obscure but awfully important framework factor we know as taxation. I am immediately confronted by realization that most everyone is against taxes on himself, but thinks it is all right for the other fellow to pay them, especially if his income is bigger. After all, he still has enough left to live on, or else the he is one of those big impersonal corporations. It is hard to get impartial consideration of matters so personal to so many, but I am nevertheless going to try to do so.

First it would seem well to get firmly in mind a broad perspective on what has been happening to taxes over the years. Most people do not realize that in America there are over 100,000 taxing authorities. Back in the 1920's the total taxes levied by them were about $9 billion. That was about 10 percent of the net national product; but by 1956 the taxes had increased to over $100 billion, or nearly 30 percent of the net national product. This is an extraordinary and startling growth and it would be surprising indeed if it did not have profound influences on the American civilization. Any tax at all tends to impair people's incentives to produce or to invest savings in production; and the bigger the share of what you produce that is taken from you in taxation, the less your interest is in producing abundantly. But just as serious as the overall trend toward enormous taxation is the fact that the taxation of income of both individuals and corporations has now come to be heavily concentrated upon the vital creation of savings that flow into job-creating investment.

Let us look at that trend for a moment. As far as the taxation of individual income is concerned this is the story of steep progressive taxation. Those best able to risk—and often lose—venture capital in the creation of new jobs are naturally those who earn larger incomes. In the absence of fraud or coercion those of larger income receive it only as they and their property equivalently serve the community at its own competitive prices. The skilled machinist gives more and gets more than the apprentice. Since each thus gives to the community the equivalent of what he gets from it there is no moral basis for taxing the more productive at higher rates. But leaving that aside, the consequences to the creation of new jobs can be disastrous because steep progressive taxation systematically eliminates a principal source of venture capital upon which progress depends. Taxing the more skilled and the more productive at ever increasing rates undermines both their incentive and their ability to provide the venture capital on which new jobs depend. It self-denies to the Nation the enterprise leadership of the very people who have competitively proved their capacity for it. No wonder Karl Marx advocated this kind of taxation. It is also profoundly shortsighted because as the sources of new jobs are dried up, government is called upon to support the unemployed and aid many undertakings, such as agriculture, housing, shipping, stockpiling, and so on. This in turn provides seeming justification for maintaining or further steepening the taxes, thus energizing a spiral into some sort of statism.

Because of preoccupation with war and postwar boom, few people realize the growth in this anti-employment type of taxation. In 1930 the top Federal income-tax rate was 25 percent, applied to taxable income over $100,000. Today the top bracket rate has been lifted to 91 percent, and the former top bracket rate of 25 percent applies to an individual's taxable income in the $4000 bracket. Half or more of an individual's taxable income over $16,000 is now taken by taxation. The individual income tax trends and the economic situation have drifted into an alarming juxtaposition: Never before has this taxation been so great a barrier to the creation of new jobs; and seldom before has the creation of new jobs been so imperative.

Consider next the broad trends in the taxation of corporate income. Corporations are not the creations of government. They are the resourceful invention of people to enable large numbers of them cooperatively to pool their resources and their labor and so accomplish mighty production tasks beyond the power of any one individual or small number of them. Corporations provide about three-quarters of all nongovernment employment. If we want many people to be employed, then it would seem to be only ordinary common sense to see to it that taxation be designed to permit and encourage job-creation by corporations rather than to discourage and hamper that process.

But the taxation and double taxation of corporate income also unhappily have come to impair productive incentive and to dissipate the seed corn of progress. Look at the facts: In 1930 the tax on corporate profits was 12 percent. Today the tax is 52 percent, more than 4 times as much. Moreover when corporate income is paid out in dividends it is again taxed to the recipients at the steeply progressive individual income tax rates. For all corporations the total dividends—which are all that stockholders ever get from their corporations—before such second taxation amount to only 3.5 percent of national income. It is important to realize, as very few do, that in this country three-quarters of the productive employment hangs on this tiny part of the national income—for without dividends or the prospect thereof there would be no corporations. Misguided tax or other assault or corporate income could well have unexpectedly dramatic consequences to employment.

The tax on corporate income as presently constituted works out as a penalty for being efficient because the company that operates more efficiently pays a higher tax per unit of production. Taxes levied at high rates against efficiency cannot help but impair that efficiency and so compound rather than diminish the problems of business recovery.

Especially significant is the tax dissipation of corporate receipts vitally needed for reinvestment in the business; for without this seed-corn income no company can either make good the insufficient depreciation allowed on existing tools of production or have money to purchase additional job-creating tools. Nor can it readily attract outside capital. It is clearly not good sense to tax away money otherwise destined to provide new jobs and products at a time when these may be much needed. This is not money to be distributed and dissipated in consumption, to enrich selected groups of people to the envy of others. It is, instead, the very core of growth in corporate America upon which so many prospective jobs must inescapably depend.

But the story of tax impairment of employment does not end there. A combination of persistent inflation—to which I will come in a moment—and lagging tax code adjustment to it, means that not only are future jobs threatened but also existing jobs are being undermined. This is because the real capital of many companies is being eroded away by taxation as that capital turns over through depreciation. It results from the fact that it takes many more of today's cheapened dollars to replace equipment as it wears out than it took originally to purchase the equipment many years ago. But depreciation allowed in computing taxable income is limited to the smaller number of dollars originally expended. The difference between such depreciation and the larger amount needed to recover the purchasing power expended—and so to keep the facilities intact—is arbitrarily called income and taxed as such. For United States Steel, about which I naturally know more than about other companies, such tax erosion of capital as it turned over through depreciation amounted to over $650 million in the years 1940 to 1957, inclusive.

If under such taxation the tools of production are not to deteriorate, then part of income must be reinvested merely to make good the deficiency in depreciation allowed. But to have $1 of income after taxation to make good the depreciation deficiency, $2 must be secured either in higher prices charged customers or in cost reduction. The unrealistic tax treatment of depreciation thus has 1 or more of 3 consequences, all of which are undesirable: Either the existing tools of production are not replaced as they wear out; or corporate income needed to fi-

nance job-creating expansion is diverted to meet the depreciation deficiency; or prices may have to be raised on a 2-for-1 basis, to the extent that competitive conditions permit.

There have been some tax expedients that have temporarily mitigated the depreciation problem. For example, under certificates of necessity portions of the cost of new facilities certified as necessary to the national defense could be amortized for tax purposes within the first 5 years of such facilities' estimated useful lives. For many companies the addition of amortization on new facilities to so-called regular depreciation on old facilities gave, temporarily, a truer total of depreciation on all facilities based on current dollar values. The record is clear that this temporary approach towards realistic treatment of depreciation for tax purposes had a most pronounced effect in releasing the flow of capital into job-creating investment.

But now—and at a most unfortunate time when capital expenditures are already declining—the effect of this tax expedient is operating in reverse. The 5-year accelerated amortization amounts are running out and the former unrealistic treatment of depreciation is reappearing and, short of corrective legislation, is due to be even more exaggerated. For, once the depreciation on existing facilities has been taken in the form of accelerated amortization, then no further depreciation on them at all may be taken in the future. Allowable depreciation will thus be even less than the quite inadequate so-called regular depreciation would have been in the absence of accelerated amortization. The employment-deterring consequences may, of course, be correspondingly increased.

I have, however, some hopes with respect to this matter. I note that it is receiving attention from the Ways and Means Committee in terms of testimony, particularly that of Rev. William T. Hogan, S. J. of Fordam University and of Maurice E. Peloubet, a distinguished certified public accountant. They testified on January 15 with respect to a treatment of depreciation for tax purposes called reinvestment depreciation. They would apply to long-term facilities certain accounting procedures analogous to those developed many years ago for short-term inventories, known as LIFO. Under the proposed plan the cost of a new facility replacing an old one could be charged to current costs to the extent that it exceeded the original cost of the facility being retired. This would represent a long step towards the only realistic basis of depreciation, which is recovery of purchasing power originally expended.

Gentlemen, in discussing the taxation of both individual and corporate income I have tried to draw your attention to how this taxation has evolved over the years while the Nation has been preoccupied and energized by war and postwar boom. The simple fact, as I have noted, is that such taxation has now come to bear most heavily upon that vital creation of savings that flow into job-creating investment. It tends to undermine the incentive of everybody to engage in superior effort. Now that the boom is over and recession is being experienced, I feel deeply that if we are to have a healthy and lasting recovery it is important to evoke the initiative, the effort, the enterprise, the leadership of our most able and efficient citizens and corporations. I doubt that it can be done by taxing away up to 91 percent of any fruits of the individual's additional effort; and I equally doubt that innovation of new products and job-creating investment in facilities can be helped by taxing away the corporate funds for their financing. Somehow we must find some way to remove these powerful tax deterrents.

But please understand me in one respect. I do not urge any overall blind reduction of taxes in general on the basis of a phony purchasing power theory or to create huge Federal deficiets. There is a world of difference between intelligent tax reform to restore incentives and to free up the flow of savings into job-creating investment on the one hand and, on the other, a blind resort to what amounts to printing press money which would only aggravate an inflation which has already become institutionalized too much in America. That way lies trouble and that brings me to the framework factor behind the vigorous continuation of inflation despite significant business recession.

INFLATION

Wartime inflation in America—as in other times and places—is characteristic. You can read all about it in the textbooks. You can think of it as a demand-pull type of inflation. It results from Government resort to printing press money or its more modern equivalent of issuing debt that becomes the basis for the expansion of bank deposits that people use for money. With this new money the Government drains the markets of goods to meet its huge wartime demands. The resulting inflation is accepted or endured as part of the process deemed necessary to winning the war. But continuous peacetime inflation is a new thing in America. You cannot read about it in the textbooks. You can think of it as a cost-push inflation. Its fundamental root is the continuing elevation of employment costs resulting from the rise to tremendous political and economic power of industrywide labor unions.

More and more people are coming to understand and accept this as a fact, regardless of whether their attitudes be sympathetic or critical. But what people do not so fully understand is that when basic employment costs advance, industry by industry, to a degree greater than the rise in overall national productivity they cannot help but force all other costs up with them. The direct employment costs of anyone business may range from a small part to a very large part of its total costs. But every business must purchase goods and services from others. These purchases from others reflect the increased employment costs of the suppliers, whose own purchases reflect the increased employment costs of their suppliers in turn, and so on and so on. When all industry is taken on a consolidated basis, employment costs represent over three-quarters of all costs. These costs cannot rise endlessly and prodigiously without bringing about cost-covering price increases; and there is your cost-push inflation, as simple as that.

I suppose at this point I should take 1 minute to dispose of the propagandized notion that inflation has been due to expanding corporate profits. The facts as collected and published by the United States Government show that total corporate profits in 1957 were actually $2 billion less than in 1950. In the same time-span labor income per year increased by over $95 billion. It is not profit inflation, it is wage inflation that has forced prices upward. It is the essence of our new institutionalized cost-push inflation.

There is a distinctive feature of cost-push inflation that is worth noting. It is that, being a manifestation of power rather than a reflection of economic circumstance, it is quite insensitive to economic forces as we know them. I find this reflected in the records of my own company, as indeed it is reflected in the records of the Nation as a whole. Year after year, whether in war or in peace, in good years or bad years, the employment costs per hour inexorably march ever upward. In my own company for over 20 years the average annual increase in employment costs per hour has been the equivalent of about 8 percent per annum compounded.

Well, as I noted a moment ago, these matters are gradually coming to be better understood by more and more people, so I need not dwell on them. But I do assure you that they are worthy of your most thoughtful consideration in studying the problem of recession with inflation, for what better guarantee could one have that unemployment would be hastened and prolonged as the great postwar boom fades than that business should be confronted with ever increasing basic costs as it tries to sell into increasingly saturated markets?

Gentlemen, I now come to the conclusion of these remarks, and as I do so I confess that I have no specific panacea to offer. But I do have a plea to make. It is that you will each for yourselves seek—as I have here briefly sought with you—to discover and define the process through which new productive jobs come into existence and with them the more and better and newer products and services that make for an ever rising scale of living in our land. Learn, too, the things that can impair that process, as well as the things that must be done to guard and improve it. And then, ever afterwards, let your attitudes, your actions and your words, public and private, be such as to guard rather than undermine that precious American heritage.

Rochester's Gain Is the Nation's Loss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the Nation will lose one of its most effective and most able public servants when Secretary Marion B. Folsom leaves his post with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At the same time, my home city of Rochester, N. Y., will welcome back one of its most highly respected residents.

Since his arrival in Washington some 5 years ago, Marion Folsom has established an enviable reputation as a man who gets the job done.

His unassuming, competent administration of what is surely one of the most taxing and challenging positions in the Federal Government has won well-merited, wide acclaim.

Marion Folsom's efforts in Washington these last few years have been merely an extension of a life largely devoted to helping others to achieve a better and happier existence. His work in framing our social security structure, the many vital programs he has extended and initiated within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and his work in making that Department an integral part of our Nation's striving toward the better life—these and many other achievements will long stand as monuments to Marion Folsom's contributions to his country.

As he leaves Washington, many, many people here, on both sides of the political aisle, and on both sides of many issues

he has dealt with, wish him continued success and happiness. And Rochester looks forward to his return with eagerness. Truly, Rochester's gain is the Nation's loss.

I feel confident the feelings of many residents of Rochester are ably reflected in recent editorials appearing in the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle and the Rochester Times-Union. Under leave previously granted, I insert them at this point in the RECORD:

REPORT ON FOLSOM

Rochesterian Marion B. Folsom brought the quiet dignity of a good man to his post as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington needed that. And when, to the dignity, was added extraordinary competence, the result was predictable—a Cabinet officer paired with Agriculture Secretary Benson for stanch adherence to principle.

When Folsom leaves his post, a process now reported underway, Rochester will regain one of its best liked citizens.

Whether he rejoins his colleagues at the Eastman Kodak Co. or decides to retire, Marion Folsom has more than earned the right to spend the remainder of his life doing just as he chooses. A large part of his career has been spent making plans to assure a better life for others. He is one of the foremost living experts at setting up practical systems for that purpose.

Much of what makes Kodak such a fine company to work for can be traced to his work. As treasurer for many years of the big Rochester industrial firm, he demonstrated that it was good business to care for people as human beings, not merely as workers. One of the principal authors of the Social Security Act in 1934, he revised and broadened the law under President Eisenhower.

It is a safe prediction that his stature will gain increasing recognition as the years pass.

FOLSOM TO LEAVE RECORD OF FINE ACHIEVEMENT

The forthcoming resignation of Secretary Folsom from the President's Cabinet should not be regretted since it means his return to Rochester, but we do regret it.

FIRST SO HIGH

After all, Mr. Folsom was the first Rochesterian to be named to the Cabinet. He has never ceased to be a source of pride to his home city.

Five years is considerably longer than Mr. Folsom expected to stay in Washington when he went there in 1953 as Under Secretary of the Treasury in the President's first administration. But after piloting through Congress the first general revision of the tax laws in many years he was named Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and stayed.

Now he is expected to revert to his former status as a frequent commuter to Washington. As an author of the original social-security statutes, his testimony was always sought by every succeeding Congress on social-security matters as well as on economic legislation. That demand will continue. He has always advocated participation in Government by business executives.

It would be difficult to assess now which was his greater contribution, as Under Secretary of the Treasury or as Secretary of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department.

As Under Secretary his principal field was tax matters and the tax revision bill of 1953 was a monumental piece of legislation. It not only made the largest reduction in taxes ever made in a single bill but it also took out of the tax code the most glaring inequities that had crept in during years of piecemeal revisions.

But at the same time, Mr. Folsom will be considered for all time the creator of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department. He was not the first Secretary of the new Department which was created under President Eisenhower, but he gave it the form it will probably retain for many years to come. Again he was active in revision of the Social security laws which extended coverage and increased benefits, though he was defeated when he opposed bracketing disability pensions into the social security system.

SCHOOLS LOSE

One unfinished task on which he extended great energy was the matter of Federal aid to school construction. The Democratic Congress first defeated his effort to equalize educational opportunity through Federal aid to school building and then defeated its own substitute bill.

Mr. Folsom will leave the Department in good hands. The expectation is that the President will appoint Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, president of Ohio Wesleyan University. Dr. Flemming has been in and out of Government service almost as long as Mr. Folsom and for 6 years was director of the Office of War Mobilization.

AEC Chairman Lewis L. Strauss' Press Club Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, so much interest has been sparked by AEC Chairman Strauss' excellent National Press Club speech on May 8, together with the question and answer period following, that I have asked to set both out in this RECORD for the benefit of those who do not have available the texts. The speech was as follows:

REMARKS BY LEWIS L. STRAUSS, CHAIRMAN, UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION, AT THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 8, 1958

Not quite 4 years have passed since I was first here as your guest. I recall that experience as a pleasure, not completely unalloyed, but of course I know that dispensing pleasure is not the main purpose of journalists; nor, in the nature of things, can it now be mine. Still, from our previous encounter, and having in mind certain issues that have made for discussions between us, I draw a consoling thought. From your hale and hearty faces, I am persuaded that none of you is any the worse for strontium 90, a substance not to be confused with printer's ink. The latter really can be deadly, especially when the fallout is intense. It is not I but you, I venture to think, who deal with the most potent materials, for you can produce mutations in the thoughts, the fears, and also the hopes of all men.

It seems to me that I can best contribute to the discussion that is to follow by setting forth, in advance, several ideas that I consider fundamental to any serious consideration of the matters that concern us.

These matters have to do with the implications of the atom. Clearly, we Americans are at the threshold of another fateful decision as regards the use that we shall make of the new power that has come to our hand. It is increasingly apparent that the world of the atom is a house of many mansions. As I read the recent history, United States policy has already crossed two such thresholds of decision and, as yet, we have only penetrated the outer chambers of a vast establishment.

The first chamber was represented by the discovery of the means and the control of fission. The first use was military; and because, at first impression, this promised to be by far its most important use, there were men and women of great influence who thought that what had been opened in a time of desperate need could be again entombed forever. It was seriously proposed that the American stock of atomic weapons be carried out to sea and dumped. It was also seriously proposed by very important people that the United States should share its weapons knowledge among the other great nations, thus to remove the envy and apprehensions which our sole possession would arouse.

In the end, we chose to do neither. We sought instead to lock the doors and bar the windows of the anteroom that we had been first to enter. That was the central intent of the original American legislation relating to the atom, the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. That act created the Atomic Energy Commission and, concerning the responsibilities with which the Congress charged the new agency, none was more explicit than the one that it should guard zealously and well the secret technologies of what was still a monopoly.

There was to be no further exchange of information with other countries—not even Great Britain and Canada, both of which had helped us cross the threshold. As for the further development of our own advantage, it was to be done by the Federal Government alone, and under civilian control.

It would not serve us here to debate again the wisdom of that first decision. No doubt, the hope was that there would be ample time, in a world at peace, to deliberate over how best the new force could be put to the service of the world at large—the act indeed began with language indicative of its tentative nature. But the alternative courses that were open to us, at the time, were anything but inviting.

The trouble was that the locks on the door were not strong enough and, in any case, there were other entrances to the vast establishment that we had so lately gained. Within 3 years, by a variety of means—by skill which was indiginous plus the fruit of widespread and successful espionage—Soviet Russia was solidly established inside the empire of the atom. Not long afterwards the United Kingdom qualified as a nuclear weapon power, and France was weighing the advisability of following suit. Meanwhile, too, the key to peace had been mislaid. In the common danger, old friends were drawn together again, and the new circumstances carried us to a second threshhold of decision.

By 1954, it was clear that the benign uses of atomic energy for power, for industry, medicine, agriculture, and countless other purposes, were not nearly so far away as had originally been assumed. Out of a profound and compulsive desire to share the peaceful atom with the other nations, and to reduce the threat of an atomic holocaust President Eisenhower composed his famous Atoms-for-Peace proposal and laid it before the General Assembly of the United Nations.

By means of new legislation which Congress then enacted and which opened the door to a room hitherto kept closed, the Atomic Energy Commission was given a new precept. It was empowered to make available to other nations a broad range of technical information, as well as material and equipment, concerned with the peaceful uses of energy. At the same time, by authority of Congress, it became possible, for the first time, to share with our allies certain information bearing on the military effects of

nuclear weapons, which had meanwhile been under rapid development.

Here, to be sure, the door was not thrown wide open. Certain important discoveries relating to the composition and design of weapons were held back and I, for one, felt this had to be, under the conditions then prevailing.

Few will question the beneficial results brought about by these 1954 changes in the law. They have strengthened our NATO alliance; they have invigorated the sense of interdependence that underlies the alliance. For example, in the search for the means of controlling power from the thermonuclear reaction—the fusion of light elements which, uncontrolled, is the hydrogen bomb—the United States has renewed its nuclear partnership with Britain, in a manner consistent with our broad objectives. A vast amount of technical information, running into scores of volumes, has been removed from secret categories and made available to the rest of the world. In the field of radioactive isotopes for use in medicine, industry, and agriculture, the progress has been far more rapid than even the optimists judged possible only a few years ago.

The International Atomic Energy Agency, suggested in the President's atoms-for-peace speech, has been set up and is functioning, with headquarters in Vienna. A large quantity of United States fissionable material—running into the thousands of kilograms—has already been committed for peaceful use by other nations. (I might add parenthetically that the Soviet contribution—or better, pledge—has so far totaled 50 kilograms.)

We, too, have been pushing forward the peaceful exploitation of atomic energy, on the national account. The Commission is itself developing a number of experimental power reactors. Nine have been built, 2 are building, and 7 more are planned. Private industry has built 1 experimental, is building 4 advanced prototypes, and planning 5 more. On the 26th of this month, the President will dedicate, at Shippingport, Pa., what is the largest single power reactor that has come into being—a product of the enlightened cooperation of the Federal Government and private industry. Industry is everywhere casting about for more efficient uses of the atom. It will not be long, in my judgment, before we shall witness nuclear explosives being used in situations where, because of the physical magnitude of the task, conventional explosives are not practical. The mining, petroleum and engineering fields will begin to use a great revolutionary new tool.

Yet, while we have made good progress in outlining the peaceful potential of the atom, we have made no visible headway in our efforts to control it as an instrument of war. And it is because of this that we find ourselves at yet another threshhold of decision—in some respects the most difficult decision of all. It is difficult for the reason that, at an hour when the strategic situation argues for a much broader sharing of the nuclear advantage with our NATO allies, our Government is under tremendous pressure, not alone of Soviet inspiration, to stop further development of nuclear weapons. We Americans must now make up our minds about two quite different matters, although they do, in fact, bear heavily one upon the other; and it is these matters that I propose to discuss in the minutes remaining to me.

It is fresh in our minds that Mr. Khrushchev has said that he will bury us. Without wishing to add melodrama to a situation that is already wearing on the nerves, let me note merely that we may take the statement as an earnest of his ambition, if not of his immediate intention or means. The means he has, however, are already quite enough to give us pause.

With their enormous manpower advantage, the Russian capability for limited war along the Soviet periphery has always been formidable. But that capacity could never be decisive, in a world sense, so long as they had no effective means of canceling out the United States deterrent.

Do they now feel themselves in possession of such means? Is this a possible explanation for their sudden announcement of a suspension of further tests? One can never be altogether sure about such things. Nevertheless, their announcement came after a series of tests that were unusual both for duration and number.

Nor was the timing of the Soviet announcement itself necessarily the product alone of chance—or of a new trait of tender regard for human life. It came when, as was well known, because we had announced it, the United States was about to begin a series of tests looking essentially to the perfection of warheads for defensive purposes against both bombers and missiles and weapons with drastically reduced radioactive fallout. It came, too, at a juncture when the United States was beginning to discuss the sharing of its nuclear arsenal with our NATO allies, under conditions that seemed to us equitable and reasonable for mutual defense against aggression.

The effect of the Soviet action has been to place us within a quandary inside a dilemma. Shall we now follow the Soviet example and stop testing before we have extended the nuclear power into the defensive side of the military equation, without waiting for comprehensive guaranties as regards detection, inspection, and the other elements of a meaningful disarmament? And, in another connection, do we meanwhile go forward with our declared intention of providing our allies with the nuclear techniques and means they need and want?

I assume that you may care to hear my views on these two propositions, and I shall give them. They are my personal views; I do not, and cannot, speak for the Government. The most that I can expect is that my views will be taken as those of one who has labored long and conscientiously in the vineyard, and whose most ardent hope it is that neither my own country nor any other shall ever experience the horrors of nuclear war.

Where do I stand on the proposition of limiting or ceasing nuclear tests? I have always been for that proposition—and not adamantly against it as sometimes reported. I am for it as part of the proposal which our Government has made which stipulates assurances adequately monitored and inspected that will make evasion as difficult as modern technology can devise—a proposal which also, and importantly, looks to constructive disarmament in its other aspects. For we must not lose sight of the fact that the danger which the world faces is not from nuclear testing but from nuclear war. Those who think otherwise, I submit mistake the shadow for the substance. The ending of tests applies no brake upon the ever-increasing speed with which the arsenals of nuclear weapons are growing.

Happily it is a central element of United States policy that disarmament can and must be negotiated—that we will persist in our efforts to achieve it—but a disarmament in which we and the rest of the world can have confidence.

Meanwhile, we would all do well, I believe, to take a long, hard look at the problem of defending our country against nuclear attack. The targets of the attacker are huge—our cities and our major installations. The targets that the attacker would present to our defenders are in contrast very small indeed—they are the attacker's aircraft and missiles. Our weapons for defense will need to be more sophisticated, more accurate, more numerous than his. Since they will be used in all likelihood over our own and friendly terrain they must also be as free from radioactive debris as we can make them. The skill and ingenuity of the dedicated people who work in our great laboratories offer us the promise of realizing all these aims.

I come, now, to the second proposition that calls for decision—the question of a wider sharing of our nuclear advantage with our free world allies. The President has proposed a much broader cooperation in the area of atomic energy to improve allied defensive capabilities. He has proposed that with regard to those allies already contributing materially to our overall security, we make certain available information which would permit them to use our nuclear warheads. He has requested legislation which with regard to a nation that has achieved a substantial nuclear weapons capability would permit mutual cooperation to prevent useless duplication and waste of scientific and technical efforts. He has stipulated, however, that these understakings be accomplished only where such action will clearly promote and not unduly risk the common defense and security.

The decision thus to move out of our present policy of extremely limited cooperation in the field of nuclear weapons is a fateful one. The subject is one which should be and is being carefully studied and debated. Yet the logic and compulsions of a system of common security seem to leave us no reasonable alternative. It will gain us nothing to stand aloof and apart while our strongest allies expend limited capital and scientific resources to achieve a nuclear status which their prestige, not to mention their need of security, demands. And by sharing with them what they are certain to have in due course, what our possible enemies surely know and what is essential to a true partnership in mutual security, we shall be contributing, as Secretary Dulles has already suggested, a more compelling incentive for the balanced and multilateral limitations of armament which the Soviet Union has thus far evaded.

I have reached the end of my notes.

This, gentlemen, is the ground on which I stand.

AEC Chairman Lewis L. Strauss' Press Club Questions and Answers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, following AEC Chairman Lewis L. Strauss' formal speech at the Washington Press Club on May 8, many interesting questions were asked him by members of the press. The questions and answers were as follows:

QUESTIONS FROM THE PRESS AND ANSWERS

Question. Admiral Strauss, someone here wants to know, don't you think the world would have a more sympathetic view of our tests if the press were given greater latitude to cover them and to explain their specific purposes?

Admiral STRAUSS. That is an interesting question.

The information which is given to the press about the Russian tests, of course, comes entirely from the Atomic Energy

Commission. I believe there have been two occasions when they have announced their shots.

To announce the purposes of the tests in detail would be to bare ourselves to our possible enemies. We have announced their general purpose, and, as in the case of the tests at Eniwetok on a previous occasion, we had made arrangements, even with the limited accommodations available on that small atoll, to take representatives of the press to a shot this summer. The tests in Nevada we are able to cover more fully.

Question. The next question is: You and Dr. Libby have both made public statements on the question of banning tests. Can you tell us whether Mr. Floberg and the commissioners agree with your stated position?

Admiral STRAUSS. I believe, although Mr. Floberg and Mr. Vance are here, and Mr. Graham was unavoidably prevented from attending, that the position of the commissioners on this subject is unanimous.

If it is not, you will see a show of hands.

Question. Sir, the aim of the current nuclear tests is to produce a so-called clean bomb. What thought is being given to furnishing the Soviet Union with the sanitizing formula?

Admiral STRAUSS. That is only one of the aims of the current series of tests, Mr. Chairman, and I cannot say that there is a sanitizing formula.

The weapons which are being developed with drastically reduced radioactive fallout involve matters of design and construction which also relate to their effort in many other respects besides cleanliness, if you will pardon me the use of that objectionable word, and it is not possible at this juncture, in time, at any rate, to reveal anything concerning their construction. It is against the law among other things.

Question. Would you say, sir, precisely what is the yardstick in measuring a clean or dirty bomb?

Admiral STRAUSS. The earliest, let us call them, conventional atomic weapons, produced a certain amount of radioactive fission products per ton of yield.

Weapons which produce a smaller percentage per ton of yield would fit the category that you have described, and I think the President stated last June, I believe this is the last authoritative statement on the subject, we had informed him that it was now feasible to produce weapons in certain ranges in which the amount of radioactive fission products had been reduced by as much as 95 or 96 percent in relation to the yield.

Is that an accurate statement, Dr. Libby?

Dr. LIBBY. Yes.

Question. Senator ANDERSON says that you made bombs dirtier by inserting something. You denied this. Were they made dirtier when you improved them?

Admiral STRAUSS. I would like to stand on the statement that I made in my letter to Congressman DURHAM which was released to the press, I think last Saturday.

This, incidentally, was not a charge that Senator ANDERSON leveled at the Commission.

I believe he said the military had done this, and the Department of Defense has itself replied to that statement.

Question. What can you tell us about the first tests of the current series?

Admiral STRAUSS. Only the fact that as we stated, I believe on yesterday, there had been the test of a very small device, I think 10 days ago, or 8 or 10 days ago.

There will be announcements of other tests of any significant nature as they occur.

Question. Admiral, someone wants to know, what about Congressman PORTER's statement in today's paper, that you told him that the present test would not be announced.

Admiral STRAUSS. I suppose that statement was as astonishing to Mr. PORTER as it was to me, since I believe this is the first time I ever had the pleasure of seeing the Congressman, and I have not yet had the pleasure of speaking to him.

I think the Congressman was undoubtedly misquoted.

Question. Sir, do you think France has reached, or is going to reach, sufficient nuclear capabilities to receive atomic secrets and materials from the United States?

Admiral STRAUSS. I would like to be able to answer this, but I am sorry to say I cannot. I do not know enough about the status of the progress of France in reaching a nuclear weapons capability. This is a matter on which, unfortunately, I have no direct knowledge.

Question. Admiral, has there been more than one unannounced test to date in this series?

Admiral STRAUSS. No comment.

Question. Sir, the Commission's proposed authorization legislation for fiscal 1959 has not yet been submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Will the Commission be recommending a substantially accelerated power reactor development program or does the Commission expect that the Joint Committee, as Chairman Durham said in Chicago in March, will come up with an accelerated power reactor program of its own?

Admiral STRAUSS. I believe the schedule, Mr. Chairman, is that we will be able to present a budget for authorization to the Joint Committee some time next week. In that event it will be sent down by the President, the facts and figures will be public, and I think it would be out of order for me to comment in any detail in advance of its presentation to the Joint Committee concerning its content.

I would say, however, or I would express the hope that the Joint Committee will find our program an acceptable one.

Question. Sir, does the AEC have enough interest in outer space activities to warrant continuing atomic energy and outer space in one Government agency?

Admiral STRAUSS. We have testified in support of the bill, I think it is Senate 3016, which seeks to establish a single agency for exploitation of outer space development.

The Atomic Energy Commission has been active for a considerable time in the development of nuclear power for propulsion and in other matters that have a direct bearing on outer space development.

We have said, and we believe, that the selection of the specific agency is important but not so important as is the principle of a single unified responsibility in one place for the job.

Question. Sir, there are a couple of related questions. Can you say under what terms the United States will provide atomic fuel for Euratom, and can you say anything about negotiations between the AEC and Euratom concluded this week?

The other question is: Has AEC firmed up its plans regarding either United States-Euratom cooperation or the civilian nuclear-power program?

Admiral STRAUSS. The Euratom negotiations have not been concluded. There was a very fruitful session for the last 10 days with the negotating team which came over from the 6-country group. This was a negotiation which had actually been begun by a team of our own that we sent to Luxembourg the month previously.

I would suppose that the end of these negotiations, which is still some time off, will result in an agreement on all points, but since they have not been settled, I cannot tell you what they are.

This is not secretiveness, this is fact that concurrence has not been reached, and it is for that reason that I am not able to be more specific about them. I will say this: The moment that they are reached they will be made public, because there is nothing secret in the entire relationship with the Euratom community. This is a development of 6 European nations for the peaceful exploitation of atomic power in 6 friendly European countries, to free them from the dependence under which they suffer today for imported fuel that could be cut off at any time.

Question. Admiral, this may be a "stop beating your wife" question, but here it is: Why does the commission give information about mining prices and licenses to other nations that is not available to American producers?

Admiral STRAUSS. I am not aware that that is the case. I would be very embarrassed to find it was. My first reaction would be to say that it is not the fact. I shall, however, with your permission, take this question and put it in my pocket in order to see what color there is to it.

Question. Can you tell us, sir, whether seismographic instruments in the United States or elsewhere detected the April 28 shot at Eniwetok?

Admiral STRAUSS. I don't know, but there will be in due course a report on all of these matters. I would like to address that question to Dr. Libby who has been following that. Has any report on that come to you?

Dr. LIBBY. I don't know of any.

Admiral STRAUSS. I think we have not reached such intelligence as yet.

Question. This questioner says that to the best of his knowledge, there has been no formal dedication of the Shippingport atomic electric plant. In view of the much-needed good publicity that we would get from that, through such a ceremony, why not hold one?

Admiral STRAUSS. I announced a few moments ago that this would take place on the 26th. The circumstances are that as the President had broken ground for the plant on Labor Day, in 1954, the people connected with it were extremely anxious to have him participate in the dedication.

His consent to do so was received about a week ago but instead of being able to stage it instantly, we were told it would require about 3 or 4 weeks in order to stage the event properly. I imagine quite a show will be made of it. I hope to go myself. Admiral Rickover and I are flying out on the evening of the 25th, and I hope that some of you will be there, and it ought to be very interesting.

The plant incidentally was completed within a period of time comparable to the best performance in building a conventional powerplant.

Question. If Congress were willing, would you be in favor of giving our allies independent nuclear strength, that is missiles and warheads under their own control?

Admiral STRAUSS. I have stated my position on this subject in testimony before the joint committee. I am in favor of the administration proposal which is on the table before the joint committee. I think it goes as far as is desirable or necessary at the present time.

Question. Scientist Landis Pawling is leader of an international group which is suing you and the other AEC members in Federal court to stop nuclear tests. Do you feel this is a matter for court decision?

Admiral STRAUSS. I am no lawyer, but I believe that if I am the defendant in a suit that the less I say about it while it is in process the better.

[Applause.]

Question. Admiral, are there any conditions under which you would reengage Dr. Oppenheimer?

Admiral STRAUSS. I was waiting for that. I have said and the President has said that the

case of Dr. Oppenheimer could always be reopened by the submission of substantial new evidence to the Commission.

Question. All right, sir. Do you favor the promotion of Admiral Rickover to Vice Admiral?

Admiral STRAUSS. I think that is definitely out of my sphere. I have nothing whatever to do with the promotion system in the Navy and I never found it worked in my own case. I wouldn't know whether if I were to say I would favor it I would help him or hurt him. I think under the circumstances, I will pass on that.

Question. Does Russia have a counterpart of AEC, and who is the head of the Russian agency corresponding?

Admiral STRAUSS. I only know the name of the ex-head, a man by the name of Larentia Berea. They have a very efficient method there of changing administrators, and I don't correspond with them.

Question. Admiral, this sums up a number of questions and of course is a very popular one: What is your decision on reappointment and how did you make it?

Admiral STRAUSS. Are my answers too short? I was looking for that question, too, Mr. Chairman; the situation is simply that my term of office expires the end of June, and as I said, the President had done me the honor of saying he wished me to take reappointment, and there are a number of considerations to be weighed, and it is under consideration. I have reached no decision.

Question. Sir, for quite some time now the atomic-energy industry with the support of some Members of Congress, have been urging a reappraisal of our policies and more precise definition of the policy objectives in the Atomic Power Development program, both from a domestic and international standpoint. Can you tell us whether the Commission plans to make or when it will make such a reappraisal and definition, or whether such action will be taken before your first term as chairman expires.

Admiral STRAUSS. The power program of the Commission is not static, and it is under a condition of constant and continuing appraisal, and reappraisal. The position of the Commission has been plainly and repeatedly stated, both with respect to the domestic program and the foreign program. They are quite different. Overseas we have friends who are power hungry. They are in countries where there is a very limited or in some cases no indigenous fuel supply. Some of them are actually dependent upon the whim of Mr. Nasser, as to whether their fuel should be shut off or not.

In respect of those situations, we are active in the sponsoring, the development, and the assistance of power programs to build a large number of kilowatts for them, and help them to build a large number of kilowatts, within the shortest possible time. In the United States we have a very different situation. Despite the enormous power requirements that we have, and the fact that they double about every 10 years, due not only to the increase in population but to the per capita increase in electric power consumption as well, we still have so great a supply of coal and oil on hand that we see no foreseeable early pressing demand for the production of nuclear power.

We have, therefore, engaged in the Commission in a large power program designed not to produce the maximum number of kilowatts but to find those types of reactors which will be the most efficient. The cheapest and the safest. For that reason we have a much more comprehensive power program than any nation, and we can afford it, and there are as I indicated a few moments ago in the course of my notes, a considerable number of prototype reactors, large ones, some as much as 270,000 installed kilowatts, and others as small as 2 or 3,000, building or built, out of which we believe or we hope will come the answer to the question of the best possible powerplant for the United States.

That is, I believe, and my colleagues share this belief, a constructive and progressive program.

Question. Admiral, before we ask the last question, I want to present you on behalf of the National Press Club, this certificate of appreciation for your service here today. (Applause.)

A man here wants to know, do you tell dirty stories?

Admiral STRAUSS. No, only stories with no fallout. I would like to tell one Commissioner Vance told me last night, with your permission. He was bracing me against this ordeal and he told me about a friend of his who had spoken at an organiaztion in South Bend, and had received the encomiums of the audience, and he also had been introduced by the toastmaster in very glowing terms, not as a shoe salesman. At any event, as he rode home, he said to his wife, "You know, I am impressed by the fact that there are really quite a number of extraordinarily able people in the world." And his wife said, "There is one less than you think."

Question. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, the question period ended at 2 o'clock.)

TV—To Pay or Not To Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the television industry has been undergoing close scrutiny from many sides here in Washington in recent months. The question of subscription television and the Federal Communications Commission's examination of the recommendations of the Commission-appointed network study staff have prompted searching analysis of whether the public interest, convenience, and necessity might be better served by a system of broadcasting other than the present system of television free to the public and deriving its financial support from advertising revenues.

In considering whether the best interests of the public are served by broadcasting in the form that has brought television the great popularity it now enjoys, it is well to bear in mind such public-spirited projects as that of the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., Inc., in sponsoring and producing a week of performances by Benny Goodman and his orchestra in the American Theater at the World's Fair in Brussels. This series of performances of American popular music, one of our greatest cultural exports, will be the first in-person presentation in the American performing arts program at the fair. I feel that its sponsorship by a broadcasting company speaks well for the dedication to the service of the community and the Nation that is to be found in the radio and television industry.

The Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. has shown genuine concern and leadership in the whole broad area of public service. Last year more than 200 educators, religious and civic leaders, and broadcasters, representing a cross section of the radio-television industry, assembled at the invitation of this company for the Boston conference on local public service programing. The success of this Boston meeting, dedicated to improving and broadening service to the public through broadcasting, can be judged from the fact that a second such conference was held this year, March 5 to 8, in Baltimore, with an attendance of more than 325.

The significance of these efforts has been recognized in the form of major awards and in the editorial praise of the members of the press who covered these conferences.

The Baltimore Sun on March 12, 1958, carried this report on the Baltimore conference, written by Donald Kirkley, the paper's radio-television editor:

[From the Baltimore Sun of March 12, 1958]

LOOK AND LISTEN

(With Donald Kirkley)

The conference on local public-service programs held here last week was, on the whole, a remarkable and encouraging thing which reflects great credit on all who had a part in it. Held under the auspices of the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., it was a prime example of the good which can be done by such firms when they are conscious of their obligations toward the public which makes their commercial operations profitable.

During the 4 days of what will be known as the Baltimore Conference, the 300-odd participants, many of whom came long distances to attend, showed, in many meetings, as in informal conversation, an understanding of the big, important problems faced by this branch of television and radio broadcasting. They displayed an awareness of the impact of sputnik I on American society, and they agreed that it is up to the various stations, as well as the networks, to place greater emphasis than ever before on the education and enlightenment of their vast audiences in matters vital to the security and well being of the Nation. This theme was vigorously stated by Donald H. McGannon, president of the WBC in his keynote address.

The speakers were aware of this, too; and among them were some of the country's foremost scientists and teachers. Stressed in many speeches and discussions were the weaknesses of the school system and the means of strengthening it. Dr. Frank H. Baxter discoursed, in his warm and witty way, on the large areas of ignorance, even on simple matters, which should be corrected; one of his hobbies, he said, is listening to radio quizzes, and he quoted one woman who, asked to name six States bordering on the Mississippi, said she knew only one—Ohio.

Dr. Bergen Evans declared that if television hopes to function on the same level as the colleges, it will be appealing to no more than perhaps 10 percent of the total audience. This, he pointed out, means that large ratings cannot be expected and this, in turn, means trouble with sponsors.

There is a second paradox, he said. If the purpose of higher education is to get at the truth, the viewer must be taken behind the scenes and taught to question many things believed by the majority. Patriotism, for instance, is valuable, he said; among other things, it makes people easier to draft and more willing to pay taxes. But, he added, if all the factors behind it are to be studied, they soon lead to "ideas which reach and transcend national boundaries, and then, of course, you get screams. Higher education requires a man to unlearn much that he

learned as a child. The question is, can you do this in public?"

Dr. Evans also warned that the teaching of science alone is not enough. Scientists must learn the humanities—must be aware of what goes on inside a man, otherwise their rapidly increasing power over external things—and other men—may be dangerous. "Scientists," he declared, "Are the kind of people who do what politicians tell them to. They have the power to destroy us."

This was strong talk, and there was more like it. There were also many instances given of excellent programs on the air here and there and the growing sense of responsibility of broadcasters, some of whom are beginning, even, to editorialize. It was a serious-minded, hardworking meeting of minds, and the consequences will be manifested over large areas in the year to come.

Heikkila Case in Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and much has been written about the sudden deportation of William Heikkila of San Francisco to his native Finland for being a part of the Communist conspiracy in the United States.

I believe it is time that this case is brought into proper perspective, remembering that Heikkila has never proved his right to citizenship in his 52 years in the United States.

Perhaps the best way to bring this case into the sharp focus of our times when Communists are undermining the historic relationship between our country and Latin America by threatening the lives of Vice President and Mrs. Richard Nixon on their good-will tour is to cite at this point editorials from three newspapers.

On Thursday, April 24, 1958, the San Francisco Examiner said, in part, editorially:

The Immigration Service asked the United States attorney's office whether a legal restraint was pending, was told there was none, then carried out its swift deportation—10 years, 3 months, and 18 days after it had started deportation proceedings. * * * We repeat that the Service erred grossly in the manner of handling the Heikkila case. Had it, within hours of Heikkila's deportation, supplied the public with the full facts reviewed above and with legal basis for acting the storm never would have blown up.

From my own inquiry as a member of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, I wholeheartedly agree with the Examiner's viewpoint.

Then on Saturday, April 26, 1958, the People's World, the Communist newspaper published in San Francisco, clamored editorially for:

A no-holds-barred congressional investigation of the Immigration Service.

Immediate dismissal of Bruce Barber, San Francisco immigration director, and all others directly responsible for the Heikkila outrage.

Repeal or revision of the Walter-McCarran Act—

Which was termed in the editorial "infamous."

You will note that not once did the Communist People's World in its high state of indignation call for a congressional investigation of its fellow traveler, William Heikkila.

Then on May 7, 1958, the Oakland Tribune had this to say, in part, editorially:

The debate about the manner in which Heikkila was picked up, placed aboard a Government plane, held overnight in Canada, then put aboard a plane for Finland no doubt will continue. * * * The findings by Representative HILLINGS will not still the loud voices of those who have design to aid special purposes rather than those interested chiefly in democratic processes and fair treatment * * * the full story of the Heikkila case has not yet been told. * * * When it is, the probability exists that justification other than that voiced by Representative HILLINGS for the Immigration Service also will be revealed.

Like many Americans I was concerned by the allegation that Heikkila had been arrested by Immigration officers and hustled out of the country in the dead of night without being given the opportunity to contact his wife or attorney.

Upon inquiry I am convinced that Heikkila had every opportunity to place a call to his wife or his attorney but, instead, he chose to tell a coworker at his place of employment who happened to be passing by at the time of his arrest by Immigration officers to call his wife to tell her that he had been taken into custody by these officers as a result of a deportation order that had been outstanding for almost 11 years.

I emphasize that after almost 11 years of litigation over this deportation order, Heikkila was aware of his rights at the time he was apprehended by Immigration officers. If he had wanted to call his wife or his attorney he would have been allowed to do so.

As the result of inquiry requested by my distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, the Honorable FRANCIS WALTER, of Pennsylvania, I am convinced that the Immigration Service moved on absolutely legal grounds and was guilty only of faulty public relations.

I am so reporting to Mr. WALTER in a personal summary of my findings recently in San Francisco.

I talked to Bruce Barber, the director who was maligned by the Communist People's World, and I found him to be of the highest type of public servant, a man who is dedicated not only to his important job but to his country. There is no more loyal and patriotic American than Bruce Barber.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Communists seized upon the initial public shock of Heikkila's swift deportation to make a "cause celebre" of this case to suit their own selfish, vicious purpose.

It was not pointed out during the public outcry attendant to the Heikkila deportation that as late as December 1956, he took refuge behind the fifth amendment in refusing to answer a House Un-American Activities Subcommittee sitting at San Francisco on the question of whether he was or is a member of the Communist Party.

Yet, Heikkila has been quoted by newsmen as saying that he left the party in 1939 since his return from Finland.

During the course of the subcommittee's questioning of Heikkila, he resorted to the 1st or 5th amendments or both 20 times on questions relating to his connection with the Communist Party and as to whether he had applied for naturalization and as to whether he has ever left the United States since he came to Minnesota with his parents from Finland at the age of 2½ months.

This is a matter of public record.

The full story of the strange case of William Heikkila has not been told.

I predict that evidence will be turned up within a matter of weeks, possibly days, that will give an entirely new light to the William Heikkila case and fully justify his immediate deportation as a threat to the security of our country.

I further am convinced that this new development which is expected to break momentarily will shock and astound even those innocents who have been bewitched by the case and now are defending this poor, defenseless alien.

Shrill Barks—Wrong Tree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I call your special attention to an editorial which appears in the Washington Evening Star with respect to the President's order of American troops to the Caribbean area after the Caracas incident when the life of our Vice President and his wife were in grave danger.

I am sure this editorial expresses the sentiment of the vast majority of the American people. Whatever the political faith of our President and our Vice President, in their respective offices they are the embodiment of the American people themselves. Any insult to either of them is an insult to all of us. To whatever danger they may be subjected we must and will endeavor to protect them.

The sending of our troops to our own bases in the area was simply a precautionary action—to make certain that the host Government of our Vice President would have available to it, if needed, adequate protection for the American people's representative. The editorial expresses my view. It follows:

SHRILL BARKS—WRONG TREE

With all deference, we venture to suggest that those Democrats who are trying to capitalize on the President's dispatch of troops to the Caribbean after the Caracas incident have embarked on what will prove to be the most unrewarding political venture of this generation.

Mr. Eisenhower ordered the troops sent to American bases within easy flying range of Venezuela as a precautionary measure. It was made clear at the time that they would not be sent to Caracas unless the Venezuelan Government requested assistance in protecting Vice President and Mrs. Nixon from the mobs.

This is very upsetting to some of the Democrats. The Morse subcommittee is going to investigate the action. And the Oregon Senator will be considerate enough to let Mr. NIXON testify if he wishes. Senator SMATHERS says the worst thing we could do would be to send in the Marines. He thinks that would play into the hands of the Communists. Senator JACKSON predicts that the Russians will play up the move as "Yankee imperialism." Senator KEFAUVER thinks it will damage the relations of the United States with its neighbors to the south.

To all of which we say: Sheer nonsense. Let's remember that the troops were sent to American bases to await a possible call for help from the Venezuelan authorities. Let us also remember that Mr. Eisenhower, at the time, did not know whether the Venezuelans would be able to protect the Vice President and Mrs. Nixon from serious injury.

Perhaps the President should have waited to see whether the mob was going to storm the American Embassy and drag Mr. and Mrs. Nixon into the street. But we don't think so. And we don't believe the American people will think so, either.

If the Communists can make any propaganda capital out of the President's decision, they are welcome to it. We don't think they can, but they may try to capitalize on what the Democrats are saying about that decision.

Transworld Airlines Leads the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the action of Trans World Airlines in hiring its first Negro flight stewardess is applauded by all who decry inequality in job opportunities. It paves the way for similar action by other major airlines. Both Trans World Airlines and the smaller Mohawk Airlines are to be commended for their positions with respect to personnel practices. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial commenting on this matter from this morning's Washington Post be inserted in the RECORD.

BREAKTHROUGH

The news that Trans World Airlines has hired Margaret Grant as its first Negro flight stewardess is a major human breakthrough every bit as significant as recent scientific advances in air travel. TWA's action marks the first time that a major air carrier has breached the unwritten, outmoded employment code among the scheduled passenger lines. A smaller carrier, Mohawk Airlines, led the way 6 months ago in erasing color limitations by employing the country's first Negro stewardess. We are confident that TWA will win widespread applause for its decision to change its policies rather than content an employment discrimination hearing in New York.

The action by TWA sets a challenging example for the Nation's Capital, where "Equal Job Opportunity Week" is now being observed. The Washington Urban League has made some encouraging progress in opening up new jobs for Negroes in many concerns (including airlines), but there is a natural reluctance to the be the first. Yet neither the conscience of the community nor the spirit of the laws support arbitrary bars on opportunity.

The Bold Stroke—Income Tax Rate Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include an editorial that appeared in the May 17, 1958, issue of the Saturday Evening Post. This editorial discusses the recession in the light of needed tax action and concludes that the legislation (H. R. 9119) which I have introduced and which has also been introduced by my friend and colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, Representative ANTONI N. SADLAK of Connecticut, is not only long overdue, but, in contrast with hastily conceived action, would provide a real and lasting stimulant to the economy.

The editorial follows:

Millions of words have been written and spoken about the current economic recession, and many of the commentators might well take to heart President Eisenhower's advice to use some commonsense and not just get a sputnik attitude about everything. With the Democrats doing their best to give the economy the count down for political reasons, and the Republicans, for the same reason, attempting to show that the recession will disappear as soon as people stop talking about it, commonsense is an infrequent ingredient of current discussion.

A man out of a job can be forgiven a sputnik attitude. Like the soldier forced to risk his life in a strategic retreat which has no immediate bearing on the issue of a war, the unemployed man is the victim of a conflict for which he has no responsibility. In the days before income tax took from the humblest worker's income somewhat more than his father was able to save, the unemployed could often sweat it out on their savings. Even as things are, savings the country over are high. Nevertheless the majority of the unemployed must depend on unemployment-insurance benefits. Extension of the number of payments in areas where they have been exhausted seems an inexpensive way to assist the victims of economic recession through a disastrous period.

Most of the more grandiose recommendations, however, are to be viewed with suspicion, especially those which involve vast made public-works projects financed on borrowed money. After all, one of the reasons we have a recession is the fact that consumer debt has been overtaking income. When the installment payments creep up too close to the paychecks, the family decides that a new car or a color TV will have to wait. Hence unemployment and depression in the industries affected. Hence also a spate of ill-conceived antirecession measures, many of which would probably make matters worse, but which few politicians care to oppose lest they be accused of indifference to the plight of our millions of unemployed. The probable major contribution of most public works projects would be an even higher national debt and a dollar still weaker than the one we now have.

Tax reduction, if undertaken as real tax reform, as proposed in the Sadlak-Herlong bill, and not as a mere cry-havoc effort to give the taxpayer a few temporary dollars with which to buy, buy, buy something, makes more sense. Unforutnately the administration appears to regard tax reduction as a life preserver that might be thrown to a man overboard, but only as he is about to go down for the third time. Presented as a last resort, the psychological impact of tax reduction might be similar to the effect on a hospital patient when they wheel an oxygen tent into his room.

Really stimulating would be the news that a basic reform in taxation and Government spending was to be undertaken—not as an emergency measure, but as a long-overdue effort to correct at least one of the major drags on our economy. Such an effort might well turn out to be the bold stroke that routed the recession.

State Convention of the Knights of Columbus Held at Wilkes-Barre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record of May 2, 1958, on the recently concluded State convention of the Knights of Columbus that was held at Wilkes-Barre:

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS STATE CONVENTION

For the first time since it was organized 60 years ago, Wilkes-Barre Council 302, Knights of Columbus, is about to play host to the State council and delegates representing its 60,000 members. The convention will be formally opened at a solemn pontifical mass on Sunday at 11 a. m. in St. Mary's Church, South Washington Street. The program will be continued with a banquet on Sunday night at the West Side Armory at 6:30.

Anniversaries of the State and Wilkes-Barre Councils coincide. Both were organized in 1898. When the Wilkes-Barre Council celebrated its 50th anniversary, attention was directed to the fact that the first grand knight was Thomas P. Ryder, at the time a member of the Record staff and in that year this newspaper's correspondent with the Ninth Regiment at Chickamauga in the Spanish-American War.

One of the memorable occasions in the history of the Council was the visitation in 1946 of John E. Swift, at that time the supreme knight. On the present occasion a highlight will be the presence of Ambassador Jose Maria de Areiliza, Spain's envoy to the United States, who will be the principal speaker at the dinner on Sunday night. Then on Monday another highlight will be the presence of Gov. George M. Leader at a luncheon at Irem Temple. The chief address will be given by Congressman DANIEL J. F. FLOOD.

With the present reservations near or in some cases exceeding the capacity of the hotels and with the convention committee

presently turning to the motels for further accommodations, a large attendance at the convention is assured, and the number of visitors from near and far is expected to be in the thousands.

In its religious and civic aspects, the Wilkes-Barre Knights of Columbus Council has been a well-established entity from the beginning. Through the 60 years of its active history, the council has participated in a wealth of church and community undertakings. Its convention is properly a subject of widespread interest, and we find this evidenced by the fact that central city streets have been expressly festooned with welcoming banners for the first time, so City Hall declares, in many years.

The Communist Party in the Abuse of the Vice President—Students Trained and Organized on Worldwide Basis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the United States is justly shocked and angered over the deplorable treatment accorded Vice President and Mrs. Nixon in several of the South American nations. There are several factors that contributed to the abusive actions directed against the Nation's second highest public official. But primarily, the Communist movement must and will be held to blame. That a great part of the demonstrations were planned and organized is crystal clear. I direct the attention of the Members of the Congress to a searching analysis on student activities in this kind of a situation. It is written by Barry Farber, a delegate to several student conferences behind the Iron Curtain and in South America, as a correspondent of student newspapers. With this kind of experience, he knows whereof he speaks.

Mr. Speaker, the article appeared in the Washington Star of May 14, 1958, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

ANTI-NIXON RIOTS CAP 10-YEAR PRAGUE DRIVE

(By Barry Farber)

NEW YORK, May 14.—There is jubilation today in No. 3 Vocelova Street in Prague, Czechoslovakia, as reports come in from the widely separated cities of Caracas, Lima, and Beirut telling of violent anti-American demonstrations.

No. 3 Vocelova Street is the headquarters of the International Union of Students, a 12-year-old Communist-front youth group. It is the place where techniques of damaging and embarrassing the United States are hatched, rehearsed and propelled into ugly action in every part of the world.

If newspaper reports of Peruvian and Venezuelan students spitting at and stoning Vice President NIXON and of Lebanese rioters burning United States Information Service libraries caused dismay in the United States, in Prague the reaction was doubtless satisfaction for a job well done. Not that the IUS is solely responsible for the outbursts; rather, it has exploited existing situations to the full.

The Prague-based IUS has invested millions of Moscow dollars convincing young people from Lima to Lebanon that America means warmongering, poverty, racial discrimination and support for dictatorships, while Soviet Russia and local leftist parties hold the only real key to peace and plenty.

TEN-YEAR TARGET

Ten years ago Moscow pinpointed Latin America as a juicy target for IUS penetration, first under the leadership of a Czech student, Josef Roman, and now under his successor, 35-year-old Jiri Pelikan, a former member of the Czech Parliament.

Pelikan's lieutenants have been such agitators and organizers as Mr. Chauduri, of India, who made a circuit tour of South America in 1957; Seadati Babak, of Iran, who attended a Latin American student conference last year in La Plata, Argentina, representing the IUS; a Mr. Alvarez, who has just returned to his native Ecuador after a year in Communist Europe as an IUS vice president, and Berard Bereanu, a Rumanian who is believed a key figure in the IUS program for South America.

The IUS sailed into business on two levels in South America. One was completely above deck. Well-dressed, well-mannered IUS representatives traveled from campus to campus enlisting sympathy and offering membership to everyone interested in fighting imperialism and poverty, war and nuclear weapons, prejudice and discrimination, dictatorship and suppression of civil liberties. Before long, most South American student federations had affiliated with the Prague body.

VACATIONS IN RUSSIA

Funds swiftly became available for student leaders in South America to take vacations in Russia and eastern Europe. Latin American universities were bombarded with scholarship offers for Prague, Budapest, Warsaw, and Moscow. Brisk exchanges of student, artist, dance, and sports groups sprang up.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, May 10 is a day warmly remembered in the hearts of American citizens of Rumanian descent. Selected as Rumanian Independence Day, May 10 stands for the achievement of national unity, freedom, and independence. In my own city of Cleveland, as indeed elsewhere throughout the Nation, the day is commemorated by an inspiring public rally, attended by the many friends of Rumania.

Regrettably, the people of Rumania can not join in public observance of this historic date as their Communist masters forbid demonstrations in the cause of freedom. The Communist regime has endeavored to expunge this scared day from Rumania's proud history. No longer can her people sing their national anthem or raise the Rumanian flag on independence day. Celebrations have been shifted by the Communists from the 10th to the 9th of May, the anniversary of a Soviet victory, in order to alter the significance of this memorable day. Although flags are raised on the ninth, the Rumanian people celebrate in their hearts the following day, patiently awaiting restoration of their freedom.

During their long history Rumanians have always stood up against aggression and repression. They have been oppressed many times before, but their will remains unbroken. Through these dark years of Communist domination, the Rumanian people have kept alive their courage and their faith. They know that freedom cannot be destroyed.

Our Government does not accede to the Kremlin's wish that the status quo be finally accepted in regard to Eastern European nations and peoples. The United States rejects the permanent enslavement of Rumania and other states by the Communists, and looks forward with them to the day when they will again live in freedom and independence. With Rumanians everywhere we join in prayer to Almighty God that that day will not be far distant.

Restore Employment and Create Incentive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the bill to restore employment and create incentive for new enterprise has had a response favorable beyond my highest expectations.

I refer to H. R. 12350 and similar measures sponsored by Senator CAPEHART and by the gentlemen from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] and California [Mr. SCUDDER] and myself.

Many of my constituents have written to me in support of the measure and advise that they are writing also to members of the Committee on Ways and Means.

They share my belief that this bill provides the best and quickest method of stimulating our economy and providing employment for every man and woman who seeks a job.

I was pleased that the following editorial comments of the Canton (Ohio) Repository show the relationship between this bill and the proposal of the Business Advisory Commission.

HOW THE PIECES FIT TOGETHER

Similar proposals introduced by Representative FRANK T. BOW of Ohio in the House and Senator HOMER CAPEHART of Indiana in the Senate would carry out a policy favored by the Business Advisory Commission.

The BAC policy, in turn, would have direct bearing on a problem which most economists believe is one of the root causes of the downturn in business—a decline in the rate of spending by business, itself.

This decline is not only one of the immediate causes of unemployment but is worrisome because it will handicap business in its ability to make the most of the coming boom in the 1960's, which will be caused by population growth and technological progress.

The BAC policy, which the bills introduced by Representative Bow and Senator CAPEHART would put into effect, is liberalized tax writeoffs for new plants and machinery.

Through these accelerated depreciation allowances, business enterprise would be encouraged to prepare for the next boom in business that is expected to restore full employment.

McGraw-Hill publications currently are pointing out to their readers that the country now is in a transition from the postwar boom based on deferred demand to a new boom in the 1960's based on dynamic population growth and a revolution in technology.

The publications also are saying that more than half the machine tools now in United States factories are over 10 years old and should be replaced for the sake of bringing down operating and maintenance costs.

The pieces all fit together, and they would fall into place automatically if Congress ever came to be of one mind on the purpose of taxation. Its purpose should be to increase the vitality of the goose that lays the golden eggs, never to shorten its life with harassment. Unfortunately, in recent years, Federal taxes have been used to harass, not help, the sources of the Nation's wealth.

Legislation Entitled "First Strengthening of State Governments"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation that would return to the States the primary responsibility with respect to certain governmental services and that would make available to the States revenue now utilized by the Federal Government. I have introduced this legislation as the ranking Republican member on the House Committee on Ways and Means at the request of the administration so that it may be available for public study and consideration. My sponsorship should not be construed to indicate that I have determined my position in regard to this legislation.

The administration has recommended this proposal as a consequence of a study and recommendation made by the Joint Federal-State Action Committee consisting of representatives of the executive branch of the Federal Government and governors who were appointed to the committee by the chairman of the governors' conference.

The President of the United States outlined the purposes and objectives of this committee in an address before the conference of governors in Williamsburg, Va., on June 24, 1957. At that time the President stated as follows:

I suggest, therefore, that this conference join with the Federal administration in creating a task force for action, a joint committee charged with three responsibilities:

One. To designate functions which the States are ready and willing to assume and finance that are now performed or financed wholly or in part by the Federal Government;

Two. To recommend the Federal and State revenue adjustments required to enable the States to assume such functions; and

Three. To identify functions and responsibilities likely to require State or Federal attention in the future and to recommend the level of State effort, or Federal effort, or both, that will be needed to assure effective action.

I strongly support sound efforts to bring about a reallocation of governmental responsibility among the Federal-State and local echelons of government so as to retrench from our posture of the present tremendous centralization of power at the Federal level. I am convinced that many of the governmental goods and services now made available by the Federal Government could be more efficiently and meaningfully made available through State or local governmental activities. The administration-recommended legislation that I have today introduced purports to take modest steps in that direction. It is my expectation that the careful study the legislation will receive as a consequence of its introduction will permit a determination as to whether or not the suggested approach set forth in the legislation is a sound and proper one.

Test of Character

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

[From the Washington Daily News of May 15, 1958]

TEST OF CHARACTER

Rocks in South America, burned libraries in Lebanon, and Algiers. We've given military aid, economic aid, Marshall plan aid, point 4 aid, famine relief, flood relief, disaster relief. We've spent billions on the military to keep the commies off their neck, and ours. Why is it so few seem to love us well-meaning Americans? It's easy to understand Russian motives, but what about the others?

There are several ways to look at it:

We are the world's rich relative and who ever heard of a generous relative getting much if any credit?

The United States is, through force of circumstances, trying to bring peace and prosperity to the world, trying to help people help themselves to independence and dignity. This is a tough job, posing some impossible problems. Since we're in charge we get blamed for everything that goes wrong. If we're so smart, why did we let it happen? The good we do is taken for granted.

America is the world's policeman, having inherited the job from faltering Britain. A policeman traditionally attracts rocks from the criminal element for being too tough, from the law-abiding, tax-paying element for not being tough enough.

It is a hard, thankless job which has been thrust upon this Nation, due to our great material progress and our successes in two world wars. Then why, since our reward is mainly abuse, not skip the whole business and let the rest of the world go for itself?

Because that would mean anarchy, war and slavery to the Communists who eagerly seek the job of world policeman and penitentiary warden. It would men chaos in which even the great United States of America must inevitably be engulfed.

We are an idealistic people, resenting injustice and deploring poverty, anywhere in the world. But basically, we act in our own interest.

World events force a severe test of character in this, our inadvertent hour of greatness. Our grandchildren will be able to judge, by their lot in life, how well we lived up to it.

Cape Cod National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week my colleague, Congressman O'NEILL of Massachusetts, and I introduced identical bills that would authorize the establishment of a Cape Cod National Park at the Greater Outer Beach of the Cape in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

With permission to extend my remarks, I would like to have printed in the RECORD editorials supporting this proposal that have appeared in the Boston Globe on May 10, the Boston Traveler on May 12, and the Boston Herald on May 13.

TO SAVE CAPE COD

The bill introduced in Congress to make a national park of the outer beach of Cape Cod from Provincetown to Nauset inlet or even as far as Monomoy Point offers Massachusetts its last chance to remedy a situation already intolerable and getting worse. One of the most densely populated of the States of the Union, Massachusetts, has only 187,000 acres of State park land and has no national park. New York State has 1 park which alone contains 2 million acres. Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont all have national parks and more State park area than Massachusetts.

Recent development of beach areas has taken away thousands of acres of seashore and woodland and threatens to take more. There is no sense in denying that all Cape Cod is in danger of being Jerseyized unless steps are taken by local, State, and national agencies.

Massachusetts is within a 12-hour drive of 50 Million Canadians and Americans. Cape Cod's Great Beach is within 300 miles of the 6 New England capitals and metropolitan New York.

Commissioner Francis W. Sargent of the Department of Natural Resources is wholeheartedly in favor of making a national park of Great Beach. He points out that it has been demonstrated that national parks bring revenue to a section by preserving natural charm. In North Carolina and Tennessee, tourists visiting the Great Smokies National Park left $28 million in a single year.

Of universal concern is the sacrifice of beach and coast line to commercial interests. Of the 3,700 miles of Atlantic and gulf coast from Calais, Maine, south, only 240 miles are federally or State-owned for public recreation uses. The Department of the Interior has recognized Cape Cod as the stretch of shore most worth preserving. Massachusetts should do the same.

SAVING THE CAPE

The way things are developing, Cape Cod may be the site of the Nation's next national park.

The preserve would be along the cape's Great Outer Beach stretching some 33 miles from Orleans to Provincetown.

This scenic strip of seashore has been the subject of an almost-concluded year-long survey by the National Park Service. And the Interior Department says the beach is in the highest priority for selection as a national park.

Meanwhile, two Bay State Congressmen have filed legislation that would speed up the preservation of the area.

Measures by Representatives EDWARD P. BOLAND and THOMAS P. O'NEILL, both Democrats, provide that anyone who now owns a home on the beach included in the proposed park, would be allowed to remain there.

Another thing the measures do is to eliminate the necessity of the Federal Government taking the land by eminant domain.

We'd like to see the natural wonder of the cape saved. Great Outer Beach is one of last remaining untouched strips of seashore along the Atlantic Coast. But it's being threatened by commercial development. Once it goes commercial, the spell of the sheer cliffs and the allure of the dunes and surf will be lost to the public. And when an area starts downgrade, it's difficult to catch the public's interest.

Legislation aimed at creating a national park is aimed at saving the cape in more ways than one.

A NATIONAL TREASURE

Do we know the priceless possession we have in Massachusetts?

The tourist brochures list some of it—the miles of gleaming beach, weathered scrub pine, sand dunes, the immense sweep of sky and ocean where flocks of gulls hang against the blue, and the ground trembles with the shock and shudder of surf. This unspoiled terrain is the essence of New England, a landscape without peer, forever fresh and beguiling.

But have our own eyes become so dulled by habit that we take the tangled wildness of Cape Cod for granted?

At the present rate of development and growth, the great outer beach of the cape is in danger of going the way of similar beaches along the Atlantic coast. In another decade it may present a different aspect—cluttered by cottages, illuminated by neon signs, paved by asphalt and plowed under by the gaseous advance of the urban sprawl.

In view of the shortness of the time left to the cape beaches, the proposals filed in Congress by Representatives EDWARD P. BOLAND and THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr., take on special significance. These bills would make a national park extending for 33 miles from Provincetown to Chatham; and they focus countryside attention on the clear and present danger to the cape.

Although Massachusetts is paying, with the other States, for the National Park Service, we have no national parks within our borders. Here is the place to begin. The great beach of Cape Cod is in every sense a national as well as a local treasure.

The sentiment of the Massachusetts Legislature, which has memorialized Congress to make a national park out of the area, is on record. But cluttered development of the outer beach is proceeding at an alarming rate. Even the balance of nature is being affected. The destruction of marsh grass resulted, during the winter storms, in sending a section of the Eastham parking area toppling into the sea.

Instances of such mishaps can be multiplied, and the survival of the cape's natural resources is not merely a matter of esthetics. From the economic standpoint the towns affected would be reimbursed at the State's average tax rate for the land acquired. They would benefit by the reimbursement and, moreover, by preserving the cape in its natural state, gain tourist revenue that will go elsewhere if the beaches are razed and given over to unbridled private enterprise.

Thoreau could wander on the great outer beach of Cape Cod and meditate on its clean and untouched beauty. A man can do that today. The great beach is still a sweeping and sun-drenched space where one can confront nature and exalt the spirit. It is being eroded by time and progress far swifter than the tides that lunge at the sandy barrier.

Atomic Energy Commission's Physical Research Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a press release which I issued on May 13, 1958, expressing concern over the inadequacy of funds being made available for the Atomic Energy Commission's physical research program in the budget for fiscal year 1959.

In recent hearings of the Subcommittee on Research and Development of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, it was developed that there is a requirement of 50-percent increase in support of basic research for the Atomic Energy Commission's program if this program is not to deteriorate to a point of disastrous proportions in relation to our competition in basic research with the Soviet Union.

Supporting the views of the top scientists within our program who testified before our subcommittee, I include also with my remarks a letter from Dr. Warren C. Johnson, dean of the division of physical science, University of Chicago, and chairman of the general advisory committee to the Atomic Energy Commission.

The address and letter follow:

Representative MELVIN PRICE, Democrat, of Illinois, chairman of the Research and Development Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, today labeled the 1959 authorization request for the AEC physical research program as "shockingly low" and a "wanton neglect" of this country's needs in the field of basic research. Funds requested in the budget proposal were limited to two projects of $500,000 each and represented improvements of existing research facilities. No new construction funds were requested to cover requirements in the three major physical research areas, i. e., nuclear physics, chemistry, and metallurgy.

"This is a sorry commentary," he said, "on the negative approach of the executive branch toward the Nation's scientific needs and provides shocking proof of the short-sighted attitude which exists in the AEC Controller's Office and the Budget Bureau. This is not true economy," he declared, "it is the costly road to decay and defeat."

"It is high time," he went on, "that the administration stop paying lip service to the importance of basic research and back its words with adequate financial support of our research effort. Without such support we cannot hope to meet the Soviet challenge nor can we long remain a first-class scientific Nation."

In referring to recent public hearings which his subcommittee held on the AEC physical research program, Representative PRICE observed that the great majority of witnesses, comprised of top scientists from our laboratories throughout the country, had emphasized the need for an increase of at least 50 percent in the overall level of support of the program.

"This view is confirmed," he said, "by many eminent scientists whom I have met in the field and by the distinguished members of the General Advisory Committee upon whom the Atomic Energy Commission relies heavily for guidance."

"It is interesting to note," he added, "that the chairman of the General Advisory Committee wrote Admiral Strauss in February of this year stating that the present level of support of the physical research program is 'greatly inadequate' and recommending that the level of funding of the program over the next 4 years be progressively increased by amounts ranging from 50 percent to 150 percent of present levels.

"It is abundantly clear," he added, "that prompt action must be taken to increase the level of support of the AEC physical research program if we are to avoid disastrous consequences in the future. The success of our entire scientific effort in the years to come rests squarely on the fundamental knowledge which is developed today in our research facilities. It is vital that we give this work wholehearted support. If the executive branch is unable or unwilling to provide the necessary leadership, the Congress must."

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
Chicago, Ill., May 1, 1958.

The Honorable MELVIN PRICE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Research and Development, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, United States Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRICE: Due to the fact that I was detained in Chicago on account of illness during the hearings on the Physical Research Program of the Atomic Energy Commission, scheduled for February 14, 1958, at the request of your Committee I am enclosing a copy of the letter dealing with this subject and addressed to Mr. Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, dated February 20, 1958:

My statement is as follows:

"During the past few months I have given considerable thought to the problem of financial support for the activities of the Division of Research of the Atomic Energy Commission. It is becoming more and more evident that the present level of support, namely, about $71.5 million for fiscal 1958 and fiscal 1959, is greatly inadequate. Furthermore, unless considerably more support is forthcoming within the next 2 or 3 years, we shall find ourselves in a difficult position.

"For the support of this conclusion, I would like to present a few facts pertaining to some of the programs under the sponsorship of the Division of Research. At the present time about $16 million is devoted annually to the support of high energy physics. Nevertheless, these funds do not enable the cosmotron at the Brookhaven National Laboratory and the bevatron at the University of California Radiation Laboratory to operate on a full schedule. In addition, these leboratories have been in a position to accept only about 40 percent of the requests that come to them for the use of the accelerators for worthwhile experiments, and many other physicists and teams in universities throughout the country do not even apply for machine time, since it is apparent that none is available. Four new high

energy accelerators are now under construction and will go into operation during the period 1960–1962. These are the 25–30 Bev AGS machine at Brookhaven, the 12.5 Bev accelerator at the Argonne National Laboratory, the 3 Bev synchrotron at Princeton and the Harvard–MIT 6 Bev electron synchrotron at Cambridge. It has been carefully estimated that when these machines go into operation, about $50 million will be the annual operating and experimental expense to maintain them on a full time basis. We are certain that when this time arrives there will be even more demand for the use of the machines than available machine time will permit.

The estimate made here is based on present-day dollars; any inflationary trend will increase the operating costs. It should also be pointed out that other high energy machines, such a cyclotrons, linear accelerators, etc., that are included in this program are not being used to capacity. If one considers it important to use our manpower as efficiently and effectively as possible, then there is the need to maintain all of our experimental devices in the field of high energy physics at full capacity. In other words, it appears to me that our manpower resources should take precedence in our effort to maintain leadership in the field of high energy physics. This statement applies equally to all other fields in the atomic-energy program.

"Another field that deserves increased attention is what one might call in general terms "the science of materials." Included in this expression are such areas as chemistry, metallurgy, solid-state physics, high-temperature thermodynamics, ceramics, the behavior of materials in a radiation field, etc. Our efforts in the fundamental sciences pertaining to these areas have been greatly inadequate. In fact, the difficulties we have experienced in the development of different types of reactors, not only for power but for military propulsion purposes, as well, have been due in a large measure to lack of fundamental knowledge in these fields. Due to the unrealistic time schedule, we have spent relatively large sums of money for pieces of hardware without knowing what components would be contained within them. By lengthening the time schedules for completion of some of our reactors for both military and nonmilitary purposes, it will be possible to devote more attention to the fundamental problems inherent in the behavior and use of materials than we have in the past. In fact, these fundamental problems must be solved before we are able to complete the programs. It is therefore recommended that considerable additional funds be devoted by the division of research to this area for the support of fundamental research in the laboratories of the Commission, the universities, and institutes throughout the country.

"A number of other activities sponsored by the Division of Research need additional support. However, in my opinion, the two general areas previously mentioned demand the greatest attention. What I would like to emphasize is that our greatest asset is well trained scientific and engineering personnel and that we should give them full support in order to enable them to carry out their work to the capacity of their talents. I would estimate that the annual operating budget of the Division of Research at the present time should be at least $100 million to accomplish these objectives and that within the next 4 years this annual budget should rise to $150 million or $175 million to make the fullest use of our manpower and facilities commensurate with the needs and objectives of the Atomic Energy Commission's program."

Very truly yours,

WARREN C. JOHNSON,
Dean, Division of the Physical Sciences.

Yearly Review of the Freeland, Pa., Industrial Development Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Hazleton (Pa.) Plain Speaker on May 2, 1958, concerning the election of officers and the yearly review of the Freeland Industrial Development Corp.:

LAMBERT BROAD ELECTED BY FIDC; REVIEW YEAR'S INDUSTRIAL CONTACTS

Lambert E. Broad, Mining and Mechanical Institute president, was elected president of the Freeland Industrial Development Corp., and other new officers and five directors for 3-year terms were elected at the annual meeting of the membership and board session which followed.

FIDC officers for 1958–59 are as follows:

President: Lambert E. Broad.

Vice president: John D. Kresge.

Secretary-financial secretary: Attorney Martin J. O'Donnell.

Treasurer: John D. Kresge.

Directors: Emerson Berger, Al Corazza, John Watahovich, Joseph Kopski, and John Zrelock, Jr.

The new FIDC president is a charter member and veteran board member of the FIDC, and has held various offices on the board, including that of financial secretary, in years past. He also served as head of various committees, including the building committee in recent years, and has been a member of the important industrial contacts committee.

Kresge, also a veteran board member, is the first FIDC officer to hold a dual role. He served as treasurer last year. Kresge is employed on the office staff of the Jeddo-Highland Coal Co. and also serves as an officer and board member of the Freeland Borough Municipal Authority.

O'Donnell, who was reelected to the posts of secretary and financial secretary, has held the positions for a number of years. He also serves as the FIDC solicitor, a post similar to that which he holds in Freeland Borough, and with the Foster Township Supervisors, and Citizens Bank of Freeland.

Four of the five directors named were reelected, with the new board member being John Zrelock, Jr., of Green Street.

Zrelock, the representative of the Freeland Post 5010, Veterans of Foreign Wars, is a past commander of the VFW and serves as president of the Foster Township School Board. He is a local carpenter contractor.

Reelected as board members were Berger, local building contractor; Corazza, official of the Free-Land Dairy who heads the FIDC's sites committee; Watahovich, Freeland police chief; and Kopski, local garage owner.

Peter Funk, garage owner who served for the past 2 years, is the outgoing FIDC president.

Zrelock replaces Joseph Collins, also the VFW representative, on the board of directors.

ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT

Reports of the past year's activities were presented to the members during the annual session by President Funk and Edward Sharp, industrial contacts committee chairman.

Funk listed in his reports the following activities engaged in by the FIDC in the past year:

Installation of an 8-inch waterline to serve both FIDC buildings, the plant of the Display and Construction Units, Inc., and the plant shell No. 2; also installation of a fireplug between the buildings, one-third of the cost of which was borne by the FIDC. He pointed out that the improvements enhanced the buildings protection factor and made possible a lower insurance rate.

Support, both verbally and by letter, was given by the FIDC to the cause of the shortway and other highway construction in the anthracite region.

The FIDC joined with individuals and other town organizations in the movement to save the Freeland Mills in town, prompted by the possibility of saving 200 jobs here. The FIDC at the time contributed $1,000, along with similar contributions of money by Stanley Genetti, the Freeland Chamber of Commerce, and Citizens Bank, in an effort to secure a Small Business Administration loan to sustain the Freeland Mills operation.

These efforts met with failure, Funk reported, as is known now, but he added that hope is being held high that a tenant for the two buildings now empty will be had in the not too distant future, and he disclosed that efforts are being made now by the building owners to revive the employment potential existing there.

The sites committee, headed by Al Corazza, had accomplished much in the past year, including completing initial steps on procuring an ideal plot near a railroad in the St. Ann's sector owned by the Speal family. An option to buy the land, which could provide space for possibly two buildings, is held by the FIDC.

In industrial contacts, Funk added that the full report will be made by Sharp, but he stated that much accomplishment had been recorded here despite the fact that an industry had not been secured here in the past year.

Explaining the Capitol Products matter, he added that the FIDC's efforts aided in no small way in having the Harrisburg area firm located in Hazleton, and that indirect benefit to Freeland will result.

Explaining the land title matter affecting the public park site on which sits shell No. 2, he stated that the title problem came about because of the fact that conveyance was not accomplished with proper consideration from Freeland borough, and that the land originally was dedicated for use as a park. All these matters are being cleared up and in fact, title clearance procedure has been filed with the courts and favorable action is expected shortly.

Sharp told the board that we have had many prospects, easily 25 or 30 in Freeland looking over our building in the past year.

In spite of recession talk, Sharp added, prospects are coming to Freeland and he expressed confidence that successful results will follow.

Citing as some of the reasons why prospective industries have not located here, he added that in a number of the cases, the faults were not those of the FIDC, but that actually the industries were not desirable from many standpoints and were not encouraged to locate here.

His report also paid high compliment to the Lehigh Valley Railroad, which, he stated, in a recent industry case, offered full-scale cooperation to fulfill railroad car needs, but that the industry likely will not locate here because of it being unacceptable for loan provisions because of a financial standpoint.

He added that the Freeland building is being constantly advertised by various means through the State industrial authority, and that prospects are being contacted and actually are coming here for inspection trips on the basis of at least two per month.

Action of the board of directors in the past year was ratified by the membership.

ADD NEW MEMBERS

The following were added to the FIDC membership rolls: Gerge Kasaba, Philip Dominic, George Fellin, John Trelock, Nicholas Bellezza, Steve Yenshaw, Charles Reczkowski, and Steve Kistulentz.

Sixty members comprised the roll of the FIDC up to last night's meeting, with the bylaws allowing for a total membership of 75.

For the election of directors, the nominating committee consisted of James Ferdinand, L. E. Broad, and Jack Kresge. In addition to the five elected, Reczkowski and Kistulentz were nominated. Nicholas Bellezza and Joe Falatko served as tellers for the directorship elections.

The summary of the financial report for the past year, from April 30, 1957 to April 30, 1958, was submitted by Kresge, and accepted. It showed a beginning balance of $5,111.13; receipts of $12,186.10; disbursements of $14,654.49; for a balance on April 30, 1958, of $2,654.04. The annual audit will be made according to the bylaws.

DIRECTORS SESSION

Immediately following the membership meeting, the board of directors convened for its reorganization session, with the officers for the years being elected.

By official action and with a rising vote of applause, the board extended its thanks to outgoing president, Peter Funk, for his work in the past year.

In his closing talk, Funk stated that while tangible evidence was lacking as far as securing an industry was concerned, he was certain that the cooperation and work of the board during his tenure as president had paved the way for success soon to be realized. He thanked all board members and especially the various committees for their cooperation and devotion to their work in the past years.

Also praised for their tireless efforts and expenditures of much time personally were Attorney O'Donnell and Sharp.

Vito Poleri, Dr. O. R. Hoch, and Sharp comprised the nominating committee for FIDC officer candidates.

Eisenhower Administration Has Reduced Atomic Power Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 13, 1958, which is entitled "From Agreement to Cipher":

FROM AGREEMENT TO CIPHER

The Eisenhower administration has reduced the atomic-power program which had been agreed upon by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to about as near nothing as possible.

The plutonium-producing reactor, needed for national defense, has been thrown out. The natural-uranium reactor, needed for the building up of an export market, has been cast aside. Of the critical projects only the gas-cooled reactor has been left in, and even there the President is determined to do nothing unless private business does something first.

The gas-cooled reactor, which the AEC has long opposed and the Joint Committee has long advocated, is attractive to many other countries and to publicly owned power systems. The coolant is cheap and convenient; and the low fuel cost outweighs the high capital costs for distribution system with low fixed charges.

The Democratic majority on the Joint Committee, and all others who believe the United States should play a dynamic rather than a passive role in the world's development of atomic energy, have hardly any alternative now to joining battle. What the agreement failed to do, a bill may yet do. When that bill comes up, it will be interesting to see what the AEC does about it. Can it in good conscience oppose as a bill what it had accepted as an agreement? The answer will supply new substance to the growing conception in the public mind of the character of the AEC.

CAMG Operations in Atomic Age Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] has written a very fine article which was published in the Military Review of January 1958 on the the subject CAMG Operations in Atomic Age Warfare.

Since General THURMOND is a high-ranking officer in the Reserve and has made a very exhaustive study of this important subject, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I sincerely trust that all my colleagues will read and study it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAMG OPERATIONS IN ATOMIC AGE WARFARE

(By Hon. STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina)

From the time the infantry first penetrates enemy-held territory, whether through an overseas, overland, or airborne movement, the commander is an occupier under the terms of international law.

Decisions must be made immediately by the commander regarding the people, government, and economy, not only to comply with the obligations imposed by international law and agreements, and to implement United States policy objectives for the area, but also to exploit for his direct benefit the potential of available resources in supporting and facilitating his combat operations.

To achieve combat success, he must destroy the enemy—and this includes the combat elements, the resources mobilized in their support, and the political agency which directs the effort against him.

Destruction is essential to winning a war. However, reason dictates that force must be applied with discrimination. Destruction must be measured and limited to actual requirements existing at the time. Hence the force applied need not necessarily be massive, neither need the destruction be total.

The application of even such controlled force as is required to win a war has a tremendous effect upon the civil population. The reaction of the affected civil population, in turn, can have a tremendous effect upon the commander's ability to continue the application of the required force.

Consequently, the commander's decisions are influenced not only by his own and the enemy's relative combat power, but also by the civil characteristics of the area of combat operations. In his estimates of the situation he carefully weighs civil affairs and military government (CAMG) factors along with those dealing with personnel, intelligence, operations, and logistics.

CAMG planning must be constant, continuous, and in full coordination with all other planning in order that CAMG operations may best contribute to the overall mission of the commander. The objective of CAMG planning is to insure support of tactical and logistical operations, as well as to resolve the civilian problems which handicap or interfere with tactical and logistical operations.

Equally valid for atomic-age warfare is Clausewitz' summation of the overall objectives of warfare. These objectives are threefold: (1) To conquer and destroy the armed power of the enemy, (2) to take possession of his material and other sources of strength, and (3) to gain public support. These objectives are inherent in the mission of the Army, which is "to defeat the enemy forces in land combat and gain control of the land and its people."

However, as the scope of warfare enlarges with the appearance of atomic weapons of increased destructiveness, so the scope of the commander's CAMG responsibilities to the population becomes correspondingly intensified. Modern military operations, even if carried out with measured discrimination, will create civilian problems of unparalleled magnitude.

ATOMIC-AGE CAMG PROBLEMS

It would be well to examine some of these problems, essentially civilian in nature, which will confront a commander in the conduct of his military operations on the atomic battlefield.

Civilians, in larger numbers perhaps than ever encountered before, will suffer the effects of war in personal loss, injury, deprivation, and lack of the barest essentials of life. In addition, they will lack the guidance, assistance, or control normally provided at the local levels of government.

Continuing damage will contribute to mass hysteria and tend to convert the previously normal populace into an uncontrolled horde. The populace of an area devastated by atomic weapons will seek to flee further injury with their possessions still intact, and they will obtain, by any means possible, that which is necessary to remain alive.

From the commander's point of view, what will be the effect of the problems posed by these civilians on his combat operations? The answer is apparent.

They will clutter the roads and interfere with or prevent the essential movement of troops and supplies. Often they are injected directly into the combat operation either deliberately by the enemy or by their attempts to evade being engulfed by the enemy and to escape from enemy-held territory.

These civilians will require amazing tonnages of military supplies merely to be kept alive, and can compel a diversion of combat troops to protect lines of communication and supply installations from their pilferage tendencies in order to survive. They can require a similar diversion of troops to neutralize guerrilla action, fomented by undetected enemy agents among them.

They can do all these things and more.

They can almost stop a military operation, unless proper action is taken to anticipate and plan in advance, as a part of the military action, the CAMG measures that will effectively counteract these otherwise probable conditions.

CAMG MEASURES

The commander's CAMG operations are not limited to civil control and relief measures. His courses of action are extremely varied in scope and in possibilities, as the following paragraphs serve to illustrate.

In coordination with counterintelligence agencies, civilians are screened to insure the detection of enemy agents and the prevention of sabotage and rear area disorders. Significantly, the extensive CAMG organization, functioning constantly at the grassroots level in enemy territory, constitutes an effective source of political and military intelligence, including technical intelligence which is important to the combat effort.

Local civil defense and damage control activities, including personnel and equipment, are coordinated with those of the United States forces. Steps are taken to enforce directives regarding such matters as blackout, curfew, and civilian circulation, and to maintain a condition of public order and safety among the civilians.

Information mediums are exploited to inform the civil populace of the purposes and aims of the United States effort, and to improve the relations between our forces and the people of the country with which we are at war.

Resources of the country are mobilized in support of military requirements, as well as to meet minimum essential civilian needs and thereby avoid a drain upon United States resources.

HUMAN NATURE UNCHANGED

The civilian problems of the future combat commander will confirm the fact that "Although weapons change, human nature remains the same."

It is evident that modern nuclear weapons and highly technical military forces will require mobilization of the full industrial and resource potential of a nation involved in war. It is evident, also, that the threat alone of the use of atomic devices affects nations as well as international balances. Consequently, under such conditions it is even more evident that the combat commander must conduct his operations with full recognition of the effect upon the population involved and their political, economic, and governmental structures, if ultimate victory is, in fact, to be achieved.

Throughout history, successful military commanders—such as Julius Caesar and Alexander of Macedonia—always have recognized the problem of controlling the populace, and took measures appropriate to the state of weapons development of their time to handle the civilian problem. On the other hand, outstanding examples of less sagacious military leaders are Napoleon I and Hitler in their Russian campaigns.

A forecast of atomic warfare reveals that the combat commander's mission will contain new elements derived from the vast numbers of human beings affected by the extent and the intensity of his operations when nuclear weapons are used.

Meeting such conditions demands the development and use of the most efficient CAMG organization which can be devised and in which is inherent two characteristics in atomic warfare organization. These characteristics are:

1. Balance and flexibility which recognizes the importance of the Army gaining postwar objectives and places greater reliance on air transportability.

2. Continuing need for conventional forces and means while recognizing the necessity to be prepared to cope with aggression of varying forms.

In addition to the foregoing characteristics implicit in atomic warfare organization there are three concepts which will apply on the atomic battlefield of the field army. These concepts contribute to achieving maximum combat effectiveness and have a direct relation to CAMG operations.

FIRST CONCEPT

In the atomic age the battlefield will be of much greater depth and width than ever before.

Because of this consideration a greater land mass and larger population concentration will come under the sphere of influence of the combat commander. As a consequence, social, economic, and political problems of a greater scope will be his concern. To avert using combat-trained troops, the commander will have an increasing need for personnel skilled in CAMG combat-support operations.

However, manpower available for control of these lands and the populations therein will be limited. This highlights the necessity to increase our combat effectiveness through developing CAMG technological proficiency to the maximum.

With respect to the development of new CAMG techniques, the task ahead in the systematic development of the "CAMG science" is a challenge which can and will be met. The availability to our combat commanders of qualified CAMG personnel will serve to minimize the many problems inherent in this field.

SECOND CONCEPT

Under atomic conditions basic combat units are small integrated battle groups of all arms, which are semi-independent, self-contained, and capable of operating over extended distances on a fluid battleground for prolonged periods with minimum control and support by higher headquarters. Extreme mobility inherent in such battle groups gives them the added capability to concentrate rapidly, attack hard, and disperse quickly.

Such tactics will call for a greater measure of self-dependence on the part of our commanders, their staffs, and their men than has been required heretofore. The demands on leadership due to dispersal and the employment of complex weapons systems will require full utilization of the capabilities of the CAMG organization to assist in the accomplishment of the mission.

Such utilization will require the use of G–5 staff sections; effective deployment of CAMG units; the thorough education of officers and men in the role and capabilities of the CAMG organization; and making provision for carrying out CAMG functions in those lower echelons which are not authorized CAMG staff sections.

In this respect it is significant to note that current CAMG doctrine is adaptable to the requirements of the atomic battlefield. It is not old; it has emerged since World War II and is derived from the lessons of history. Four basic characteristics of this CAMG doctrine are:

1. CAMG units are the flexible cellular type capable of being tailored with CAMG functional specialists and CAMG officers necessary to meet the requirements of the area in which deployed.

2. CAMG units, specially trained for both overland and airborne field operations under combat conditions, are assigned or attached to armies, corps, and divisions to give CAMG support to the command.

3. In a mobile or unsettled situation, decentralization of command authority ("operational chain of command") over all CAMG units, supplementary to those providing direct support of combat, assures that the demands of dispersal can be met.

4. Aid to battle groups operating over extended areas for prolonged periods is the primary function of CAMG operations to insure maximum utilization of the resources of the area for the support of the combat forces.

THIRD CONCEPT

Staggered tactical formations of the atomic battlefield, dispersed in great depth, place heavy emphasis on reconnaissance and surveillance to cover unoccupied void areas, as well as increase the need for accurate and timely intelligence in order to reduce to a minimum all uncertainty regarding enemy actions in the unoccupied void areas.

The vital part which CAMG intelligence plays in keeping the responsible combat commander informed of the political, economic, and population effects on courses of action open to him has been recognized, and it is incorporated in Field Mannual 101–5, Staff Officers' Field Manual, Staff Organization and Procedure, as the CAMG estimate of the situation. The purpose is to develop a systematic procedure which will furnish the combat commander with the type of intelligence he needs regarding the people in his area. He will thereby be able to take action to preclude the economic, political, and governmental reactions of the population from erupting into threats to the security of his forces or the accomplishment of his mission.

The accent on dispersal presents critical problems in the surveillance, intelligence, and security of lightly held or unoccupied areas. For some time it has been recognized that the main factor for effectively gaining control over guerrilla forces is the restoration of public order and safety coupled with a basic economic stability.

For lightly held areas the task is primarily one of generating confidence among the population in the local government's ability and willingness to function. This is done by furnishing government services such as communications, employment, relief, and protection.

Unoccupied void areas present a more difficult problem. This problem can be overcome also by extension of local governmental influence into these areas with particular attention to extending local public safety personnel and agencies under CAMG supervision into the unoccupied void areas to act as a guerrilla and subversive force deterrent.

MEETING CAMG REQUIREMENTS

Consistent with the thoughts thus far presented, following are some specific proposals for meeting the CAMG requirements of the atomic age:

1. G5 staff sections and CAMG units must be included in the combat commander's force. This has several corollaries.

(a) Military personnel throughout the services must be indoctrinated in CAMG capabilities in order to provide the balanced force needed to carry out the commander's mission. In this connection all branch service schools must give greater emphasis to CAMG orientation.

(b) The operational nature of CAMG activities must be reflected throughout military doctrine so that the G3–G5 relationship will be understood fully by commanders and planners.

(c) CAMG plans, units, and staff sections must be included in all maneuvers and command post exercises in order that organizational and doctrinal developments may provide the combat commander of the future with a tested capability to handle his CAMG responsibilities.

(d) There must be an appreciation of the need of the field commander for clearly defined national objectives and policies.

2. G5 representation should be established in all military assistance advisory groups in order to develop a capability within the armies of our allies to conduct CAMG operations. Close liaison must be maintained with governmental agencies such as the Foreign Service, the International Cooperation Administration, and the United States Intelligence Agency in order to make maximum use of techniques developed and to smooth out transition of authority problems when occupied areas pass from military to civil control.

3. Development of a viable doctrine to counteract Communist propaganda must be encouraged. Maximum use must be made of the free intellectual and religious traditions of the United States in combating communism and gaining our postwar objectives.

4. The technological proficiency of CAMG personnel must be increased by:

(*a*) Maintaining a continuing research program in order to develop new techniques, procedures, testing criteria, and detection of new research areas.

(*b*) Placing emphasis during CAMG training on such subjects as the role of CAMG in combat operations; development of plans, orders, and annexes; problem-solving methods and techniques; cultural and environmental factors affecting the relationship between our military and local governments and peoples, and procedures for allocating manpower and resources.

5. Because of the wide areas of great depth which are contemplated for atomic age warfare, the problem of preparing CAMG personnel in area characteristics and language will be magnified greatly. Consequently, area documentation must be kept current and extremely concise. The designation of areas of deployment must be made early in order that language training requirements may be met. In addition, increased emphasis must be placed upon CAMG intelligence training, including the estimate of the situation, and intelligence collection planning.

6. Operational planning must give greater emphasis to refugee control in order to prevent interference with ground mobility. The local public-safety organization, under CAMG supervision, should be extended throughout the unoccupied void areas as far as practicable to act as a guerrilla and subversive force deterrent.

CONCLUSION

The critical point of atomic warfare will hinge on the combat commander's ability to exploit the advantage gained from the use of the weapon. With the chaotic conditions envisioned, his ability to handle the multitudinous problems—technical, ideological, logistical—posed by the population among whom he is operating may mean the difference between success or failure.

Social Security Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. McINTOSH
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 30, 1958

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced legislation to make changes in the Social Security Act, which, in my opinion, are very necessary at this time.

The first bill, H. R. 12503, would lower to age 62 the minimum retirement age at which both men and women may start receiving full benefits. The second important provision of the bill would eliminate the requirement that an individual attain 50 years of age in order to be eligible for disability-insurance benefits.

The purpose of the second bill, H. R. 12504, is to clarify the meaning of the term "disability" so as to overcome the strict administrative interpretation that has been given to the social-security disability provisions.

The third bill, H. R. 12505, would liberalize the provisions of the act on outside earnings and would increase from $1,200 to $1,800 the amount that may be earned annually by individuals receiving social-security payments.

Everyone is well aware that our social-security system is far from adequate to meet present-day living costs. Although we have made much progress in the 23 years since the original enactment of social-security legislation, we still have a long way to go in improving and liberalizing our system. The changes recommended in the bills I have today introduced are conservative and merit the early attention of the Congress. Persons living on social security have been forced to lower their standards of living, and I am hopeful that the Congress, when it studies proposals to improve our social-security system, will also give consideration to the need for increasing present benefits.

Norwegian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on May 17 the people of Norway celebrate their 53d anniversary as a fully independent people and as a sovereign nation. The celebration recalls the final dissolution of the union of Norway with Sweden and the establishment of a constitutional monarchy in 1905.

This does not mean that Norway is one of Europe's younger states. On the contrary, she is one of the oldest kingdoms in Western Europe with a political history going back more than a thousand years. The early history of these Scandinavian people was the history of proud seafaring men who roamed the world in search of adventure and conquest. About the 14th century, however, a period of decline set in, brought on by economic difficulties and the ravishes of the Black Death. During a prolonged period of catastrophies Norway became united with Denmark. For more than 400 years, although united with stronger neighbors, Norway preserved her national identity. After the long slumber, Norway awoke during the early 19th century with hopes of national independence. After the Napoleonic Wars, during which the Dano-Norwegian monarch sided with France, Norway became one of the unfortunate spoils to be distributed to the victorious powers. By the Peace of Kiel, Norway was ceded to Sweden. The brave Norwegian people rose in arms and refused to abide by the peace terms. Thereupon, they declared Norway to be a free and independent nation.

The Norwegian and the American people share much in common, but above all they share a love of liberty. A national assembly, meeting on May 17, 1814, gave Norway a democratic constitution, based on John Locke's doctrine of the sovereignty of the people, from which our own Constitution is derived, and on Montesquieu's principle of the division of powers. The people of Norway honor this historic occasion on their Independence Day.

The period of Norway's first independence was short lived. The political fortunes of Norway did not then favor independence. The balance of power in Scandinavia and in Europe made it impossible for Norway to retain full independence. She was finally forced to accept a union with Sweden, on the principle of complete equality and with the retention of her newly acquired democratic constitution. This constitution, in subsequent years, became the symbol for the Norwegian people in their struggle against the authority of the Swedish Crown. Norway remained in union with Sweden for over a century, but, finally in 1905, the Norwegian Parliament declared that the Swedish King had ceased to function as the King of Norway. The union with Sweden was thereby dissolved without bloodshed.

On this occasion it gives me a deep feeling of honor to praise and to pay my respects to the people of Norway and the people of Norwegian descent in this country. The American people happily join with the Norwegian people in celebration of Norwegian Independence Day.

Foreign Trade: Challenge to Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Act of 1934 is considered one of the most controversial bills before the Congress. To me, the extension of this act is not only economically sound, but diplomatically sound. I believe the following article entitled "Foreign Trade: Challenge to Americans," by the Reverend James L. Vizzard, S. J., is one of the most profound writings on this subject. Father Vizzard is a professor of economics and his article portrays a firm understanding of the subject. It clearly points out the need to adopt a trade policy that is true to our national principles and responsive to our national interests:

FOREIGN TRADE: CHALLENGE TO AMERICANS
(By James L. Vizzard, S. J.)

For many years the Catholic Association for International Peace has supported the principle of international cooperation through expanded world trade. In 1945, for example, in appealing for renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Act of June 1934, the CAIP subcommittee on economic life pointed out that the free flow of trade was of primary importance in postwar reconstruction plans, declaring:

"The recovery of our broken world and its future peace depend * * * on the cordial

atmosphere that derives from international economic cooperation and the free and easy movement of goods between the nations which the trade treaties aim to bring about. Economic barriers and resulting discords have been fundamental in creating antagonism between nations."

The principle embodied in this brief passage has been emphasized anew in the statement on United States foreign-trade policy released this month by the CAIP committee on economic life. This most recent statement endorses, directly or indirectly, the following recommendations:

1. Extension of the President's authority to negotiate the reciprocal reduction of tariffs for a period of not less than 5 years;

2. Expansion of the President's authority: (a) To reduce tariffs by 50 percent below present levels but not to exceed 10 percent in any 1 year, such reductions to be made on a selective basis and through cooperative arrangements with other countries; and (b) to reduce to 40 percent existing tariffs in excess of 40 percent (whether specific, ad valorem, or a combination), to be proclaimed either unilaterally or in consequence of trade agreements, such reductions to be made after taking into account the prospective impact on the domestic economy and to be limited to a maximum of 10 percentage points in any 1 year;

3. Authorization of United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation;

4. Provision for assistance to injured domestic industries in the transitional phase.

The reason for these recommendations is simple. Action along such lines is necessary to our national well-being—to our basic economic, political, and security interests.

There are those who disagree. Those opposed to the traditional trade-agreements program will be opposed also to the type of authorization here urged. In fairness, however, it must be conceded that the opponents base their position on the same ultimate considerations claimed by the CAIP committee in support of its own; namely, the public and national interest. That in itself is good.

In trade policy, as in other matters in the realm of government, it is not uncommon that there should be difficulty in determining precisely what measures, in the particular times and in the context of the particular circumstances, do in fact promote the public interest. It is good, therefore, that advocates and opponents of a liberal trade policy agree that the issue should be resolved by adoption of the course which will best serve the common good. Congress, in discharge of its necessary and unique responsibility for promoting the public and national welfare, must make the final decision.

On what issues, then, do the opposing parties differ?

Because pertinent and comprehensive data on foreign trade are readily and abundantly available from the executive agencies of the Government, it is not necessary to duplicate such evidence here. Nevertheless, in order to identify the area of conflicting views, it may be useful to direct attention to two conclusions, the validity of which is overwhelmingly demonstrated by such data: (1) That United States commercial exports, currently at an annual rate in excess of $19 billion, directly or indirectly benefit the entire American economy; (2) that imports are at least as valuable as the $13 billion Americans are currently paying for them; otherwise there would have been no sufficient inducement to cause their importation.

Fortunately, the export side of foreign trade is relatively uncontroversial; evaluation of the conflicting views is thereby simplified. It is generally recognized, for example, that the plight of the American farmer would be relatively desperate, were we to lose our agricultural export markets. This is not to imply that other Americans would not also suffer from the resulting contraction of our economy; they would. It is also a matter of common knowledge that exports of the great volume and variety of the products of our mines and factories account for billions of income to the American economy annually. American farmers, miners, and other workers are the best customers for each other's products. So when any of them increases his earnings from overseas sales, he increases his purchasing power for other domestic products and vice versa.

Thus the benefits of export earnings spread throughout the economy. The residential builder and the construction worker, for example, do not produce for export. Some of the earnings from our export trade, however, go into good or better homes and schools, even courthouses and churches. By and large, therefore, there is little complaint against exports. To deny the benefits derived from them is rather futile. If one is opposed to liberal trade, it is more effective merely to ignore the obvious benefits of exports.

EFFECT OF IMPORTS

The situation with respect to imports, however, is quite different. Imports do not enjoy popular esteem comparable to that enjoyed by exports. There are many reasons which account for this difference. We shall limit ourselves to commenting briefly on the two which seem most reasonable and, therefore, most important.

The first of these is reflected in the proposition that imports deprive Americans of employment opportunities. If valid, this would be a most persuasive consideration. As it stands, however, this proposition is simply false. With their earnings from the goods they sell to us, other countries buy our exports.

Hence, if we did not import, we would soon so impoverish our overseas customers that they would be unable to purchase our products. Consequently, our exporting industries, which are heavily dependent on foreign markets if they are to continue to operate at full or nearly full capacity, would inevitably go into decline. Widespread unemployment would occur in these industries. Some of it might be offset by increased employment opportunities in those industries whose products compete with imports. Yet the general contraction of purchasing power in the economy, resulting from the loss of our export markets, would tend to diminish domestic demand for these products also. The result would almost certainly be net unemployment in the economy as a whole, which could easily precipitate a general depression.

Moreover, such jobs as would be created in the sector of our economy which competes with foreign producers for our domestic markets would certainly add less value to our national product than the jobs which would be lost through the suspension of exports. Generally speaking, the pattern of our exports and imports is determined by the principle of comparative advantage. We export the things which we can produce at the lowest factor cost and we import the things whose factor cost to us would be higher had we produced them at home rather than bought them abroad. No doubt we could produce domestically many of the things we import. But to do so we would have to divert domestic resources to less productive uses. By importing these goods, we free our productive resources for more efficient and better-rewarded employment.

Through foreign trade American labor gets more higher-paid jobs.

To put the argument somewhat differently, imports provide Americans with goods at less cost than similar goods can be produced domestically. This involves no loss of productive employment opportunities; quite the contrary. To the extent that imports meet the wants of American consumers more economically and make United States production more efficient and less costly, imports enlarge American purchasing power. Expenditure of the enlarged purchasing power generates new income, stimulates further production and productive employment. Moreover, American dollars spent for imports are not lost or diverted from the American economy. Ultimately these dollars come back home to the United States in payment for the great variety of American goods the peoples of foreign countries need and want. Thus, imports expand both our domestic and foreign markets. By restricting imports we impair the ability of fellow Americans and of foreign customers to buy the products of our own industry. This is neither good economics nor good politics.

The other principal basis for opposing imports and, therefore, a liberal trade policy stems from the assumption or apprehension that imports undermine American wage and living standards. The argument is that American wage rates are high and are supported by legally enforced minimum standards. Ostensibly low-wage foreign imports have such a great competitive advantage that our higher standards will be undermined in the effort to meet this competition. This argument has the appearance of being reasonable; hence, it deserves detailed consideration.

WAGES NOT ONLY FACTOR

It is true that American wage standards are high, the highest in the world. But many factors, in addition to wages, enter into production costs and help to determine competive advantage or disadvantage. Among these are: the availability of raw materials, the cost of their development, climate, the size, quality and proximity of markets, the skill of workers and the competence of management, investment resources, the utilization of technology, etc. Insofar as labor is a factor of production cost, the measure of that cost is not the wage rate per hour or day; rather, it is the labor cost per unit of production. High wage rates and low labor costs commonly exist together. Low labor costs and high productivity are the usual basis for high wage rates.

The importance of the distinction between wage rates and labor costs is illustrated and emphasized by the fact that the United States, although it has the world's highest wage standards, is the world's largest exporter. The lowest-wage countries in the world provide markets for American exports. It is American high-wage industries which generally tend to meet foreign competition most successfully in world markets. On the other hand, the low-wage industries of the United States tend to be most vulnerable to import competition. That high wage standards do not automatically result in competitive disadvantage is perhaps most dramatically evidenced by the fact that the major barrier to even higher levels of American exports is not foreign competition but the inability of other countries to earn the dollars to pay for them.

CONSUMER BENEFITED

In the face of these facts, advocates of protectionism are sometimes driven to oppose only those imports whose price is lower than the price of comparable American products. This position is, of course, less defensible than the first. In essence it is tantamount to advocating a trade policy which removes the sole incentive for trade between nations. Why buy a foreign product if it costs more than it would to produce an equivalent item at home? Obviously, if other countries pursued a like policy the market for United States exports would be closed.

Nor is this position made more tenable by the qualification that only "competitive" goods need be excluded. Foreign goods will be able to compete successfully in our domestic markets only if their prices are lower than comparable home-produced products.

Are American consumers to be denied the opportunity to buy what they want more cheaply, simply in order that some domestic producers may reap windfall profits? Conceivably an enterprising American might undertake to grow coffee in greenhouses and supply it to the domestic market at $5 a pound, on condition that the "cheap" foreign product be kept off the American market. His success in excluding foreign coffee and selling his own high-cost product would clearly be a gain to him. It would certainly be a great loss to those of us who like coffee, as well as to those workers and producers whose markets would shrink because, in order to subsidize our own coffee industry, we had to cut back our outlays for other domestic products.

No nation is rich enough to afford that kind of trade policy. As a nation, the United States cannot afford such a luxury any more than most individual Americans can afford the luxury, say, of making their own household furniture instead of buying it from those who can make good furniture economically.

Certainly there may be occasions when imports constitute a threat to particular American industries. Frequently, however, the threat is more apparent than real. To find out whether it is real, each such situation must be carefully examined. Examination will often indicate a source of difficulty other than import competition.

For example, the root of the trouble may be domestic competition, or changed consumer preferences, increasing costs resulting from depletion of resources, dwindling need for dray wagons, buggy whips, etc. An industry's difficulty may also result from a different form of domestic competition than that found in the market where the product is sold: e. g., from competition for capital and labor against expanding American enterprises—say, textiles versus aircraft. In any such situation, tariff "protection" will not really cure an ailing industry. The false remedy will, moreover, unnecessarily burden the rest of the economy.

It is to be expected, of course, that significant tariff reductions will hurt domestic industries whose products compete with imports, supposing that labor costs are actually a large factor in the unit cost of producing these products. Labor is cheaper in most foreign countries than it is in the United States. This fact does not weaken the force of the argument in favor of freer trade even in this restricted area. It merely means that American resources in these industries are underemployed.

Our expanding industrial economy has bid the price of labor, relative to other inputs, steadily upward, until it has become the most expensive factor of production in the American economic system. Labor-intensive industries tend in consequence to be high-cost industries. This means that the capital and labor tied up in these industries could be more productively employed in other uses. If these resources were withdrawn, recombined in more efficient proportions and used to produce capital-intensive goods, they would add much more to the national product than they do in their present application. In our export markets these capital-intensive goods could be exchanged for more labor-intensive products than we could have produced at home with the same resources.

In this situation the erection of high tariff walls serves only to perpetuate the present uneconomical use of our factors of production. To reap the benefits of a wider division of labor through freer trade, our economy must be kept flexible enough to respond automatically to precisely such shifts in comparative advantage. Tariffs create artificial rigidities which prevent normal and natural adjustments from taking place in our use of resources. And they do so at a high cost to the economy as a whole.

SOLUTION SUGGESTED

The solution, then, does not lie in the multiplication of import restrictions. It lies in measures designed to shift capital and labor out of industries in which they are underemployed and into more productive uses, with the least possible cost to all concerned. Unemployment insurance, employee training and placement programs, fast tax write-offs, etc., would facilitate this transfer of resources and make such moves attractive. The benefits to the whole economy accruing from the resultant flexibility and efficiency in the use of our productive resources would more than compensate us for the temporary and relatively trifling dislocations affecting the few declining industries in question.

No matter how the foreign trade situation is viewed, the existing facts or future prospects afford no justification for increasing tariffs to levels above those that prevailed in 1934, even in relation to so-called escape-clause actions. No reasonable person can deny that many trade relationships have profoundly changed since 1934. To authorize an increase of traiffs to rates above those that prevailed then, on the grounds of maintaing the ratio of tariff incidence, is to introduce a radical and dangerous principle into public policy. It would accord to private persons a vested right in perpetuity to a particular degree of economic subsidy by the American people; and this, not because that subsidy is needed for the national good, but because it once existed in the past.

This would be Government interference of a vicious type. Adoption of such a proposal could open a Pandora's box of claims for Government protection of a multiplicity of private economic advantages of a bygone day. In an era of unprecedented change, it would seem to require better reasons than have been presented to warrant the use of Government authority to preserve the status quo, not merely of a tariff, but of the degree of protection. Adoption of such a proposal would also be a warning signal to foreign countries that their efforts to develop American markets might be frustrated by the sudden imposition of an unexpectedly high tariff.

Compared to national security, domestic prosperity is a lesser good. Our foreign trade is a vastly more important servant of our security than it is of our economic well-being. But security and economic strength are not alternatives. Military strength is based upon economic strength.

INTERDEPENDENT WORLD

The United States and the other free-world countries are economically interdependent; they are even more interdependent for their mutual security. Notwithstanding the fact that the United States exports and imports more goods than any other nation, foreign trade is significantly more important to our principal allies than it is to us. It represents a relatively greater proportion of their total production. One need only consider, for example, the island economies of England and Japan to begin to appreciate that high levels of foreign trade are in a most literal sense necessary to their survival. Even Canada, with its vast area and extensive natural resources, is more dependent on foreign trade for its economic health than we are.

And as in our own case, so in that of each of our allies, economic strength is the foundation of military strength.

Whether we like it or not, our responsibility as a Nation is proportioned to our power. The United States is the economic giant of the free world. We have the power to help or to hurt the other members of the free-world community. When we impose unjustified restrictions on their trade, we unjustly hurt them: we impair the maintenance and expansion of their economies, of their military strength and, in consequence, of our own security.

"An American depression is the fear of our friends and the hope of our enemies." This expression conveys something of the importance of the United States as a market and source of supplies to the free world. Because of the diversity of our exports, as well as of our overall production, we can easily underestimate the unique value of our market. Many countries must rely on 1 or 2 export commodities as the source of their foreign exchange. Restrictions on the flow of one of these can accordingly have severe and far-reaching repercussions on their domestic economies. Hence the saying that when the United States economy sneezes, the rest of the world catches cold.

The division of the world resulting from the cold war has made the United States and its economic policies even more important to the free-world countries than they would otherwise be. Trade between the United States and the countries now under Communist domination was never significant to our economy. It was, however, to many of our allies. The effect of trade controls with Communist countries has been more costly to them than to us.

Thus, the economic preeminence of the United States makes our conduct and trade policies matters of major concern to our allies; indeed, our power conditions to a considerable extent what they can do for themselves and for our common objectives. Unnecessary trade restrictions on the part of the United States also have political repercussions. They strain our alliances. While it is perhaps conceivable to our allies that the American people may be unaware of the harm resulting from our conduct, we expect too much when we ask these allies to believe that the American Government—responsible as it is obliged to be for our security—is in reality so ignorant. Even were our friends able to regard such ignorance as blameless, it must inevitably undermine their trust in our capacity for leadership and in our basic reliability as a partner.

Could we plead ignorance, even to ourselves, were we to reject a policy which so overwhelmingly serves our national interests? Such a decision would not be ignorance but willful self-deceit. Such a rejection would not only be contrary to acutely urgent national requirements, it would be contrary also to the heritage of American traditions and history, to the lessons of two world wars, and to the fundamental values which we so frequently characterize as the American way of life.

What, in fact, is a liberal trade policy except the reflection in our international conduct of what have long been the principles of our internal conduct? True, customs receipts were once a main source of Federal funds but restrictionism is not being urged today for reasons of revenue. It cannot be denied that a time-honored philosophy advocates protective tariffs on behalf of infant industries unable to stand the rigors of international competition. Yet even this philosophy was grounded on considerations of public good; it was formulated before the United States became the world's chief creditor Nation as well as its greater exporter. That philosophy did not contemplate protection from infancy to senility.

ELEMENTS OF TRADE POLICY

Consistent with national attitudes in economic matters, the chief elements of a liberal trade policy are simply these:

1. To encourage private enterprise.

2. To minimize Government interference with and domination of economic production and distribution.

3. To make possible the fruits of free and fair competition.

They are the counterparts of political freedom.

These fundamental values are reflected in our Constitution and in major legislative enactments over the past half century. These values have been explicitly championed by the United States throughout the world. Against the background of war, we invoked them in the most heroic program ever undertaken by any nation for the benefit of all humanity. It is useful and wholesome to recall the declaration of policy by the Congress of the United States in the legislation authorizing the European recovery program:

"Mindful of the advantages which the United States enjoyed through the existence of a large domestic market with no internal trade barriers, and believing that similar advantages can accrue to the countries of Europe, it is declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage these countries * * * to exert sustained common efforts which will achieve speedily that economic cooperation in Europe" [which is essential for lasting peace and prosperity.] [1]

[Matter in brackets added.]

This position was not an expedient. It was a policy. It was not done thoughtlessly but was the product of profound deliberation. Similar declarations have recurred many times: in the Bretton Woods legislation, the Point Four legislation, the mutual security legislation. This is the kind of policy that comes naturally to us. Such policy still reflects the requirements of lasting peace and prosperity. The essential change wrought by the passing of time is that the requirements are more imperative and the urgency more pressing than ever.

What of the arguments of the restrictionists in relation to our international and security interests? Those applicable to the domestic aspects fail to take into account all the relevant facts. Those applicable to international considerations run directly contrary to fact.

It is said, for example, that United States participation in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) constitutes a surrender of sovereignty. What is the fact? The GATT is an agreement through which the participating countries seek to improve living standards by cooperation in the reduction of tariffs and other unnecessary barriers to trade. In origin and characteristics it is conspicuously American. It was conceived, planned and initiated by the United States. Its objectives conform with legislative authorization. It was founded upon those typically American concepts:

1. Private enterprise,

2. Exclusion of government, insofar as possible from economic production and distribution,

3. Free and fair competition. Surely these principles have not become "un-American." Their incorporation into international agreements, far from being a surrender of sovereignty, was in fact an exercise of sovereignty.

GATT AND OTC

The great, almost incredible achievement of GATT is that over 30 countries, accounting for some 80 percent of world trade, have actually subscribed to these American principles as the basic code for their conduct of foreign trade. This is a tremendous tribute to the integrity and soundness of the principles; for they have not been part of the historic tradition and practice of many of these countries, as has been the case with us. In light of all the facts, including particularly the labyrinth of government restrictions which almost strangled trade in the period between the wars, United States initiative and participation in GATT have proved a most prudent exercise of sovereignty.

Perhaps the worst that has been said about the Organization for Trade Cooperation is that it is the product of bureaucratic global planners. In reality, it is quite the opposite. It is more likely to be an obstacle to the global planners. The OTC is a procedural instrument which would have to do, not with the making of policy, but with its execution. Its purpose is to make more efficient the pursuit of those policies and principles embraced in GATT, that is to say, the principles specifically designed to prevent and to avoid the necessity of government and global planning of matters best left in private hands. The need for such an instrument as the OTC is clearly evident from the fact that so many countries are participating in the GATT; it is important that the GATT function promptly and with a minimum of expense.

Because the foreign trade of the United States constitutes so large a proportion of the total volume of world trade, there can be no OTC without the United States. Such developments as the European Economic Community, the prospective European free trade area and other moves toward regional economic groupings, all these emphasize the need for the kind of administrative efficiency that the OTC could bring, particularly since there is not even the promise of a worldwide economic trade association other than GATT. In view of the magnitude of the American interests at stake, we might well ask ourselves whether the refusal of the United States to join the OTC is not an abdication of sovereign responsibility.

Failure of the United States to pursue a liberal trade policy, in good faith and with vigor, is to invite tragic consequences. It would be a betrayal of what we have professed as our basic principles. To betray such principles without the honesty of denying them, without even making the effort of identifying and developing standards to take their place, would liken us to an immense floundering mass of matter and energy, a menace to our friends as well as to ourselves.

The consequences are far-reaching and fearful. The danger has, if anything, been understated. Our trade policy does not exist in isolation. It is an integral and inseparable part of our national policy. The United States is face to face with a mounting crisis of far greater magnitude than any other confronting our generation. United States trade policy must be consistent with and made to serve the national interest. We cannot blind ourselves to the relationship between trade policy and NATO objectives without danger of frustrating the latter. We cannot afford to ignore the extent to which the success of all our foreign aid and mutual assistance programs are contingent on a sound and healthy trade policy. We must recognize that if we are to succeed in encouraging American capital to invest abroad, we cannot impose trade restrictions which, in effect, prohibit the recovery of the capital as well as any fruits of the investment.

It is true that the United States does not face this crisis alone. Yet, because the United States has power and might beyond that of any of its allies, it also has the responsibility above all others to choose the right measures affecting the welfare of all. Failure to choose can be as fatal as choosing the wrong measures. To stand still in this crisis is to lose ground. We have already lost too much time.

"If we fail in our trade policy, we may fail in all. Our domestic employment, our standard of living, our security, and the solidarity of the free world—all are involved." These words were addressed to the Congress by President Eisenhower on April 14, 1955, when he initially recommended authorization of United States membership in the OTC. They were true then. Events since then have emphasized their truth and added urgency to the necessity of moving forward.

We must adopt a trade policy that is true to our national principles and responsive to our national interests.

[1] Public Law 472, 80th Cong., 2d sess., S. 2202, approved April 3, 1948. See A Decade of American Foreign Policy: Basic Documents, 1941–49. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1950, pp. 1299, 1322.

Counterpart Fund Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on my amendment to require the budgeting and accounting of expenditures of counterpart funds by congressional committees, many members indicated that they did not quite understand how this matter was presently handled. As a result, I have prepared a short fallacy-fact statement which, I hope, will clear up some of their doubts. I hereby submit this statement for the RECORD:

1. Fallacy: That local currency or counterpart funds are "funny money" and consequently should not be accounted for like other public funds.

Fact: These foreign currencies are paid for usually at a rate of 10 tax dollars to $1 foreign-currency equivalent and they can and are used to pay legitimate costs of the United States Government in the countries where these expenses occur.

2. Fallacy: That members of the executive branch can spend these funds without restriction and my amendment would discriminate against Congress in this regard.

Fact: Congress has prohibited executive agencies from spending counterpart funds unless the currency is purchased with dollars appropriated to the agencies by Congress. For every dollar of counterpart funds spent by an executive agency a dollar is returned to the Treasury by that agency.

3. Fallacy: That my amendment would require complicated budgeting procedures involving shifting exchange rates of different foreign currencies.

Fact: No change in budgetary methods would be required. Congressional committees would simply anticipate how much money they need and request Congress for that amount in dollars. They would be required to purchase foreign currency just as in the case of executive departments now.

4. Fallacy: That my amendment would discourage use of counterpart funds.

Fact: It would not discourage legitimate expenditures of counterpart funds. It would just require members to justify and report them.

5. Fallacy: That counterpart fund expenditures by individuals are secret.

Fact: These expenditures are secret only so far as Members of Congress and the press are concerned. Officials and employees in various embassies throughout the world who issue the funds know how and by whom they are spent. Critics of Congress (and there are many in the State Department) gossip and exaggerate every instance of abuse or waste and since the press through fear of libel does

not identify the offending Member when reporting the alleged abuses, the finger of scandal points at us all.

6. Fallacy: That adoption of my amendment would disrupt current committee plans.

Fact: This amendment would not disrupt present operations. It would not become operative until the next Congress.

Gus Jones—American Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I do not know my fellow citizen C. Augustus Jones, but after reading his letter to the editor of the Long Beach Press Telegram printed May 12, I would like too. Apparently Citizen Jones was born with a keen sense of humor and somewhere along the line acquired a very sharp pen. With the latter in hand, he took a figurative peek in the American mirror with the following "if the shoe fits, wear it" result:

JOHN Q. CITIZEN LOOKS IN MIRROR

We, the people of the United States of America, seem to be having a great deal of trouble these days. Through the press, in our parlors and on street corners, we are hurling accusations of blame in all directions.

We blame the administration and damn it if it does something and damn it if it don't. We blame the Soviet Union and cast fearful eyes in that direction. We blame the corporations for trying to make money and blame the union leaders for trying to stop them. We call the youth of today a bunch of juvenile delinquents. We blame the scientist for splitting the atom and hurling us out in space, and we blame them for not making faster progress so we can keep ahead of our enemies. We blame the weather, the doctor, the lawyer for our discontent. We blame everyone and everything except ourself.

For a change, let's have a look at ourself. A true self-analysis will give you a picture something like this:

I want something for nothing. I prefer not to work at all and blame it on recession. As I stand in line at the Department of Employment, I'm not worried about getting a job. I want my employment check with the least delay possible.

A few days ago I was in the half-block-long line for the cashier's window at the Department of Employment and a truck driver stopped and offered me a job, helping him unload his deliveries, and I turned him down flat. For that matter, everyone turned him down and we made a pretty good joke of his coming to the wrong place to find a laborer.

If I am working, I demand top wages. I received top wages during the war and I intend to receive the same in peacetime. I don't care anything about the law of supply and demand. I want higher wages and lower taxes.

I want the Government to keep ahead of the Russians. I yelled so loud they could hear me in Moscow when sputnik was aloft and the Government couldn't get one of ours above sea level. I don't care how much satellites cost, but I don't want to pay for them.

I'm afraid of this radio-active business so naturally I don't want any more bomb trials but I want us to have weapons far superior to the wildest dreams of any possible enemy.

I'm 100 percent for a summit meeting but I hope the Government is smart enough not to believe a word that's said at that meeting.

I want cheaper food price and cheaper rent, but I intend to keep my cattle and corn off the market until prices go up.

I want more discipline in the schools, but I don't want anyone to lay a hand on one of my kids.

I don't want socialism but I want free medical attention and more help from the Government for highways, schools, my farm, my business, and myself. I repeat I want lower taxes, city, State, and Federal. I want all I can get and I want it for nothing. I expect the Government to take care of me.

I seem to remain totally ignorant of the fact that the Government is me. I can't seem to get it through my flat, fat head that when I cost the Government a dollar, that dollar comes out of my own pocket; that the defense, the education system, recession, or prosperity is my own responsibility or decision. If I can possibly comprehend that the Government is not some vague mass of other people or a rich uncle, then I'll have sense enough to see that I must work and pay for what I want; that I must sell for less if I want to buy for less; that I must pull myself up by my bootstraps, for the good or bad of this fantasy, the Government, is a reflection of me.

I am the Government so maybe I'd better quit cussing myself and behave the way I, the Government, should—like a conscientious, industrious man and not like a selfish, indolent moron.

C. AUGUSTUS JONES.
(Alias John Q. Citizen).

LONG BEACH.

Mutual Security Act of 1958

SPEECH
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12181) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am obliged to be for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] for reasons other than have been mentioned in the last 4 or 5 minutes. If the amendment be construed precisely and its terms followed, practically all European arms manufactured years ago or manufactured today being based on an action that was originally a military action, I am sure that the customs officials of our country will meet with an imponderable situation when they read the provisions of this section and attempt to enforce the customs laws of the United States.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman's statement, for he is making a good statement, but I should like to recall to the Members of the House the fact that the gentleman is an authority on these matters and is a national director of the National Rifle Associaion, the organization which more than any other one organization speaks for and represents the sportsmen of America.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. The substitute I have offered has met the objections of the National Rifle Association. That is why I have offered it.

Mr. KING. I was not aware that the National Rifle Association had voiced objection.

Mr. SIKES. If the gentleman will yield further, just a few minutes ago I talked by telephone to the executive director of the National Rifle Association, and here is what he told me: Yes, he had seen Mr. MORANO's substitute language. It is better than the original language of the bill. A hand with one finger is better than a hand with no fingers, but not much better. The members of the National Rifle Association do not want the original language or the substitute language.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. The fact of the matter is that the National Rifle Association does not object and has favored the new language. They say one thing one day and they may say another thing to the distinguished gentleman another day. I am not going to dispute him, but I just want to point out this one thing about the Carcano rifle. The latest edition of the National Rifle Association Book of Small Arms, volume II, Rifles, by W. H. B. Smith, whom I am sure you know, states:

The safety system (of the Carcano) is an Italian design, and is inherently dangerous as shattering or shearing of a fragile holding lug will let the firing pin blow back out of the bolt.

In addition, another high expert in this field makes the same statement.

Mechanically, these are essentially the same. They both blow.

Then another man, Jack O'Connor, writing in the Rifle Book, says:

The less said about the French Lebel the better; they are terrible. So are the Italian Mannlicher Carcano actions which have a coy habit of blowing the firing pin out into the shooter's face.

Do we want that kind of gun imported into this country?

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. I would like to say only this: The question I asked specifically of the National Rifle Association was: "Do you favor the original language or that of the substitute?" The answer was, "No." I said, "Do you object to either of these versions?" They said, "This organization is not in a position to object. We cannot object to what the Congress, in its wisdom, does. We have to accept what the Congress does." I repeat the National Rifle Association

does not favor and has not approved the Morano language.

Mr. KING. I might say to the gentleman from Connecticut that the technical section of the National Rifle Association has determined that the firing pin mechanism of the Italian piece is not unsafe and that Mr. Smith's article was in error in that particular reference. But, to go on, Mr. Chairman, I have determined that the Arms Manufacturers Institute has not to date ever brought its plight to the Tariff Commission. If it is being injured and these imports are damaging this industry, it would seem that their first avenue for proper relief should be at least explored. To date they have not approached the Tariff Commission with this problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Case of Ezra Pound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the articles on Ezra Pound which I have previously inserted in the RECORD, I have here a clarification of the remarks of my colleague, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, which appeared recently in a Washington newspaper:

THE CASE OF EZRA POUND

(Supplement to The Medical, Legal, Literary, and Political Status of Ezra Weston Pound—Selected Facts and Comments by H. A. Sieber, research assistant, senior specialists division, the Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service, March 31, 1958, revised April 14, 1958.)

On April 7, 1958, the Washington Post and Times Herald reported that Representative EMMANUEL CELLER, of New York, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, had protested the release of poet Ezra Pound from St. Elizabeths Hospital. In an article by Paul Sampson, staff reporter, the Washington Post reported: [1]

"Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, protested yesterday the planned attempt to dismiss the treason indictment against poet Ezra Pound and obtain his release from St. Elizabeths Hospital.

"CELLER said: 'I don't care how long he's been in there. Maybe we want to keep him in a little longer. * * * I can't understand how they'd let him out scot free. I can't conceive of that.

"'Many of our men lost their lives as a result of his exhortations.'

"CELLER was referring to Pound's vitriolic denunciations of the democracies over the Italian radio in World War II."

The Washington Post report of Representative CELLER's remarks was quoted and was the subject of editorial comment by other newspapers.

[1] Sampson, Paul, Plan To Free Ezra Pound Is Protested—Move for Release from St. Elizabeths Stirs Representative CELLER, the Washington Post and Times Herald, April 7, 1958, p. 1.

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE CELLER, APRIL 30, 1958

After noting the citation of the Washington Post article in The Medical, Legal, Literary, and Political Status of Ezra Weston (Loomis) Pound (1885–) Selected Facts and Comments, a report prepared in the Legislative Reference Service, Representative CELLER released a statement that "the statement that appears in the Washington Post of April 7, 1958 * * * is only a portion of what I said."

The full text of Representative CELLER's statement dated April 30, 1958, follows: [2]

"Unfortunately, my statement on Ezra Pound was given to the Washington Post reporter under rather trying circumstances. I was engaged in conference and tried to conduct two conversations at one time. In effect, the statement that appears in the Washington Post of April 7, 1958, and quoted on page A3897 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 29, is only a portion of what I said. It should have been coupled with the additional conditional statement that anybody, however, in Ezra Pound's state of mind must be examined most carefully to see whether he could comprehend and understand intelligently the court process that was to be taken against him. This, unfortunately, was omitted from the newspaper report. I also said if he could not comprehend fully, then he could not be brought to trial."

Representative CELLER's references, in the above statement to page A3897 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is to the Legislative Reference Service report on Mr. Pound which was reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in four installments: Installment 1, pages A3894–A3899, April 29, 1958; installment 2, pages A3899–A3901, April 29, 1958; instalment 3, pages A3941–A3945, April 30, 1958; and installment 4, pages A4172–A4174, May 6, 1958.

[2] CELLER, EMANUEL, statement, April 30, 1958. One page. (On file with the Legislative Reference Service.)

Contributions Made by Residents of Plymouth, Pa., in Time of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following historical matter submitted by William H. McAlarney, of Plymouth, Pa., relating the roles played by residents of that town during past wars:

PLYMOUTH, PA., *April 28, 1958.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Will you kindly autograph the enclosed first day cover on its face. They belong to a historical collection in our town library.

This village sent 85 men to Washington's Army in December 1776, who fought in the battles of Brandywine, Germantown, and Bound Brook, and were at the surrender of Cornwallis at Trenton—the company reduced to 62 men. It sent 65 old men and young boys to the Indian massacre at Wyoming, 5 miles east, on July 3, 1778, it being attacked by 700 Indians. Also sent men to the War of 1812.

The 143d Pennsylvania Volunteers from this valley was the first on the field at Gettysburg on the morning of July 1, 1865, where it fought 3 brigades of the Confederate Army under Gen. Robert E. Lee, including 2 charges of General Pickett's Louisiana Tigers against Missionary Ridge; it supported Colonel Rickett's battery from Wilkes-Barre, our county seat. This was the high water mark of the Civil War.

In the Spanish-American War, Company I of the 109th Regiment from here was the only company of over 8,000 men of the Pennsylvania National Guard that brought every man home from the typhoid fever camps, owing to care given by its company officers.

Same outfit as the 109th Light Field Artillery, 28th Division, it was sent to the Mexican border in 1916 under Gen. John J. Pershing, and on its return fought in France. My nephew was captain of Battery C and this Battery C was selected as the personal escort of the King and Queen of Belgium on their entry into Brussels at the end of World War I, Adnah Kostenbauder.

This small anthracite mining town sent over 600 boys and girls to the service in World War II, including my youngest son, 1st Lt. Wm. J., who convoyed overseas for the whole period.

The 109th Light Field Artillery, 28th Division, fought in France in World War II, and was caught in the German push along the Our River on December 16, 1944, with heavy losses.

Anthracite coal was first shipped from here to market in 1837, down the Susquehanna River to the Chesapeake Bay in flat-bottomed scows with square ends.

I thank you in advance for this courtesy, and wish you and yours the very best of everything.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM H. MCALARNEY.

STATE CAPITAL,
Harrisburg, Pa.

Mr. W. H. MCALARNEY,
Plymouth, Pa.

DEAR SIR: In answer to your letter regarding the 109th Field Artillery Battalion along the Our River in World War II.

On December 16, 1944, the 110th Infantry Combat Team, comprising the 110th Infantry Regiment, the 109th Field Artillery Battalion, and Company B of the 103d Combat Engineer Combat Battalion, was holding a line 12 miles in width, along the Germany-Luxembourg border. This defensive position was on the high ground overlooking the Our River, the boundary line between the two countries. The German Siegfried line was on the German side. The 110th Combat Team had just been brought out of the Hurtgen Forest where it had had a terrific battle and many casualties.

At 5:45 on the morning of December 16 the Germans put down on all positions of our defensive sector a heavy artillery concentration and immediately launched the big drive against the Americans. They stormed over the river rapidly and into the thinly held lines of the 110th Infantry and on to the positions of the 109th Field Artillery Battalion. The word went out to small troops to hold at all costs for there were no reserves or reenforcements in our rear. Five German divisions, 3 tank divisions and two infantry divisions, struck on the front of the 110th in an effort to break through to Bastogne, miles to the rear. Almost immediately the infantry units and artillerymen at gun positions had to fight for their lives and for 4 days held off the enemy by fighting hand to hand. The artillery was used to fire direct fire point blank at the oncoming enemy tanks and infantry units.

On the fourth day what was left of the artillery joined with what was left of all other troops to make a last stand at Wiltz, the

division headquarters, 7 miles to the rear. Finally after the job of the 110th was done, and ammunition gave out, Wiltz fell and remnants of the troops escaped in small groups to Neuchateau, Belgium, 35 miles to the rear and through German lines which had swept on toward Bastogne where the 101st Airborne Division had moved.

When it was all over, out of the 110th Infantry Combat Team, consisting of about 5,000 men, only 37 officers and 492 men were left, the rest had been killed, wounded, or captured. The 109th Field Artillery Battalion stood its ground well and took to infantry fighting after every gun was lost, destroyed, or captured. A group of about 500 men of the infantry, artillery, and other remnants stood their ground at Neuchateau until December 29 when troops from Patton's army in the south moved up and released our men.

The heroic stands made many times by small groups of artillerymen and infantrymen were simply marvelous and will long be remembered.

DANIEL B. STICKLER,
Brigadier General (Former Commander of the 110th Infantry).

THE 143D PENNSYLVANIA VOLUNTEERS, CIVIL WAR

The 143d Pennsylvania Volunteers, recruited at Camp Luzerne here in Luzerne County, Pa., Wilkes-Barre, the county seat, with 1,100 enlisted members, left over the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad on November 7, 1862, commanded by Col. E. L. Dana, for Camp Slocum, of East Washington, to fight in answer to President Lincoln's call, in the Civil War, the camp being located in a muddy cornfield, many sickened and died. My brother-in-law was a member of this 143d, S. U. Shaffer, Burgess, Plymouth.

It was assigned to the First Army Corps, 3d Division, Grand Army of the Potomac under Gen. Joseph Hooker in February 1863. The first under fire was below Fredericksburg, May 1 to May 6, at the Battle of Chancellorsville.

The corps, after severe marching, was the earliest in the field at Gettysburg on the morning of July 1, 1865. In severe fighting General Reynolds was mortally wounded, General Doubleday assumed command of the corps and Colonel Dana, of the 143d, took command of the brigade, which fought 3 brigades of the Confederate, including Pickett's 2 charges of the Louisiana Tigers against Missionary Ridge. The supported Colonel Rickett's battery from Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

Colorbearer Sgt. Ben Crippen, of the 143d, was shot while shaking his fist at the advancing Confederates; Major Conygham then gave the command, "143d rally on your colors" and with a rush the colors were saved, and their position on Missionary Ridge was secured. A monument depicting this occurrence is on the battlefield.

After a series of severe marches the Army went into its first winter quarters at Culpeper in 1863 and the shattered regiment was recruited to 850 men. On the night of May 3, 1864, the regiment broke camp and crossed the Rapidan and fought in the Battle of the Wilderness on the 4th, 5th, and on the 6th. Col. E. L. Dana was wounded and captured. On the 8th, 9th, and 10th charging and countercharging, lines wavering, ammunition exhausted, the cartridge boxes of dead and dying, the men searched for supplies, repulsing the enemy with bayonets. Finally relieved by the 53d Pennsylvania Volunteers, the 143d was 1 of the 3 regiments that suffered the greatest loss. General Wedsworth and Lieutenant Colonel Mercer mortally wounded and Major Conygham and Major Hughes severely wounded.

The 143d fought next at Spottsylvania, North Anne, Bethesda Church, Cold Harbor, and at Chickahominy, crossing the James River on June 15, reaching Petersburg on the morning of the 17th, participating in the 3 days' fighting along the Weldon Railroad; next battle was at Hatchers Run; and went into winter quarters in the rear defenses of Petersburg. Another brother-in-law, aged 14 years, member 187th Pennsylvania Volunteers in Second Battle of Bull Run, blowing up of Fort Hell and along the Weldon Railroad. He was an honor guard to President Lincoln's body in City Hall, Philadelphia, Joseph W. Campbell, contractor, Plymouth.

Early in February the 143d was engaged in a campaign for 10 days. It fought in the Second Battle of Bull Run where Captain Gaylord, from Plymouth, was killed while leading a charge at the head of his Company D. A large monument to his memory and deeds is in our Shawnee Cemetery.

WM. H. MCALARNEY.

PLYMOUTH, PA.

GENTLEMEN FROM HELL

(By Pfc. R. G. Ogborn, 112th Infantry)

They were formed in Pennsylvania
Joined by men from every State
With the keystone for their emblem
They were called the "Twenty Eighth".

They hit the beach at Omaha
Crossed the hedges row by row
Where the Jerry learned to hate and fear
The Keystones ruddy glow.

Fire and movement were their watchwords
As they climbed up Hill 210
Wrote a bloody page in history
In the woods of Compeigne.

A victory march in Paris
Ever forward with the dawn
Through Belgium, France and Luxembourg
The "Twenty Eight" rolled on.

The Siegfried Line has seen them
All along its mighty wall
From Aachen to the Alsace
Where they fought at Colmars Falls.

There are towns they'll long remember
Vossenack, Schmidt and Kommerscheid
And the breakthrough in December
When they slowed the German tide.

With blood and sweat they carved the niche,
In history's hall of fame
With deeds of valor shining bright
And victory was their aim.

In Valhalal's Halls their heroes live
Who fell along the way
They're resting now awaiting call
To march on judgment day.

When my last recall is sounded
May I go there to dwell
And march again with the legions
Of the gentlemen from hell.

Another Southeastern Ohio Pottery Free-Trade Casualty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, another industry in southeastern Ohio has fallen victim to a ruthless trade policy which has in so many cases favored the industries of nations where workers are paid a starvation wage, at the expense of our home industries.

This is the second pottery to close its doors in as many months. Hundreds of pottery workers have been affected. The following editorial from the Morgan County Herald tells the story in detail:

ANOTHER SOUTHEAST OHIO POTTERY FREE-TRADE CASUALTY

The Pope-Gosser China Co., of Coshocton, ceased operations a week ago Saturday. Company officials gave as a reason for the suspension, inability to compete with pottery-ware manufactured abroad, especially in Japan. The president and treasurer of the company has called for a shareholders' meeting to liquidate the business.

Pope-Gosser was founded in 1902 by I. B. Pope, jeweler, and Charles Gosser, Coshocton businessman. It specialized in high-grade chinaware which could successfully compete with finer grades of dinnerware and ceramics which at that time were largely obtainable only from abroad. The late B. F. Matson, of McConnelsville, was the first and oldest salesman for this company.

From the start, the plant was a success. Mr. Pope, the jeweler, was the designer. Mr. Gosser was an excellent businessman. They had the goods plus successful business management. Coshocton people were rightfully proud of a high-class institution such as Pope-Gosser, the excellence of whose product gave it a nationwide reputation.

For years Pope-Gosser added to the wealth of this up-river thriving and prosperous community. During its more than half a century of existence, millions of dollars of new money were poured into Coshocton and Tuscarawas County from this source. It was a typical example of the manner in which industry has built America. The enterprise of I. B. Pope and Charles Gosser was encouraged by the Government. They were given protection against cheap imports from abroad and an incentive to devote their energy and their ability in something which would add to their own success and at the same time add to the wealth of Coshocton.

No need to rehash why this pottery—or any pottery—cannot compete in ceramics products under existent world conditions. The Jap or the pottery employee of any other nation in the world commands but a small fraction of the wage of the American worker. Our taxes are outrageously high and growing more and more confiscatory. The cost of doing business increases daily.

Pope-Gosser followed the Crooksville China pottery, which ceased to exist, a few weeks since, and closed its doors for the same reason. At Crooksville, 160 employees lost good jobs. At Pope-Gosser, 150 casualties resulted when this plant closed down. In these two clay industries which we know about right here in this section of Ohio, 310 employees will no longer produce wealth. This number will be added to the unemployment and relief rolls. Both communities and everyone living in them will be directly or indirectly injured—the merchant by loss of trade—the property owner by a general decline in values, through loss of wealth and loss of people who must move elsewhere to obtain employment.

Senator MALONE, of Nevada, recently wrote a book, Mainline. In this volume, the Senator points out the idiocy of a trade policy, which builds industry abroad through foreign aid, and allows the products of cheap labor overseas to drive the American manufacturer out of business. The Senator also points out that under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), "over 55,000 concessions have now been made to freeze or lower American tariffs. An average of 68 percent is now in effect, and our tariffs are the lowest of any major trading nation in the world."

There, in a nutshell, is the story of Crooksville China and Pope-Gosser potteries. Already hundreds of thousands of American

laborers in other industries have been displaced in a similar manner and for the same reasons. The pottery business in southeastern Ohio was built on a protective tariff. Other potteries, as time goes on, will be compelled to close their doors, if the reciprocal trade agreements, now under fire in Congress, are extended when they expire this year.

We are in the midst of what is called a recession. Congress has been battling over an extension of the 6-month period allowed in compensation for the unemployed. It seems to us that an American policy which encouraged American enterprise to build factories and employ American workmen, so that they will produce, instead of consuming, wealth, might bring the Nation farther along on the road to recovery. Every time a factory closes, the Nation's economy is that much impoverished; the number of unemployed is increased instead of decreased; recovery is just that much delayed. How closing down American potteries and throwing additional thousands of men out of jobs is going to get us anywhere in efforts to restore prosperity, is not apparent, even to those who are accustomed to almost anything in a strange period of government.

The Courage of Mr. Nixon—An Inspiration to the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have recently read a reprint of an editorial authored by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., which appeared in the May 11, 1958, issues of Hearst newspapers. It is captioned "Two Statesmen Show Courage." It is a timely pat on the back for two of our outstanding citizens who are presenting our country and the free world so well in combating the Communist menace.

In discussing the Peruvian incident the author says:

They did not reckon on DICK NIXON'S courage. They did not reckon on the shock this outrage will produce among decent men and women of other Latin American countries. It will lead them, I believe, to a reappraisal of the danger of Communist infiltration, its contempt of their independence and their heroes who symbolize it, and to a better understanding of the good intentions of the United States.

DICK NIXON'S courage is an inspiration to the free world. As our country's representative he has added new luster to the cause of freedom throughout the world.

In placing this editorial in the RECORD I do so with appreciation to Mr. Hearst for his timely commendation and expression of faith in our dynamic leadership:

TWO STATESMEN SHOW COURAGE
(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

Two happenings this past week recalled to mind Senator JACK KENNEDY'S excellent book, Profiles in Courage (free advertisement—cheerfully given). It deals, as you probably know, with Senators in our history, who, with their political fortunes at stake, displayed the moral and political courage of their convictions.

JACK was writing about the past.

I am writing about the present.

The two men who exemplify it today are not Senators, but I would recommend their inclusion in contemporary history under some such title as "Statesmen of Valor."

They are Vice President DICK NIXON and Secretary of State Foster Dulles.

In the long run—and perhaps not so long at that—I think the courage of DICK NIXON in walking into a Communist student mob outside San Marcos University in Lima, Peru, will boomerang against the Communists. Even as I write this, officials and newspapers in Peru are expressing a sense of shame and shock.

The Vice President had been advised by the Peruvian Government and our own Embassy in Lima not to go to the university. He did go, because not to have done so would have handed the Communist anti-American agitators a victory by default. And it wasn't for reasons of personal glory that Mr. NIXON dared the violence of the mob. He was the envoy of the good intentions of the United States. As he explained later:

"It was important not to allow a minority element to appear to have power."

He was grazed on the neck by a stone. He was spat upon. To compound these insults, the Communists then desecrated the United States flag, by ripping out flowers that formed it, in a wreath Mr. NIXON had laid at the statue of Jose de San Martin, Peru's greatest hero in the fight for independence in the early 1800's.

This is the kind of violence that does far more ultimate injury to those who perpetrate it than to those against whom it is directed.

As DICK NIXON reasonably commented:

"This was not a Peruvian affront to me. When, for example, one demonstrator spat in my face, he was spitting on the good name of Peru, he was spitting on the memory of San Martin, he was spitting on men who through the years fought and died for the right of free expression."

Having failed in demonstrations against the Vice President in Uruguay, Argentina, and Bolivia, the Communists decided to make the big try in Peru because of the traditional Peruvian-United States friendship. They figured that if they could explode an anti-NIXON, anti-United States outburst there, they could show other Latin-American countries that even Peru's long-time friendly relations with us were on the skids.

They were stupid.

They did not reckon on DICK NIXON'S courage.

They did not reckon on the shock this outrage will produce among decent men and women of other Latin-American countries. It will lead them, I believe, to a reappraisal of the danger of Communist infiltration, its contempt of their independence and their heroes who symbolize it, and to a better understanding of the good intentions of the United States.

On our side of the border DICK NIXON'S courage should make us realize the role we must play in our hemisphere.

For one thing Communist footholds in South America would not be as strong as they are if we had interested ourselves more in the problems of our neighbors.

Occasional expressions of friendship are not enough.

We should lose no time but get going on a realistic, considered Western Hemisphere policy which will be to the mutual advantage of everyone, except the Communists.

I think President Eisenhower in his message to DICK NIXON expressed the thoughts of many of us when he wired him:

"Dear DICK: Your courage, patience, and calmness have brought you new respect and admiration in our country."

It has done the same thing for him in very many countries, I would add.

In the face of open hostility and half-hidden derision, Foster Dulles held onto the courage of his beliefs in dealing diplomatically with the Russians, particularly the steps to be taken toward a summit conference.

Commentators and cartoonists, both in this country and abroad, variously depicted him as frozen solid, hypnotized rigid, and cemented in unreasoning obstinacy.

Our papers, I am pleased to say, did not go along with this opinion. I recall remarking, in an editor's report written when Mr. Dulles was at his lowest ebb of esteem, that we do not choose a Secretary of State to win an international popularity contest. We choose one to represent the best interests of the United States, which Mr. Dulles has done consistently and admirably.

At the NATO meeting in Paris last December the Secretary was under terrific pressure from our European allies, and equal pressure of public opinion, to agree to take a flying leap onto the summit on the off-chance that the Russians might be sincere, for a change.

He replied with a quiet "No." He argued that nothing could come of a flying-leap meeting, mostly on Russian terms, but a Soviet propaganda show with the West appearing in the unfortunate posture of a hat-in-hand supplicant of peace.

The Dulles position was that to have any prospect of genuine accomplishment a summit meeting would have to be prepared carefully in advance at the diplomatic level, and there would have to be general agreement on what would be discussed. So the consensus among our allies, and also among the pseudoliberals here at home, was that Mr. Dulles was an inflexible fuddy-duddy.

Well, time marches on (to coin a phrase), and the meeting of NATO foreign ministers in Copenhagen last week ended in solid support behind Mr. Dulles' views. Observers report his prestige in European diplomatic circles has never been higher.

It is not that the foreign diplomats have suddenly succumbed to Mr. Dulles' charm. It is that events since December have proven him right. These include the dreary record of Soviet letter writing, the endless Soviet propaganda maneuvering, and the increasing evidence of insincerity, climaxed by the Russian veto in the U. N. Security Council of President Eisenhower's plan for Arctic inspection against surprise attack.

An old baseball saying is that you're a bum one day and a hero the next. The same apparently applies to statesmanship. In both professions, having the courage of your convictions will help you regard either status with equanimity.

Resolution Adopted by the Council of Kingston, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution that was adopted by the Council of Kingston, Pa., relative to the subject of social security for borough police and firemen:

Whereas Representative JOHN DENT, of Westmoreland County, has introduced H. R. 11497 which would allow borough police and firemen to be included in social security

which would be optional with each borough and each individual policeman; and

Whereas the passage of such legislation is deemed desirable: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Burgess and Town Council of the Borough of Kingston, Pa., That the Borough of Kingston go on record as favoring the passage of H. R. 11497, which has been referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Adopted at an adjourned regular meeting of the Town Council of the Borough of Kingston, Pa., held the 22d day of April, A. D. 1958.

RALPH M. BROWN,
President.

Attest:

THOMAS J. REESE,
Secretary.

Approved this 29th day of April 1958.

WM. I. MARTIN,
Burgess.

To Destroy the Reciprocal Trade Program Would Be a Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune of May 13, 1958:

WHO STANDS FOR AMERICA?

It seems incredible but the United States is on the verge of dealing itself a staggering blow in the cold war. It is a long-haul blow the like of which the Soviet Union could not inflict on us.

It is a blow that could turn our recession into depression quicker than almost anything else we could do.

It is a blow that will surely start us down the road to economic war—not against Russia but against ourselves and our allies. And that road to economic war could carry us as well in the direction of hot war.

Why should America be so short-sighted at this critical moment in history as to swing a haymaker at its own jaw?

Why should America have learned so little from recent history that it will elect to travel a path that led us to disaster and, as many believe, to war only a few years ago?

The answer is obvious: It is because too many Americans are considering only their own selfish, short-range interests; too few Americans are considering what is good for America.

Congressional leaders have warned President Eisenhower that if his reciprocal trade program were put to a house vote in its present form it would be defeated by a majority of 61 votes.

They have warned the President that unless the administration is prepared to compromise, this program, which has served the Nation and the free world well for 24 years, will be scrapped.

This would represent a return to isolation. Its effect would be to disarm the United States as effectively for cold war purposes as would the scrapping of our bases, the bringing home of our forces and finally the dismemberment of our Military Establishment.

Nothing could better please Nikita Khrushchev. Nothing could better insure the eventual triumph of world communism.

Supporters of the reciprocal trade program have tried harder than ever before to hammer home the facts of life in an interdependent world to Americans. Secretary of State Dulles made a gallant effort to do so in Minneapolis Sunday.

We have pointed out repeatedly that:

We sell goods abroad worth $8 billion more annually than the goods we buy abroad.

The job of 4.5 million Americans depend on our foreign trade.

Only a freer international trading system can insure the steady flow to America of raw materials our economy and security demand but which we no longer produce.

If Americans only could realize the fact that high tariffs rarely protect for very long even the industries for which they are established. As the Wall Street Journal said recently of protectionism:

"It impedes competition and growth. It keeps prices high, penalizing the consumer. In the long run it doesn't even help the protected ones; the crutch finally fails to support the imaginary cripple."

Can this impending self-inflicted disaster for America be avoided? Only if Americans in vastly greater numbers than have yet appeared will demand that their Congressmen stand fast for the national interest.

Are there Americans at this moment who will speak up clearly for America?

A Man Loved by the Whole Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article that was featured in the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent of May 4, 1958, on Rev. Anthony G. Ezerskis, pastor of St. Francis Lithuanian Church of Wilkes-Barre who on July 13 will mark his 50th year in the priesthood and his 30th year as pastor of St. Francis:

A MAN LOVED BY WHOLE TOWN—FATHER EZERSKIS OF MINERS MILLS A PRIEST 50 YEARS

(By S. C. Wintermute)

"He has the same vim and vigor he had when he came to town 30 years ago."

That 17-word statement by a neighbor best tells the story of the beloved Rev. Anthony G. Ezerskis, pastor of St. Francis Lithuanian Roman Catholic Church, Miners Mills, who on June 13 will mark his 50th year in the priesthood and his 30th year as pastor of the 45-year-old Miners Mills parish.

To Catholic, Protestant, and Jew, young and old, he is "Father" as he walks and rides about the North End community that he admittedly "loves with all my heart."

An orphan boy of 18, he arrived in America from his native Lithuania in 1898—during the busy days of the Spanish-American War.

He went to Chicago to reside with an uncle, Karol Ezerskis, following the death of his father. His mother died when he was 12.

He was born in Stulgi, Lithuania, the son of Anthony and Praxeda Ezerskis, and completed grammar school there.

AIDED BY UNCLE

Upon his arrival in Chicago, his uncle enrolled him in St. Stanislaus College.

From childhood he had a strong desire for a religious life and his uncle joined in helping him fulfill this calling. He went to St. Mary's Seminary in Cincinnati, Ohio, and on June 13, 1908, was ordained to the priesthood by Bishop Quigley of Chicago.

For 10 years he served as pastor and assistant pastor at numerous parishes in Illinois and then was assigned to Pennsylvania. He served at St. Mary's, Eynon, and St. Anthony's, Forest City, before being named to St. Francis Church where for 3 decades he has served as pastor and his community efforts have won him the undying admiration of residents of all faiths.

WIPED OUT DEBTS

St. Francis Church was built in 1923 and a mortgage of more than $50,000 faced Rev. Father Ezerskis when he arrived in 1928 to take over parochial duties.

Ten years later the mortgage was paid in full and the parish was free of debt.

In 1934 he invited the Sisters of Jesus Crucified to his parish and a modest property was obtained for use as a convent.

Not only a scholarly man, but also a handy man with tools, the 78-year-old priest during his 30 years of service in the parish has been personally responsible for many of the improvements made to the church, rectory and convent.

During his years in Miners Mills, Rev. Father Ezerskis guided improvements to the parish cemetery, complete renovation of the convent, interior and exterior improvements to the church and the erection of a rectory.

NEVER TOO BUSY

Probably the greatest tribute ever paid to this kindly man, who has never been known to be too busy to hear or aid any man, woman or child coming to the rectory door with a problem, was his selection by the North End (Miners Mills) Civic League for the first life membership ever granted by that group.

James Moran, president of the civic league, said the life membership was approved "not only unanimously by the members, but the whole town practically insisted that Father Ezerskis be given recognition for "his untiring service to the community and his kindness to all regardless of nationality or creed."

The parish will honor Reverend Father Ezerskis at a testimonial in June to mark his 50th year as a priest. Although details are still being arranged, it was reported by parish leaders that "just about 100 percent of all the other groups in Miners Mills have asked to be permitted to participate."

Repeal Excise Taxes Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the House to take decisive action on repealing excise taxes. Prompt action will stimulate business at all levels and really help end the recession.

I have introduced a bill, H. R. 12508, which repeals excise taxes on automobiles; automobile parts and accessories; jewelry; furs; cosmetics; ladies' handbags; luggage; electric, gas and oil appliances; electric light bulbs and tubes; photographic equipment; telephone and telegraph; and transportation of persons and property. Some of my views are contained in a letter I have written to the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

I strongly urge every other Member of Congress who feels as I do to express his views to the committee. Under unanimous consent, I include the letter, in its entirety, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 15, 1958.

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, House Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The grave economic condition of our Nation prompts me to address this letter to you urging that you and your committee give early and prompt consideration to my bill pending before your committee which in my judgment would contribute immeasurably to the economic recovery and stability of our country. I have reference to H. R. 12508 introduced by me on May 14, 1958.

This bill is designed to repeal the excise tax on automobiles and automobile parts and accessories retroactive to March 1 of this year. It also repeals, effective July 1, the excise taxes on the following: jewelry; furs; cosmetics; ladies' handbags; luggage; electrict, gas, and oil appliances; electric light bulbs and tubes; photographic equipment; telephone and telegraph; and transportation of persons and property.

I know of no quicker nor more effective way to help small merchants and consumers than to reduce the price of retail merchandise by repeal of the excise taxes provided for in my bill. This will give manufacturers and retailers a nationwide shot in the arm without causing inflation. This is a practical, immediate proposal to end the recession.

The economic plight of the automobile dealers and manufacturers is being almost daily compounded by the remarks of Members of Congress and other responsible Government officials which indicate that the reduction or removal of the automotive excise tax is a subject likely to be considered at this session.

Every auto dealer I meet tells me that there will be no marked pickup in automobile sales until such time as a final decision by Congress on this all-important matter is reached. It's watch and wait with thousands of potential buyers. Even a flat refusal by Congress to repeal the tax would clear the air and be better than no action at all.

The automobile industry plays a dominant role in the Nation's economy. Take 1956 for example. This industry purchased 42 percent of the total United States consumption of sheet steel, 24 percent of bar steel, and 23 percent of stripped steel. Additionally, the automobile industry purchases 65 percent of the United States consumption of natural rubber and 61 percent of the synthetic variety.

Insurance premiums paid by motor-vehicle owners run near the $5-billion mark, and some kind of installment credit is used to buy about 6 out of 10 new vehicles. About 1 out of every 5 patents issued each year is for an automotive device. Automobiles also contain unusual products like beeswax, sugarcane, resin, cork, and iodine.

The new-car purchaser of today pays considerably more for his automobile than his father did for his, but a good portion of the purchase price of today's new car is hidden in taxes—27 cents of every auto dollar. Of the total cost of a $2,500 car delivered in 1956 to a resident of Michigan, taxes were responsible for $599, with other States about the same.

So the Federal Government, to a large degree, prospers when the auto industry experiences boom years, and suffers, through losses in tax revenues, when car sales experience a slump.

States, too, reap benefits from the automotive industry, receiving 30 percent of their total tax revenues from motor-user taxes. In 1956 alone the 48 States collected almost $4 billion from motor-vehicle fuel and license taxes.

The American people have the money and want to buy 1958 automobiles. Savings are at an alltime high. The new models have been well received. It seems to me that the time has come for us to act promptly and decisively to end the paralysis in the giant auto industry, where unemployment is so prevalent.

One of the important things to remember is that all of these taxes were either imposed or increased as a World War II measure. The war ended 13 years ago. It's about time we repealed them.

If these excise taxes on automobiles and merchandise are repealed, the income taxes that the Government will receive on increased profits and earnings resulting from greater sales would more than make up for the loss of the excise-tax revenue. Since the taxes on transportation and communication are in many instances charged against business income, the revenue loss from their repeal would also be offset by increased income-tax receipts.

Delay in the enactment of H. R. 12508 will prolong and deepen the recession. In the national interest, I strongly urge that your Committee report out this bill immediately.

Best regards.

Sincerely,

FRANK C. OSMERS, Jr.

The Alaska Statehood Bill Needs a Conservation Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader announced earlier today that the Alaska statehood bill is scheduled for consideration next Wednesday.

Recently I sent all Members of the House a mimeographed copy of testimony I had hoped to present to the Rules Committee on H. R. 7999. Since it is doubtful if such an opportunity to testify will develop, I include that statement hereinafter in case the copy sent direct went astray or escaped notice:

TESTIMONY OF HON. THOMAS M. PELLY, OF WASHINGTON, PREPARED FOR PRESENTATION TO THE HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE ON H. R. 7999, STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity of appearing in connection with H. R. 7999, a bill to grant statehood to Alaska.

In principle, I support statehood, and I feel a personal moral obligation as a Republican to support my party's platform. But passage of this bill without amendment to safeguard the broad public interest by providing for sound management and administration of fish and wildlife resources should not be undertaken. So, to make my position here clear, let me say I urge an open rule, and I hope when I have pointed up the lack of protection in this bill that in any debate on the rule when it is taken up on the floor that members of this committee will emphasize the need for an amendment. My purpose in appearing here is to gain support for a conservation amendment which I intend to offer.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that I come before you with encouragement of several national conservation organizations who feel that the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in reporting out H. R. 7999 ignored the testimony of C. R. Gutermuth, vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute, as it appears in the printed hearings (pp. 375, 415, 476) and, therefore, this measure contains no safeguards for the future welfare of the Territory's fish and wildlife resources. Indeed, in addition to the Wildlife Institute, whose president is Ira N. Gabrielson, the American Nature Association, the Izaak Walton League of America, the National Parks Association, the National Wildlife Federation, Nature Conservancy and the Wilderness Society have just issued a joint letter to all Members of Congress saying that adoption of the statehood bill, without a clarifying amendment, would jeopardize those invaluable resources upon which a major part of the Territory's economy is based. So today, Mr. Chairman, I appear in the interest and with the blessing of organitions whose memberships exceed 3 millions of American citizens who reside in all of the 48 States and also, may I add, many of whom reside in Alaska.

The basic resources of Alaska are timber, minerals, and fish.

As to timber, with the major forests remaining under the permanent management of the Federal Forest Service on a sustained yield basis, I see no danger on account of statehood of discrimination or lack of control against special interests.

As to mines and minerals, with the new State of Alaska allowed a choice of lands, article VIII, section 3, of the proposed Constitution, provides for common use of natural resources. In my own State of Washington, the State was given a choice of lands in 1889 and I don't believe it has finished selecting all the sections it is entitled to yet. In filing on the public lands for oil leases in the Anchorage district, there has been favoritism under Federal management and, I believe, there may have been fraud. Insiders have had access to information in the land office, and frankly I think I was responsible for the transfer of the manager of the Anchorage land office because of information furnished by me to the Secretary of the Interior. My constituents' applications were held back and one group was favored as against another.

However, I am not qualified to suggest any provision to H. R. 7999 to allow all citizens equal participation on a fair basis. That is a matter for the proper officials of the new State to administer. Of course, I recognize the fact that these situations are possible under either Federal or State management where you do have incompetent or dishonest officials.

And now coming to the item of Alaska's fishery resources and when we consider turning over the management to the Alaska Fish and Game Commission, as presently constituted, it is a "stacked deck," and there should be no transfer until the way is open for an honest deal.

This resource is absolutely vital to Alaska's economy—it is her major industry, the wholesale value of its annual production averages about $80 million a year, and employs seasonally about 25,000 persons.

The conservation witnesses testified at the hearings and have since strongly reiterated that the stage already is set in Alaska for the commercial fish interests to take over the administration of the valuable fishery resources if this legislation is passed.

It is true the proposed Constitution calls for common use of natural resources and section 15 of article VIII reads: "No exclusive right or special privilege of fishery shall be created or authorized in the natural waters of the State."

However, under a law passed last year by the Territorial Legislature commercial inter-

ests are assured of complete domination over the Territory's fish and wildlife resources on the advent of statehood.

Let me say that it is in the public interest to insure that neither nonresident nor resident commercial groups, both of which have been in contention over a long period, should gain the power of administration of the Alaska fishery. Special interest control has been sought by legislation both in Congress and in the Territorial Legislature over many years. Such attempts failed and thousands of nonresident fishermen many hundreds of whom, by the way, live in my district have not been excluded from equal participation in that public resource; but I see now what conservation groups have pointed up—statehood would offer a new beachhead of attack. As is evident, the purpose of all that discriminatory legislation could be accomplished by the device of regulation once the management of Alaska fisheries is turned over to its Fish and Game Commission as that Commission is now constituted.

As to this commission, let me simply read from the hearings (p. 419). This is from the testimony of C. R. Gutermuth of the Wildlife Management Institute:

"Senate bill 30, which is now a law, does exactly what I predicted last year. The conservationists had hoped that Governor Hendrickson would veto that bill, which will place the administration of much of the Territory's natural resources in the hands of the users when Alaska becomes a State.

"Senate bill 30 calls for a 7-member Alaska Fish and Game Commission. Three of the commission members will be commercial fishermen, one a fish processor, one a trapper, and one each representing sport fishing and hunting. The commercial fishermen and fish processor representatives now serving on the Alaska Fisheries Board will be blanketed into office on the new commission for fixed terms of years. Some of them will be 'taken care of' in grand style; one term runs to 1964. Furthermore, by requiring appointments to the commission by districts, occupations, and interests, it means not only turning the administration over to the users, but bars all other citizens from serving on the commission.

"Mr. Chairman, the provisions in that new law will serve only one purpose—they will freeze the present commercial fishermen in office for several years, and assure the carryover of current administrative policies and philosophies. Yes; to overcome any possibility, however remote, that any less commercially dedicated commissioners might get in office. Commercial fisheries is the industry of Alaska, and this law certainly sets the stage for looking after everything but the public's interest."

As to how the commercial fishing interests of Alaska feel about conservation, let me quote from the statement of Jim Downey, secretary-treasurer of the Bering Sea Fishermen's Union, and agent of Resident Cannery Workers' Union, No. 46, AFL. This appears on page 22 of the 1955 hearings on Senate Resolution 13 of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, 84th Congress. This witness said:

"For conservation purposes, it is our firm belief that fishing should be limited to residents of Alaska."

And speaking of conservation, our colleague, the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], stated at that same hearing:

"I should say that in a general way we feel that the industry itself has exerted an undue control in the matter of regulations which govern and guide the industry; and that the best policies of conservation for maintenance of the fish run have not always been followed."

That quote is from page 4 of those same Senate hearings, and certainly Mr. BARTLETT ought to know. In fact, apparently the commercial fishing interests of Alaska have pressured him in this very way against conservation because I noted in the testimony of the witness from the Bristol Bay Resident Cannery Workers evidence of this.

"In 1953," the statement reads, "we successfully fought a closure order for the Nushagak fishery." He went on to point out that when 5 cannery superintendents were in Washington in support of the closure order, with the help of Delegate BARTLETT, a compromise 2-day-a-week commercial operation was permitted.

You can imagine that there are pressures on our Federal Division of Fish and Wildlife, but with commercial fish interests in control of Alaska's Fish and Game Commission the regulations will hardly be objective or in the interest of conservation. The national conservation organizations are not opposing statehood as such, and their opposition to the pending statehood legislation could be removed entirely if the Commission setup were changed. Conservation groups believe that the responsibility for managing Alaskan fish and wildlife resources should not be relinquished by the Federal Government until the new State legislature makes provision to protect the broad national interest. And I strongly support their position because, at the same time, an impartial setup in the management of our Alaska fishery would give some hope of protection against forces which would limit fishing to residents of Alaska by manipulation of regulators.

In this connection, I support an amendment to the pending bill to stipulate that the fish and wildlife resources be turned over to the new State as soon as the Secretary of the Interior can certify to the Congress that the Alaska State Legislature has made adequate provision for the proper administration, management, and conservation of those fish and wildlife resources. And by proper I mean that no special interest, either from outside or inside Alaska, would control.

As to the financial ability of the new State, I simply point up that the 1958 Federal budget asked for $876,955 for management and enforcement, $524,170 for vessels, and $165,425 for aircraft. The Division of Resource Management presently operates 7 patrol vessels and 9 aircraft. That is a total budget of $1,594,000.

I would trust that the Committee reporting this bill is satisfied that the new State could finance this extensive operation. Of course, 70 percent of the net proceeds of the annual sale of fur sealskins will accrue to Alaska, but under the new treaty, I understand, Canada's share goes up and, of course, the price of furs is down. Roughly, I figure Alaska would get about three quarters of a million dollars, so Alaska taxpayers would be required to pay an additional tax of about $750,000 a year to carry on in the way the Federal Government has administered the fishery in the past. This will be a burden and I wonder if Alaska's share in the annual fur sealskin sale should not be increased. Here, I might point out the testimony of the conservation director, Charles H. Callison, of the National Wildlife Federation; in a statement appearing in the hearings on H. R. 7999 on page 494 in which he referred to a resolution adopted by the federation at its annual convention in 1957 which "stressed the need for more adequate funds for fish and wildlife management in Alaska." This is the position of State wildlife federations and sportsmen's leagues and includes the Alaska Sportsmen's Council. So, as I say, it is going to be a heavy burden on Alaska taxpayers to maintain proper management and administration at the previous level to say nothing of increasing the amount.

Incidentally, this organization, the National Wildlife Federation, opposed the Alaska law, Senate bill 30, which established the special interest control. And since the law passed, its repeal or revision has been urged. That is what is needed—then let us consider transfer of the Fish and Wildlife Service to the State.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the conservation organizations whose names I gave earlier have asked me to support the amendment to which I referred earlier and which I propose to introduce if and when the Alaska statehood bill is brought up. The statehood bill should never pass without this safeguard amendment.

In conclusion, I quote from a letter dated April 25, 1958, which is self-explanatory.

"There obviously is some objection to that portion of the proposed amendment suggested by certain conservationists which would require Congress to approve the certification of the Secretary of the Interior. That objection could be overcome by the following, which would satisfy the many people who are insisting upon a protective amendment:

"'*Provided*, That the administration and management of the fish and wildlife resources of Alaska shall be retained by the Federal Government under existing laws until the first day of the first calendar year following the expiration of 90 legislative days after the Secretary of the Interior certifies to the Congress that the Alaska State Legislature has made adequate provision for the administration, management, and conservation of said resources in the broad national interest.'

"Congressman PELLY, the millions of conservationists in Alaska and in all of the State are indebted to you for working so tirelessly to protect the life-sustaining resources and basic economy of Alaska and the Nation. They must rely upon you and the other conservation-minded Members of Congress to see that proper safeguards are included in any statehood legislation."

With this, I conclude my testimony and thank the committee again for the opportunity to appear here today.

Acts of Violence Against Two Jewish Community Centers and a Synagogue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Wilkes-Barre Lodge of B'nai B'rith concerning the recent bombings of 2 Jewish community centers and a synagogue:

S. J. STRAUSS LODGE 139,
Wilkes-Barre, Pa., May 1, 1958.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: You are no doubt aware of the recent bombings of the Jewish Community Center in Nashville, Tenn., and synagogues in Miami and Jacksonville, Fla., and the attempted bombing of a synagogue in Birmingham, Ala.

I know you realize that much more is involved than merely an overt act of violence to the Jewish centers and synagogues. These acts of violence are assaults upon law and order, the principles of democracy, and the very foundation of the Judaeo-Christian heritage. We join with the members of our

lodge in respectfully urging you to use your good office to prevail upon the Attorney General of the United States to authorize and direct the intervention of the Justice Department into this matter. Certainly, these bombings, and attempted bombings, which have occurred in several southern States, indicate a concerted plan and effort which is interstate in nature, and affords ample basis for the Justice Department to assume jurisdiction, and to use the full investigatory powers of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Very truly yours,

MURRAY MACKSON, *President.*
SOL LUBIN, *A. D. L. Chairman.*

Tide Turning for the Free World in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the Far East has long been a prime objective of the Communists. For years things went their way, largely because the free world underestimated Asia's importance or was too preoccupied elsewhere. When they finally did wake up, many Americans were defeatist. They were pessimistic on Korea, Formosa, Vietnam, even Japan. They counseled that we accept a supposedly inevitable Communist victory, and come to terms with Red China—as if that were possible on any honorable or livable basis. Others of us urged steadfastness in support of free peoples, no matter how shaky their governments seemed at the time, and resolute resistance to anything that would build up the Communist regimes. That policy is beginning to pay off. A Pulitzer prizewinning reporter finds significant changes in Asian attitudes. Here is Relman Morin's on-the-scene assessment.

TIME NOW ON SIDE OF FREE WORLD—SEATO CONSIDERED EFFECTIVE—JAPAN THE KEY

(By Relman Morin)

TOKYO, May 10.—On a warship in southeast Asian waters recently, a top military commander was asked to appraise the battle for Asia as it stands today. Without hesitation, he replied:

"Time is working for us and against the Communists now. A few years ago, it was just the reverse."

Recently, the United States ambassadors in the Far East met on Formosa to exchange information on the same question. The consensus of the conference, as three of them reported it to this correspondent:

"The picture looks good. You can't tell about Indonesia, of course."

In March, the foreign ministers of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) met in Manila. This conference, too, ended on a note of optimism. And Associated Press correspondent reported:

"SEATO is now considered to be a going concern, capable of standing up to communism militarily and economically."

CHANGES ARE VITAL

Does all this mean that the tide finally has turned in the Far East? Has the Communist drive been checked?

To consider the question, think back less than 4 years:

The Reds had just destroyed Dien Bien Phu, the French fortress in Indochina; the entire country looked ripe for the taking. Thailand was threatened. Communist guerillas were operating over a wide area in Malaya. Where would the Reds strike next?

SEATO did not exist. There was no organization for pooling the military resources of the free nations, standardizing their equipment, providing joint training.

In Japan, as United States procurements dwindled after the Korean war, there was deep concern over the problem of maintaining the economy.

In war-torn Korea, the people suffered from cold, hunger, and disease. To make matters worse, they were openly critical of almost every aspect of the United States aid program.

Today, the changes that have taken place in the Far East seem almost magical. The picture looks bright, indeed.

These are the most significant factors in it now:

Japan holds the key position. It is the industrial powerhouse of the Orient. The furious energy and dynamism that once were channeled into war and preparations for war now are going into economic expansion. The standard of living is high. The export-import position seems sound. You may even see small size Japanese automobiles competing in the American market soon.

The military outlook, however, is cloudy. Japanese leaders doubt that any forces comparable to the powerful prewar machine will be recreated in the near future. To permit it, a constitutional change is necessary and the majority of the people seem wholly opposed.

Japan has become the Communists' No. 1 target.

Far Eastern observers believe Russia and Red China will step up the effort to detach Japan from the alinement of free nations, to neutralize her, and finally to bring her into the Communist bloc.

The free nations are growing steadily stronger.

Take the two showcase nations, South Korea and South Vietnam. They have common frontiers with the Communists. Here the two systems compete at close quarters. What are the outstanding results?

KOREA ON THE RISE

The Koreans have made spectacular economic gains. They are eating more, living better, looking happier. They have stabilized the currency, held wholesale prices in line for 18 months, controlled inflation. They are beginning to make a modest start toward exporting. Here, American money has been put to highly effective use.

Meanwhile, the former bitterness over the United States aid program has evaporated entirely.

In South Vietnam, the prime development has been political rather than economic. President Ngo Dinh Diem—one of the most unusual personalities on the world stage—is firmly in power now. He won a rough struggle with dissident elements and liquidated a situation that might well have opened the gates to the Communists. The country is at peace now, getting American military and economic aid, moving ahead steadily.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*.
Abernethy, Thomas G., 6278 29th St. *Miss*.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*., 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*.
Albert, Carl, *Okla*., 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*.
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*.
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*.
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*., University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*., 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont*., 800 Crescent Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*., 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*.
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*., 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*.
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*.
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*., Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*., 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*.
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*.
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*.
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*.
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*., 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*.
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*.
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*.
Bates, William H., *Mass*.
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*.
Beamer, John V., *Ind*., 110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*.
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*.
Belcher, Page, *Okla*.
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*., 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*., 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*., 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*.
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*.
Blitch, Iris Faircloth (Mrs.), *Ga*.
Boggs, Hale, *La*.
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*.
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*., 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), 2301 Wyo. Ave. *Ohio*
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*., Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*., 4301 Mass. Ave.
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*., The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*.
Bray, William G., *Ind*.
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans*.
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*.
Brooks, Overton, *La*., 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich*.
Brown, Charles H., *Mo*., 3606 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*., Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*., Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*.
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*.
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*.
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*.
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*.
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*., 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*.
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*.
Byrne, Emmet F., *Ill*.
Byrne, James A., *Pa*.
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*., 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*.
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*.
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*.
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*.
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*.
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*., The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich*.
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*.
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*.
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*., 1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill*., 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*., 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*., The Jefferson
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*.
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*.
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*., 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*.
Coudert, Frederic R., Jr., *N. Y*.
Cramer, William C., *Fla*., 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*.
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*., 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*.
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*.
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*., 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga*.
Dawson, William A., *Utah*.
Dawson, William L., *Ill*.
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*.
Dellay, Vincent J., *N. J*.
Dennison, David S., Jr., *Ohio*.
Dent, John H., *Pa*.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*.
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*.
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*.
Dies, Martin, *Tex*.
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*.
Dingell, John D., *Mich*.
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*., 2828 Conn. Ave.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*.
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y*.
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*.
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*.
Dowdy, John, *Tex*.
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*., 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*., The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J*.
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*., 3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed., *Okla*.
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*., 3840 Lorcom Lane, Arlington, Va.
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*., 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*.
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y*.
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*.
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*.
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*., 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*.
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*., Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*., The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*.
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*., 3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*., 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*., 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*.
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*., The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn*., Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*., 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*.
Fulton, James G., *Pa*.
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*.
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*.
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*., 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*.
George, Myron V., *Kans*., 3801 Rodman St.
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J*., Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa*.
Grant, George M., *Ala*., 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*.
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*.
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*.
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*., 2401 Calvert St.
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*.
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich*.
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*.
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*.
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*.
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*.
Hale, Robert, *Maine*., 2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*.
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*., 4926 Upton St.
Harden, Cecil M. (Mrs.), *Ind*., The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*.
Harris, Oren, *Ark*., 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*.
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*., 110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Haskell, Harry G., Jr., *Del*.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*., 314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*., 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y*.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*., 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C*.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*.
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*.
Heselton, John W., *Mass*.
Hess, William E., *Ohio*.
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*.
Hill, William S., *Colo*., 110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*.
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*., 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*., 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*.
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*.
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*.
Holt, Joe, *Calif*.
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*.
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*.
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*.
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*.
Ikard, Frank, *Tex*.
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*.
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*., 200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*.
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*., The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*.
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*., 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*., 3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*.
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*., 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*.
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*., 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*.
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*., 2425 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*.
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*., Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*., 1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va*.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y*.
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*., The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*., The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*., 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*., 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif*.
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*.
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C*.
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*.
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*.
Knutson, Coya (Mrs.), *Minn*.
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*., 112 Schotts Court NE.

Appendix

Developing All Our Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address that I made to the annual meeting of the Tennessee Municipal League, in Nashville, Tenn., Tuesday, May 13, 1958. In this address I discuss the need for a continuation of the basic TVA program and for cooperative action at all levels of Government toward the end that all our resources—human, natural and industrial—might be developed.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a privilege for me to meet with you here today to discuss some of the interrelated economic and political problems that confront us as public officials. I believe the theme for your convention, Economic Survival for Tennessee, is well chosen and indicative of the crucial decisions that need to be made. It is indicative that we realize troublesome economic conditions disappear only after decided effort and that the best treatment for declining economic activity is preventive treatment designed to stop the decline and reverse it.

It is refreshing to be among you municipal public officials. When one goes to Washington, it is possible to lose perspective on problems and to lose the sense of immediacy which comes to those who actually operate programs that affect our everyday lives. For this reason I take every opportunity afforded me to return to Tennessee and learn what you are thinking here. I am certain that I will learn as much or more from listening to you discuss your problems and aspirations than you will from hearing me.

STATE AND MUNICIPAL PROBLEMS

I want to assure you that many of us in Washington are acutely aware of the growing problems of the States and municipalities. We have been striving against some opposition by the administration to take steps to counter the recession. As you know, the President vetoed the rivers and harbors bill recently and thus eliminated the chance of starting on many worthy and necessary flood control and harbors projects. I would like to think otherwise, but I doubt very much that Congress will be able to override his veto. The Senate recently passed the community facilities bill, which I cosponsored, to expand the lending facilities for local public agencies and at lower interest in order that they might expand their efforts to improve physical conditions in their areas. The House has yet to act on this measure, but I am confident that it will pass. We have passed measures to speed up the highway program and the housing program. The Democratic members and some Republicans are ready to take all necessary action to assist the economy regain its stability.

I think that we are at a critical period in this country's history. Of course, every period is critical in some ways, but I think that this one is especially important because of the changing nature of our society. Not too many decades ago we were primarily a rural people with a majority of our people on farms. Recent studies have revealed that no more than 12 percent of our population now lives on farms and that the future holds further decreases. As you well know, this means that many of the people now living on farms will leave them to come to the city, and most of our children will find their livelihood there.

OVERCROWDING CITIES

I have heard eminent students of municipal problems state that the biggest national, and I emphasize national, problem for the future will be that involving large concentrations of population. As our people gather even closer together, using up some of our most fertile farmland, overtaking our highways, crowding our parks, requiring increasing amounts of electricity, gas, and other natural resources, we are going to have to face the fundamental political, economic, and social problems that such concentrations of population bring. We have not faced these problems adequately as yet and there are few signs that we will. It is a lamentable fact that we so frequently recognize our problems only when they reach scandalous proportions. The National Government should be planning to assist the States and the localities in providing for the necessary adjustments and expansion of facilities because these metropolitan areas far exceed the ability of any single community and often even any State to support. In many instances, the metropolitan region itself crosses State boundaries.

Your organization is one of the most important instruments in the improvement of community conditions. Your members have the experience and first hand knowledge of municipal problems. You know what it means when you talk about substandard housing, crowded streets, inadequate water supplies, poor zoning and planning, air and water pollution, and the myriad other conditions that people in urban areas experience. I believe that it is your responsibility to come up with ideas for meeting our problems. The Federal and State Governments may be effective instruments for assisting in projects beyond the financial resources of the local governments but they have no monopoly on ideas. Your leadership, your guidance, and perhaps even more important, your goading and pressure can make things happen and make them happen in such a way that they actually lead to suitable solutions to your problems.

NEED FOR PLANNING

I have dwelled on these general conditions at length, because I feel it is necessary to take the long view in considering our resources—human, industrial, and natural. We cannot plan our utilization of resources in traditional ways, becase the traditional society no longer exists. That is what some of our standpat friends refuse to recognize. They would have us treat a kitten and tiger the same way, because they are of the same family. I would suggest that the cat and the tiger are essentially different from each other, whatever their similarities, and that handling of them must be somewhat different. In the same way, large numbers of people living in a small area need essentially different kinds of programs or "handling" than they do when they are spread over an extensive area, in spite of the fact that they remain people. And we must keep in our minds the one fact that perhaps outweighs all others, and that is rapid increase in population. Present estimates indicate that the population of the United States will reach 212 million by 1975. And most of these new souls will be crammed, stuffed, squeezed, herded, and polluted in cities unless we make the necessary efforts and, although it is painful to everyone to mention it, the necessary expenditures.

TVA—EXAMPLE OF FORESIGHT

We have had in the Tennessee Valley one of the most farsighted resource programs that any nation or region has ever undertaken. The dream of the late George Norris, brought into being by the imaginative Franklin D. Roosevelt, the program is now 25 years old. It has virtually altered the face of the earth and certainly has altered the nature of our economy and our way of living. I do not have to tell you what the Tennessee Valley Authority has meant to all of us here and to the United States as a whole. But I am going to tell you, anyway, just so the record is clear in our minds. The TVA tamed a savage and unpredictable river that threatened every community, its property, and citizens every year. It made this river a thing to be used for the betterment of the people of the valley in countless ways. Instead of wreaking havoc, the waters of the river became a broad liquid highway to transport our goods to and from the markets of the Nation. Our citizens no longer feared the river but used it as a place for recreation and relaxation. And in cooperation with the Corps of Engineers, much the same thing has been done with the Cumberland River.

Certainly not the least important product of the TVA was the power produced at its dams. This relatively inexpensive power altered the economic system both on the farm and in the city. Where only 3 percent of our farms received electricity before TVA, now 95 percent of the farms receive it. New industry was attracted by our lower power rates and the burgeoning population of our cities was served with electrical energy. We are familiar, of course, with the extensive defense industrial development that was created owing to TVA power.

These direct benefits are enlarged immeasurably when one considers the collateral effects of TVA—the reforestation, the soil conservation, the advances in health, and other programs undertaken by the TVA in cooperation with the local and State governments. In sum, they constitute one of the greatest achievements in the history of the United States and provide a prototype for other regions which are beset with similar problems.

RESPONSIVE TO NEEDS

At the risk of belaboring the obvious, which is always the privilege of a speaker, I want to point out some other well-known facts. The Tennessee Valley Authority is unique in that it is a Federal agency not operated from Washington. Its headquarters are located in the valley, close to the going operations and the people who benefitted from its work. Thus, it was responsive to the needs of the communities and purposely set out to coop-

erate in a joint effort to alleviate suffering and improve economic and social conditions.

Secondly, the TVA takes unified approach to the natural-resource question. While other areas continue to suffer from jurisdictional disputes and differences in opinion regarding policies, the TVA resolves whatever differences there are within itself and approaches all of its resources programs on a unified basis. Here is a clear recognition of the fact that resources, soil, water, tree, and human are interrelated and that they must be approached with a recognition of their interaction.

Admittedly the TVA has run into obstacles that have prevented it from realizing the full measure of its being. This has been particularly true during the past 5 years under a relatively unfriendly administration and an extremely unfriendly Bureau of the Budget.

As a result of these obstacles, some people are urging other alternatives for carrying forward the programs formerly expected of the TVA, particularly in relation to the production of power. Some are proposing that municipalities, States, and power districts take on the responsibility. I feel this will be ultimately self-defeating because it destroys the very assumptions on which the TVA has operated and takes too short a view of human affairs. I am convinced, and I am sure many of you share the conviction and surely the hope, that the climate in Washington will not always be as negative toward TVA as it is at present.

BALANCE OF RESOURCES

The more serious question relates to the effect on unified basin development if we accept some of the schemes that have been proposed. As I stated before, the TVA and its programs has recognized the essential unity of all the elements of the basin—human and natural. The entire valley's resources were managed to provide for a maximization of man's benefit. While protecting the resource base, the TVA had a clear understanding that a variety of man's needs required satisfaction. Here was balance of resources management because of the integrated approach.

Why was the TVA able to accomplish this? I do not think that we can find the answer in either the kind of men who staffed the TVA or the form of organization alone, although these contributed heavily to its success. The essential fact was that the TVA was and is a national instrumentality reaching into many States affecting the lives of millions of people. TVA thus took a broad view rather than a narrowly parochial view concerning the development of resources. The valley and its people constituted its realm and no arbitrary boundaries or special localities determined its decisions. And I think we have all benefited from this point of view.

Other alternatives invariably involved the assumption of responsibility by a locally constituted organization representative of the major political and economic units receiving benefit from the TVA system. And usually such alternatives center their attention on power, without consideration of the other facets of TVA's program. I would like to ask one or two questions about such schemes.

CONFLICTS WOULD ARISE

First, what would become of the broad viewpoint I have discussed here? Let me tell you from many years of experience in legislative bodies that the ultimate result would be a splintering of the unity that has so characterized our efforts heretofore. Each unit represented would consider first—what is in it for me—rather than—will this proposal meet the needs of people throughout the valley? There would be a tendency, not necessarily out of selfishness but more out of unfamiliarity with the problems of others, to be concerned about local interests rather than the public interest. One power district or REA or municipality claiming that it is not receiving its share of power. The power interests claiming that the river was being managed for navigation to the detriment of power production. The shipping companies claiming that there was insufficient recognition of their needs.

Conflicts of this sort have arisen in the past of course. But they have been settled because the public interest was always kept in the foreground and the local and private interests were required to meet the standards which the public interest imposed. I am extremely fearful that we will be giving up this public spirit that has so stimulated our efforts in this valley. For contrast, one need only see what has happened in other major river valleys where there has been less than the public interest in view. The States of the upper basin and lower basin of the Colorado and States within the two basins are constantly in conflict over the terms of the Colorado River compact. The various interests along the Missouri, alined with their governmental spokesman, are never in agreement on Missouri River development programs. Other instances could be cited. I do not think we want to endanger our future by adoption of such programs which invite dissension.

FATE OF TVA?

Another important aspect of the problem relates to the ultimate fate of the Tennessee Valley Authority itself. If its power functions are stripped away, will the Authority continue its work in flood control, soil conservation, reforestation, navigation, and other activities? I have my doubts. The elimination of its power functions would be the first step in the dismemberment of TVA and its eventual destruction—a goal long sought by its enemies these many years. Power rates themselves would go up, up, up. Strong pressures would be created to return to the piecemeal approach to resource development and many of the existing programs would be reduced or eliminated entirely. The States of the valley would be required to undertake a much larger share of responsibility for resource development than is presently the case.

As you all know, all the valley Senators and Representatives, have sponsored what we consider to be the better way: self-financing for the TVA. The self-financing bill is now before the House of Representatives after having passed the Senate last year. I have every hope that such a bill will pass the House and be enacted into law. This bill would allow the TVA to issue revenue bonds for the construction of added power installations. Such a plan would allow the TVA to support its own expansion without having to obtain appropriations from Congress with all of its attendant difficulty. And certainly expansion is needed in view of the projected power needs of the valley. The TVA would remain intact as an organization and would continue to perform its many integrated programs. With appropriations, for its other related activities, we could expect a bright future for the valley.

FUTURE IN OUR HANDS

We all recognize that the Tennessee Valley Authority and other agencies of the Federal Government cannot insure prosperity of our State. They can and have contributed heavily to our well-being, but in the long-run our economic security lies in our own hands through the full development of our human and natural resources. We have perhaps done less than is possible to develop our resources and take adequate measures to meet our growing problems.

This meeting is evidence that there is a reawakening and desire to make up for lost time. I note that there has been considerable discussion of State and community planning and development programs at these sessions.

I note also that the Tennessee Municipal League has gone on record supporting larger appropriations for the department of economic development, the establishment of a Tennessee industrial building financing plan, and creation of a Tennessee dock authority. These activities are badly needed.

We have many serious economic problems in Tennessee. With coal mining and agriculture declining in economic importance, it is imperative that we find industrial outlets for our working population. We have a rapidly growing population, with many young people who are in need of opportunity here in Tennessee. It is a lamentable fact that so many of them are finding it necessary to leave the State in order to make a living. All of the States of the Union are in competition to obtain industry and we must take steps to insure that we are not deprived of our share of industrial expansion.

A DYNAMIC GOVERNMENT

In conclusion, I would like to encourage you in your efforts to use your Government at all levels to stimulate and expand your economic base. We have a tendency in this country to feel that governmental activity is somehow evil or a last resort. I think we should recognize that our governments have been instrumental in developing this Nation throughout our history: the railroads, atomic energy, technical assistance in agriculture, airlines, and many others. We should use our governments today to assist private enterprise in fulfilling its basic responsibility always maintaining sufficient safeguards to prevent abuse to provide the means of support for our expanding population and for higher standard of living. If our State government and the cities will develop the means to consult, to finance and administer cooperative programs, there is no reason why we cannot look to the future with confidence. You may be sure that if the States and municipalities do their share, the Federal Government will be forced to do what is necessary to supplement their efforts. I will certainly do all within my power to assist you from Washington.

Death of B. H. Peace, Greenville, S. C., Newspaper Publisher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the death of Mr. Charlie Peace last Thursday brought an untimely end to the career of one of South Carolina's finest citizens and ablest newspapermen. He was a man of rare vision and foresight who contributed a great deal to his community and region. He was an extremely friendly man and he had a great number of devoted friends who mourn his death.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials which express the sadness felt over his passing throughout South Carolina. The editorials are: Newspapers Are People—Charlie Peace, from the Greenville News of May 6; Charlie Peace, from the Columbia State of May 17; and Charlie Peace, from the Charleston News and Courier of May 17.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville (S. C.) News of May 16, 1958]

NEWSPAPERS ARE PEOPLE—CHARLIE PEACE

(By Wayne W. Freeman)

Throughout most of his career as a newspaper executive, Charlie Peace was concerned primarily with the business and mechanical side of the complex publishing operation. Since his days as a youth in his late father's commercial printing plant, machinery had fascinated him.

As vice president and general manager of the News-Piedmont Co., he had personally shopped for most of the multitude of machines required to produce the two newspapers, and he probably knew more about them than anyone other than the men who operate and maintain them.

But as valuable as was this contribution to the common task and as much as it was appreciated, it is the memory of another side of his character that his associates will cherish as long as they themselves live: Charlie Peace, the generous, hearty, fun-loving, understanding, and compassionate human being.

In discussing newspapers and what makes them, Mr. Peace almost invariably would observe, "newspapers are people."

For all of his preoccupation with other matters, he never forgot nor let anyone else forget that the men and women who write and edit the copy, run the machines, and produce and deliver the final product were the most important element in the success of the paper as a community institution.

Thus it is that in the death of Charlie Peace the officers, executives, and employees of our publishing company have lost more than a business and professional associate. The greater loss is that of a close and beloved friend.

Part of this characteristic, too, was his boundless love for children and, invariably, children who came within range of his radiant affection for childhood returned his love.

His friends of all ages were literally legion, not only in this community and State but throughout the United States and even in Canada, where he had many dealings with manufacturers of newsprint. Wherever newspapermen gathered in their professional conferences, Charlie Peace was known. Usually he was there and, when he wasn't, members of the News-Piedmont staff were greeted on all sides with, "How's Charlie?"

Mr. Peace was a newspaperman from his boyhood. As a youth, he and his brothers were instrumental in their father's acquiring The Greenville News to make it a forceful influence in the Piedmont Carolinas. From the old Peace Printing Co., he went to the News as a proofreader and set out to learn all phases of the operation.

It was natural that he should move gradually into the business and production side exclusively. He played a big part in the steady growth in the circulation of the News and in the renovation and expansion of the Piedmont after the company acquired it in 1927.

Production, however, was his first love, and as the years passed he devoted more and more of his time to the expansion and improvement of the mechanical plant. He literally roamed the country in search of new ideas, better techniques and better machines for doing the job.

And wherever he went, on a business trip or to the beach home he loved, each edition of the papers was sent to him and he read them meticulously.

As far as we know, Mr. Charlie never wrote an editorial or a news story, but he knew when they were done right and he was quick to spot a mistake. Reporters and editors alike found him a kindly critic and a strong backer when controversy arose or the going otherwise got a little rough.

After the News-Piedmont Co. acquired the Asheville Citizen-Times Publishing Co., he became its president and gave to that responsibility the same sort of devotion he had given to the Greenville operation. His basic tenet there, as here, was that the newspapers belonged to the community and that the publishers should give the community the kind of newspapers it wanted and needed.

Although the press was his great love, Mr. Peace gave much of himself and his substance to the community and region in other ways. Many were his acts of charity and philanthropy, and as often as not those who benefited never knew the identity of their benefactor.

Many years ago he saw the importance of aviation to Greenville's future. He accepted appointment to the Greenville Airport Commission. He participated in the vision of a modern airport which became a reality with the cooperation of other officials and the public. And with his colleagues he was looking to the age of the jet transport.

Such at a glance was the 54-year lifespan of a man who loved life more and lived it more fully than most who are spared long beyond the allotted three score and ten.

Those of us who lived with him, worked with him and played with him are conscious of a great loss. We are comforted by the knowledge that the loss is shared by the community and that he might say, in the words of George Crabbe in The Village:

"Life is not measured by the time we live."

[From the Columbia (S. C.) State of May 17, 1958]

CHARLIE PEACE

Charlie Peace was a newspaperman by inheritance and by love. He came from a newspaper family; he would have been unhappy in any other work.

Jovial—given to being in a happy mood—he was nonetheless serious when the occasion demanded it. His fellow journalists recognized his leadership by making him president of the South Carolina Press Association; he held important committee appointments from the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association, and his own family called upon him to assume responsible executive duties as vice president and manager of the Greenville News-Piedmont, and president of the Asheville Citizen-Times.

In the last year or so, ill health had curbed Mr. Peace's activities, but this did not lessen his keen interest in successful operation of the newspapers, and other properties with which he was identified, nor did it cause him to lose his enthusiasm for Greenville and for South Carolina, in which he had so much faith, and in whose upbuilding he had done his share.

There are many to mourn the loss of Charlie Peace. He was a friend, indeed; a man with a big heart whose fine qualities were appreciated by those of us who had the privilege of knowing him and evaluating his real worth.

May God rest his kindly soul.

[From the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of May 17, 1958]

CHARLIE PEACE

Three sons of the late B. H. Peace have carried on the newspaper business he bought in Greenville and expanded it through the years. The death of Charlie Peace at the age of 54 has removed one of the brothers from a successful family enterprise.

Jovial of manner and friendly in approach, Charlie Peace was well known among newspaper people not only in South Carolina but elsewhere in the profession. He had been assigned to all departments of the Greenville News and Piedmont, and was general manager of the two papers since 1939. When the Asheville Citizen and Times were bought in 1953, he became president of the enterprise. Mr. Peace also was a director of the company operating the Peace radio and television stations.

Fond of jokes and a good time, Charlie Peace was good company when newspapermen got together. We shall miss him.

The Secretary: Today and Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently the National Association and Council of Business Schools held its nationwide contest to select the outstanding secretary of 1958. In many parts of the country these contests were held until at last the three finalists were brought to Washington. These three who entered the final contest here were: Mrs. Mary M. Smith, Huntsville, Ala.; Miss Johanne Curran, Washington, D. C.; Miss Leatrice U. Youth, Hawaii.

The final requirement in the contest was a brief comment on the subject assigned to them on short notice. The subject on which each one was asked to speak was The Secretary: Today and Tomorrow. At the conclusion of the three short talks the final vote was taken. The one chosen as Miss Secretary of 1958 was Mrs. Mary Matthews Smith, of Huntsville, Ala.

Mrs. Smith is the very competent secretary to Mr. Joseph Pelham, chief of the test and inspection department of the Thiokol Chemical Corp., Redstone Division, Huntsville, Ala. This company's work is an essential part of the great missile program that is being carried on at Redstone Arsenal.

Huntsville and that whole area are proud of Mary Smith and were delighted to see her crowned as Miss Secretary of 1958.

I believe all of us would be interested in the brief speech made by Mrs. Smith on the subject The Secretary: Today and Tomorrow. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY: TODAY AND TOMORROW

Today, the secretary holds a unique position in the American business world. She is not included in the vast rank and file of office workers nor in the echelons of management; she hangs suspended between these two factions. She types, takes and transcribes dictation, and files (all tasks of her clerical sisters). Equally often, she accounts, originates correspondence, and manages the office (all tasks of her management brothers). She has long strived for recognition of her unique position as a profession. One of the movements for this recognition is the certified professional secretary program. Under this program, CPS certificates are issued to candi-

dates in the secretarial field who pass a 12-hour battery of examinations. CPS is to secretaries what CPA is to a accountants.

The secretary of tomorrow will, of course, benefit in many ways from the efforts being made today toward professionalization. It is my opinion, too, that the secretary of tomorrow (and I refer to the very near future) will leave her suspended position and move upward into the ranks of the recognized junior executive. If she is to have this recognition—she must merit it. I believe the most expeditious way in which she can prepare for this elevated status is through specialized training—training offered by our business schools.

And so, ladies, and gentlemen, I present this challenge to you: Give her the training she needs and she will be a credit to you, to your schools, to your firms, and to the National Association and Council of Business Schools.

Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as a longtime supporter of statehood for Alaska, I was pleased and proud to be a member of the Senate Territories Subcommittee which favorably reported to the Senate the measure which would make Alaska the 49th State of the Union.

In recent weeks editorial comment throughout the country has pointed up the widespread support of the American people for legislation granting statehood to our great northern Territory. Because the Senate and the House will soon have an opportunity to vote on this issue, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent editorial which succinctly expresses the compelling reasons in favor of Alaska statehood. The editorial, entitled "Statehood for Alaska," appeared in the Northern Virginia Sun, Arlington, for May 14, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Northern Virginia Sun of May 14, 1958]

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

It is extremely probable that Congress will decide on the question of Alaskan statehood before the end of this month. The decision in part rests on the abilities of Representative CLAIR ENGLE (Democrat of California), and Representative LEO W. O'BRIEN, Democrat of New York, to untangle the redtape wrapped around the issue by the powerful House Rules Committee, headed by Virginia's Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, of Broad Run, who is unalterably opposed to the idea.

The arguments for Alaskan statehood, we think are numerous and logical; the arguments against not so numerous and not so logical.

Free enterprise in Alaska squirms under the provisions of musty outmoded laws which are hardly based upon the presumption that Alaska is an integral part of this Nation's future. For example the fishing industry, and 1 of every 3 Alaskans makes his living from the seas, has chafed under the control of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, a control which does not apply in the fashion to the domestic fishing industry.

Alaska is important to us because of its mineral wealth. Of 33 metals the United States considers strategic, 31 exist in great quantities there, as well as untapped oilfields, abundant farming land and a host of valuable raw materials.

The opponents of statehood for Alaska defend their view with such general arguments as "it's not ready for statehood," or "it's too small and sparsely populated," and "it's not contiguous to this country, being separated from the State of Washington by British Columbia.

These, however, do not reveal the real reasons for the Congressional opposition to Alaskan statehood, most of which comes from Congressmen and Senators who fear that the new Representative and the two new Senators that the new State of Alaska would send to Congress might not share either their political philosophy or their political party affiliation.

It seems a pity that such wholly political considerations should overshadow the fact that Alaskans share in rich measure the pioneer spirit that built this Nation. Congress, it seems to us, should recognize that spirit by granting Alaska the statehood she so richly deserves.

Anti-Semitism Disturbs South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a news article and an editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal, which I hope will clarify any misconceptions about anti-Semitism in the South.

The article and editorial follow:

ANTI-SEMITISM DISTURBS SOUTH—JEWS HAD CLOSE LINK WITH CONFEDERACY—HISTORY BOOKS CITED

(By Milton Friedman)

WASHINGTON, May 8.—Millions of southerners sentimentally linked with the Confederacy are fighting mad. They are angered by the use of the name "Confederate Underground" by hoodlums dynamiting synagogues.

Southerners with authentic attachment to the Old South are indignant that the new self-styled Confederates are giving the Confederacy a bad name. By dynamiting Jewish religious institutions, including synagogues founded many years ago, the unknown terrorists have offended southern sensibilities.

VOICED IN EDITORIALS

Such sentiments have been voiced in newspaper editorials throughout the South. They have been reflected in official Washington by southern Members of Congress. Most southerners oppose the integration of Negroes in public education. But to them, such violent anti-Semitism is alien to the southern tradition.

Southerners have mustered history books to support a case that the Confederacy was freer of anti-Semitism than the "Abolitionist" North. There is evidence. Horace Greely's Abolitionist New York Tribune read like the "Der Sturmer" of its day. Anti-Semitism among Abolitionists was such that the northern Jewish leader, Simon Wolf, sought action against these (anti-Semitic) manifestations radiating from the highest official circles.

A scholarly Jewish study of the Civil War concluded that "the volume of Abolitionist anti-Semitism exceeded southern bias, and its proponents were sometimes men of stellar prominence."

HARANGUE WAS PROTECTED

An anti-Semitic harangue delivered in the Senate in Civil War days was such that the Jewish community of Washington held a mass protest meeting. The speech was made by Senator Henry Wilson, of Massachusetts. Gen. U. S. Grant, northern commander, was ordered by President Abraham Lincoln to withdraw an anti-Semitic order issued to troops. The anti-Semitism of Yankee Gen. Benjamin Butler was notorious. Jews under his command were court-martialed in the manner of France's Dreyfus trial.

Like Americans of all faiths, Jews were found on both sides in the Civil War. Loyal to their region, the Jews of the South served the Confederacy to the extent that a Jew was Secretary of State and later actually Premier of the Confederacy. He was Judah P. Benjamin.

The Memphis Daily Appeal reported in 1861 that "the Israelites of Memphis are behind none in showing their devotion to the South, both by liberal contributions and by taking up arms in her defense."

At the Battle of Seven Pines, a 19-year-old Jewish youth, Albert Moses, of North Carolina, seized the Stars and Bars from a dying flagbearer and rallied his company. He died heroically.

Judge A. T. Watts, of Dallas, wrote of MAX Frankenthal of the 16th Mississippi Infantry. He said that Frankenthal, "a little Jew, had the heart of a lion. For several hours he stood at the immediate point of contact, amid the most terrific hail of lead, and cooly and deliberately loaded and fired, without cringing. I observed his unflinching bravery and constancy." Frankenthal later became a leader of the United Confederate Veterans.

NO PART OF THE SOUTH

Abba Eben, Israel's Ambassador to the United States, will speak in Memphis on May 28 when the 10th anniversary of Israel's national birth will be observed.

Governor Clement, of Tennessee, will also speak.

The committee planning the celebration is made up of leading citizens of Memphis of both the Jewish and Christian faiths. All are Americans.

We cite this because of a false belief current in some areas that anti-Semitism is becoming more prevalent in the South. If it is, we haven't noticed it, and we try to make a point of keeping informed on all types of subversion.

Deeply impressed on the minds of Memphians a few days ago was the sacrifice of a young Jewish citizen who gave his life trying to save his Christian neighbor.

Anti-Semitism has never marred the Memphis scene and the South is not the fertile ground for its evil growth as other sections have been. We published some observations by Milton Friedman, of the Jewish Telegraph Agency, on this subject a few days ago, especially as it pertained to the Confederacy. He cited the South's anger over the use of the name "Confederate Underground" by dynamiters who have used schools and synagogues as targets.

He reminded us that a Jew, Judah P. Benjamin, was Secretary of State of the Confederacy. "The Memphis Daily Appeal," he said, "reported in 1861 that 'the Israelites of Memphis are behind none in showing their devotion to the South, both by liberal contributions and by taking up arms in her defense.'"

Mr. Friedman declares that millions of southerners sentimentally linked with the Confederacy are angered by the use of the name "Confederate Underground" by hoodlums dynamiting synagogues. He can be sure of that.

The South doesn't like hoodlumism in any guise, night-shirted or otherwise. It has driven the Klan into the jails and impotency. It will deal as vigorously with any self-styled "Confederate Underground" and doubly so because of the profanation of an honored name.

When Israel's Ambassador Abba Eben comes into the South, into Tennessee, and into Memphis he will find himself among people who have a special feeling for others with aspirations of freedom and the courage to strive for it. He will be among friends.

More Community Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have letters from two officials of Wisconsin communities which give further proof of the need for speedy enactment of the Community Facilities Act, which already has passed the Senate.

One is from Mayor H. J. Wachsmuth of the city of Bayfield, a community with a population of about 1,000, who says that his city can comply with a requirement of the State of Wisconsin that it build a sewage disposal plant if the city can borrow the necessary funds at 3½ percent interest over 50 years' time. That is what the Community Facilities Act would make possible.

The second is from Village Clerk Bert Wester of the village of Belgium, who tells of several projects that his community can construct with Federal help.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these letters be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CITY OF BAYFIELD,
Bayfield County, Wis., May 10, 1958.
Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I thank you for your letter of May 2, and in reply the city of Bayfield has a problem that maybe you can help us on.

The State of Wisconsin is compelling the city to construct a sewer disposal plant. The plant will cost about $175,000. The Federal Government will give us a grant of $47,255.70 for said construction. Now, we have to sell bonds in the amount of about $121,000. The bonding company wants 5½ percent interest and will only give us $96 for a $100 bond, which will make our interest almost 10 percent.

The city now owes about $70,000 including some school bonds. Now, if we have to bond ourselves for the disposal plant we will owe near $200,000, our water tax of $27 per year and sewer tax of $6 will have to be doubled to pay for bonds.

We have about 340 homes of which about 60 occupied by 1 person, mostly widows who have a very limited income, and about 50 homes occupied by 2 people with small income.

I feel that Bayfield does not need a disposal plant. First, all our water comes from artesian wells; second, we have a very good current which takes all the sewage out into the laks, no sewage on the bottom or on the shores. Lake Superior is the largest disposal plant in the world.

Ashland and Washburn are on the bay where the sewage settles on the bottom and they drink the lake water after treated with chlorine. If we have to pay this heavy tax Bayfield will be a ghost town in a short time. The lamprey eel has ruined our fishing so that our income from that is cut 50 percent. The Bayfield Canning Co. will not operate any more, the only industry now operating is the All-Wood Manufacturing Co., which employs about 30 when they are operating.

If we could sell bonds on a 50-year plan at about 3½ percent interest, we could put it on the tax roll, and pay same with real estate taxes. Your cooperation will be appreciated.

With kind personal regards, I remain,
Very respectfully,
H. J. WACHSMUTH,
Mayor, City of Bayfield.

VILLAGE OF BELGIUM,
Belgium, Wis., May 12, 1958.
Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: In recent weeks we have noticed articles in the newspapers referring to legislation which the Government is contemplating to provide aid to municipalities which are in need of various projects, such as, sewer, water works and municipal buildings.

At our last general election, a referendum authorizing municipal water works for the village of Belgium at a cost of $160,000 was defeated. Village officials felt the reason for defeat of the referendum was the fact that we have a $55,000 indebtedness on the sewer at the present time. This plus the cost of the water works would encounter too large a tax rate increase. Our present evaluation is $1,287,000.

Now it becomes evident that the village of Belgium is also greatly in need of a municipal building for village offices, fire department housing, and recreational facilities.

The village board feels that if Federal aid is restored, these projects could be undertaken.

Kindly let us know what has been done in this regard and what is required of the village of Belgium to obtain aid of this kind, if such legislation is approved.

Respectfully yours,
BERT WESTER,
Village Clerk, Village of Belgium,
Belgium, Wis.

The Agricultural Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOS. E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, one of the ablest students of American agriculture is the dean of the College of Agriculture at Purdue University, the Honorable Earl L. Butz. He was formerly Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

Agriculture is experiencing a technological and scientific revolution. The productivity of our farms is increasing at an astounding rate. Today's agriculture has required a great increase in the investments in tools and equipment for each individual farm. Dean Butz shows that on many of our more efficient farms, the investment per worker is as high as $75,000 to $100,000. The capital investment per worker in American industry is approximately $15,000. The agricultural revolution will progress regardless of political considerations.

Dean Butz presented a review of the problems confronting agriculture in an address at the 46th annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States last month. I found his analysis of such interest that I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. President, I have been informed by the Public Printer that the text exceeds 2 pages, and would make 3 pages, which would cost $243 to print in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the additional cost, the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AGRICULTURAL DILEMMA

(By Earl L. Butz, Dean, College of Agriculture, Purdue University, former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture)

Agricultural technology and farm belt politicians have squared off for a major tug of war.

Modern agricultural science and technology are bringing far-reaching sociological and economic changes. This, of course, calls for adjustment in our whole agri-business complex. And adjustment is always painful.

Many farm politicians direct their energies essentially toward maintenance of the status quo. This will be increasingly true during the next decade, as cries of pain from inevitable economic and sociological adjustment reach sensitive political ears along the Potomac.

The main effect of many governmental programs in agriculture is to slow down adjustment to change that would take place in the absence of such programs.

Agriculture is in the midst of a far-reaching scientific and technological revolution which is shaking the very foundations of its traditional institutional patterns.

We are now experiencing the third great agricultural revolution in this country. The first came in the middle of the 19th century, when we substituted animal power for human power. This change permitted a significant increase in productivity per man on our farms. It caused the dislocation of some farm workers, but the change took place slowly enough that adjustments were accomplished without political interference.

The second great revolution in American agriculture occurred beginning in the 1920's, with the substitution of mechanical power for animal power. This change likewise brought a tremendous increase in productivity per worker. Again the change occurred slowly enough that we were able, in the main, to take it in our stride.

Agriculture is now in the midst of its third great revolution. It is changing from a way of living to a way of making a living. It is changing from a business of arts and

crafts to a business undergirded with large amounts of science and technology. Productivity per worker on our commercial farms is increasing phenomenally. Still greater increases lie ahead, as we substitute more capital and technology for labor.

THE DILEMMA WE FACE

The dilemma we face, therefore, is this: Will the people who man the farms of America be permitted to share fully in the benefits growing out of modern science and technology, or must they live with a ceiling over opportunity imposed by governmental programs designed to maintain small, inefficient, often peasant-type production and living units on the land?

The industrial revolution of the past half century bypassed much of agriculture. The agricultural industry, even though mechanizing and increasing its output per worker remarkably, still remained organized typically around the relatively small entrepreneurial family-type unit. In this respect the industry was, and still is, fairly unique among the major industries of America. A large number of these individual units—perhaps more than half of them—are so small or so inefficient as not to yield their operators a living standard generally regarded as adequate. Yet they have survived, one way or another. The traditional institutional pattern of owner-manager-operator, combined in a single person, has not been seriously challenged by developments associated with the industrial revolution.

The present agricultural revolution, resting on basic science and closely allied with the widespread advance of automation in both production and distribution, is threatening the traditional pattern of owner-manager-operator all wrapped up in a single person.

This is the very basis for much of today's social and political unrest in agriculture.

FACETS OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENTS

There are five fundamental characteristics of the current agricultural adjustment which bear on the problem under discussion. These adjustments are the inevitable result of the scientific and technological revolution in modern agriculture. The pressure behind these adjustments is building up each year.

1. Capital requirements for agriculture will grow, in total, per farm, and per man. Capital requirements have now grown to the extent that it is becoming increasingly difficult for an individual, during his productive years, to accumulate a sufficient amount to finance an economically sized operating unit. This will become increasingly true in the decades ahead.

Many family commercial farms today have total capital investment exceeding $100,000. It's not uncommon to have capital investment approaching or exceeding $200,000 on family commercial farms in the Corn Belt.

Last year a group of 273 family commercial farmers throughout central Indiana kept records in cooperation with Purdue University. Their average size was 280 acres. They had a total capital investment per farm that exceeded $95,000. These farms used labor so efficiently that they averaged only 1¾ men per farm on an annual basis, including the operator. This means that on these farms there was an investment per worker in excess of $55,000. Many of the individual farms had an investment per worker that went up as high as $75,000 to $100,000. But the average for the entire group was $55,000 per worker. A comparable figure for investment per worker in American industry is approximately $15,000. This means that it takes between 3 and 4 times as much capital investment to create one agricultural job on our good family commercial farms in central Indiana as it does in American industry.

As agricultural science continues to advance, it is inevitable that the business units in agriculture will get bigger and bigger with still larger amounts of capital required. This trend cannot be stopped. Nor should it be. We must adjust our farm institutions and our farm programs to it, so as to capture such benefits as will flow from it.

2. The trend toward larger and fewer commercial farm units will continue. Machines will continue to displace men on our farms. We will produce more with fewer farms and fewer workers than at present.

This is not a new trend. It has been going on for decades. It has only been accelerated in the present decade. It will accelerate still more in the decade ahead. All the power of government and politics cannot stop it. Nor should it. It can only confuse the issue.

As our farms become larger and more specialized, with total investment per unit pushing hard against a quarter of a million dollars, there will be growing pressure on the combination of owner-manager-operator in one man, as the typical institutional pattern of farm operation.

We have departed from this pattern in the majority of other major business sectors of America. Time was we had many family entrepreneurial foundry shops, tailor shops, bootmakers, corner grocery stores, and yes, even automobile assembly plants. These have given way, in the main, to larger units, with more capital, with higher levels of management, with more specialization of labor, and, if you choose, with a higher degree of integration. In the main, when such changes have occurred, opportunities for profit and for higher living have increased for owners, for managers, and for workers. Some individuals were injured in the adjustment, but on the whole, society gained.

It is not necessary to dwell at length on the difficulty of passing a $200,000 farm unit intact from father to son, without pausing at least to catch one's breath as he passes the tax collector.

Moreover, if the son has to face the prospect himself of getting on top of this kind of capital structure, perhaps by paying off 2 or 3 other heirs in the family, he may choose to spend more of his current income in living and less in saving, than his father before him chose to do. This means that he will be not only willing, but anxious, to enter into some kind of financial arrangement whereby a third party puts up some of the capital, or perhaps becomes a financial partner, on a permanent basis, at the time of father's death.

Managerial capacity is even more difficult to pass from father to son than is accumulated capital. Management is now the critical factor in successful farm operation, and this means a highly specialized kind of management.

Fathers do not necessarily breed managerial capacity into their sons. A generation or two ago it was not difficult for son to apprentice under father and take over the family farm, provided son had a strong constitution and a propensity for hard physical work. The latter factors are no longer limiting. The limiting factor now is managerial capacity.

It is equally true that fathers don't necessarily breed vocational preference into their sons. With the growing tendency for farm youth to be educated beyond the high school, many farm-reared youngsters will have their vocational preference tipped away from the 3-in-1 farmer their father was. They might prefer to train themselves for manager, for manager-operator, for part owner-operator with some integrator supplying part of the capital and part of the management, or for some combination of these.

The point is that economies that inevitably come from specialized, well-financed, and well-managed farm units of this kind will make it increasingly difficult for the undersized, undercapitalized, undermanaged, quasi-self-sufficient farm unit to survive in the competitive struggle. The operator on such a farm will be under increasing pressure to improve his lot in life and better provide for his family by making vocational adjustments rather than agricultural adjustments.

This kind of vocational shift has been going on for generations. It will accelerate in the decade ahead.

3. Management has become the key factor in successful farm operation: This is in sharp contrast to a generation or two ago, when the farm unit was much more self-sufficient than now, with much less capital involved, with much less science applied, and with many fewer critical managerial decisions to be made.

The typical cycle of farm ownership and operation under our present system of fee simple ownership by individuals is essentially the life cycle of an individual. In the main, our farms need to be rather completely refinanced each generation. But still more important, with the process of refinancing usually comes a shift in management and operation. This is seldom accomplished without considerable disruption of the farm as a going concern. This disruptive process in transfer will increase as the size of unit grows, as financing becomes more difficult, and as the importance increases of maintaining a unit large enough to be economically efficient.

Industry has met this problem by having divisible shares of ownership which in many cases are not even remotely related to management or to operation. This permits passing ownership from one generation to the next without disrupting management or operation. This permits the accumulation under single management and single operation, or under single management and multiple operation, of units so large as to be beyond the capacity of the ordinary individual to accumulate in his productive years, and yet large enough to attain the economies associated with scale of operation.

The pressure is in this direction in commercial agriculture.

This does not necessarily mean the growth of corporate farms. This may be accomplished in a number of ways. We shall see the growth of family shares of ownership of the family farm, instead of placing the farm in an estate to be sold as a unit. The family shares will be transferable, so that one of the heirs, wishing to convert his inheritance to some other form of property, may sell his share to a third party who may be entirely outside the family. But in this way the farm unit will remain intact. Thus what starts off as essentially a family-owned farm may end up as a farm under group ownership, but still as a single unit and single operation, with single management for the entire unit. Increasingly, on units of this kind, management will be provided by a professional management group, standing between the individual owners and the operator of the farm. This is, of course, a kind of integration we have seen develop in recent years, although we haven't called it by that name.

Another way of meeting this problem is single operation of multiple tract ownership. The operator may be either a part owner or a complete tenant. In either event, he shares with others part of the traditional owner-manager-operator function. He surrenders certain freedoms and privileges in the process, but he gains greater rewards in return.

It is obvious from the above analysis that we will continue to develop a professional management group in agriculture. This

won't necessarily be at the level of the general professional farm manager. The big growth will be in enterprise managers. After all, integration generally involves single enterprises, not whole farms.

Witness the managerial arrangements in contract broiler production, fruit and vegetable production under contract with canneries or freezing plants, and other specialized types of agricultural production where management can be easily separated as a package and assigned to someone other than the producer himself.

This may alter the traditional entrepreneurial, risk-taking function of the individual farmer. It may even move him in the direction of a quasi-riskless, semiguaranteed wage earner. But this is not necessarily bad, per se. He may be, and frequently is, better off this way than he was before.

We often pride ourselves on being a nation of entrepreneurs. But we really aren't. We are no longer a Nation of self-employed people. Of our total personal income payments in this country, more than two-thirds now come from salaries and wages. Less than one-sixth comes from rents, interest, and royalties—payment for ownership of property. Likewise, less than one-sixth arises from entrepreneurial income. In this are included farmers, small shop owners, self-employed artisans, and the like. The percentage of our income from entrepreneurial sources is constantly decreasing. But this doesn't make us a poorer Nation. We grow constantly wealthier, in the aggregate and on a per capita basis, as this shift progresses. Therefore, we should not automatically condemn as bad for agriculture a change which has really been beneficial to the rest of the economy.

4. The commercial farm will increasingly assume the characteristics of a manufacturing establishment. In these farm units the manager will spend much of his time and energy assembling packages of technology which have been produced by others on a custom basis. The share of total farm receipts spent for production items will increase still further, the gross margin per dollar of receipts will become narrower, and profits will depend increasingly on growing volume. This will place still more pressure on the smaller and less productive farm units.

5. Our countryside will be "rurbanized." Our modern science and technology have made it possible for farm and city folk to live alongside each other in our newly "rurbanized" communities. The effect of the resulting intermingling has been that there is no longer a clearly defined farm population and an industrial population, especially within 40 or 50 miles driving distance of our big industrial centers, and that includes practically the whole eastern and central parts of the country.

Today the commercial farmer not only takes on the financial aspects of a big businessman, but because he now associates with businessmen and laborers who live nearby him in the country and whose children go to the same school, increasingly this farmer is beginning to think like they do.

For many years in our city communities the doctor has lived beside the lawyer, beside the machine operator, beside the bricklayer, beside the schoolteacher, and each has lost his vocational identity as a member of his community. So it will tend to be with our commercial farmers in the newly "rurbanized" communities. The farmer-businessman will live beside the urban businessman, the urban industrial worker, and the urban professional man, with a decreasing emphasis on vocational differences among them.

Ultimately they will lose their vocational identity as members of the community. At this point farming will no longer be a way of life, but will be a way of making a living, just the same as other business enterprises.

THE POLITICAL PREFERENCE FOR SMALLNESS

Political leaders will resist the trend toward large, well capitalized units in agriculture, both in their oratory, in their congressional hearings, and in their legislation. The philosophy of the small, owner-operated family farm is deeply ingrained in our social and political mores. The controversy over this issue is often more emotional than economic. Political pressures will continue to be on the side of maintaining small family farms, even though modern technology dictates strongly that family farms become larger.

Witness, for example, the language in the report of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations of the House of Representatives issued March 28, 1958, as report No. 1584. I quote from page 4:

"ELIMINATION OF SMALL FARMER NO ANSWER

"A job in town is no answer to the problems of the low-income farmer. * * * Yet the principal efforts of the department (U. S. D. A.) during the past few years have been directed toward urging farm families to obtain off-farm employment and to move off their small farms.

"To leave the farm for town under present conditions would only swell the unemployment rolls. * * * As a matter of fact, it may soon be necessary to start thinking in terms of moving people back to the farms where they can at least find food and shelter.

"Further, moving the small farmers off their farms will have very little effect on the level of agricultural production. The small farms contribute very little if any to surpluses. * * *

"Therefore if all small farmers were removed from their farms, and their land were allowed to remain idle, the maximum possible reduction of surpluses would be 9 percent. It is probable, however, that land released from small farmers would be added to larger producing units which, being more efficient, would increase production on that land and thereby further increase surpluses."

Seldom has the language been plainer in any congressional report that political influence will be on the side of preserving small, inefficient, low-income units on the land, even though it is clearly indicated that agricultural efficiency would be increased by reversing the trend and even though it has been clearly demonstrated that farm families who find themselves in this situation and who can make vocational adjustment usually improve their economic status.

There is no prospect that ambitious politicians in Congress will stop demagoging the emotionally explosive family farm issue, any time in the foreseeable future.

On the other hand, we are all familiar with the fact that something over half of our farm units in the United States are so small or so inefficient that they don't yield their operators a decent standard of living. It's economically impossible for them to do so.

LET'S BE SENSIBLE, NOT EMOTIONAL

We must help the marginal farmer and the operator of an undersized acreage to become a better and more efficient farmer, or failing that, to find opportunity in other fields where he is better suited and where his income opportunities are larger.

There are some people who just weren't cut out to be farmers, just as other people don't make successful machinists, carpenters, or salesmen.

It is not at all coldblooded to suggest to a farmer that he seek other employment if he can't make a good living in farming. It is really coldblooded to attempt through legislative programs to keep him tied to a farm which everyone knows is inadequate to provide a decent living for himself and his family. People in other jobs and in other professions take this kind of healthy competition in their stride. And they usually improve their lot in life. Many low-income farmers can and will do the same if they are given the opportunity, and if the politicians will stay out of their hair.

In many areas of the country, in the years ahead, there will be a job waiting in industry, a job with good pay, for the farmer or member of his family who finds that farming is not his long suit. And if his children want to go into engineering, into medicine, into teaching, or into the skilled crafts in the city, they'll find a position there when they finish school. There's nothing dishonorable about this kind of vocational shift. It has been taking place ever since the founding of the Nation. Without it, our high level of living would have been impossible. We would have been a nation of peasants, with each family tied to its small acreage of land. We would have advanced little beyond the current status of major agrarian populations in the Near East and the Far East.

Most of our low-income farm families on our more than 2 million small-scale, part-time, or residential farms get little or no direct benefits from price support and commodity stabilization programs. They are almost completely bypassed by the expensive commodity price-support programs the Government operates. Likewise, the Soil Bank doesn't have much to offer them. By the same token, their hope does not lie in easier and less expensive credit.

A large share of these farm units, although classified in agriculture, are operated by farm people who really need more opportunity to improve their situation either through enlargement of the individual farm business or by additional employment off the farm. Many of these people are so situated that the solution of their problem must be found outside agriculture. Indeed, for all practical purposes, many of them have already left agriculture. We just haven't stopped counting them. They are increasingly turning to off-farm employment as their principal sources of income. Yet, unprincipled politicians will continue to agitate their nostalgia for the smalltime farming of yesteryear.

At the end of the Civil War, President Lincoln instructed General Grant to disband the Army and see to it that every soldier who wanted it could have 40 acres and a mule.

A CEILING OVER OPPORTUNITY

The modern counterpart of this philosophy is found in the politics of equal shares, when the Government rations the right to produce wheat, cotton, rice, tobacco, peanuts, and corn—the six basic commodities.

It becomes increasingly difficult for the individual operator effectively to apply sound management principles and to take advantage of advancing science and technology available to him.

Consider for a moment what production allotments are doing to some of our farmers. The rationing of the right to produce among smaller and smaller production allotments results in a large number of relatively inefficient production units. This tends to raise unit production costs for the entire production. As a result, important sectors of agricultural production, in our most sicentific and mechanized agriculture in the world, now find they are being undersold in foreign markets by underdeveloped areas of the world.

In attempting to eliminate the risk of price variation, the system of high price supports we have been following for our basic crops has sacrificed income stability. In other words, we are in danger of sacrificing income security for the illusion of price security.

This is a risk agriculture cannot afford to carry. Yet it is a path inevitably trodden by the high price-support politican. Under this system, increasing numbers of growers who are efficient, ambitious, and capable, must live with a ceiling over opportunity imposed by their Government.

When we have relatively little Government interference, and the dollar bill is used as a ration ticket, each individual is issued tickets roughly in proportion to his contribution to society. There is a strong incentive for everyone to maximize his personal contribution in order to secure a greater claim against the total product of society. But when Government takes over and rations the right to produce or the right to consume, a new criterion is established in the distribution of such rights. Politics dictate that we move in the direction of equal shares for everyone. Under this system we experience a gradual impairment of the individual incentive to produce and to grow.

Because prices and quotas are nearly always fixed with reference to a historical base, it is difficult if not impossible to maintain the flexibility in fixed prices necessary to permit desirable adjustments to changing technology. This nearly always means less efficient utilization of resources than would occur under a free pricing system.

Let us sit for a moment alongside producers of our so-called basic crops and think through their problems. Many such producers have so small an allotment that they find it difficult to meet operating and living costs with production so curtailed.

A cotton farmer with his 3-acre allotment, a tobacco farmer with his half-acre allotment, or a wheat farmer with an allotment of only 60 percent of what he used to grow, needs something besides 90 percent of parity. One hundred percent of parity won't solve his problem. There isn't much that any kind of price support program can do for him. His big need is for an opportunity to expand production. But his Government prevents him from producing enough to make a decent living.

A GOVERNMENT PERMIT TO FARM

Let us consider for a moment the case of a wheat farmer and his son. This is a farmer who has high yields, high quality, and low-production costs. He is a good wheat farmer.

He has taught his son how to be a good wheat farmer also. His son decides he wishes to become a wheat farmer, and follow the vocational footsteps of his father.

How can he do that in America in 1958? There are 3 ways, and only 3 ways:

1. The son can take over the production quota assigned his father, as his father retires from the wheat business.

2. The son can purchase the neighboring farm and take over the quota assigned to that farm, as his neighbor retires from the wheat business.

3. The son can marry a quota, as father-in-law retires from the wheat business.

There is no other practical way for a young man to get started in the wheat business in this country today, or the cotton business, or the tobacco business, or the rice business, or the peanut business.

This means that, for all practical purposes, such a young man must get a permit from his government before he can follow in the vocational footsteps of his father.

This is not the way to encourage the beneficial adoption of cost-reducing technology in agriculture.

This is the pathway that inevitably leads toward a peasant agriculture.

TECHNOLOGY WILL WIN IN THE END

Many agricultural and political leaders are frightened by the technological changes taking place in agriculture. They should not be any more wary of these changes than of other economic and sociological changes occurring in modern society.

Change is the law of progress. The challenge which faces us is to direct the change along constructive and beneficial channels. There is much good in the changes occurring in modern agriculture. With proper direction, they will result in increased production and distribution efficiency, added control of quality, a more even flow of product seasonally and geographically, less risk of price and income variation to the producer, more rapid adaptation to scientific and technological innovations, and increased per capita incomes to those producers who are able to grow along with the dynamic agriculture of our day.

It is clear from the preceding analysis that the forces of economics are and will continue to be on opposite sides of many of the broad changes engulfing agriculture. In this engagement, politics will fight a delaying action. They will neither stop nor reverse the economic trend. They will only delay and confuse it. In the final analysis, the economic forces working in this process will be overwhelming.

Our problem, therefore, becomes one of intelligent analysis and direction of the future, not cowering fear of it.

None of us would want to live under the economic institutions which prevailed just a short 20 years ago. Yet I am confident that some of us in this room, 20 years ago, vigorously resisted changes which were then occurring in the patterns of production, processing, and distribution. As we look back now, we wonder why.

Likewise, 20 years from now we'll look back on 1958 and be a little amused that we were so fearful of change, rather than directing our energies toward channeling change down beneficial pathways.

It has been said that the proponents of the status quo are often the villains of history.

Those who resist inevitable change frequently perish in the process.

Those who manage our agricultural production, processing, and distribution firms are challenged to give intelligent direction to the changes ahead, so that our great food and fiber industry will function even better than now.

Those who man the political battalions in our legislative halls should be challenged to do likewise.

False Race Propaganda, Hurting United States Overseas, Spread by Our Own Side

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it has been a popular thing in some areas to say that racial separation customs in the South have inspired much anti-American propaganda overseas.

The News and Courier of Charleston, S. C., has been diligent in exposing the fallacies of this argument and in pointing out that an honest and undistorted presentation of the facts would be of great service to American interests abroad.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "False Race Propaganda, Hurting United States Overseas, Spread by Our Own Side," printed in the News and Courier for May 15, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FALSE RACE PROPAGANDA, HURTING UNITED STATES OVERSEAS, SPREAD BY OUR OWN SIDE

Antisouthern propaganda, which brought bayonets to Little Rock and which still threatens chaos to public school systems of Southern States, is backfiring against the United States as a whole on the international scene.

Evidence is mounting that the racial issues stirred up for domestic political purposes are being turned against American interests abroad. Instead of playing up the benefits enjoyed by the Negro race in the United States—far greater than those enjoyed by Negroes elsewhere in the world—the antisouthern propagandists have ground out horror stories to inflame northern voters.

Now the propagandists are trying to undo the damage. Efforts to patch up the reputation of the United States will be made, according to a dispatch to the New York Herald Tribune, at the forthcoming International Labor Organization session at Geneva. The dispatch says that Secretary of Labor Mitchell will present a brighter side of race relations, stressing the progress made by Negroes in literacy and earning capacity. More Negroes own automobiles in the United States, for example, than are owned by all 216 million Russians.

Heretofore it has been popular to say that racial separation customs in the South have been a cause of anti-American propaganda overseas. Much of that propaganda has been circulated by Americans themselves.

The News and Courier in the past has pointed out fallacies in the argument that racial separation should be abandoned on account of the effect it might have on the people of Africa, Asia, and other lands. Those peoples well understand the differences among races, for they have experienced the same thing themselves. The caste system persists in India and elsewhere.

Of greater significance was the use of bayonets at Little Rock to suppress southern resistance to Federal orders. Subject peoples over the world at once recognized this use of naked force. Even Mr. Nehru of India said he thought the United States Government made a mistake.

Corroborating our viewpoint was a recent dispatch from Versailles, France, by our correspondent, Warrington Dawson. From his vantage point Mr. Dawson could see the effect of American propaganda overseas.

"At the moment when violent trouble broke out at Little Rock," he said, "the propaganda circulated by services under the control of the administration but paid for by American taxpayers was bitterly and aggressively partial. Such considerations as American national interests and the influence of the United States in Western Europe were ruthlessly swept aside for the sake of proclaiming to the world the purity and righteousness of the administration. This policy did lasting harm to America as a whole."

Some of the current wave of hatred, Mr. Dawson says, thus was started against Americans by themselves. When the facts of race relations in the South are viewed without distortion, the falsity of the propaganda becomes as obvious as the harm it has created.

A New Look at the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address made by the Honorable Maurice H. Stans, Director of the Budget, before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW LOOK AT THE BUDGET, ADDRESS OF MAURICE H. STANS, DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET, BEFORE THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

I have been Director of the Budget for a very short while, as most of you know, a bare 2 months, to be explicit. I wouldn't have believed it possible, if anyone had told me that a budget so carefully and conscientiously compiled in January would be hardly recognizable a few weeks later.

Now, you and I know that in a dynamic economy the factor of change is always to be reckoned with. The budget is both a long-range estimate of income and outgo, and a work program for the Government sector of the Nation's economy. In any private business, the best laid plans are likely to be upset by shifts in consumer preferences, market conditions, and unforeseen requirements over and above a normally adequate cushion of reserves.

This is what has now happened to the Federal budget. Our income is down, our defense costs are up, antirecession measures are underway, and deficits of serious proportions confront us. Simple prudence compels us to rethink our work program and look critically at each one of the additional expenditure proposals being urged upon us.

I have said we must reckon with the factor of change. This does not mean that we either propose to fight change or be overwhelmed by it. Rather, it means that we have to accept it within a perspective that measures its meaning, its needs, and its probable duration. This is far from a do-nothing psychology; we are doing plenty, but we are doing it with our eyes open.

In my meeting with you today, therefore, I want to tell you something about the budgetary situation the country is facing at this time and its implications for the years to come. I hope that by doing this I can help to clarify some of our fiscal problems and how we might best approach them. Within this general setting, I want to talk about our public works programs, and more specifically about those concerned with water resources.

A year ago, a great deal of indignation was voiced throughout the country about a Federal budget totaling almost $72 billion. A lot of pressure developed to cut back the budget and get Government spending down below $70 billion in the next fiscal year.

Then last fall, while we were working on the 1959 budget, came the sputnik and increased awareness of Soviet technological progress. This resulted in a substantial stepup in our expenditures for defense purposes.

Of course, we too had been making great progress in shifting to modern weapons and reshaping our military strategy over a period of years before the sputnik. Significant changes in emphasis were taking place and are continuing to occur in our defense programs. For example, over three-quarters of our procurement funds in 1959 will go for types of equipment which hadn't been developed or weren't being brought in production quantities as recently as 1955, the first full fiscal year after Korea. Our spending in 1959 for missiles will be about 4½ times greater than in 1955, while spending for military equipment of declining importance is decreasing substantially.

Because of our efforts during the past few years, we can now take advantage of the successful developments thus far and are adding immeasurably to the power of our forces.

Since the 1959 budget was prepared, we have found that certain high priority military activities can effectively be speeded up even more. The President therefore recently requested $1.5 billion in additional funds from the Congress, and defense expenditures are now expected to be higher than the $40 billion estimated in the budget.

With over half of the budget going for defense, we are determined to assure that this spending is devoted to sound and essential purposes and that pressures for pump-priming do not lead to unnecessary military expenditures. But there is no escaping the great budgetary cost involved adequately for the security needs of this country, given present world conditions. This is a cost we certainly must meet.

Even more striking than the increase in defense costs is the way in which the current economic setback has changed the budget outlook. The early signs of an economic downturn were just appearing at the time we prepared the 1959 budget last fall. We now have a better measure of the recession we are in and have taken various actions to help reverse it.

Substantial programs have been enacted, such as the new housing bill and the Highway Act. Authority has been granted to enable civilian agencies to speed up planned purchases of supplies and equipment. The executive branch has acted to accelerate defense contracting, housing programs, repair and modernization of Federal buildings, civil public works (about which I will say more in a few minutes), and various other activities. Various proposals are now pending, including those to extend present periods of benefits for the unemployed and to assist areas of high and persistent unemployment.

These actions and proposals mean rising expenditures. Therefore, with lower tax collections as well, the deficit in the current fiscal year will be bigger than we anticipated. Similarly, a large deficit—in the general range of eight to ten billion dollars, according to present tentative estimates—is in prospect for next year instead of the surplus we had planned.

Although we accept these deficits as inevitable now, if the Government is to do its part in promoting economic recovery, we can't close our eyes to what's ahead. Pressures are continuing for vast new programs which would commit the Government to large expenditures for years to come. Many of the proposals call for large-scale new public-works programs, even though these programs are already at a high level, and it would take a long time to get new projects started. Let's look briefly at this portion of the budget.

Here, a little perspective may be helpful. In the early 1820's, about the time the rivers and harbors program was started, Federal expenditures for public works amounted to about half a million dollars. By the early 1900's, when the National Rivers and Harbors Congress was founded, spending for public works came to about $40 million a year, with rivers and harbors work accounting for about half of this amount. Fifty years later the annual amount for all public works had reached more than $2 billion. In fiscal 1957, the total was $4½ billion. This increase of more than one-hundred-fold since the turn of the century far exceeds the general growth in national production.

The upward trend is continuing. The 1959 budget estimated more than $6½ billion for public works, including highway construction. This estimate is higher than any previous year's total except during World War II, when military construction hit a peak.

Now let's look more specifically at the water resources programs. They account for the largest segment of civil public works except for the Federal-aid highway program. Over the years the Federal Government has made large investments in navigation, flood control, irrigation, and related power developments. From the early 1820's through 1957, the Government has spent $11 billion for projects of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation alone. More than half of this investment has been made in the last 10 years. By the end of 1959, the total investment will reach around $12½ billion. These are capital expenditures for construction only. They exclude the substantial amounts spent for operation and maintenance of the projects.

In the 1959 budget, construction expenditures of these 2 agencies were estimated at almost $700 million—higher than in any of the 5 preceding years. Recently, the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation were directed to provide for an orderly speedup of their rates of construction in 1958, and the 1959 budget was amended to provide additional appropriations to continue the expanded rates in 1959. Such actions reflect the belief that speeding up projects already underway can provide employment more promptly than new starts would. The result will be to increase expenditures in these years over the budget figures.

To complete the projects now underway will require expenditures of about $5 billion in the next few years. By 1960 and 1961 annual construction expenditures by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation may well reach a billion-dollar level, even with no new starts. The completion of going projects will, of course, pave the way for new starts at a later time.

This administration is vitally interested in the orderly development, conservation, and use of the Nation's water and land resources. The President has continuously sought, with the cooperation of other public and private interests, to strengthen and improve resource programs at the Federal, State, and local levels. Recently he regretfully withheld his approval of an omnibus bill authorizing appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control improvements. While the bill included many worthwhile projects, it included some which did not meet the requirements of sound projects. The President dislikes vetoing legislation. But he feels that he must meet his responsibility to follow an orderly and legally established process under which a project authorization is sought only after basic investigations have indicated its economic justification. Moreover, there should be adequate local cost-sharing to reflect local benefits resulting from the project.

Over the 50 years of its existence, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has contributed toward the orderly development of our water resources. With your background of information and experience in this field, I am sure that you can be most helpful in the coordination of efforts to secure enactment of legislation—such as the President recently recommended in his letter of April 26 to Senator KNOWLAND and Representative MARTIN—which carries out these principles.

There is now a backlog of almost $8 billion of authorized river and harbor, flood control, and irrigation projects which have

not been started. Through mutual efforts of all interested groups, other justifiable work will be authorized within the framework of sound overall budgetary policies.

As you know, the budget as a whole includes a large variety of programs. We have programs for national security, for agriculture, for veterans, for natural resources, and for a host of other competing needs. Of necessity, these must all be weighed against each other and priorities must be determined on the use of the tax money we all pay. In that way we can plan to meet our urgent national responsibilities while keeping our financial position sound.

At the present time, with so many programs being considered as antirecession measures, we are moving rapidly toward $80 billion budgets, just a year after the loud outcry about a budget of $70 million. This could well mean extended deficit spending. Then the pendulum will swing the other way again and there will be great demands for economies and cutbacks in Government programs.

I am sure you will agree with me that it would be far better in the long run if the problems of the country could be dealt with on a more rational and consistent basis. To accept and deal with change does not necessitate violent ups and downs from year to year in an atmosphere of crisis over temporary conditions.

That is why I want to urge upon you that we must keep a sense of perspective about our national problems and the budget. The current recession should not be allowed to stampede us into hasty, ill-considered actions which will add unnecessarily to our future burdens. Let's not forget that the course of our type of economy depends in the last analysis on millions of economic decisions by individuals and businesses, made freely every day. The role of Government in this economic system should be to stimulate rather than to try to dominate private activity.

To perform this role wisely, the Government needs the understanding and assistance of everyone—individuals, business organizations, and local, State, and National groups. As citizens and as members of this Rivers and Harbors Congress, your continued cooperation can play an important part in helping to assure that our Federal investments in resources are devoted to those projects which contribute most to meeting national needs, with due consideration for our total fiscal situation. In this way, you will be making a vital contribution to the present and future strength of America.

Current Scientific and Political Issues: Russian and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOS. E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, Donald R. Wilson, the assistant publisher of the Albany Times-Union made an important contribution to our understanding of the current scientific and political issues involving Russia and the United States before the Women's National Republican Club in New York City on May 1. Mr. Wilson stressed that sputnik did not represent a new level of scientific achievement on the part of the Russians, rather it was a direct propaganda stroke.

Mr. Wilson said:

The Soviets, in launching sputnik, had not uncovered any new principles through basic research or theoretical science or mathematics. All the theoretical scientific principles needed for the launching of satellites had been developed years before.

I repeat that Russia merely saw the propaganda advantage of beating us to the satellite punch which we had already announced.

Mr. Wilson presented the political issues which must be resolved before a summit conference could contribute to the peace of the world.

I ask unimous consent to have Mr. Wilson's address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CURRENT SCIENTIFIC AND POLITICAL ISSUES: RUSSIA AND THE UNITED STATES

(Address by Donald R. Wilson, Assistant Publisher, the Albany Times-Union, Before Women's National Republican Club, New York City, May 1, 1958)

The scope of this subject, believe me, is more appalling to me than it is to you. After having worked with it for a little more than 6 weeks, the thing that surprises me most is that, in a moment of intellectual relaxation, I had the temerity to suggest it to Vada Horsch.

In picking such a subject, I am reminded of the knight of olden times who was said to have mounted his charger and to have ridden off in all directions at once.

Having embarked on such a hazardous project, however, I have no alternative but to try to reduce it to manageable proportions. In doing this, as I warned Miss Horsch from the beginning, I shall try to confine myself primarily to a mere analytical discussion. To announce hard and fast solutions to all problems would be not only a species of unjustifiable presumption upon the spirit and purpose of this occasion but could easily constitute a scaffold from which, in this distinguished audience, my political immaturity and naivete could be hanged for all to view and ridicule. However, at whatever risk, I shall be unable to avoid stating certain conclusions. Valid or not, they may at least serve the purpose of stimulating some discussion.

I must plead for patience, indulgence, and tolerance. More than that, however, I plead for your critical appraisal of the issues and for your own constant endeavor in conscientiously searching for their solutions as a part of the great democratic process which spares no citizen from the challenge of his Nation's problems, nor from the responsibility of thinking his way through to their solution.

We are now at the crossroads of civil destruction and divine destiny. Two segments of mankind are trodding these roads. One segment, under the evil genius of Societ amorality, is dedicated to the erasure from the face of the earth of every vestige of man's partially successful efforts to move closer to the divinity which created him and gave him the potential of governing himself in his personal, political, economic, and social relationships. The other segment, represented by the United States, seeks to dignify mankind and exalt him in his organized efforts to pursue these relationships under law and in peace.

If you can picture these crossroads and if you can picture these two segments of mankind walking these two roads, you can envision a meeting at the summit having nothing to do with letter writing or foreign ministers' meetings. This summit is inexorably created by the clash of ideologies.

This is the ultimate issue. It is an irreconcilable one. On this there is no room for negotiation or compromise. One or the other of these two ideologies will be destroyed. To paraphrase Lincoln, the world cannot exist half-slave and half-free; it must be all one or all the other.

We frequently lose sight of this ultimate issue. We frequently forget that on this we must either win or lose. By forgetting, our judgment of other issues (which are only byproducts of this fundamental one) and our role with reference to them becomes distorted and absurd.

It is, therefore, imperative that we so bear ourselves that we never weaken either our material advantages or our moral and ideological supremacy.

With this grim thought constantly before us, we have a frame of reference within which to place and by which to measure all the current scientific and political problems between the United States and the Soviet Union.

It is true that, in this day, scientific issues cannot be isolated from political ones. There is always an interplay between them. They are also intertwined with military and economic problems. The totality of them is a maze which must often appear impenetrable to those who carry the awesome responsibility of guiding our destinies. It is a tribute to them that they do not despair.

Prior to October 4, 1957, it would not have occurred to any of us to emphasize scientific issues between the Soviet Union and the United States. With the first sputnik, however, we immediately attached new importance to Soviet scientific creative abilities. Sputnik served to dramatize an assumed Soviet genius.

The first flurry of excitement all over the world led many to believe that we had suffered a major scientific defeat. Many immediately said that we had lost our scientific superiority. There were instant cries for a complete revamping of our entire educational process. Some inaccurate observers suggested that, although we were still tops in applied science, we had lost the lead in theoretical science and mathematics and so-called basic research.

The fact of the matter is that sputnik not only didn't prove any of these allegations, but it didn't even indicate them. The only defeat handed to us by sputnik was not a scientific one in any sense of the word. It was merely a propaganda one.

The Soviets, in launching sputnik, had not uncovered any new principles through basic research or theoretical science or mathematics. All the theoretical scientific principles needed for the launching of satellites has been developed years before. Sputnik was not a triumph of Soviet production genius. We, too, had developed a satellite and the means of placing it in orbit. These things being so, it could hardly be proved that sputnik constituted a victory over American education or technology.

I repeat that Russia merely saw the propaganda advantage of beating us to the satellite punch which we had already announced.

The only scientific issue raised by sputnik was resolved at the moment it was raised. It consisted merely of serving notice on us that the Soviets were working hard and competently in the field of science and should not be regarded as scientifically backward.

It has taught us not to assume blindly and erroneously that all things come to us first. It has taught us the truth of the old saw that brains are where you find them, and it has made us aware of the fact that there are some brains in Russia as well as elsewhere around the globe.

We are now alerted to the importance and the potential of space. We are aware of its military, its psychological, and its historical significance. We are aware of the power of science to influence our destinies and lift

our horizons. We realize now that we must constantly march in the vanguard of science. Our imagination must be stirred to its military consequences. Our lives depend upon it. But even more important than that, we must constantly seek its civil uses. Our future as human beings depends upon it.

That is the truly great scientific issue between the United States and the Soviet Union. Which of the two nations, while not neglecting the military indispensability of science, will progress most, in both theoretical and applied science, in making the powers of science available for the betterment rather than the destruction of mankind. Which will do the most to turn the talents of science to the use of mankind in providing new and better fuels, food, clothing, medicines, and all the host of other improvements to prolong life in dignity and prosperity.

Perhaps, I am wrong. Maybe this issue is not a scientific one. Maybe it is an issue of the humanities. Perhaps it is a mixture of both. I am sure of only one thing—progress in science will be made in both Russia and the United States. Victory and immortality will go to the power which makes science serve humanity best.

And just as that must be the role of our scientific competition, so must it also be the role of our international political behavior.

On international political issues, we are separated from the Soviet Union by wide chasms.

The major issue today is not whether there shall or shall not be a meeting at the summit. A meeting is merely a form. I don't believe that either President Eisenhower or Secretary of State Dulles have any tendency whatsoever to exalt this or any other mere form. Their constant preoccupation must be with the maintenance of the right against the wrong. They must seek honor rather than expediency. They must raise freedom to victory and cannot succumb, in spite of all pressures, to blandishments which they know will only increase the power of tyranny and exalt enslavement.

As I told you earlier, the ultimate political issue between Russia and the United States is an historical one. Will the peoples of the world choose freedom with all its problems or will they choose the masquerade behind which hides enslavement with its moral, spiritual and physical death?

I am not here concerned with a description of the different geographical areas of the world in which this conflict rages. I am concerned with trying to distill the essence of the current issues which reflect this conflict in all geographical areas.

For example, one manifestation of this conflict concerns the importance of the roles being planned and played by both Russia and America in encouraging the inevitablity of the economic advancement of underdeveloped areas of the world.

Now, it is not my purpose to outline current arguments either for or against President Eisenhower's foreign-aid proposals. They are as well-known to you as they are to me.

My purpose is to emphasize that this is a realm in which we are committed whether we like it or not.

I think it is unwise to fix on the term "underdeveloped areas." I would rather hear them described as "developing areas." It would be wiser of us to describe them in terms of their aspirations rather than in terms of their present and passing conditions.

Make no mistake. They will develop. The only two economic forces in the world great enough to feed their aspirations are Russia and the United States. They must and will turn either to us or to Russia. Russia has already issued a challenge to us. The issue, then, is not whether we shall respond to the challenge but how, in responding, we not only serve the material aspirations of these developing areas but also demonstrate to them that, material growth alone, without personal, political, and economic freedom can end only in disaster. If we would truly serve them, we must find a method of binding them to the way of life which has made us strong enough to help them. If we divorce our material aid from our political ideology, we will have turned them over, regardless of all else, to Soviet enslavement. We cannot assume that they will see and adopt the greatness of our philosophy. It must positively be conveyed to them as a part of the whole package.

This is only one facet of Russia's economic challenge to us. By barter and trade arrangements she is assaulting our supremacy among all nations. She is trying, by getting a stranglehold on the economic throats of other countries, to drag them into political orbit.

Here again, there is no alternative to accepting the challenge. This is a part of the competitive area from which we must emerge victorious. We must demonstrate that our theory of life and government has produced an economic strength of sufficient greatness and with enough resilience to enable us to overcome the economic tricks of the Soviet Union.

We who are the world's greatest traders, manufacturers, producers and financiers must prove to a fearful world that our theory of economics will profitably operate to the advantage of the other nations and ourselves. This may necessitate a revision of some of our prejudices and thoughtlessness. If so, I say "good." This battle will not be won by adherence to old prejudices. It will be won by bold and imaginative measures based on our fundamental theories but enlivened by modern needs and circumstances of competition for economic markets and political opinion.

This, in part, also involves the issue of the reunification of Germany and political and economic freedom for Russia's satellites. It seems almost impossible to resolve these political issues. But the problem is not that of resolving the conflict of views; it is that of being victorious in maintaining our view. We cannot expect Russia to unloose her satellites voluntarily. This would be political and economic suicide for her. Our problem, then, is that of keeping such constant worldwide political and economic pressure on Russia proper, through every possible means, that Russia will find it impossible to sustain her satellites, and her satellites will find it economically and politically unprofitable to sustain Russia.

This would seem to call for our skillful usage of established institutions such as the United Nations, our progressive employment of financial and trade potentials, the constant strengthening of our political and economic theories and practices, and our never-ending effort to exploit fully the skills of propaganda.

If we succeed in all this, we shall make Russia desperate. As we do this, we increase the risk of driving her to resort to war. This is a risk we must take. In taking it, we must resolve to keep ourselves overwhelmingly strong militarily. We may dream of disarmament, but Russia has given us no reason to believe that she will seriously compromise the last hope she has in the event that all other competitive means to destroy us should fail.

Of course, Russia would like to trick us, if she could, into yielding advantages which we possess in this important field. That is why she announces abandonment of nuclear tests but scoffs at the idea of inspection to assure compliance. Pyramiding on that, she would like to get us to renounce our forward and indispensable military bases and to liquidate our association with other powers for the common defense of all. That is why she proposes banning nuclear weapons but insists that we dissolve our regional defensive arrangements and withdraw our troops from the advanced positions which they occupy under them. She would like to make fear of nuclear destruction a paralyzing condition precedent to political absorption. That is why she makes such menacing threats and then suggests nuclear-free zones first in central Europe, then in Scandanavia, next in Italy and Albania, and finally in all of Asia. She would like for the free world to wallow in the luxury of false security. That is why she suggests nonaggression pacts.

You may think that these are military issues. They may ultimately be. However, at the moment they are in their political phase. For that reason, we must be guided by realities. We must know one fear greater than the fear of nuclear attack and that is the fear of not being able either to meet it or retaliate against it. We may seriously consider disarmament, but only under conditions of such complete inspection that our security and that of our friends is in no way diminished.

We must not overlook the awesome power of conventional armaments, and with reference to them we must in no way diminish our capacity to spring to the defense of ourselves and our friends in the event of Russia's disposition to launch an attack with conventional armaments alone, either in localized or widespread aggressions.

In all this, we must stop crediting deceptive Soviet announcements as propaganda victories. They are not propaganda victories except insofar as we proclaim them to be. They are mere opening propaganda salvos. We must meet the Russian lies with American and free world truth, and we must believe in the conquering power of that truth.

The scientific and political issues between Russia and the United States are many. They add up to life or death. How shall we respond?

I say we shall respond with honor for ourselves, truthfulness in our utterances, confidence in our abilities, courage in our actions, without fear for the future, and with belief in the inevitability of our ultimate victory.

See Nothing, Hear Nothing

SPEECH

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1958

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12428) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, it is appropriate that in connection with the enactment of appropriations for the State Department, attention be directed to the administration of that Department.

It is putting it mildly to say that both in its policymaking and in its execution of policy there can be much improvement. No program can be successful unless properly administered, and every dollar appropriated will be wasted unless we do get better administration.

I cannot believe that the files of our State Department are not and were not filled with reports, all foreshadowing the sad events on the international scene about which we have every right to complain.

While we are made monkeys of, our State Department sees nothing and hears nothing, and what it says amounts to nothing.

The column written by Walter Lippmann which appeared in the Herald Tribune of May 15, 1958, succinctly expresses what most of us are thinking.

For instance, he said:

Once the Vice President and his wife are back home, and after all the official regrets and apologies have been received and accepted, the immediate question before us is how it happened that the Nixons were exposed to these outrages. It is manifest that the whole South American tour was misconceived, that it was planned by men who did not know what was the state of mind in the cities the Vice President was to visit. For what has happened should never have been allowed to happen, and those who are responsible for the management of our relations with South America must answer to the charge of gross incompetence.

It is essential that this charge be investigated either by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, or, perhaps preferably, by a panel of specially qualified private citizens. We must fix and we must correct the causes which led our officials into this fiasco—into what it would not be exaggeration to call a diplomatic Pearl Harbor. Unless and until this is done, there is no chance that we shall profit by the lessons of this bitter experience. We must know why the planners of the trip were so ignorant, so ignorant about so many countries, so ignorant of what it is suitable and what it is not suitable for the Vice President of the United States to do when he goes abroad.

Before we can do anything to improve our position in Latin America, we must deal with those who have made such a mess of our position.

The situation in Latin America is as bad as it is in other parts of the world. With reference to the situation in the Middle East, Mr. Lippmann said:

It is almost certainly a coincidence that simultaneously there are crises in Lebanon and in Algeria and that in each there have been violent manifestations against the United States. In South America the hostility which has been shown is directed primarily at our own acts of omission and commission. In Lebanon and in Algeria we are not principals but are entangled in the quarrels of others.

About Lebanon the evidence is not clear but there are grounds for suspecting that there are Syrians and Egyptians who are intervening in a bitter internal struggle which centers on the reelection of President Chamoun. There are reports that as many as 500 have infiltrated themselves into Lebanon. The violence they are perpetuating has a strong resemblance to the raids—for the present suspended—against Israel.

So far as we are concerned, it is clear enough that the Eisenhower doctrine, which has a lot of fine print underneath its resounding declarations, does not apply. The Lebanese case is one for the United Nations, it may be for a special session of the General Assembly.

The events in Algeria are the most important of all. They may well be the central crisis in the North African story, the crisis which leads either to catastrophe or to the beginning of recovery. Until now there has never been a government in Paris which was strong enough to win the Algerian war or strong enough to negotiate a settlement of the war. The center parties in France, which lie between the Communists on the left and the semi-Fascists on the right, have been paralyzed by a very powerful minority composed of the French settlers in Algeria, the vested interests in France which do business there, and portions of the French Army.

In the present crisis, the adventurous and extremist wing of this minority have seized power in Algeria and are attempting to impose their Algerian policy on the government in Paris. It is hard to see how this issue can be compromised, as it was a little while ago when the Tunisian town of Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef was bombed and the Paris government did not dare to disavow the act. For then the defiance of the French Government was concealed. Now the defiance is open and avowed.

So there is at issue now the sovereignty of the French Republic.

I hope that the State Department will learn from the lessons of the last few days.

Retirement of Edwin B. Fred, President, University of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the president of the University of Wisconsin is retiring this year. President Edwin B. Fred has been a dedicated scientist and a splendid university president. Personally, I have particular admiration and respect for the thoughtful, courageous, and persistent fight Dr. Fred made at the University of Wisconsin for freedom of speech and freedom of thought and action. Dr. Fred's presidency has coincided with an era of Wisconsin politics in which freedom of expression in our State suffered its most serious challenge. During the time of trouble this quiet, scholarly, dedicated man could always be found battling for full freedom of thought and expression.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an eloquent editorial from the Milwaukee Journal entitled "Dr. Fred: Gentleman, Scholar," written on the occasion of Dr. Fred's retirement, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. FRED: GENTLEMAN, SCHOLAR

In an expression of respect and affection, retiring President Edwin B. Fred is being honored at a University of Wisconsin student dinner in Madison today. Nothing just like this ever happened at the university before.

Always and above all, Dr. Fred is the real gentleman and real scholar, and sincerely modest. When he was offered the university presidency 13 years ago the regents had to press him to accept.

He had distinguished himself at Wisconsin as a scientist. Among students and Wisconsin people generally, however, he was almost unknown.

Reluctantly, almost apologetically, he took on the ardous duties of the presidency of a huge public university. He was hesitant, cautious, painstaking and humble almost to a fault. His way was the way of the research scientist—to get every available fact from every available source, and to weigh them thoroughly and deliberately before venturing a conclusion.

Dr. Fred never liked public appearances and speechmaking, and still shuns them. He confided that he dreaded the struggles with budgets and the legislature. He has, however, demonstrated exceptional ability to cope with both administration and legislators. It was his dogged insistence, for example, which finally won for the university the new library it had so long needed.

His straightforwardness, sincerity and personal charm all have had great part in winning support for the university, not only from the legislature but from industry, alumni and other sources. Dr. Fred's efforts have been as tireless as his patience has appeared inexhaustible. He has been unfailingly courteous, kindly, and fair.

No wonder students have grown unusually fond of him. Among all who know Dr. Fred at all well, who hasn't? So there are very many Wisconsin people who would like to add an extra flower to the deserved bouquets Dr. Fred is receiving at the time of his retirement from the presidency, and are hoping that, as president emeritus, he will still be long with us.

Banking and the Rural Redevelopment Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOS. E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, a very significant booklet has just been issued by the American Bankers Association. The title is "Banking and the Rural Development Program." This is the program now underway in some 30 States, where there are small farms, underemployed farmers, and low family incomes. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the contents of this booklet be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

One of the distinguished bankers of Iowa is chairman of the agricultural commission of ABA that issued this constructive and useful statement. I refer to Harry W. Schaller, president, Citizens First National Bank, Storm Lake, Iowa.

This emphasis on the importance of the rural development program becomes especially impressive when the list of the able bankers on the commission is studied, along with their advisors.

There being no objection, the booklet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIST OF BANKERS AND ADVISERS

S. E. Babington, president, Brookhaven Bank & Trust Co., Brookhaven, Miss.

Frank W. Black, executive vice president, the Peoples National Bank of Barre, Barre, Vt.

Richard H. Clark, assistant vice president, Walker Bank & Trust Co., Salt Lake City, Utah.

William C. Clary, Jr., president, the Bank of Toccoa, Toccoa, Ga.

John H. Crocker, chairman of the board and president, the Citizens National Bank, Decatur, Ill.

L. R Driver, president, the First National Bank in Bristol, Bristol, Tenn.

Charles K. Johnson, president, the First National Bank, Artesia, N. Mex.

Royal L. Mullins, president, the Wolfe City National Bank, Wolfe City, Tex.

John W. Scott, president, Valley Bank of Grand Forks, Gilby, N. Dak.

Roy G. Shaull, vice president, the Harrisburg National Bank, Mechanicsburg, Pa.

Rex B. Stratton, assistant vice president, Security Trust & Savings Bank, Billings, Mont.

ADVISERS

Dr. Van B. Hart, professor of farm management, New York State College of Agriculture, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

Dr. O. B. Jesness, professor and head emeritus, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn.

W. A. Sutton, director, agricultural extension service, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.

Dr. Tyrus R. Timm, head, department of agricultural economics and sociology, Texas A. & M. College, College Station, Tex.

Dr. G. B. Wood, head, Department of Agricultural Economics, Oregon State College, Corvallis, Oreg.

E. T. Savidge, deputy manager, American Bankers Association, New York, N. Y.

Lawrence E. Kreider, assistant secretary, New York, N. Y.

BANKING AND THE RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Most of us don't realize that a majority of American farmers earn very little income from their marketings. Fifty-six percent of our farms produce only about nine percent of marketed farm products. Families on these low-production farms receive little help from traditional programs of price support.

More than anything else, these farm families need greater opportunity—opportunity to upgrade their skills, to find work supplementing farm income, to obtain capital permitting them to make fundamental changes in farm production.

Put another way, their long-term prosperity depends on local job opportunities, community services, especially in the fields of education and health, and progressive local leadership that can aid them in adjusting to modern-day trends in farm production and family living.

Agricultural improvement alone will not solve the complex problems of this one-half of the farm population.

THE CHANGING RURAL ECONOMY

The past decade has witnessed tremendous changes in many of our rural areas: industry expanding and moving into previously all-rural counties; greatly increased job opportunities for farm people; better schools and training programs; improved farming, using new methods and producing higher value products; and rural community planning and long-range programs of economic betterment.

All these activities make up a little-known little-heralded farm program that is improving, permanently, the living standards of people in hundreds of rural counties throughout the Nation.

Rural development is speeding up these vital improvements and widening their impact to include rural areas with many underemployed people—those who don't earn much money from either farming or nonfarm employment. Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson has said the rural development program has three basic aims:

1. To strengthen industry in low-income rural areas and widen the range of off-farm job opportunities.

2. To help families who want to stay in farming gain the tools, land, and information that will permit them to farm successfully.

3. To help all people in these areas arm themselves with adequate training and good health.

This fundamental approach to the farm problem has now been started in 62 counties and 8 trade areas (2 or more counties each), in 30 States, in all regions of the Nation. The program is on a demonstration or pilot basis, to gain experience and information which will help all Americans interested in the welfare of rural people obtain a clearer picture of what can be accomplished to improve their living conditions.

President Eisenhower said recently in a special message to Congress, "Though only about 3 years old, the rural development program has already achieved much, and with the increased emphasis planned for the coming year, progress promises to be more rapid in the future."

NOT A GOVERNMENT PROGRAM

Local leaders in agriculture, business, banking, civic groups, church affairs—they are the vital element, the make-or-break core of the rural development program. For rural development is not just another Government farm program. Success depends on the initiative and willingness of leaders in rural towns and farm areas who contribute their skills and resources to this work. Rural development has been termed a people's program. And this it is, organized, guided, and made successful by those with the greatest stake in the economic and social development of the areas in which they live.

Take Choctaw County, Okla., for example. This is a rural county in the southeastern part of the State, with many families on small, low-income farms. The Choctaw Rural Development Committee is made up of leaders representing all major areas of the economy, including farmers' organizations, the chamber of commerce, banks, the city planning commission, schools, the ministerial alliance, and newspapers.

It's the policy of State and National Government agencies to cooperate with and support the work of citizen committees, such as the Choctaw County group. Bringing local people into day-to-day planning and project development that involves many different agencies is a unique feature of rural development.

WHAT'S BEING ACCOMPLISHED

In a report published late in 1957, Secretary Benson cited more than 350 new development projects in agriculture, forestry, marketing, industry promotion, health, and vocational training which are going forward due to the initiative or support of rural leadership in the pilot countries. Here are a few typical projects:

A boat manufacturer has started a small factory in Perry County, Ind., which has resulted in jobs for 50 rural people.

Vocational training in such skills as welding, electrical wiring, and plumbing for 500 people in isolated Kentucky rural counties.

Employment for 130 people in a new poultry processing plant in a Texas trade area.

Increased poultry production on farms in Chesterfield County, S. C., bringing 58 new job opportunities to the county.

Interviews of more than 1,000 farm families in Arkansas' 3 pilot counties to obtain accurate information on the need for off-farm employment.

A 2-day exhibit of handicrafts produced on small farms in Missouri's Taney County which brought visitors from 7 surrounding States and sales to several major buyers.

Production and marketing of peppers, the first commercial crop in an isolated Tennessee community, which grossed $40,000 for farmers the first year.

Reforestation in a Mississippi county, principally through the work of young people who helped set 200,000 pine seedlings.

Community organization is the basis of rural development. Many of the problems such as market development and industrial expansion, however, cannot be solved on a community or county basis. These can best be solved on an area or trade area basis.

Bankers play an important role in area development because of their trade area interests. As a result of an area organization, a country banker who was chairman of a dairy committee led a group of over 150 dairymen and other interested persons on a tour to processing plants in the area. The dairymen were impressed with the importance of the dairy industry to the entire area and heard the processors indicate that they could use more milk.

Industrial expansion has continued at a rapid rate and many new industrial plants have been located in areas that were mainly agricultural in the past. Such activity has increased the off-the-farm employment opportunities and has tended to insure a balanced economy between agriculture and industry.

A United States Chamber of Commerce report on the relationship between industrial growth and general community development measures the effect of new industrial jobs to a community.[1] The report indicates that 100 new factory workers meant the following to their communities: 296 more people, 112 more households, 51 more schoolchildren, $590,000 more personal income per year, $270,000 more bank deposits, 107 more passenger cars registered, 174 more workers employed, 4 more retail establishments, $360,000 more retail sales per year, 31 fewer agricultural workers.

IT'S A BANKER'S BUSINESS TO KNOW THE ECONOMY

In many rural development counties and areas, officials of banks are serving on development committees and councils. Leaders in the economic life of their communities, they are in a unique position to see both agricultural and industrial potential. It's their business to know what can be done (and, just as important, what can't be done), given the resources of their community and the skills of the people there. Through the leadership of a country banker, a poultry-processing plant was built at Dobson, N. C. Over 100 persons are employed in operating the plant. Several million dollars per year is being paid producers of broilers in the local bank's trade area.

The banker, along with the minister, the educator, the farm organization leader, and the county agent is a key person. A local program stands or falls on the interest and initiative of these people.

Through a variety of activities, State and local bankers and their organizations can join with others in the rural development program and other area programs to promote long-range agricultural and industrial improvements in underdeveloped rural areas.

In many States, representatives of State bankers associations are participating in the meetings and discussions of State committees formed to help coordinate the work of agencies and organizations which are contributing to projects in demonstration counties.

Representatives of State bankers associations might cooperate on a review of business and industrial needs in underdeveloped rural areas. Such a review could lead to a better understanding of the situation in these areas.

---

[1] What New Industrial Jobs Mean to a Community, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C.

It might also produce guidelines for business loan policies of banks and encourage greater participation in local development programs.

Where they have not already done so, bankers in rural development counties should volunteer their services to councils and committees guiding the program.

One of the first tasks in unified, county-wide development is to get the facts on manpower, resources, business needs, education, etc. Some banks will already have some of this data, and their employees often possess important skills needed in compiling and evaluating related statistical information.

Often, rural development will open up sound credit possibilities in farming, marketing, and nonfarm enterprises which did not exist previously. For example, a Tennessee strawberry-growing project last year gave local market outlets new opportunity to increase sales. A boat plant in Indiana stimulated expansion of a small firm selling boat parts. Through their credit resources, bankers can help their neighbors take advantage of new opportunities.

Charles N. Shepardson, member of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, addressing a group of Tennessee bankers, summed up the crucial role of bankers and their services when he said, "The initiative in development must always lie in the hands of local community leaders. Traditionally, we have looked to our bankers for leadership in such programs."

In the same speech, Governor Shepardson said it was encouraging to see interest in the rural development program. "It is properly aimed at drawing off the surplus farm labor which has had a depressing effect on our whole farm economy. At the same time, it is aimed at providing local employment that permits people to continue to live in the rural environment that they prefer and to contribute not only to the maintenance but to the actual upbuilding of the rural community."

A RURAL BANKER COMMENTS

One of the many credit officers taking part in the rural development program is C. T. Welch, president of the Citizens Bank in Savannah, Hardin County, Tenn., a heavily rural area on the Mississippi border. Mr. Welch is chairman of the county rural development committee. He has this to say about the program:

"As a businessman, I see in the rural development program the greatest concentrated, realistic approach to the problem of the low-income farmer that has been made in our time.

"Our problem is primarily one of agriculture," Mr. Welch continues, "but one which will not be solved by an agricultural approach alone. The area which approaches the solution of this problem by strictly agricultural means is doomed to failure from the start.

"The success or failure of any undertaking depends more upon the mental attitude of its leadership than on any other factor," he continues.

"Whether a pilot area moves toward its ultimate objective will depend largely upon the leadership. People from all segments of our society and from all the agencies of our communities have joined hands in this great undertaking to try to provide opportunities for the development of the social, educational, religious, and economic welfare of the areas in which they live and serve. Never have I observed an undertaking in which so many agencies and individuals have been united on one team to undertake to solve a problem as far-reaching and with such implications as this one which faces us of opening wider the doors of opportunity for the good of our country and all our people."

State Department News Curb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there is no more dangerous threat to democratic government than secrecy. The prime requisite of democracy is that ultimate decisions are based on the informed wisdom of all the people.

When the people are not told what is going on their decisions cannot be informed, and are likely to be dangerously in error. The State Department has dropped a black curtain of secrecy over many of its activities and decisions which do not relate to military or delicate diplomatic actions. Competent reporters have protested that new instructions given by the State Department to its officers are seriously restricting the free flow of news.

Mr. President, we will never solve our problems, particularly our challenging problems in foreign relations, unless we understand them. We will never understand them unless we have the pertinent facts. Ever since President Eisenhower's news conference admonition that the French and Lebanese situations were too delicate for comment, the State Department has blacked out the American people by shutting off information to the newspapers on which the American people must depend for that information.

Mr. President, this is a seriously mistaken policy. I ask unanimous consent that an Associated Press article by Warren Rogers, Jr., describing the situation as both grave and ridiculous be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE DEPARTMENT NEWS CURB IS FELT

(By Warren Rogers, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Strange things are happening at the State Department.

Old friends pass you by. And others act like the three wise monkeys—see no evil, speak no evil, and hear no evil.

The situation, as it concerns keeping the American people informed on United States foreign policy, is both grave and ludicrous.

The grave view was taken this week by reporters who cover the State Department.

They protested to the Department that new instructions to its officers were restricting and limiting the free flow of news. The Department denied there was any gag on news.

Department spokesmen said old regulations, long winked at, had been put back in force. They declined to say why. But it was an open secret that top State Department officials were disturbed about recent news leaks.

OLD RULES REVIVED

This is nothing new. There always have been leaks, but this time something was done about it. The old rules were dusted off and the word went around to officials at the various levels:

1. Refer all news queries to the Department's Public Affairs Section, if possible.

2. Alternately, have a public affairs officer with you when you talk to reporters.

3. If this is not done, make a memo of all conversations you have with reporters and pass the memo around the Department.

4. Don't talk about anything outside your immediate "area of competence."

These instructions went out by word of mouth usually, about 2 weeks ago. But Hugh Cumming, head of the Department's Research and Intelligence Section, put his instructions to his staff in writing, it was reported.

That was when the strange things started to happen.

"I DON'T KNOW YOU"

One day a reporter went to lunch with a State Department official. Next day he called him up and was told flatly by the official, "I don't know you."

A State Department official went out to welcome Vice President NIXON back to Washington Thursday and commented that he thought NIXON handled himself well during his Latin American difficulties. Asked by a reporter to identify himself, the officer said he was not talking to any newsman unless accompanied by a public-affairs aid.

A reporter telephoned a State Department contact and was told, "I can't talk to you." The reported said that was all right, he just wanted him to listen. The reply was, "I can't listen * * * they cut off my ears as well as my tongue."

SOME IGNORE CURB

A veteran reporter stormed into the Department's news division saying, "What's going on? I grew up with Mr. X and now he says he can't talk to me without a public-affairs officer at his side."

In some cases, veteran officials have ignored the newly enforced rules. In others, especially among young officers, the rules are followed to the letter.

Added to the imposition of the new rules was President Eisenhower's news conference admonition that the French and Lebanese situations were too delicate for comment. Reporters checking the State Department on these two big stories found themselves referred time and again to Mr. Eisenhower's words while officials clammed up.

Need for Post Office in City of Carthage, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, recently I received a copy of a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Panola County Chamber of Commerce relating to the need for a Federal building in the city of Carthage, Tex., to house a post office and other Federal offices.

As the resolution points out, the rate of growth in the city of Carthage has been 6.14 percent per year for the past 17 years and postal transactions have increased 55 percent during the same period. Also, Carthage is the only city of its size in the immediate area with a

first-class post office that does not have a Federal building.

Here is a clear case of the need for immediate construction of the post office building, and I trust that the Post Office Department will take action soon to begin construction of a post office in Carthage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the resolution which was adopted by the board of directors of the Panola County Chamber of Commerce.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the regular March meeting of the board of directors of the Panola County Chamber of Commerce, the following resolution was passed:

"Whereas the population growth of the city of Carthage, from 2,200 in 1940 to 4,571 in 1950, and to 6,230 in 1957, and the postal receipts of the Carthage post office, from 12,000 in 1940 to 42,000 in 1950, and to 60,000 in 1957, show the paralleled growth of Carthage and its postal transactions; and

"Whereas the rate of growth of the city of Carthage has been 6.14 percent per year for the past 17 years and postal transactions have increased 500 percent during the same, and the projected population of Carthage, based on the past rate of growth will be 7,200 in 1960, 9,700 in 1965, and 23,800 in 1980, and the projected postal transactions will total 238,000 by 1980; and

"Whereas Carthage will shortly outgrow its present post office facilities; and

"Whereas Carthage is the only city of its size with a post office of first class in the immediate area that does not have a Federal building, housing its post office; and

"Whereas the many Federal officers badly need proper housing facilities and office space and the facilities they are now occupying in the county courthouse is needed for county purposes of Panola County; and

"Whereas the new Sabine-crossing highway will increase the service area of Carthage by 500 families: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Panola County Chamber of Commerce*, That the United States Government, the Federal postal authorities, and the congressional representatives be requested to take appropriate action for the construction of a Federal building in the city of Carthage for a new post office and offices of Federal officers and employees."

J. S. BUNYARD,
President, Panola County Chamber of Commerce.

Attest:

LLOYD A. GOODIN,
Secretary.

The Importance of Transportation to the Growth and Development of Minnesota

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the finest articles I have yet read on the history of Minnesota concerns the importance of transportation to the growth and development of the State, and Minnesota's increasing importance as a transportation hub as we enter our second century of statehood.

This article by the distinguished professor of history at the University of Minnesota, Dr. Philip D. Jordan, appeared in most Minnesota newspapers during the centennial celebration recently.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the article entitled, "Two Hundred Restless Years of Transportation in Minnesota," by Philip D. Jordan.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO HUNDRED RESTLESS YEARS OF TRANSPORTATION IN MINNESOTA

(By Philip D. Jordan)

Minnesota today stands on a technological divide separating the wilderness past of primitive transportation from the wonders of contemporary land and air travel and the benefits to come with the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Changes are dramatic. Rutted pioneer roads, dusty in summer and snow clogged in winter, have become ribbons of concrete; and such highways rapidly are giving way to toll roads and freeways. Where once a solitary stagecoach lurched and jounced, today thousands of sleek automobiles and freight-laden trucks jostle one another to pose problems of which the frontiersman never dreamed.

Minnesota's first railroad, running between St. Anthony and St. Paul in 1862, was the forerunner of a vast network of rails operating within the State and connecting it with the outside world. The dome car of today is a far cry, indeed, from the wooden day coach of Civil War vintage, with its grimy windows and wood-burning stove.

River traffic has altered also. A hundred years ago, the upper Mississippi literally was clogged with steamboats, bringing immigrants to homes on a new frontier and supplying them with the necessities of life. Today the passenger vessel has disappeared. Yet, with the completion of a 9-foot channel, the Mississippi once again is an important carrier for barges laden with coal and grain. And high above Minnesota's forests and lakes and streams thunder planes, modern today and obsolete tomorrow, that throw giant shadows over waterways which in an earlier day knew only the voyager and his canoe.

Growth of Minnesota's transportation follows a well-defined pattern. The matrix, in turn, was determined by the area's geographical location, by Federal land policy, the influx of settlers, and by the State's economic activities—farming, lumbering, mining.

WATER ROUTES

Thus, the period prior to 1823, when the *Virginia* was the first steamboat to navigate the upper river, largely was a formative one. This does not mean, of course, that it lacked the picturesque. No Minnesotan ever can forget the lucrative traffic in pelts and the farflung transportation system of the French and English fur companies or even the extensive excursions undertaken by trappers themselves. But it was not until Minnesota became a territory in 1849—some quarter of a century after the *Virginia* whistle shattered the peace in the vicinity of Fort Snelling—that attempts were made at systematic transportation.

Territorial legislatures urged road construction, stimulated the establishment of ferries, incorporated railroads. The Federal Government laid out military roads reaching into the interior. Mail stage lines were established. Three trails carried creaking Red River carts to the St. Paul market.

Yet, despite all these efforts, from 1823 to well past the Civil War, the steamboat was the very backbone of transportation. In 1858, 1,090 boat arrivals were recorded in St. Paul. Steamers with tremendous tonnage—vessels like the *Hawk-Eye, Phil Sheridan, War Eagle* of later years—puffed into port laden with eagerly sought commodities. They carried barrels of apples, rolls of carpeting, tons of coal, flax seed, live hogs, oysters, oranges, stoves, window glass, wagons, and sleighs. More than 2 million pounds of agricultural implements were unloaded in 1873.

Nor was river traffic entirely one way. Minnesota also exported down river, sending its wealth throughout the Middle West. Locally manufactured items and regionally grown and processed products included buffalo robes, flour, furs, ginseng, sheep pelts, and deerskins. More than 107,000 bushels of wheat and 250,000 feet of lumber were exported in 1867.

No one knows exactly how many new Minnesota residents were brought in by river boats, but everyone agrees that the number was large. Year in and year out, people surged through St. Paul like the floodwaters of a river during spring runoff. Many, after claiming their luggage and household goods at the levee, purchased wagons and teams to carry them into the interior. Fully 10,000 horse-drawn settlers moved north of the Minnesota River during 1867, and some 40,000 land seekers located in the northern portions of the State.

CLAMOR FOR RAILS

Although the steamboat rendered an invaluable service and was of significant value in the development of the area, it had its disadvantages. There were months when the river was frozen over and traffic could not move. Always there was danger of river accidents. And even the fastest boat was slower than a train. It was even more important that trains could run anywhere a track could be laid down, while boats must keep to waterways.

It is little wonder, then, that from Territorial times a clamor went up for railroads. An early editor called railroads indispensable. Governor Ramsey urged their chartering and construction. In 1857, the Federal Congress made liberal land grants to five Minnesota railroad companies, but stipulated that construction be started promptly and provided that a certain amount of progress must be shown before the land should pass into their possession. Unfortunately, the panic of 1857, a depression that blighted the Nation, withered plans for building. Not even a $5 million loan by Minnesota kept the program alive. On the eve of the Civil War not a mile of track was operating in the State.

During the war years, however, new companies were chartered and construction commenced. On a proud August day in 1870, the Lake Superior & Mississippi Railroad, connecting Duluth and St. Paul, was opened for traffic. It was destined to haul vast quantities of wheat to Duluth, to be shipped via the Great Lakes to eastern markets. Some 2,000 miles of track, serving about 15 railroads, were in operation by 1872. Although the panic of 1873 slowed, it did not halt construction. James J. Hill rose to fame as an empire builder. By the middle 1880's, railroads were doing what steamers originally had performed—furnishing the Northwest with necessities, hauling away local products, connecting Minnesota with eastern and western points.

The Northern Pacific was completed to the Pacific coast in the autumn of 1883; the St. Paul, Minneapolis & Manitoba was traversing the developing wheat area of the Red River country; the Wisconsin Central was operating into St. Paul by 1885. The St. Paul & Duluth Railroad brought the North Shore and the Twin Cities closer together. There was heavy traffic on the Chicago, St. Paul & Omaha, the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul, and the Minneapolis & St. Louis.

GROWING TRAFFIC

"It is difficult for a traveler, as he alights from his train at the union depot and sees the ceaseless bustle of the thousands of passengers going and coming," said a St. Paul businessman in 1885, "to realize that it is not yet 23 years since the first rail was laid in Minnesota, nor a score since the first all-rail connection was made with Chicago and the east."

The chamber of commerce spoke glowingly of the expansion of St. Paul trade: "The opening of the Northern Pacific as a through line to the Pacific coast, and the extension of several other lines into Dakota and Wisconsin, have given great impetus to the wholesale trade of the city."

This also was true of Minneapolis, where the board of trade had characterized Minnesota as a thoroughfare between the East and the Pacific coast. Its wholesale trade, largely because of railroads, increased from more than $5 million in 1876 to more than $68 million in 1886. More than 25,000 car lots of freight were received in 1876 and more than 120,000 in 1882. But the railroad did much more than haul freight, ore, and passengers. It carried mail, stimulated the growth of towns, battled with embittered farmers over freight rates, established line elevators.

Between 1880 and World War I, when the village depot and telegraph office were a source of gossip and news, many smaller roads were absorbed by larger companies, and relatively few miles of new track were laid. A 1920 traffic map of Minnesota looked much like it does today. Now there are 8,287 miles of track. This mileage is more likely to diminish than to increase in the future. The number of trains operated has declined and will continue to do so.

RAILWAYS TO HIGHWAYS

By the 1920's railroads were facing a new and stern competitor. At first the automobile did not appear too fearsome. After all, the horse and the surrey with the fringe on top were sure and safe for short trips; and the train, although it frequently was late, nevertheless was reliable. No passenger ever "got out and got under" when riding the coaches. Yet the new-fangled automobile, with the introduction of the pneumatic tire and the beginning of mass production, annually increased in numbers on Minnesota's expanding network of roads.

Automobile licenses were first issued by the State in 1907 and the first stretch of concrete road was laid down near Red Wing in 1912. By 1920, more than 300,000 cars were licensed and this number doubled during the next decade. Each year has seen an increase in the total number of passenger cars in the State. Today more than 1,300,000 vehicles carry Minnesotans more than 30 million miles daily over a total of 121,000 miles of roads and streets.

COME THE TRUCKS

Of particular significance is the development of trucking, a business which has provided intense competition for the railroads. From a small beginning about 1916, with a registration of 4,000 trucks, the number has increased to 241,170 in 1957. These trucks give employment to a sizable army whose annual earnings amount to more than $525 million. Almost 5,000 filling stations today cater to Minnesota's restless motor cavalcade.

Not until 1920 did the State, as the result of an amendment to the constitution, provide for a planned system of highways. Today there is a total of 109,257 miles of highways and major rural roads. With the increase in the number of passenger cars, trucks, and buses, it is estimated that over a billion dollars will be needed within the next decade for highway repairs and improvements.

It is of interest to note that the Nation's bus lines, now hauling millions of passengers annually, had their beginnings in Minnesota. The Messaba Transportation Co. was organized in 1915, and from it emerged the great Greyhound system. As early as 1917, bus lines carried some 15 million passengers throughout Minnesota. In 1957, Greyhound transported 2,200,000 passengers within the State.

THEN THE AIRWAYS

Perhaps the most spectacular change in Minnesota's transportation took place not on the ground but in the air. The first passenger plane to fly from St. Paul to Chicago made its historic flight in 1927, the very year that a Minnesotan, Charles A. Lindbergh, flew nonstop from New York to Paris. A year later the Wold-Chamberlain field became a municipal airport. Ten years later there were some 35 airports throughout the State, increasing to 336 by 1950.

Today, many airlines fly into the Twin Cities, annually carrying more passengers than did all the railroads of the State 70 years ago. Some 1,428,000 persons arrived at and departed from Wold-Chamberlain field in 1957. Airfreight shows an annual increase, reaching more than 18 million pounds in 1957. There is every evidence that planes will become bigger and faster, and that they will haul increasing hordes of passengers in the future. A major problem of tomorrow is to make airfields more easily accessible to the traveling public. It is probable that helicopter service from urban centers to outlying fields will prove helpful.

SEAWAY SIGNIFICANT

Traffic on the Great Lakes long has been a major factor in Minnesota transportation. Even before the first shipment of iron ore in 1884, Lake Superior was an important artery of trade. Transportation was made easier by cutting a canal through Minnesota Point in 1871, by improvements of the Duluth Harbor in 1887, and by a channel through Rice's Point in 1890. Lumber, wheat, and ore constituted the bulk of the cargoes. Today the port tonnage of Duluth and Superior is second only to that of New York City. Ninety-two percent of lake exports is iron ore, and 80 percent of lake imports is coal.

The St. Lawrence seaway, moving toward completion, will effect drastic changes. Minnesota may benefit industrially as a result of lower costs of shipping raw materials and manufactured products. Grain can be moved directly from Duluth to coastal and foreign ports in oceangoing vessels. The seaway may firmly establish the steel industry and prevent it from moving to Atlantic coastal ports. It likely will increase the State's service to ships in the form of repairs and furnishing supplies. Finally, it is said that the seaway will benefit the defense of the region and the Nation because the Great Lakes may serve as a fourth seacoast for the movement of industrial products and raw materials.

Although specific changes cannot be pinpointed for Minnesota's system of transportation, one thing seems certain: The State, a hundred years from now, will be as different from today as we are in comparison with that gala day in 1858, when Minnesota entered the Union.

The Record of Marion B. Folsom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, several days ago it was revealed that one of the leading citizens of Rochester, N. Y., and this city would leave the President's Cabinet in the next few months. I speak of Marion B. Folsom, the esteemed Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Folsom has been the first Rochester citizen to serve in the President's Cabinet and we are all proud and pleased at the outstanding service he has rendered to the Nation in his position.

Marion Folsom has a long record of outstanding service to his community and the country. As an official of the Eastman Kodak Co. of Rochester he pioneered in creation of industrial welfare and pension programs 30 years ago. Later he put his knowledge and experience at the service of the entire Nation as a member of the President's Advisory Committee on Economic Security to help draft the original Social Security Act of 1934.

Before assuming command at HEW in 1955, Marion Folsom served 2 years as Under Secretary of the Treasury. There, in 1953, he again demonstrated his acute social and economic awareness by participating in the first complete revision of our Federal tax laws in 79 years. This legislation provided the largest tax reduction ever granted the American people and corrected many gross inequities. It ranks as one of the major accomplishments of this administration.

More recently, Mr. Folsom has been instrumental in presenting plans to strengthen our education system. Here again he has exhibited a great understanding of the historical responsibilities and needs in this area. In addition to these accomplishments, he has been instrumental in creation of hospitalization and medical plans in the Rochester area and has served on many other important Federal, State, and local boards and agencies. Mr. Folsom's interests have always been directed toward programs which made a better life for others.

Now, for personal reasons, he wishes to return to private life. I would like to take this means to pay tribute to the knowledge, understanding and ability of Marion Folsom and express our appreciation that he has used these talents for the benefit of all our people. His contributions are monumental in his field.

The Rochester Times-Union has printed an eloquent editorial in praise of Mr. Folsom in its edition of May 7, 1958, and I request unanimous consent to include this editorial in the RECORD.

FOLSOM TO LEAVE RECORD OF FINE ACHIEVEMENT

The forthcoming resignation of Secretary Folsom from the President's Cabinet should not be regretted, since it means his return to Rochester, but we do regret it.

After all, Mr. Folsom was the first Rochesterian to be named to the Cabinet. He has never ceased to be a source of pride to his home city.

Five years is considerably longer than Mr. Folsom expected to stay in Washington when he went there in 1953 as Under Secretary of the Treasury in the President's first administration. But after piloting through Congress the first general revision of the tax laws in many years, he was named Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and stayed.

Now, he is expected to revert to his former status as a frequent commuter to

Washington. As an author of the original social-security statutes, his testimony was always sought by every succeeding Congress on social security matters as well as on economic legislation. That demand will continue. He has always advocated participation in Government by business executives.

It would be difficult to assess now which was his greater contribution, as Under Secretary of the Treasury or as Secretary of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department.

As Under Secretary his principal field was tax matters and the tax revision bill of 1953 was a monumental piece of legislation. It not only made the largest reduction in taxes ever made in a single bill but it also took out of the tax code the most glaring inequities that had crept in during years of piecemeal revisions.

But at the same time, Mr. Folsom will be considered for all time the creator of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department. He was not the first Secretary of the new Department which was created under President Eisenhower, but he gave it the form it will probably retain for many years to come. Again he was active in revision of the social security laws which extended coverage and increased benefits, though he was defeated when he opposed bracketing disability pensions into the social security system.

One unfinished task on which he extended great energy was the matter of Federal aid to school construction. The Democratic Congress first defeated his effort to equalize educational opportunity through Federal aid to school building and then defeated its own substitute bill.

Mr. Folsom will leave the Department in good hands. The expectation is that the President will appoint Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, president of Ohio Wesleyan University. Dr. Flemming has been in and out of government service almost as long as Mr. Folsom and for 6 years was Director of the Office of War Mobilization.

Florida Sweet Corn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, last week the Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association and the Florida congressional delegation had the happy privilege of making available some of Florida's choicest sweet corn for Members and their guests to enjoy.

Many of my colleagues have asked me for the best receipts for the preparation of sweet corn. I am happy to furnish these recipes through the courtesy of Mrs. Kathleen Vandegrift, whose husband is Mr. Roy Vandegrift, Jr., the president of the Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association.

I think it is interesting in this connection to point out that the sweet corn feed growers of Florida are spending somewhere between $50,000 and $75,000 in money that they have raised themselves to promote more purchases of our Florida sweet corn. Last week in Florida the price to the producer of this corn was $1.25 per crate. The farmers estimate that of this amount they only received about 3 cents per crate to pay for the cost of production. This illustrates the difficulty again of the farmer getting a fair share of the consumer's dollar. Florida sweet corn last week was selling in the Washington markets at 5 ears for 29 cents, or a little bit less than 6 cents per ear. This amount is not an excessive cost for the housewife, and yet the producer does not receive his right share of that cost because of what we might call the in-between processes from the farmer to the consumer. The recipes sent by Mrs. Vandegrift follow:

RECIPE FOR BOILING FLORIDA SWEET CORN

Cook 8 ears at a time flat in a heavy skillet with a tight cover. First, put three-fourth of a cup of water in the skillet, add one-half teaspoon of sugar, and 1 teaspoon of salt. Bring to a boil. Then add eight ears of the cleaned corn. Add pepper to taste. Add a sprinkle of paprika (for color only), and two generous pats of butter for each ear. Turn down heat. Cover and cook for 3 minutes. Turn with tongs, very gently, and cook 3 minutes more. Remove from heat.

RECIPE FOR FRIED FLORIDA SWEET CORN

Cut corn off the cob. Add salt, pepper, sugar, and butter to taste. Put on medium heat, no cover. When hot through the corn is ready to eat.

Summer Fellowship Program for Secondary-School Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a brief news article which appeared in the San Leandro (Calif.) Morning News just recently. The article is brief, but to my mind, it is significant.

It states how one industrial company—the Maxwell House division of General Foods Corp.—is giving a helping hand to local high-school teachers in San Leandro, Calif.

Sidney L. Feener, Jr., the plant manager of the local Maxwell House operation, calls the program the summer fellowship program for secondary-school teachers.

His program, which is comparatively simple and inexpensive, strikes directly at an area of our educational system which has been of deep concern to us recently. It involves providing a grant or grants to secondary-school teachers to take advanced courses of study during the summer months at little or no expense to themselves.

It is my understanding that Mr. Feener's parent organization, General Foods, is going to expand this high-school teacher grant plan to many more of its plant communities. The program will become effective this summer.

The need to improve the quality of teaching in our secondary schools has been apparent for some time, and recent world events have added emphasis to this. One of the main reasons for our great teacher shortage is low pay, and this grassroots method of alleviating some of the teachers' financial burden is certainly welcome at this time. Furthermore, this novel program of teacher-aid will benefit the teachers themselves academically as well as benefit the local school system by strengthening it in areas where greater teaching skills are needed.

It is a source of personal satisfaction to me to know that an industry in my district of California is taking a lead in so practical and effective a plan to help teachers and hence the community school system.

I would hope that other industries, other communities, civic groups, and educators, would study this General Foods high-school teacher fellowship program, for this is an area in education which certainly needs to be helped at this time.

Statehood and the Fishery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, objections have been made to the Alaska statehood bill, schedueld to be considered by the House later this week, on the grounds that the State government would discriminate against nonresident fishermen. This objection has come principally from the State of Washington. No more effective rebuttal could be given than that which appeared in an editorial in the May 1 issue of the Fishermen's News published at Seattle, Wash. Entitled "Alaskans, We're With You," the editorial reasserts the paper's support for Alaska statehood and upholds the contention of many Alaskans that Washington State itself discriminates against fishermen from elsewhere. I take pleasure in calling this editorial to the attention of the House:

ALASKANS, WE'RE WITH YOU

The hue and cry for hearings on Alaska statehood has become a big issue in the current Congress as battlelines are drawn once again in this dispute which began back in 1916 with the introduction of the first statehood bill by Republican James Wickersham.

Sometimes the issue has been fought on straight political lines but seldom on the righteousness or justification of the citizens themselves. Representative TOM MURRAY of Tennessee on the House floor recently estimated that some 5,000 pages of printed testimony had been taken on the subject of Alaskan statehood.

Our interests are unquestionably guided to some extent by the hope for better fisheries management under statehood. There are many who feel that a change from Federal to local management would be the beginning of the end, but surely the record of United States management of the Terirtory's fisheries cannot be pointed to with pride. Perhaps the end is in sight, anyway.

Seattle Representative TOM PELLY, who has surely shown every interest in the fishermen's lot in the matter of the 12-mile limit problem, declares his position one of doubt for fear that Alaskans might take advantage of United States residents in their fishery management. This might be a valid argument in Washington, D. C., but in the State of Washington we are sure that our current license law tops any fishery discrimination we have seen.

Alaskans attempted, a few years back, to clobber nonresidents with exhorbitant license fees, but their plan was thwarted by the courts, just as such future efforts under statehood would be set aside. Keeping statehood from residents of the Territory because we fear what they might do with the authority and power is about as insulting a charge as could be presented.

We have long favored statehood for Alaska. We reiterated our thoughts early this year in one of our Statements of Purpose.

Beyond the fishery issues involved, the United States has a moral obligation in the matter. In the Treaty of Cession, signed March 30, 1867, the United States guaranteed Alaska citizens that "The inhabitants of the ceded territory * * * shall be admitted to all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States."

Amend Reciprocal Trade Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following letter and resolution 41, which I have just received from the American Legion. Both the letter and the resolution express sentiments closely akin to my own on the subject of the reciprocal trade agreements program.

As you will note, Mr. Speaker, the American Legion urges that we adopt a foreign-trade policy that will prevent injury to, and the liquidation of, industries essential to the defense and the economic welfare of our country. I certainly share with them the hope that such legislation will be enacted as soon as possible, and I commend both the Legion's letter and their resolution to the attention of every Member of the Congress:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 16, 1958.

To All Members of the House of Representatives:

Referring to the proposed extension of the Trade Agreement Act, I enclose a copy of Resolution 41 adopted at the April 30–May 2, 1958, meeting of the national executive committee of the American Legion, our governing body between national conventions.

This resolution urges Congress to enact legislation and the Government to adopt a foreign trade policy that will prevent injury to and liquidation of industries essential to the defense and the economic welfare of our country.

We would appreciate it very much if this resolution could be given favorable consideration by you at the appropriate time.

The American Legion supports a truly reciprocal trade policy, one which will not do mischief to our economy and defense potential.

Sincerely yours,
MILES D. KENNEDY, *Director.*

RESOLUTION 41

Committee: Foreign Relations Commission.
Subject: Amend Reciprocal Trade Act.

Whereas certain American industries, labor and segments of our agriculture, essential to our defense and the economic welfare of this country, are being injured by the provisions and administration of the Reciprocal Trade Act; and

Whereas the continuance of this act and its administration will seriously affect the defense of the United States; and

Whereas we are becoming more and more dependent upon industry, agriculture and raw materials located near Communist dominated countries and in easy reach of potential enemy army, navy and air forces: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the national executive committee of the American Legion in regular meeting assembled in Indianapolis, Ind., on April 30–May 2, 1958, That the American Legion urge the Congress to enact legislation and the United States Government to adopt a foreign trade policy that will prevent the injury to and liquidation of industries essential to the defense and the economic welfare of this country.

Minnesota Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Ogden Standard-Examiner of May 7, 1958:

MINNESOTA CENTENNIAL

On May 11 the people of Minnesota will celebrate 100 years of statehood. Already Senators and Representatives from Minnesota are telling their colleagues in House and Senate what a splendid State they represent. And they are right. It is a wonderful State.

Minnesota has a population of 3,313,000. Its people produce abundantly of manufactured goods, ore, and farm products. The manufacturing payroll is over $1 billion a year, wholesale and retail businesses $750 million a year in wages.

Minnesota ranks first among the States in the amount of iron ore shipped, second in butter manufacturing, third in sweet corn for processing, fourth in the production of calendars.

We have long known that Minneapolis is a great milling center. We were surprised to learn that the South St. Paul livestock market is the second largest in the world.

A great many other pleasant things can be said about Minnesota, and one of these is that the State produces a sturdy brand of men and women, many of whom have come to live among us in Utah. In fact, Minnesotans are to be found everywhere, and that is why the Minnesota centennial will be widely celebrated.

Conservancy District Off to Great Start

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, an event of unusual importance to the Arkansas Valley in Colorado took place recently, when the Southeastern Colorado Water Conservancy District was organized by an order of the district judge at Pueblo. This district comprises the land to be served by the Fryingpan-Arkansas water diversion project, which is now pending before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

This district was organized under the laws of the State of Colorado, which provide for an assessment to be levied upon this land in order to raise funds for the district. The law also calls for the naming of a board of directors to handle all matters relating to the district. Last week in the Pueblo district court an order was entered appointing 15 men to this board. The directors elected Mr. J. Selby Young, of Colorado Springs, as their chairman.

The board of directors are empowered to sign a contract for the repayment of the costs of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project when the same is authorized and ready for construction. This is the first time that the sponsors of the project are able to act as a legal entity under the laws of the State of Colorado. The organization of the district and the naming of the board of directors are significant and important steps toward the realization of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project. These people are willing to assume the full financial responsibilities imposed upon them by reclamation laws in the construction of this project, and will be ready to enter into negotiations with the Bureau of Reclamation for the repayment contract.

I include as part of my remarks an editorial from the Pueblo Star-Journal, as follows:

CONSERVANCY DISTRICT OFF TO GREAT START

Judge S. Phillip Cabibi appointed a board of 15 members of the Southeastern Colorado Water Conservancy District Tuesday that would be hard to beat.

The board represents fairly all parts of the district which runs from north of Buena Vista to land under the Fort Lyon Canal east of Las Animas, and including Colorado Springs and the agricultural regions north of Pueblo.

It is the largest conservancy district in point of acreage and valuation in the State of Colorado.

For the first time in the history of the Arkansas Valley, it is in a position to act as the legal entity representing all water interests in the valley. It provides the vehicle for focusing attention on the Arkansas Valley and requiring that water users in the valley be heard. This has not been the case in the past.

The occasion of the appointment of the board and its organization through the election of officers and appointment of committees is also significant because it will wind up

the principal efforts of the Water Development Association of Southeastern Colorado which was formed just 12 years ago. It accomplished the organization of a conservancy district for the benefit of all water users and the protection of their rights, and it has promoted a reclamation project for the use of Colorado's rightful share to the waters of the upper Colorado River Basin. The Fryingpan-Arkansas project now before Congress is the culmination of that effort.

The board of the conservancy district has a great responsibility. The district is not just another organization, as all board members well realize. We congratulate them and wish them well in the firm belief that they will receive complete and full cooperation from all interested parties in the valley.

Past Mistakes Have Made for the Tinderbox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the indignities visited upon our Vice President and his wife in Latin America, and the insults showered upon us in the Middle East, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House an editorial appearing in the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of May 16. It is enlightening and should be of interest to the Members of the House.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include it herein. It follows:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of May 16, 1958]

PAST MISTAKES HAVE MADE FOR THE TINDERBOX

There are tinderboxes all over the world—with a low flash point—upon which artisans of friction are showering the sparks.

Venezuela and Peru, with near explosions of most recent memory, and close to the United States; in the Middle East, Lebanon, undergoing internal trial by fire; in this hemisphere again, Bolivia forced by insurrection to proclaim a state of seige. Regradless of individual circumstances making for present unrest—or in cases for chronic unrest—what is the factor of almost simultaneous outbreak?

Realistic appraisal identifies the Red hand feeding and stirring that flame for its own sinister purpose; but it gets in a major blow only where conditions, by bungling stupidity or deliberate despoliation, are ready made for it. Both have occurred toward—and in—lands of Latin America. United States policy treatment in the past toward some of these has heightened the conditions on which Red exploitation and free lance riot have fastened.

These are facts assuredly to face, as they now are being faced, to redress grievances and act against the common danger.

There was bungling of the diplomatic responsibility, by dignitaries, some of them playing footsie with dictator regimes. Milton Eisenhower's role, as in the Argentine case, was a protracted blunder—a misbegotten conferment of tolerance and respectability on the foul tenure of Juan D. Peron. No less disgraceful was the sanctuary bestowed on that dictator, in the Washington Hotel at Colon, Panama, after he was called to account by his people and overthrown.

Henry Holland, the erstwhile Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, likewise played his part in the policy of insufferable patronage. There was Rudolf E. Schoenfeld, too, Ambassador to Guatemala when the latter was in the throes of internal turmoil at the hands of the infamous Arbenz.

Their shenanigans disgraced principles of responsible stewardship by a nation standing for, and extolling the democratic concept. For the regimes tolerated, or inferentially endorsed by the charity of silence—or more, close diplomatic embrace—were the ones despoiling their lands, depleting treasuries, and impoverishing their economies.

That was an era of frivolity, compounding consequent problems. It began before a stronger hand took the United States policy helm—but phases of it were carried over all too long.

Dictators, whether in Argentina, in Venezuela, in Guatemala, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, or elsewhere, destroy the economic strength of their lands. They take money from the impoverished purse of their constituents, and food from their mouths; and hungry bellies make for riot and a ready surrender to enticing promises, even of communism.

Preachments of democracy, however eloquent, do not convert hungry people, particularly when accompanied by actions suggestive of tolerance and endorsement of their oppressors.

America has learned that fact of life—though there still are exdictators whom are are handling with ostensible hospitality and kid gloves.

Communism moves in upon a situation of want, unrest, and insurrection. It exploits and foments these. It has showered its sparks. The intent, characteristic of the Red conspiracy, is to set such a fire. It is the handiwork of infiltration for its own violence and pillage, and of turmoil to direct hate at the United States. And it comes at a time when Soviet Russia is concentrating a renewed cold war effort all over the world.

It is no mere coincidence that it is timed with the newly renewed sputnik extravaganza—which Khrushchev glibly used for his own propagandic twist; and revived mention of disarmament for pressure to compel summit discussions on Soviet terms.

International turmoil is a favorite Red device to weaken ties of the West, to subvert and alienate lands of mutual security arrangements with the United States; to incite suspicion and hate.

The danger is not wholly what communism in this connection has achieved to date—for even in Venezuela and Peru it did not succeed in destroying these ties. The danger is what it can achieve if these powers do not work together; and if, severally, they do not exert their own rightful responsibility to extinguish these sparks. At the same time they have the obligation to set their house in order for the maximum of economic and political strength, recognizing that communism capitalizes on weakness.

But a related fact to remember, and on which to fortify hemisphere action from here on is:

Dictatorial regimes, some of them overthrown, sowed the seed for this harvest of tempest and threat by their own pillaging. If the nationals of some of these lands will examine the record, they will see the cause of economic distress in those tenures which impoverished Argentina, for instance, will be paying for years for the debauchery of Dictator Juan Peron—who even now is striving for comeback. Gustavo Rojas Pinilla hopes to stage a coup to recover the reins in Colombia. Marco Perez Jimenez (now enjoying an undeserved sanctuary in the United States) was responsible for the state of affairs prejudicial to good will and on which Red conspirators fastened when Vice President NIXON visited there.

Cuba still is the target of internal unrest, anti-American despite claims that is wholly domestic. In Central America, Guatemala was redeemed from a regime that was Communist-infested, but its liberator was assassinated, and the Red-sympathizing Jacob Arbenz Guzman, reportedly in Mexico, hopes for return.

The United States has sought to shore up these economies for economic strength—though policies in the past have not been wholly employed as a stabilizing force. There have been, as pointed out, weaknesses and defects at points, and a misbegotten willingness to gloss over the derelictions of such as Peron. Still, Latin America has gained from the basic policy of mutual effort, and of American investments predicated on the program of hemispheric accord.

Strong, united effort—stripped of errant nonsense, and convincing of purpose—can meet both internal and external dangers.

Thinking leadership in these lands knows that it is not the United States that is the enemy, or that has ulterior designs upon them. They know the necessity of standing together—in their own interest and against a common foe.

Like the United States, they must know the meaning of these flareups—whether in the hemisphere—or across the ocean on the shores of the Mediterranean.

They must know also the imperative need of strengthening their own economy, and of putting out these political sparks—partly by eliminating conditions that make for a tinderbox.

Communism can be defeated. Only by going to sleep, and ignoring its obvious antics of infiltration, can the battle against it be lost.

Cherish the Federal Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared an editorial in the American Banker, a newspaper devoted to the interests of the American banks. Too many people, when they hear something said by a banker, are inclined to think it is said for a selfish personal reason. Banks exist basically for the welfare of their community. All laws made to regulate banks have but one basic objective—the welfare of the public.

I note that a great deal of recent publicity is designed to appeal to patriotism as the motive to "buy now campaigns." It seems to me, this patriotic appeal still further casts a doubt to the consumer that an appeal based on patriotism is a last resort. In other words, it shakes the confidence of the prospective customer still further. The consumer, after all is the ultimate cause of when the recession will end.

The article appended hereto clearly points out the necessity for the integrity of the dollar. The stability of the dollar is not something to talk about—it must be done.

The consumer of either credit or goods must have confidence in the future. When this confidence is restored in the consumer, the recession will end, and no

amount of Government boondoggling under fancy names will restore this confidence.

I commend the following article:

CHERISH THE FEDERAL CREDIT—FAILURE TO DO SO COULD TURN RECESSION INTO DEPRESSION

There is one way that we can really make this readjustment and recession period into a full-dress depression. Deficits and spending that dissipate the Federal credit will do it if we lose our heads and our guts.

How much deficiting and spending it will take to create fear where there should be confidence cannot even be guessed. But there is a breaking point for the credit of the United States. Congressmen who are being glibly importuned to cut taxes and add to United States spending should not forget this very important fact in attempting to control our economic future by the deficit method.

How could a breakdown of the credit of the United States come about? It could happen at any point that our foreign creditors get the idea that Treasury deficits and guaranties have piled up to such a point that another devaluation of the dollar is inevitable. Simultaneously, very likely, economically sophisticated people with money in savings institutions might very likely begin hoarding or sending their money abroad. Foreign holders of deposits in American banks in such a set of circumstances, would begin to withdraw them. Foreign holders of United States Treasury securities would become sellers, transferring the proceeds overseas.

Net result would be a vicious spiral of contraction of bank credit, pressure on the reserves of the Federal Reserve banks and epidemic loss of confidence in our money and credit system. It happened in 1932 and 1933, when the program of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation became interpreted as a commitment by the United States Treasury to underwrite the liquidity and refinance the losses of the American financial system, banks, insurance companies and, indirectly, big business. The breaking point then was much closer than realized by anyone who favored the RFC in February 1932. We were off the gold standard and into dollar depreciation by March 1933.

We can ill afford to risk approach now to a repetition of a similar undermining of the Federal credit in the guise of a recession cure. In the 1930's the cure was so evanescent, the aftermath so lasting, that we wonder that people have forgotten so easily the almost 10 years of lack of faith in our economy which followed dollar devaluation in 1933. The number of unemployed remained in the millions, industrial investment for expansion almost stagnated. World trade stayed in a slump and efforts to bring about international economic cooperation as a foundation for peace were torpedoed because of the insecurity of American business and politics. How long this depression cycle then would have lasted had we not let Europe blunder into World War II and get dragged in ourselves is anyone's guess.

Confidence is a big and important word in our economy today.

But in no area is confidence more necessary than in the soundness of our Federal credit, the value of the United States dollar and the stability of prices.

ABA President Welman, in his Georgia bankers' convention address, counseled "forbearance and willingness to do with less profits and wage and salary increases" to assure stability of prices, adding: "One thing which the public would understand clearly and to which it would respond quickly would be a cessation of the seemingly never-ending rise in the cost of living and the bringing about of some reasonable price stability."

Other observers have voiced like views; that is, that a buyers' strike against constantly rising prices is at the root of this recession, and people will begin spending again when they feel they are getting their money's worth for their not-so-easily earned dollars.

Stability of prices is the reward of the saver. Without it, sayings are not worth saving. Stability of prices is also the best guaranty of stability of the dollar and of maintenance of that international and national confidence which is so essential to keeping our recession from deepening into a depression characterized by worldwide fear of collapse in our credit and in the value of the United States dollar.

"Cherish the Federal credit," said George Washington in his Farewell Address. True in 1798, our first President's advice is as true and timely today as it was then.

Financial Aid for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, recently George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, as a witness before the House Banking and Currency Committee, presented some of his views on small business and some of its problems in the present economic situation. Since his statement represents the thinking of an important group on an important subject, I certainly feel it should have a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Burger's statement, as follows:

FINANCIAL AID FOR SMALL BUSINESS

(Statement of George J. Burger, vice president National Federation of Independent Business, Before House Banking and Currency Committee, May 9, 1958)

I am George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. We are the largest business organization in the Nation. Our membership is made up exclusively of independent business and professional people. These people who are your independent-enterprise constituents — they alone set our stand on bills and issues by direct, signed votes, through our mandate polls, which they send to you. In that sense, when I speak here, I speak only through their collective voice, as though they were here before you to speak for themselves.

First, let me make one point clear, and that is, we have not polled our members on recent bills introduced to make equity capital and long-term credit more readily available to small business. Whether this will be instituted by the federation will depend largely on the overall correspondence we receive from our nationwide membership on this new proposal introduced by Members of Congress.

We want to be on record in complimenting the committee and its efficient staff for the splendid action being taken on the subject matter relating to small-business financing. It goes without saying such action is very encouraging to small business throughout the Nation.

We are not unmindful of the thoroughness of the committee and its staff in public hearings held during the 1st session of the 85th Congress on the expanded operation of the Small Business Administration. The committee took a very forward and constructive step in bringing about the improved, far-reaching legislation as recently voted by the House. It was our hope that by this time the Senate would have followed through with concurrent action. This in itself would have been another inspiration to small business throughout the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, last fall, by direction of our head office at Burlingame, Calif., I personally visited and conferred with regional directors and top staff members of the Small Business Administration in Chicago, Minneapolis, Seattle, branch office at Portland, Oreg., San Francisco, Los Angeles, and after my return east, with the regional office in New York City. In each instance the regional director was not aware of the firsthand information we desired on the operation in the various regions. In each instance the conference lasted close to 2 hours and, to be on the safe side, I made it mandatory that another person accompany me on these visits so there would be no conflict in our findings as to the operation in these various regions.

The information we were after was:

1. Applications filed in the regional office from its inception to June 30, 1957.
2. Loans approved in that period.
3. Loans disbursed.
4. Timelag between filing and approval.
5. Timelag between approval and disbursement.
6. Average amount of application.
7. Applications filed for certificates of small business. (a) Number approved. (b) Number denied.
8. Applications filed for certificate of competency. (a) Number approved. (b) Number denied.
9. Number of banks participating in the regional area.
10. Percentage of bank-participation loans.

Mr. Chairman, I have the complete recapitulation of the results of this extensive survey, and I believe it should be made a part of the record of these hearings. In each and every instance no attempt was made by the Government official to conceal any of the information requested.

Shortly after the Small Business Administration was constituted by the Congress I had personal visits with regional directors of SBA in San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Kansas City. Although SBA was at that time in the embryo stage I must confess it did not look very promising as to its help to small business. Shortly after those visits the entire operation of the Small Business Administration was changed for the better, and as I review the present operation of SBA it shows considerable advancement and progress, more in keeping with the intent of Congress.

I think it is most necessary for the committee to have this firsthand information, because such information coming from small business itself should be the determining factor as to whether there is any need for further financial assistance to small business.

These nationwide surveys made by us disclose some interesting action taken by the various regional offices. For example, in one area personal visits were made to all towns in that area 500 or over in population to acquaint the banks with the operation of the Small Business Administration. They believe such action brought greater interest from the banks in the area to SBA. They believe the 5-percent interest rate provided in the House bill would be a deterrent.

We found, in many instances, that regional offices of SBA were plagued with inquiries at the time of the announcement of the President's Conference on Small Business and the question was put to them: "Who selected the small business from this area?"

It was reported in many areas that chain banks may look more favorably on the operation of SBA if it is made a permanent agency. Then again, some regional offices maintained they should have a closing attorney which would, in a more effective way, speed the closing of loans. Additional help was needed in some of the regional offices, and in many instances complaints were made of the continual paperwork placed on the regional offices from the head office of SBA.

It was also brought to our attention that additional work is placed on the regional offices through loans issued by the Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, and in connection with Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans.

Criticism, in some areas, was leveled at the big banks for failing to cooperate with SBA.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, after my return to Washington I kept my ears to the ground to get the reaction from well-informed financial people as to what beneficial effects to small business would take place if the action of the House in the 1st session of the 85th Congress was finally adopted. The opinion was expressed that if this took place (and we hope it does) it would take away the dependency of small banks on the bigger banks. Now, bear in mind this was the opinion of well-informed banking officials heretofore with big banking institutions.

Mr. Chairman, we would be derelict in our obligation to small business if we closed our eyes to any action by the Congress which would give greater financial help to efficient small business, but there is a wonder in our minds as to the origin of this sudden action on the need for equity financing for small business. I stand before you today and can tell you without fear of contradiction that in the Washington office of the federation—where we have received hundreds upon hundreds of inquiries as to the procedure on SBA loan applications from small business—we have yet to receive any request for long term equity capital financing, except for what is provided in the present Small Business Administration Act.

We believe, from actual business experience of more than a quarter of a century, that where term loans of 5 to 10 years are granted to small business, this would serve the purpose. It might be possible for SBA's loan period to be extended to a 20-year period. That's for the Congress to decide. But there is one thing paramount in our minds, and that is, if a small-business institution could not qualify for a loan under SBA, then we ask the question: "How could they qualify for loans under the new proposal?" I think you will agree that makes sense. Credit standing of an applicant must be good or bad when it comes to loans either through SBA or through any other financial institution, private or Government.

Since congressional action has been instituted on this legislative proposal to make equity capital and long-term credit more readily available to small business we have explored every possible source to get factual information from competent banking authorities. By that we mean people who grew up in the banking field, from the ground floor up.

Let me quote from a communication dated as late as April 29, 1958, from the president of a bank in New York State. He states:

"First, I would be very much against the creation of another agency. Frankly, I think there are too many agencies already and they always seem to weaken the national effort rather than strengthen a cause. Second, I would definitely be interested in the consolidation of the proposed new legislation in the present SBA Association.

"At times I may be critical of the SBA in not pushing for more loans, but I do believe that concentrating all activities and creating one strong Small Business Administration will bring the national effort more prominently into focus.

"The most important thing, George, as I see it is to be very certain we do get some legislation as it is going to become increasingly difficult for the small-business man in America, unless something is done by Mr. United States Government. In fact, I think there should be one agency that should be almost a little czar."

A west coast banker, prominent in his field, advised our head office under date of April 28, that between programs by private banks and the Small Business Administration, the shorter term loan problem of small business is pretty well in hand and he thinks it necessary to continue the SBA lending program as it is now. He believes there is need for small business longer term loans. He is of the opinion that whatever is done should be done through the Small Business Administration. He further stated that there is uncertainty as to whether creation of another agency might, in the long run, undermine the Small Business Administration and its vitally needed programs. He doesn't want anything to knock the SBA and its program out of the picture. He makes a very important observation that the general feeling is it is sounder to perfect an agency that we already have than it is to go off and create a new one.

Another important observation was made by a bank president, and it is a very important one, when he said under date of May 2, "I would consider it very advisable to add aggressive and progressive, independent businessmen of experience to the Loan Policy Board: But only if their advice and suggestions were going to be considered. Too often the businessman is a front used by Government agencies without any real participation in the formation of policies and his value in that case is nil."

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in view of this it would be our belief that Congress should complete the work so ably instituted by the House in the 1st session of the 85th Congress, and if we in small business find that this agency of the Government is not serving the best interest of efficient independent business, we will be the first to be knocking on the door of every Member of Congress for the necessary legislation to protect and aid efficient small businesses.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to present to you and the members of the committee the facts as we evaluate the situation through daily living with small business throughout the Nation.

Hon. Kenneth B. Keating's Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer felicitations to KEN KEATING, of New York, on his birthday. We have been associated together on the Judiciary Committee for many years and I have grown to have a great respect for him personally. He does a splendid job as ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee. We feud and fend and battle each other and sometimes are as opposite as the poles, but never are we personal or abrasive in our opposing roles. Then too, we frequently close ranks, join forces and fight together, as we did on the civil-rights bill. It is heart warming to serve with KEN. He is intelligent, efficient, erudite, and kind. He could not do a mean thing. It is not in his nature to do so:

A man cannot speak to his son but as a father, to his wife but as a husband, to his enemy but upon terms; whereas a friend may speak as the case requires, and not as it sorteth with the persons. (Francis Bacon Essays xxvii: 1625.)

I wish KEN KEATING, on his natal day, good health and happiness. My felicitations also go to his family.

Statement by the AFL-CIO Executive Council on Defense and Disarmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the AFL–CIO executive council on Defense and Disarmament, Washington, D. C., May 1, 1958:

We desire, as do all people, to live in peace. We refuse, however, to allow our apprehensions of the total destructive character of modern weapons of war to blind us to the reality our Nation faces. Many wishful suggestions for relieving world tensions are currently receiving wide discussion, but we must point out the major responsibility for the acute tensions rests on the continued drive of Soviet communism for world domination and its opposition to all proposals designed effectively to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons and to reduce conventional military forces and armaments.

The executive council, therefore, feels that our defense and the safety of the free world require the reaffirmation of our belief that—

(a) There is no evidence that any change has taken place in the objectives and methods of world communism; on the contrary, there has been a return to a one-man dictatorship and a tightening of the Soviet grip over its satellites.

(b) No considerations of truth, consistency or honor govern the behavior of the Soviet Government representatives in their so-called peace offensive and in any negotiations which may take place.

In the light of these considerations, we reaffirm the resolution on peace and disarmament, adopted unanimously by the Tunis congress of the ICFTU, which stated:

"To date, the Soviet Government has vigorously opposed a system of control, inspection and supervision, without which any agreement on disarmament would entail the gravest dangers for the security of the free world. * * *

"While democratic nations must continue their vigilance and reject any disarmament proposals which would imperil the security of the free world, we support them in every effort to obtain the conclusion of an international disarmament agreement free of this danger.

"To be really effective, disarmament agreements should be paralleled by settlements of the most urgent problems affecting the peace of the world, such as the reunification of Germany, in accordance with the freely determined will of its people, and the estab-

lishment of genuine peace in the Middle East and in all other areas of tension, through direct negotiations on the basis of mutual recognition of territorial integrity and national independence."

We further endorse the resolution on the summit conference, adopted by the ICFTU subcommittee on March 18, 1958, which stated:

"Our fifth world congress clearly stated the responsibility for the tension and emphasized that disarmament agreements, to be really effective, should be paralleled by settlements of the most urgent problems affecting the peace of the world.

"This view still holds good; but the immediate dangers for the future of mankind resulting from the armament race have become so great that no efforts should be spared to bring about serious conversations, at least on certain limited agreements, especially in the field of nuclear weapons, which, while safeguarding the security of the democratic countries, would bring relief in the atomic armament race.

"The fact should not be lost sight of that last year the Canadian, French, United Kingdom, and United States Governments submitted concrete disarmament proposals to the United Nations Disarmament Subcommission and that by rejecting them the Soviet Government has paralyzed the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. If the Soviet Government means its declaration in favor of a summit conference seriously, there should be sufficient scope to resume negotiations in the light of last year's disarmament proposals of the democratic governments."

We believe that it is not enough to brand Moscow's recent announcement of provisional uninspected suspension of nuclear tests as propaganda. Our Government should take positive action in furtherance of genuine worldwide nuclear disarmament by arranging with as many powers as possible, through the U. N. Disarmament Commission, to reaffirm and carry out the unanimously adopted resolution 1 (I) of th First U. N. General Assembly which provides for international inspection to assure "the control of atomic energy * * * to insure its use only for peaceful purposes * * * the elimination from national armanents of atomic weapons and all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction * * *" and "effective safeguards by way of inspection and other means to protect complying states against the hazards of violations and evasions."

Until this is achieved, we further urge that our Government should reinforce both the conventional and nuclear elements in the basic NATO defense system and continue its policy of acquiring missile bases abroad, and strengthen the Strategic Air Command in order to maintain a strong deterrent against aggression and to preserve peace.

The Great Drama of the Columbia River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in recent testimony before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, that able public servant, Gen. E. C. Itschner, Chief of the Corps of Army Engineers, told us that only the Columbia among American rivers was a rival to the four great rivers of Siberia in hydroelectric-power potential. This is a significant statement from an eminent authority, particularly at a time of international competition between the United States and the Soviet Union in the realm of production.

One of the finest statements I have yet read on the vast resources of the mighty Columbia was delivered May 16, 1958, before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress here in Washington, by Marshall N. Dana, of Portland, Oreg., representing the commission of public docks of my native city. Its appropriate title is "The Drama of the Columbia River."

Mr. Dana is assistant to the president of the United States National Bank of Portland, he was formerly editor of the editorial page of the Oregon Daily Journal, and he was a member of the Pacific Northwest Regional Planning Commission during the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, when the great dams at Bonneville and Grand Coulee first were started.

I particularly would call attention to that passage in Mr. Dana's address which emphasizes that skeptics once claimed the power never could be marketed, but that by today, the Bonneville Power Administration has sold 219 billion kilowatt-hours of energy at an average rate of 2.37 mills—one of the lowest in the land—and that gross revenues have exceeded $500 million.

I know that all supporters of wise and prudent river-development projects will want me to share with them Marshall Dana's informative speech, and for that reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DRAMA OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER

(By Marshall N. Dana, assistant to the president, the United States National Bank of Portland (Oreg.), representing the Commission of Public Docks, Portland, Oreg., and the city of Portland, before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D. C., May 16, 1958)

I

First, may I tell you that I acknowledge, with sincere appreciation, and a degree of pride, the opportunity to bring the Drama of the Columbia to this national platform.

Next, the introduction by Herb West executive vice president of the Inland Empire Waterways Association, not only confers lasting pleasure, but increases the confidence with which I undertake to speak of the destiny-laden region which we call the country of the Columbia. His is not like John the Baptist, a voice crying from the wilderness. His is the clearest of many voices heard from no wilderness, but from a great subnational area endowed with power and opportunity.

Trace the curvings of the Columbia River upon a map of the Pacific Northwest; the resultant form is that of a vast amphitheater.

Nature made the Columbia and its basin a setting for drama. In the beginning it was the drama of ice, the glaciers gouged deep into earth's crust. They spread between the mountain ranges, valleys broad and wide, and, far below, grooved some of the deepest canyons on the face of the American continent.

When warmth recaptured the land, came the drama of flood. The melting ice, the dissolving snow sent waves of unimaginable volume and height, sweeping into channels 5, sometimes 10 times greater than are known today, with no controls save the mountains that stood in their path. One waterfall was miles wide, carried the volume of Niagara multiplied half a dozen times, then for ages remained dry with no hint of former sound and fury.

As spectacular as the drama of flood was the drama of fire. Volcanoes, and we know not how many, spilled curtains of fiery ash. They built dikes and diversions. Over wide areas they spread mineral-filled soil that later was to ache with drought as the desert does, because the water, although in great abundance, flowed deep in mighty chasms.

It is not easy to tell what were the alternations of ice and fire and flood, but we know, as the ice cap melted, the floods poured down against the mountain ranges, backed up into spacious lakes, spilled over the crest so that the fluid cutting tools supplied by the source mountains carved deep gorges through which the Columbia might make its impatient race to the sea.

When the ages of ice and fire and flood had walked upon the stage and played their roles, the mountains and the valleys and the rivers flowing deep stood waiting. The curtain lifted upon the mightiest drama of them all, the drama of life.

During the warmer centuries strange life strutted the prehistoric stage. There are still found the fossils of the Eohippus, the four-toed horse, and the saber-toothed tiger. There were trees growing like the redwood, and the ginkgo, now found only in their petrified forms.

The eyes of pioneers, as of those who travel today, were awed and charmed by the titanic scenic outlooks. Especially notable is the gorge of the Columbia as it thrusts at right angles through the massive Cascade Range. The imaginations of aboriginal Indians were so stirred that they produced legends narrated around the cliffs, the waterfalls, the volcanoes, and the surging river. These legends rise to an imaginative level equal to the legends of the Greeks and the Norsemen.

Even the earliest boatmen would rest their paddles from fighting the rapids and spend long, breath-recovering moments looking upon the majestic scene.

They saw, as we see, the Gorge of the Columbia River, a mile-deep cleft cut transversely through one of America's major mountain ranges, the Cascades, by the Nation's second-largest river and greatest power stream. Its flowing floor is made of the waters that are gathered from a thousand lineal miles of the west slopes of the Rocky Mountains and concentrated in the narrow passage leading from the interior to the sea. The domed roof is the sky. The mile-high walls are bordered by monoliths sculptured through the ages by the wind, by the rain, and by the sheer passing and modifying influence of time. Waterfalls gathered in the upper places are like fleecy scarfs draped over the shoulders of beauty.

There is no other place just like the gorge of the Columbia in all of this land. In the gorge, the Columbia makes its last urgent leap before it widens into the harbor of Portland and the channel for the ships of the seven seas. It is a place to create a reverent heart and an uplifted mind.

The drama of people in the country of the Columbia requires three acts. First, the mountain men following the game trails—men like Joe Meek, Robert Newell, William Craig, and Cabot Williams. They came westward, rifle in the crook of the arm, gold pan dangling. There was great dramatic quality in the pageant of the covered wagon. Not since the *Mayflower* landed has the expansion of America for the sake of homes and

cultivated lands been quite so picturesque as the parade of white-bowed Conestoga wagons, ox-drawn, crowding to the shores of the Pacific. They carried civilization westward in little trees and rosebushes. Plows were strapped to the wagonsides. Cows followed. Women rode high-seated beside their men. It was their lot to bring to thrilling climax the old, long-extended period which contained the legends of the River of Kings with "shores of pure gold." Stories of the Oregon "which hears no sound save its own dashings" lured them to forests without boundaries, valleys of widespread rich soil, a great verdant basin made by the Creator's hand with tools of time, which became the setting of homes.

The covered wagon held under the American flag the territory found by Capt. Robert Gray, who entered the Columbia in 1792, and further explored by Lewis and Clark in transcontinental expedition at the direction of President Jefferson in 1804, 1805, and 1806.

No better adventure tale is told than that of David Thompson, the first white man to see the high source of the Columbia where a lake gives it birth. But there, through another tributary, water flows out of the Columbia ice fields, still the greatest mass of ice on the American Continent, from which also streams begin that ultimately discharge into the Arctic Ocean, and the Atlantic, through Hudson Bay.

Even earlier is the story of young John Ledyard, Dartmouth student, who saw the green shore of Oregon from Captain Cook's ship, that shore upon which he never was to set foot. Yet his enthusiasm found vent in letters that he wrote to the then-Ambassador to France, Thomas Jefferson, and much of the settlement—possibly the Lewis and Clark Expedition—resulted.

We witness the beginning of cities, Portland, with the first settlers, Lovejoy and Pettygrove, flipping a coin to see whether the city to be would be called Portland or Boston. Later, a magical line telling how a ton of gold had been unloaded from Alaska at a dock in Seatle, signaling a great gold rush, and marking, likewise, the emergence of the Puget Sound city into metropolitan status.

Dr. McLoughlin, Admiral Vancouver, Peter Puget, General Lane, Jonathan Carver, Captain Bonneville, are names to conjure with. There were also the pioneers of faith. Jason Lee, Father Blanchet, martyred Marcus Whitman.

Where homes are cut into the forest, with loaded rifles nearby to repel savage invasion, the church and the school soon follow.

Painted on the backdrop of history are other notable scenes. There was the great but bloodless boundary crisis of "54–40 or Fight." There was the historic gathering on the shore of the Willámette at Champoeg where the settlers in 1843 voted 52 to 50 to create a provisional government and remain under the American flag. There was the Astor Expedition which gave a name to the city at the mouth of the Columbia, and brought from Washington Irving, in his Astoria, some prophetic words: "As one wave of emigration after another rolls into the vast regions of the West, and our settlements stretch toward the Rocky Mountains, the eager eyes of our pioneers will pry beyond, and they will become impatient of any barrier or impediment in the way of what they consider the grand outlet of our empire."

Before there were railways, airways, and highways, the rivers were the principal routes of transportation. Upon them operated the fur-bearing bateaux of the French-Canadian voyageurs and the canoes of the Indians.

Into the river mouth came the sailing ships. The first river steamboats ran the shouting rapids in joyous abandonment of fear.

Thus, in quick and spreading strokes, the drama of life had its sequences in the greater drama of the Columbia. It is the play that captured the rapt attention of a national audience, and still does.

II

The country of the Columbia is built upon ample and flowing lines. The drainage area of this one great river system joined by the Snake is more than a quarter million square miles (259,000; 39,700 in Canada). This is an area four times that of the New England States, twice that of the British Isles and France.

The Columbia is the biggest powerplant on the American Continent. Its cataracts and falls provide for generating units at convenient service intervals. The Federal Government is the greatest developer of the Columbia's power, but there are other powerplants built by people's utility districts, electric utilities, and private capital. Netting them all in one regionwide service is the Pacific Northwest Power Pool, which takes energy from where it is produced in largest amount to where it is most needed, equalizing the distribution of power as the dams of the upper and lower rivers equalize and control the seasonal floods, and thus include the whole area in a zone of security and service.

The Snake, which brings half of the current at the Kennewick-Pasco meeting point of the two rivers, is, in its own right, a noble and scenic river taken in part out of the high ridges of Yellowstone National Park, yielding a contribution of its water for irrigation across southern Idaho, and roaring the rest through a gorge which is the deepest cleft on the American Continent, called Hells Canyon, well named for its controversy in the generation of power.

A year's flow of the Columbia would cover its whole basin 15 inches deep. It delivers into the Pacific, in the average of a 50-year period, 180 million acre-feet, which is 11 times that of the Colorado River, half that of the Mississippi. The secret of its power is found from the fact that its fall from the Canadian border to the ocean is 1,290 feet. The United States engineers have estimated that 11 dams would take care of 92 percent of the fall of the river generating 8 million kilowatts on the main stem, and 32 million with complete regulation and development of the Columbia system.

While the Mississippi is the mightiest of rivers, the Columbia is the most powerful, holding in its potential 40 percent of the total represented by other rivers. Two of its projects are the Nation's greatest. One, in power, Grand Coulee, which is the vastest steel and concrete mass ever laid down by man. The other, the Columbia Basin irrigation project, which holds a million acres within its ultimate development. Bonneville came first. "More power to you," said President Franklin D. Roosevelt, with Senator Charles L. McNary and Representative Charles H. Martin looking on.

Now in the Bonneville system are Hungry Horse, Albeni Falls, Detroit, Big Cliff of the Willamette; McNary, which started out as Umatilla Rapids; Lookout Point, Dexter, also on the Willamette; Chief Joseph, the Dalles, Chandler, Ice Harbor, Cougar, and Hills Creek.

At one time skepticism insisted that the power could never be marketed. But, in 20 years, the Bonneville Administration has sold 219 billion kilowttt-hours at an average rate of 2.37 mills per kilowatt-hour; gross revenues are more than one-half billion dollars; the transmission system has grown to 7,318 miles, 183 substations, and a transformer capacity of 10,777,915 kilovolt-amperes.

After two decades the Columbia River power system has 4,702,000 kilowatts of installed capacity, and is on the way, when Federal projects under construction are complete, to more than 7,700,000; and yet the demand is beyond the supply.

The one-time skepticism whether big power could be marketed has changed to worry whether development can keep up with demand. The argument still goes on whether the roaring rapids of the Columbia should be further developed by the Federal Government, or with the aid of private investment. To anyone who respects facts, the answer is clear: every dollar of capital investment from every legitimate source is imperatively needed merely to keep pace with necessity.

Once Bonneville was proposed as a yardstick wherewith to compare costs, operation, distribution, and service of a Federal plant with the powerhouses of the private utilities. And, in the public interest, we now can see the desirability of a double yardstick and a perpetual comparison of service and rates, public and private. It is the people who are to be served. The spirit of the power agencies and the regulative agencies of Government promise that they shall be served and served well.

III

Into the affairs of the Columbia Basin also enter the strange, ominous factor yet new to this planet. At Hanford on the Columbia and Arco on the Snake are the atomic energy plants which shared in the blasting of Hiroshima, and now share in the projects which have to do with eradication of disease, the stimulation of industry, the operation of submarines and airplanes, the generation of greater electric power, and the servicing of a thousand new and revolutionary enterprises that will be foremost in the nearing years.

The idea of use was generated long before the day of electric power.

Pioneer river men talked of the development of the Columbia for all of its uses. Some of them operated the open river line to maintain competition with the railroad. Some of them led the way in reclamation projects. Some of them installed the early nets and wheels when commerce turned to fishery.

It was not difficult under such a slogan of full development to include the powerplants. Nor is it difficult now to see how every agency, public and private, in cooperation and in joint endeavor will be needed as the growth and progress of the Pacific Northwest continues.

Of that continuance, have no doubt.

The population growth of the last census period in America was about 14 percent. In the Pacific Northwest it neared 40 percent. With California, and its 11 million added, the Pacific States markets have an increasing importance to the industry of the entire country.

One needs but to travel the highways, many of them fine, broad and new, of the Pacific Northwest to feel another throbbing of power in the enterprises converting into high living standards and security for the future, the forests and the minerals and the fishery of the region.

Tourism is a rising tidal wave. The big highway program will lure countless additional numbers. It only remains that the highways to rugged and beautiful scenes shall be equal to the traffic upon them, and the camps, the motels, the hotels and the lodges will provide accommodation.

Water is the controlling factor in our Pacific Northwest region, as it is in the Nation. The efficient combinations of water and land bespeak the growth of intelligence. We must go farther and speak of the water, the land, the plant, and the animal, all in harmonious combination. Not even then have we gone far enough, for we must combine water, the soil, the plant, the animal—and man.

The controls upon water are a part of its power and its service. Flood control not

only reduces raging destruction, as it was known in 1894, when Portland streets were traveled Venice-style—in boats; or in 1948, when 1,000 miles of the Columbia's shores knew turbulent flood and the city of Vanport, population 50,000, was obliterated; but flood control also equalizes and increases the annual yield of power, and radically reduces erosion.

Effective check to erosion is also one of the important objectives in the development of the Columbia for all of its uses. Often have I seen in the murky, tumbling flood, rich brown loaves of bread, which no one will ever eat, red apples, which no one will ever enjoy, and beautiful flowers which never will bloom, because the soil that would have nourished them is gone forever.

Look into the country of the Columbia today.

Broaden it to include Puget Sound in the entire scope of the Pacific Northwest. Reach into the mountain valleys and their strong rivers rising in western Montana, then let attention linger on the broad and fertile expanses of southern Idaho. What brought about this step-by-step development until forestry, agriculture, and recreation must be measured in billions of dollars annually? Much of it is due to initiative and hard work of the people themselves. The self-help precept is exultant in the motto of Oregon "She Flies With Her Own Wings."

But an essential animating principle in the growth and progress of the Pacific Northwest will be found in the very proper exercise of cooperation by the Federal Government.

An important group of Federal agencies, such as the Army engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the National Parks Service, the Forest Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Public Health Service, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Agricultural Marketing and Research Service, the Air Force, the Coast Guard, the Bureau of Public Roads, and the Weather Bureau, do their assigned parts.

Since Maj. R. S. Williamson, in October 1866, tackled the serious Swan Island Bar in Portland Harbor, the Army engineers have built more than a billion dollars worth of river and harbor improvements in the region. They have dug the channel from Portland to the sea and are listening to pleas that the depth of 35 feet and the width of 500 feet shall be increased, depth to 40 feet and width to 750 feet, with a controlling harbor entrance depth that will permit, night and day, winter and summer, passage of inbound and outbound ships. They are extending their study of upper river to include excavation of a channel 9, 12, or 14 feet, 250 feet wide, along the 57 miles from McNary Pool to Priest Rapids Dam. They are looking at the navigation potential to Rock Island and to Chief Joseph Dams.

IV

In the not distant future, they will amplify what is known as the 308 Report of 1948, viewing considerably the appeals of more than a score port districts, a dozen of them up-river, to provide the depths and widths of channel and the security of navigation that will encourage further extension of the already-great barging outfits.

In the Columbia Basin, in Vale-Owyhee of eastern Oregon, in central Oregon and Klamath, in southern and northern Idaho and in Montana, the Bureau of Reclamation has stored water in the mountains, channeled it to thirsty acres, and permitted responsive citizens to develop the homes, the farms, the enterprises of a high-grade economic system.

In the next year after the act of 1902 passed, in the administration of Teddy Roosevelt, studies were started of the Umatilla project in Oregon, the Minidoka in Idaho, and the Okanogan and Yakima projects in Washington.

The first Federal power installation of Columbia Basin was made a part of Idaho's Minidoka project in 1909, and in 1910 power from Minidoka provided the first space heating in the Pacific Northwest.

In these reclamation projects, as of June 30, 1957, the Federal Government had invested approximately $880,997,000, and the gross value of the crops totals between three and three-quarters and four billion dollars. Last year there were 2,700,400 acres to which full or supplemental irrigation water had been provided. And, the average value of crops annually was slightly more than $108 per net acre.

The Bureau of Reclamation is also a power producer with an installed capacity of 2,434,900 kilowatts, producing 15,235,181,580 kilowatt-hours during the calendar year of 1957. The power revenues from reclamation in this area had amounted to more than $173 million as of June 30, 1957. Now I hear projects for river and harbor work by the Army engineers called pork barrel. I see a dubious administrative eye turned upon the further land and water development projects to be undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation. In the same breath I hear the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation extolled as among the world's finest building organizations manned by executives and engineers of the highest caliber.

What an anomaly is this contrast between the honor of the builders and the loose challenges to the honesty of their works.

The building agencies of the Federal Government and our Congress should be freed from such stupidity.

The Government as principal landowner in the Columbia Basin, as steward of great natural resources, and as cooperative agent in the growth and progress of an important subnational area, very appropriately joins with the forward looking, constructive groups of the region in orderly planning and accomplishment. Nor should shortsighted politics be allowed to interfere.

Seattle and Tacoma on Puget Sound have great developments at stake. Portland-Vancouver-Longview, and Astoria must depend upon the depth and safety of the harbor entrance, and the channel to the sea, as controlling factors in their own programs pressured by growth of population and industry.

Strong and rapidly growing cities of the interior which have the greater part of their accomplishments in their future ought to be made a studied part of the program. I think of Wenatchee, Yakima, The Dalles, Klamath, Pendleton, La Grande, and Baker; Walla Walla, Lewiston, Boise, Great Falls, and Missoula. I think of even newer towns in reclamation districts—Othello, Soap Lake, Ephrata, and Ontario.

By reason of the power of the Columbia, we built a billion dollars worth of ships during World War II. From the same source, the great aircraft industry of Pudget Sound is powered amply by electric energy.

Aluminum plants which are equal to half of the market requirements of the Nation are all made possible by Columbia River power.

Lights now spangle irrigation districts and towns because of power from the river of the West.

The size of ships that enter the Columbia, the volume of cargo, and the radiating service of docks heavily under construction, ship repair, and improved facilities and servicing will succeed or fail as projects are allowed and financed. So it is with the upper river where port districts getting ready for barges signal the mounting enthusiasm for a feasibly and economically navigated river.

The old-time slogan "The Development of the Columbia for All of its Uses" is limited by the extent to which new starts are authorized and the program of development in all of its parts is allowed to proceed.

V

We have stalwart friends. We give our gratitude to that warrior organization, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, which battles always and effectively for the full development of our rivers and harbors and the commerce upon them, and, thus, for a sound and enduring national economy.

We pay tribute to the courage and aggressiveness of those Members of the Congress—Senate and House—who win for us the vitally essential projects of land and water development. Their vision and capacity for action open wider the door of American destiny.

Every dollar appropriated for power, reclamation, flood control, and recreation, will have its partners in dollars from private enterprise, and, together, these dollars will make many dollars more for the economic stability and the defense of America.

The people of the country of the Columbia are aroused in behalf of land and water development, and the conservation and use of natural resources.

Only an orderly program in which development and progress are steady, and the public rights and interests are protected, can attain the sound and great degree of accomplishment now so closely within reach.

But we vision an even further goal. The largest resource and the greatest promise of the country of the Columbia are its people. Just as the drama of the Columbia is made of the dramatic interludes of ice and fire, flood and power, we know that men and women are to grow tall like the trees and the mountains. And, are to attain the power of personality like that which rolls and surges in the greatest of all the power rivers.

Harness the Columbia for all of its uses, and you release the human mind for greater ideas and the unquenchable strength of character and citizenship..

The country of the Columbia is in its springtime and the white-maned horses are bending to the plow.

The river possesses the genius of the future.

The Trend of Exports and Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1958

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted I am glad to place in the Appendix of the RECORD, for the information of my colleagues, a letter which I received from the Department of Commerce in answer to specific questions I have asked about the trend of exports and imports in recent years. I have since been informed that this information is not in the record of hearings on the Reciprocal Trade Agreements bill.

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., May 9, 1958.

Hon. JOHN H. RAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RAY: In answer to your request of yesterday for information regarding the trend of exports and imports since our participation in reciprocal trade agreements, the following table will give you indications of these trends. Countries covered were selected at random and are indicative of typical countries with whom we trade.

[In millions]

Country	United States exports	United States imports		United States exports	United States imports
Canada, 1st full year of agreement, 1936	$391	$376	1957	$3,880	$2,901
Brazil, 1st full year of agreement, 1936	49	102	1957	468	700
Cuba, 1st full year of agreement, 1935	60	104	1957	610	482
United Kingdom, 1st full year of agreement, 1939	505	149	1957	1,096	766
Belgium, 1st full year of agreement, 1936	59	59	1957	416	270
Netherlands, 1st full year of agreement, 1936	53	50	1957	555	163
France, 1st full year of agreement, 1937	165	76	1957	582	259
Sweden, 1st full year of agreement, 1936	43	48	1957	226	119

The leading imports, as of 1957, from the countries listed in the chart are as follows:

Canada: Newsprint, woodpulp, and lumber; nickel, aluminum, and other nonferrous metals; crude petroleum; iron ore; various chemicals; fish, agricultural machinery; whiskey.

Brazil: Coffee, cocoa or cocao beans, iron ore and ferroalloys.

Cuba: Sugar, molasses (mostly inedible), tobacco, nickel oxide, copper, some coffee.

Imports from the European countries are rather highly diversified, but the following are among larger items in each case:

United Kingdom: Autos, machinery, whisky, diamonds, wool manufactures.

Belgium: Steel, diamonds, glass, a variety of textile manufactures.

Netherlands: Meat products, bulbs (e. g., tulips) and corns, tin steel.

France: Autos, steel, various textile manufactures, artworks and antiques, wines and other beverages.

Sweden: Wood pulp, machinery, autos, steel products (e. g., wire and wire rods), iron ore.

It will be remembered that in 1957 our exports, exclusive of military, were approximately $19.5 billion. During the same period our imports were approximately $13 billion. Out of the $13 billion, our studies indicate that no more than $3 billion is in any way competitive to American production. In other words, out of a total world trade of $32.5 billion, less than $3 billion is in a sector that could be considered competitive.

If you wish further information, I hope you will call us at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY KEARNS,
International Affairs.

Jaycees Endorse Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in calling to the attention of the House a resolution favoring statehood for Alaska and Hawaii which was unanimously adopted by the board of directors of the Connecticut Junior Chamber of Commerce when it met at Enfield, Conn., on April 9, 1958. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I should like to express my appreciation and the appreciation of all other Alaskans favoring statehood to the Jaycees all over this land. That organization, locally and nationally, has been in the forefront of our supporters. Such support has meant, and means, much to us. Just so there will be no doubt about the matter, let it be recorded here that the Alaska Jaycees are battling for statehood every day of the year led by their president, Edward A. Merdes, Fairbanks attorney, who has made a great contribution to the statehood cause.

Here is the resolution from the Connecticut Junior Chamber of Commerce:

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

Whereas in view of the fact that immediate statehood for Alaska and Hawaii has been adopted in the platforms of both major political parties and the national administration and hence is nonpartisan; and

Whereas the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, in annual convention assembled, in Milwaukee, Wis. the 26th day of June 1957, unanimously resolved immediate statehood for Alaska and Hawaii; and

Whereas the people of both Territories have demonstrated their readiness and ability to assume and discharge the obligations of statehood; and

Whereas the people of these Territories have upon their own initiative and expense adopted by more than 2 to 1 majority a State constitution in conformity with the principles of American Government; and

Whereas the legislatures of these Territories have year after year passed memorials urging Congress to enact enabling legislation; and

Whereas the people of these Territories as United States citizens are denied the right to vote for the President and Vice President of the United States and have no voting representation in Congress; and

Whereas Territorial status in view of its temporary nature discourages investment capital and thereby hinders the economic development of the Territories; and

Whereas statehood for these Territories would result in a decrease of Federal expenditures for the operation of government in Alaska and Hawaii; and

Whereas Territorial status contributes to an indifferent and slothful attitude toward government while statehood encourages an active interest and participation in government; and

Whereas it is in accord with cherished principles of American Government to grant the responsibility and privileges of local government to American citizens who have suffered the hardships of frontier areas and developed the same; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Connecticut Junior Chamber of Commerce at its monthly board of directors meeting, assembled in Enfield, Conn., this 9th day of April, 1958, That the President, the Members of Congress representing Connecticut, the Secretary of the Interior, the Delegates from Alaska and Hawaii be urged to support immediately, statehood for the only two remaining incorporated Territories under the American flag, Alaska and Hawaii; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, each Member of Congress from the State of Connecticut, the Secretary of the Interior, the Delegates from Alaska and Hawaii, and the Jaycee presidents of Alaska and Hawaii.

We Are Caught in the Middle in Lebanon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, one of the South's well-informed editors on the Middle East situation, the Honorable Creed Black, executive editor of the Nashville Tennessean, feels that internal politics and rivalry in the Arab world make the United States a target for Beirut rioters.

Mr. Black has just returned from a tour of the Middle East and speaks with authority on this troublesome situation.

Mr. Black has written a rather illuminating story for his paper, entitled "We Are Caught in the Middle in Lebanon," which I commend to the reading of the Members of the House. Under the unanimous rule, I insert the same in the RECORD. It follows:

WE ARE CAUGHT IN THE MIDDLE IN LEBANON

(By Creed Black)

Just a little more than 2 months ago, I sat in the American Embassy in Beirut—a beautiful new 8-story building that overlooks the peaceful Mediterranean—and heard an official there describe the little Republic of Lebanon as "probably the most pro-Western of all the Arab countries—our anchor spot in the Middle East."

Yesterday only the intervention of Lebanese troops kept an angry, jeering mob from storming that Embassy on the heels of the destruction of American libraries in Beirut and Tripoli.

Two months ago a spokesman for the Lebanese foreign ministry talked hopefully to me of his country's "mission as the promoter of peace, amity and concord among all the Arabs."

But now Lebanon has become the hottest spot in the Middle East, unable to keep peace and order at home, much less among its neighbors.

What has happened?

The answer is not hard to find as these statements of 2 months ago might indicate.

For even then the makings of crisis were apparent enough in Lebanon to warrant the statement in a report from Beirut, published in this space, that "powerful forces of unrest are at work both within and without" the country and that "real internal trouble" was threatening.

To understand the causes of this trouble, which has now erupted so violently, it is necessary first to understand something about Lebanon's unique position in the Middle East.

It is the smallest of the countries in that area, with an area about the size of Connecticut and a population of 1.5 million. But it is also the most prosperous, for it is the commercial, cultural, communications, and resort center of the Middle East.

Politically, its Government is delicately balanced—like the total population—between Christians and Moslems. But the present administration of President Camille Chamoun, a Maronite Christian, is strongly pro-West in its outlook and has tried to maintain a neutral role as "middle man" in the struggle between rival Arab blocs.

This would make for a volatile situation in any circumstances, but normal political

differences have been heightened in recent months by two major developments.

The first of these is the question of whether President Chamoun is going to try to amend the constitution so that he can succeed himself when his current 6-year term ends this year. Reports that he is planning such a move have greatly intensified the opposition to his government, which already was under heavy fire for being too closely tied to the West.

The other is the dramatic rise of Arab nationalism symbolized by Gamal Abdel Nasser, who has had a magnetic influence on Lebanese citizens—particularly the Moslems—who want to see their country linked with the United Arab Republic.

While Nasser was visiting in nearby Syria, for instance, thousands of Lebanese made the short drive across the border to Damascus to join the throngs welcoming the new champion of Arab unity.

And while I was in Beirut, his picture was displayed in many shops and taxicabs and his voice was frequently heard over radios tuned to Damascus or Cairo.

Even then, there also was a hint of the emotionalism that can grip Arab demonstrators and turn them into violent mobs. For a student march that started out as a protest against French actions in Algeria wound up as a pro-Nasser demonstration punctuated by shouts of "down with Chamoun."

Now those shouts—and worse—are being directed against the United States as well.

The propagandists who fire these mobs, of course, link us not only with Chamoun but with the imperialism the Arab world so bitterly resents. And though many—possibly even a majority—of Lebanon's people favor Western ties and a neuutral position in the struggle between the competing Arab blocs, even the government spokesmen join the criticism of our role in respect to Israel.

Thus has the United States been caught in the middle of thee Middle East conflicts—Labanon's own political struggle, the rivalry between competing Arab groups, and the Arab-Israeli feud.

How we will come out of it for the immediate future probably depends on the Lebanese Government's ability to restore order and achieve some kind of domestic political stability. And the odds on that, in any Middle Eastern country, are anybody's guess.

State, Justice, Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1959

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12428) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, my friends on my right seem to have the idea that we should not, when we find out that we have a problem to solve, try to solve it and straighten it out and get the people in that part of the world thinking our way.

Now they refer to the situation in 1936. At that time the Communists had not progressed so far down the line after their recognition as to be a menace in South America. They developed to that extent since then as a result of grants-in-aid that have been made to them by the United States of America. We are up against that situation because that was done.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. Certainly, the gentleman on the other side cannot take credit for correcting the situation in Guatemala.

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. MORANO. We were able under this administration to overthrow a Communist government in Central America and bring about democratic rule there.

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Just a word in answer to the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt] with respect to the Development Loan Fund. I heard him say over the air last night something to the effect that its money had been available for a year and a half and almost none had been spent. Actually, the President did not get to sign the bill authorizing the fund until early last September. It was, of course, the end of the year before the organization could be set up and its personnel selected, hired, and organized. Mr. McIntosh, its director and a man who has spent his life in foreign trade, did not take over the management of it until January. So, actually, when you consider that it has been in operation for only 4 months, it is completely unreasonable to expect that he could have made any loans on the applications received for projects all over the world unless he had followed the careless policies and practices of previous administrations by just giving handouts to almost anybody who asked for one. We would be the first to condemn him if he were to make loans before projects are adequately studied and demonstrated to be sound.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. I just want to make one more point. Since 1946, at least 3 countries have now elected a democratic government under truly democratic processes, and they are Argentina, Honduras, and Guatemala. There has been the overthrow of a dictator in Venezuela. Now that is pretty good. I want to pay a compliment to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs]. Certainly, he has emphasized that we do have problems there and I agree with him, but I also want to say that we are getting at those problems and we are trying to solve them and we expect to solve them.

Mr. TABER. And we would not be doing any good if we did not try to solve them. That is what we must do. There is no sense in our making all these appropriations and giving these people all the considerations that we have in every way all along the line of legitimate trade and all that sort of thing and not expecting to get some good results. In these countries where they said we had trouble and people annoyed Mr. NIXON while he was going through, the majority of the people in those countries were not the ones who did that, but it was simply a small group of students and youngsters who were stirred up by Communists to make trouble. We have to face that situation. We have to find a way to reach the people so that that sort of thing will not happen. The Communists all over the world will do the best they can to make trouble for us. We have to fight all the way and those who say that we should not have tried to fight and to get this situation straightened out are making a mistake.

Socrates and the Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently the Minneapolis Tribune printed an article entitled "Socrates and the Farm Problem," written by Msgr. L. G. Ligutti, and published in the Des Moines Register.

Monsignor Ligutti is the executive director for the National Catholic Rural Life Conference. His article is deserving of the attention of everyone.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCRATES AND THE FARM PROBLEM

(By Msgr. L. G. Ligutti)

Let us imagine for a few moments that Socrates is appearing before a TV forum. The topic is "The Farm Problem." The panelists, editors, economists, labor representatives, big and little farmers, businessmen, university professors, Department of Agriculture personnel.

Socrates: What is the main farm problem of today?

Chorus: Overproduction creating a surplus which has been bought up by the Government (about $7 billion worth as of September 30).

Socrates: What do you propose to do?

Editors, economists, Department of Agriculture, etc.: Get rid of inefficient farmers (about 1,225,000 of them on 25.7 percent of United States farms) because their income from farm production is less than $2,500 a year.

Socrates: How much do they produce?

Statistician: Seven and one-tenth percent of total agricultural production.

Socrates: Who produces 58.2 percent of the total agricultural production?

Statistician: Five hundred and eighty-three thousand farmers that have an income of $10,000 a year or more (i. e., 12.2 percent of United States farms).

Socrates: Would it be easier and better to ask this efficient group to bring their production down 7.1 percent or to push off 1,225,000 smaller farmers?

Panelist: Silence.

Small Voice: I am Piccolo Pete. I was in an orchestra once upon a time. The diners complained we were making too much noise. The master of ceremonies with pontifical authority ordered off the scene all piccolos, all flutes and violins.

Socrates: Did the noise subside?

TV Audience: Not as long as the trombones, tubas, bassoons, saxophones, and drums remained on the scene.

Socrates: In the nether regions I was reading the New York Times for Sunday, January 12, 1958. It said, "United States jobless rise at steady rate. Survey finds conditions likely to worsen." If that is true, and the Times enjoy's good reputation even among us, where would you put the piccolos of agriculture?

Echo: Where?

Dr. Butz, dean of agriculture, Purdue University, one of the panelists, reading part of his speech as quoted in the Kansas City Times, January 8, 1958: We must stop using agriculture as an institutional burying ground for large numbers of underemployed human resources we aren't smart enough to use more productively elsewhere.

Chorus. Well spoken.

Socrates. Apparently your hearts bleed for the poor, low-income farmers.

Chorus. Yes, indeed! (Sobbing heard—not seen.)

Socrates. Who is a farmer?

Professors. Anyone who works on a farm.

Socrates. I have heard some gossip across the River Styx about United States migrant farm laborers—wetbacks, Mexicans, Okies and Arkies (over a million of them). Undoubtedly they are farmers because they work on farms. Are they in the decent-income bracket?

California Ranchers. Oh no, they are just farm hands. They are needed to carry on our big farming operations efficiently.

Socrates. Why not start moving them out of agriculture and train them for industry, and thus improve their standard of living?

Chorus. Silence.

Socrates. Would you advocate closing down any and all small business because of low income?

Businessmen. No, indeed. That would interfere with free enterprise.

Socrates. Are low-income farmers free enterprisers?

Piccolo Pete. Yep!

Socrates. Thank you, gentlemen.

Twenty-fifth Anniversary of TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the 25th anniversary of the TVA, I include the following editorial entitled "Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of TVA," and published in the May issue of the Progressive, in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article follows:

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF TVA

We are devoting nearly all of this May issue of the Progressive to commemorating the 25th anniversary of the social achievement that represents, for us, the high tide of democracy in our century—the Tennessee Valley Authority.

It will be 25 years ago May 18 that President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in those first, frenzied days of the New Deal, signed the TVA Act that was not only to tame a wayward river and regenerate an ailing valley, but was to become celebrated the world over as a shining example of democratic planning.

The extension of the TVA idea, in our judgment, is an indispensable ingredient in any program for a resurgent progressivism in America. The middle-way TVA idea makes a shambles of the doctrinaire nonsense of both Karl Marx and Adam Smith. It has come to symbolize a deeply democratic alternative to both the law of the jungle and the tyranny of totalitarianism. The TVA idea, with its concept of national planning, regional administration, local participation, and individual freedom, has brought us a giant stride closer toward fusing two of the great goals of the American Constitution as expressed in the preamble—individual liberty and the general welfare.

The very essence of the TVA idea is the partnership of the Federal Government with the people of a great river valley to plan the unified development and maximum use of all the resources for the benefit of all the people. Countless experts from almost every country on earth have come to study TVA's extraordinary record of achievement. It isn't the dams that attract them, for there are bigger dams elsewhere. It isn't the public development of power, for this is the rule rather than the exception abroad. Nor is it TVA's remarkable record in flood control, navigation, reforestation, soil improvement, the minerals program, and the development of recreational facilities that draws them to the valley.

It is the unity of these in one all-encompassing planning operation that captures and parallels the oneness of nature—this is what has beckoned so many visiting statesmen and technicians hunting for new and creative methods of resource development. Mostly they come to see and study the physical plant, but they stay to be inspired by the unprecedented extent to which planning is possible without the surrender of freedom to an all-powerful bureaucracy.

For this is one of the glories of TVA—that it achieved so much by demonstration and inspiration, and not by command and regimentation. The seven States of the TVA basin, and the countless communities within them have found their rights and privileges undisturbed by the Federal agency planted in their midst 25 years ago, although many were fearful at first that TVA might be sent them from Washington as a superstate. As a matter of policy, TVA has worked closely with State and local agencies and has encouraged them to assume new duties and responsibilities. Again and again TVA officials have seen clearly what needed doing, and have had the legal power to do it, but they have preferred to wait until the idea caught on with the local people who then went ahead and did it. This is democratic planning in action.

Stuart Chase, in an article in the Progressive more than a decade ago, wrote: "A commercial civilization throws on the scrap heap the most constructive element in human nature: the instinct to cooperate with one's fellows in building up the community. The biological fact that man is a social animal is neglected, and a great storehouse of energy and enthusiasm wasted."

TVA has reversed the cheerless characteristic of commercial civilization without in any way undermining the system itself. Far from throwing cooperation on the scrap heap, it has made cooperation the heart of its way of doing things. Far from wasting energy and enthusiasm, it has recognized man for the social animal he is, or can be, and proceeded to harness his neglected instinct for cooperation in a great program of community building.

TVA was an experiment in its infancy. Never before in American history, or the history of any other nation for that matter, had a public agency been assigned the task of developing all the resources of a great river system. How successfully that experiment has proved itself is clearly presented in the documented articles that make up this special issue of the Progressive. They tell a graphic story of physical achievement and material success, but they emphasize, too, how it was done—which is part of the spirit of TVA.

From its very beginnings TVA was blessed with unusually able and dedicated officials and staff who caught and kept alive the vision of a great human enterprise. Their task has not been an easy one. They were faced from the outset with the relentless opposition of the power trust, which continues even now. During the past 7 years they have been obliged to contend with the ill will of the Eisenhower administration, which has made their task doubly difficult and has taken its toll of able personnel and struck at the morale of those who stayed on.

But TVA, we are confident, will ride out the present storm, just as it has fought its way over rough waters so many times in the past. When inexorable events lift this Nation out of the swamps of conventional conservatism and put us on the high road to a progressive program of democratic planning, TVA will be there to provide guidance and inspiration for the unified development of the other great river systems in America.

In Debate on Alaska Statehood, Stick With the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I offer for printing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a timely editorial which appeared in the May 13, 1958, Seattle Post-Intelligencer. Some of America's best fiction is written about Alaska, but myths and legends belong in literature and especially should be omitted from this week's debate on statehood. Misstatements can be repeated so often they come to be accepted as facts. Here is the truth about Alaska shipping:

THE FACTS

In the heat of pro and con debate on Alaska statehood, let's stick with the facts.

A national weekly May 5 said: "By terms of a fuzzy 1920 law, all trade from and to Alaska must go in United States bottoms and on United States rails. The results of this outrageous protectionism are unmercifully high monopoly shipping rates and what Alaskans call the FCL—fearful cost of living."

Well, let's have a look here.

There is no monopoly in the Alaska trade. Any United States operator who desires can enter that trade. All it takes are fortitude and capital, rather plenty of both.

As for outrageous protectionism the United States Merchant Marine needs all the help it can get these days—but the weekly should know that this situation exists in all 48 States and United States Territories.

It should know also that an exception to the principle is allowed by the Merchant Marine Act of 1920. Canadian rail lines in transporting cargo between United States points may use foreign craft for a portion of such movement under interstate commerce regulation. But for reasons obvious to those familiar with ocean shipping, the exception

does not apply to Alaska. Neither does it apply to points in Hawaii or Puerto Rico.

What's more, Alaska rates are under the jurisdiction of the Federal Maritime Board.

And Alaska's foreign trade is as open as the Alaskan skies. If the weekly cares to send a competent observer north he will likely see foreign ships calling for lumber, woodpulp, and other commodities.

As we have mentioned here often, Seattle owes Alaska far more than Alaska can ever owe Seattle. But the picture of Seattle and Seattle companies as the villains of Alaska's plight is a tired old melodrama that has little or nothing to do with the statehood problem.

Kate Duncan Smith DAR School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, the Daughters of the American Revolution support a number of fine educational projects throughout the country and among them is the Kate Duncan Smith DAR School which is located in my district.

This school, high atop Gunter Mountain at Grant, Ala., has turned out scores of well-trained, patriotic and useful citizens since it was established by the DAR in 1924. This school, like other DAR educational projects, has undertaken to teach better farming methods and better homemaking to rural children of the area it serves. We in Alabama are proud of the great DAR school and of its graduates. I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an address delivered by Mrs. June Gayle Troup, an alumna of the school, at the recent DAR Continental Congress:

KATE DUNCAN SMITH DAR SCHOOL

(By Mrs. June Gayle Troup, a graduate)

I should like to take this opportunity of saying "Hello" to all of you, my DAR friends. I feel as though I know you all even if I haven't had the pleasure and privilege of meeting you personally.

I'm very proud and happy to be a graduate of the Kate Duncan Smith DAR School. I feel that we have many opportunities that other schools of the State do not have. As a matter of fact, my son and daughter both attend the Kate Duncan Smith School. It is with intense pride that my family holds the record of having the largest family group ever graduated from the Kate Duncan Smith School. I am 1 of 6 children. My sister, Charlotte, graduated in 1939 (her oldest son will do the same within 3 years); my brothers, Wallace and Gene, both graduated in 1941. I graduated in 1945; my sister, Ruth, graduated in 1946 and lastly, my sister, Earlene, in 1948. Two of her four children also attend the Kate Duncan Smith School.

At times we have discussed moving to a new place of residence, but it would necessitate severing our "tie that binds" with the Kate Duncan Smith School and my children, Rhonda and Tommy, protest very vigorously. To prove this point, last Saturday, my daughter actually made this statement when we were approaching the town of Guntersville, "Mama, this would be a pretty place to live if we had the DAR School over here."

They are quite attached to the school and try to prove their affection and loyalty in attaining the best marks possible. They are zealous in their schoolwork and all of us enjoy the recreation night when parents cease to become parents and assume the rolls of grownup playmates. The spirit of the home pervades the surroundings and for an hour or so, the parents have turned back the hands of time and become upperclassmen. You can understand the deep love of school when I tell you my children cry and are upset, if, for any reason, they have to be absent. Their father understands their feelings, too, as he also graduated from the Kate Duncan Smith School. So, you see, we are into the third generation attending our DAR School.

It is with sincere humility I stand before you today in this great city of Washington. It is fitting that I bring you a report of the progress of our school from the time of its founding, 34 years ago, to the present.

As early as the year 1910, the Alabama chapter recognized the need of a school for the mountain children of northern Alabama. However, the matter rested until 1921, when this resolution began to rouse interest and action. It was then the people of Gunter's Mountain began to talk and plan how it wolud be possible for them to obtain the location of the school for their community. Special effort was made to contact the common people since the school primarily was for their use. Successful results depended upon the honest efforts, understanding, hard work, and sincerity of all concerned, speaking favorably for their earnestness in desiring this particular school.

Through the efforts of a Mr. Jasper Morrow, the rural postman, speaking at length of the needs, stressing the benefits, the aid and interest of the people were aroused. These people of pioneer stock, courage, and farsightedness were determined to bend every effort for success.

In 1922 they receive the long awaited news that they were being considered, among others, as recipients of the school. It is to the everlasting credit of the people that they chose to be themselves, to present the visiting delegation with the homespun hospitality natural to themselves. They proved their practicality in surmounting obstacles when it was necessary to pull the carload of delegates up the rough and muddy mountain road. Once there, they were treated to a huge picnic spread, speeches of welcome, and delightful singing of the children. The "family" air surrounded the mountain people and spoke favorably for cooperation necessary among people with such an important goal in mind.

It was a strange entourage that accompanied the car of the delegates to the proposed sites—wagons, buggies, an oxcart, and the rest walked. What a gay parade. Laughter, happy chatter, and the voices of joyous children raised in song. A friendly rivalry coursed between the local people as to the location of the desired school. When the crowd reached the site of the present school, a hurried conference determined the choice on the spot. Quickly the land was obtained at a very reasonable price and people donated their labor, wagons, and horses. Everyone joined in helping—women preparing food, children fetching drinking water and running errands. Our school began humbly as a 4-room building, 2 teachers, and 100 students. Today it comprises 23 teachers, 22 buildings, and nearly 600 students. In addition, we have our own school farm and a school chapel. Many students have been aided in college as the result of our college-aid program. We are fortunate in not having a teacher shortage and our classrooms are not overcrowded, which permits more careful supervision and individual instruction per pupil, due to careful, farsighted planning for necessary expansion. However, we have not neglected the student who excells by the use of his hands. Some students show outstanding ability with intricate problems, scientific, business, or mathematical, while others show a marked ability with their hands. It is for these students we now have a mechanical arts building to teach, train, and observe the results of these talented children. This is very timely since so many of our young people obtain employment at the famed missile agency close by. However, of great importance, is the fact these youngsters still maintain their homes and interest in and around Kate Duncan Smith School. Eagerly they assume their share of responsibility for helping others to follow them.

Lastly, we sincerely acknowledge that all this could not have been possible without the initial and continued interest on the part of the DAR. Truly, we cannot help feeling the common bond uniting us all in love, Christian brotherhood, and Americanism. It is best expressed by the words of Ruth to Naomi, "Thy people shall be my people."

Statement on Senate Bill 2791

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a statement made by Joseph Meegan, executive secretary of the Back of the Yards Social Action Club of Chicago, Ill. It was made to the members of the Senate Housing Subcommittee on May 15, 1958.

The Back of the Yards Movement is an outstanding illustration what progress can be made beneficial to ten of thousands of persons when the civic spirit and interest of a community is aroused to action. Mr. Joseph Meegan, a dedicated man in this notable contribution has been executive secretary of this Movement for years.

Throughout the years he has also been a leader in establishing by law, and strengthening and extending the National school lunch program.

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH MEEGAN, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, BACK OF THE YARDS SOCIAL ACTION CLUB, CHICAGO, ILL., BEFORE THE SENATE HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE HEARING, MAY 15, 1958

On behalf of the Back of the Yards Social Action Club, I welcome this opportunity to testify before this committee on Senate bill 2791. With me today and also representing the club are: Mrs. Anne Murrell, housewife; Mr. John Higgins, a builder; and Mr. Emil Seliga, president of a savings and loan association.

The Back of the Yards Social Action Club represents nearly 100,000 people living in back of the stockyards, an area which is familiar to you as the scene of many national political conventions. The club was organized to promote the general welfare of our community.

The Back of the Yards Social Club is interested in all problems of the community. We differ from other local organizations because we were not organized to deal with one specific problem and abstain from getting enmeshed in other problems which are related to each other.

Because of our many accomplishments, our record in health, nutrition, delinquency

prevention, safety and other related problems is known all over America. In the field of neighborhood conservation, we have received national recognition because of the achievements by our people themselves, without the aid of outside planners and a multiplicity of agencies duplicating each other's efforts.

Please permit me to tell you something about our self-help conservation program which is related to Senate bill 2791. Back in 1953 we recognized that blight, which is a common problem in every old community in America, was casting its shadows in back of the yards.

Representatives of church, labor, business, industry, real estate, and savings institutions met for the purpose of attacking neighborhood decay, blight, and flight. We asked ourselves the question, why should we move away from our community? Where else are there 20 churches and schools all paid for, and where else are there places to work, nearby shopping centers, 33 recreation agencies, and 29 savings institutions? We asked, where else is there a community with children wanted and appreciated? We talked about our low taxes. We had no hidden costs in the area such as special assessments to pay for paved streets and alleys and sewers to eliminate floods. After reviewing all the benefits we were blessed with, we decided not to run away, but to stick and stay and work on a program of positive action by repairing and remodeling our present homes, and at the same time building new ones with private financing which was furnished by 22 of our savings institutions.

Without delay, our self-help program swung into action. Local home-improvement contests, sparked by appeals from local churches and by our community paper, stimulated unprecedented home improvements and remodeling. Thousands of residents were cited with certificates of merit as recognition for beautifying their homes. Cash prizes and savings bonds were awarded to citizens whose homes showed the greatest interior and exterior remodeling improvements.

Social pressure played an important part in encouraging neighbors to improve their homes in order to keep up with their neighbors. Today, more than 4,000, or over 50 percent, of the homes in our community have been repaired and remodeled.

With the aid of the mayor and other city officials, a rigorous program of enforcement of building codes, zoning and sanitation laws has been maintained. There are no sneak or illegal conversions in back of the yards. Our streets and alleys are among the cleanest in Chicago.

At present, the extent of local interest is best reflected in the fact that over 162 blocks in back of the yards are participating in a citywide home improvement contest sponsored by the Chicago Real Estate Board with cash prizes amounting to $20,000 offered to the winning blocks in the community.

The Back of the Yards Social Action Club recognized the need to build homes for our own people who couldn't find housing in the community and who, as a result, would be forced to move away. Here is how we are attacking that problem.

We successfully completed a tax and title search on over 800 pieces of vacant property in the community. Our committee has been told by the Chicago Title and Trust Co. that no community, to their knowledge, ever did this before. Our zeal was not to be deterred by painstaking searches and because no one else ever attempted this project.

The Back of the Yards Social Action Club decided to buy 2,000 front feet of property to be subdivided for 49 homes in our old neighborhood. The subdivision was named Destiny Manor with homes only for those with children. With the help of our mayor and other elected officials, we paved our own streets, provided water, gas, electricity, sewers, sidewalks, and alleys.

To date, over 150 new homes have been built in back of the yards. These 3-bedroom, full-basement, fully plastered homes with paved streets, sidewalks, sump pumps, and overhead sewers are sold for as little as $15,900.

Now, we are ready to begin another phase of our conservation program of new home construction which we believe will enable us to make possible the most dramatic progress to date in improving and conserving our community.

In the back of the yards area, there are approximately 600 vacant lots with frontages of 24 and 25 feet. The Chicago City Council recently amended its building and zoning regulations to permit 20-foot wide homes to be built on 25-foot lots, and 19-foot homes to be built on 24-foot lots. Most of the lots are 125 feet deep, so that the lack of frontage for the homes will be more than made up by the length of the house. Each house will have three bedrooms, a full basement, a combination living-dining room, and a kitchen.

We are now in the process of beginning construction of several hundred new homes. As was the case with Destiny Manor, all of the new homes will be hold to relatives of families already in the back of the yards area. We hope a substantial number will be purchased by young married couples. Frankly, we want to keep these young families in our community because they assure a continuation of healthy progress in the area, and because they assure too, a continuation of efforts to achieve high standards of neighborhood improvement and maintenance.

A surprisingly large number of the folks who have purchased these newly-built homes have had a large cash equity, but as this committee recognizes, many young families are unable to come up with more than a modest down payment. To satisfy these financing needs, we naturally turn to the 29 savings and loan associations located in the back of the yards area. They have worked closely with us both on our current programs and in our Destiny Manor development. They, like all the people of our community, are anxious to do their part to improve their community. These institutions, holding over $406,754,000 of neighborhood savings, have furnished us a complete and highly satisfactory service with but one exception. By charter and regulations they are limited to loans not in excess of 80 percent of value. Nor will they approve loans where the difference between their top loan and the purchaser's down payment might be covered by secondary financing, for which we commend them. We believe this one shortcoming, a higher conventional mortgage loan, can and would be overcome if Senate bill 2791 were enacted into law. We know from our experiences with our people that a 10 percent down payment is within the reach of the majority of our young folks and we know our savings associations are willing to make the higher percentage loans under such a program.

I hardly need describe the immediate stimulating effect this will have on employment and on restoring confidence during the current recession. Our buyers are at hand, our builders are ready, our savings associations have the funds and are prepared to grant loans immediately.

We therefore respectfully urge Congress to endorse this bill and thus provide another important step in our neighborhood conservation program.

Our Trade Problems With Canada and the Latin American Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I cannot emphasize too strongly the remarks that I made on the floor on yesterday with respect to the Soviet economic penetration in Latin America.

As I pointed out at that time I have been attempting to acquaint the Members of this body with the problems existing these since my subcommittee made a tour of the area late last year.

You will recall that I incorporated a speech in the RECORD, which I made before the Mississippi Valley World Trade Conference in New Orleans way back in January.

In this talk I pointed out that the Soviets were exploiting the economic distress in most of the areas of Latin America; how they were negotiating for the purchase of raw materials and agricultural commodities from Colombia, Brazil, Peru, and other countries; and how many of our policies were helping them in building up unrest and animosity against the United States.

I specifically pointed out the very damaging effects of the recommendations of the administration with respect to lead and zinc, not only in Mexico and Peru, but in Canada as well. As I said on Thursday, it helps us not one whit to bury our heads in the sand about these proposals. We had best face up to them and come up with constructive solutions.

I am very happy that we have reported a good reciprocal trade agreements bill. Development in Latin America point up the necessity for passing this bill better than any arguments that I can advance. It can certainly be said that if we fail to pass the bill we will have tremendously aided the Communists in their economic penetration of the good-neighbor countries.

I include herewith an article which I wrote for the New Orleans Item some months ago:

OUR TRADE PROBLEMS WITH CANADA AND THE LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES

(By HALE BOGGS, chairman, Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy, of Committee on Ways and Means)

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy, I have just returned from an extensive trip to Canada and South America, studying the trade problems of these countries with the United States. This subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means has also just now completed 2 weeks of panel discussions on all phases of our foreign trade policies. So I am very pleased, indeed, to comply at this time with the request of the item and write some of our observations about our recent trip, as well as speculate on the prospects for trade legislation in the approaching session of Congress.

I might first point out that the Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy was created

by the Ways and Means Committee in the closing days of the 84th Congress and has been continued for the life of the 85th Congress. In a period of about 15 months, the subcommittee has completed one of the most thorough studies ever made of the trade relations of our country. In this work we have been greatly aided by Mr. Charles Nutter, the very able secretary of International House.

In the fall of 1956, we divided the subcommittee into 2 groups. One group headed by myself studied trade relations in the Far East, principally in Japan but we also made inquiries in Formosa, Hong Kong, the Philippine Islands and Thailand. At the same time, half of the subcommittee was conducting investigations in all of the free nations of Europe. Prior to starting these journeys, we conducted hearings in Washington on the history and background of our tariff policies.

In March of 1957, the subcommittee reported on the trips abroad and also made a comprehensive report to the House of Representatives on the general subject of tariffs. This report—known as the Report to the Committee on Ways and Means on United States Customs, Tariff, and Trade Agreement Laws and Their Administration from the Subcommittee on Customs, Tariffs, and Reciprocal Trade Agreements—is now found in practically every library of any consequence throughout the country and has become almost a standard textbook on our trade laws. The report has recently been supplemented by a compendium of papers which has also gained wide attention throughout the commercial and trade centers of our country.

The subcommittee now contemplates filing its recommendations with the House of Representatives shortly after Congress reconvenes in January. These will be the first recommendations of the subcommittee.

Thus, I think, it may be said that our subcommittee has worked quite hard. Whether or not we will be able to contribute to a further liberalization of the trade policies of the United States remains to be seen.

Now back to some observations relative to our recent tour through Canada and South America.

First off, I believe that your readers will be interested in the type of schedule we followed and the people that we contacted.

Upon arrival in a given country we would be briefed by our Ambassador and his staff. This briefing would consist of a comprehensive summary of the political conditions existing in the given country, economic developments and finally a rather close look at trade between that country and the United States and the frictions, if any, existing therein.

After this briefing, we would generally meet with the Foreign Minister of the country and members of his staff, followed by similar meetings with the Minister of Commerce and the Minister of Finance and other officials of the Government. On successive days we would meet with the American business community, with the local business leaders, with Members of the Congress, and frequently with the President or Prime Minister. In Canada we had the great privilege of meeting with the new Prime Minister Mr. John Diefenbaker who impressed us as a devoted and dedicated public official. We also met with President Perez Jimenez of Venezuela and with Provisional President Pedro Aramburu and Vice President Admiral Isaac Rojas of Argentina.

In a short space, it is difficult to do much more than make rather general observations. Among these are the following:

We have a tremendous reservoir of good will throughout Latin America, but even our very good friends sometimes find it difficult to understand some of the vagaries of our foreign policy.

For instance, when the administration recommended an increase in duties on lead and zinc last summer, this created very little attention in the United States but to Canada and Mexico and Peru, three of our best friends, it was most alarming. In the case of Peru, it nearly brought about a panic. I can cite similar instances.

We have no better friend on earth than Canada. Historically, we have held up to the world the example of these two great nations with a common frontier of 3,000 miles dedicated to friendship, and, yet our surplus wheat disposal program has created a very serious problem in Canada. Canadian officials pointed out to me that our policy had resulted in transferring a hundred million bushels of wheat from American storage to Canadian storage. The political impact of this sort of thing is very difficult to judge, yet these are the things which create friction and strain friendly relations.

Unfortunately, I could go on with many such examples.

On the affirmative side of the ledger, South America is probably the finest potential area for development in the world and no section has done more to establish friendly relations than has our own city of New Orleans. I think that Mayor Morrison is probably the best known public official in Latin America and International House has done a magnificent job throughout the area. Probably the most impressive thing about South America is the effort being made everywhere to establish economic stability as well as political stability. This is particularly true in the great country of Argentina which is trying desperately to overcome the legacy willed it by Peron and his henchmen.

If you can imagine a nation almost the size of the United States which has almost all of its rail system in disrepair, which has built no roads of any consequence for the last 10 years, which has incurred a fabulous debt and which is going through a period of staggering inflation, then you get some concept of the problems facing the Provisional Government. The important thing, however, is that here, as elsewhere in South America, the Government is facing up to its problem and reestablishing confidence.

One of the encouraging signs is the maturity of our American businessmen abroad.

I met with the American Chamber of Commerce in Caracas, Rio, Sao Paulo, Buenos Aires, Santiago, Lima, and Bogota. In each country I found the officers and members of the American business community anxious to translate to the American Government and American officials the importance of encouraging more trade and the dire consequences of the imposition of new trade barriers.

For instance, the most eloquent spokesmen against new duties on lead and zinc were not found in the Government officials of Peru, although they too recognized and pointed out the serious problems involved, but among American businessmen.

Throughout the area, the Russians are watching what we do. The Khrushchev regime in Moscow is using trade as a weapon for political action and Latin America has not been neglected. Only recently, you will recall, Mr. Khrushchev said that Russia would buy more coffee and sugar from Brazil, providing Brazil established friendlier political relations with Russia. Actually, if Russia desires to purchase these commodities she can do so with the greatest of ease, but invariably Russia considers the political consequences of such trade and in many areas of the world is using this weapon to subvert or to attempt to subvert free governments throughout the world.

That is why it is so important that we do not reverse the direction of our foreign trade policy. As I write this the NATO nations are meeting in Paris. The free Europeans for the first time in modern history are about to create a common market. The implications of this market on American trade have not even been explored, but this much can be said. For us now to reverse ourselves and to change the policy created by Cordell Hull in 1934 would be, in my opinion, a catastrophic thing for America.

That brings me to the approaching session of Congress. On June 30, 1958, the existing trade-agreements program expires. Although it seems elementary that this program should be extended without crippling amendments, there are many forces at work in our country today opposed to such an extension. Some people argue that failure to extend the program would simply mean that the President of the United States would no longer have the power to negotiate multilateral trade agreements, and this failure would really have no consequential effect upon the foreign trade of the United States. Actually, nothing could be further from the truth. Foreign trade is simply an extension of domestic trade. Those of us who live in New Orleans understand this perfectly. We see it happen everyday. We see manufactured articles from plants on the Ohio come down the Mississippi River to New Orleans. From New Orleans, these manufactured articles, tractors, let us say, may move through the inland waterway system to parts of Texas or Florida. This is domestic commerce. Some of the same tractors may move by ship across the Caribbean Sea to Venezuela; this is foreign commerce.

The same essential factors are involved. The seller must have a buyer in whom he has confidence. The buyer must be able to pay for what he buys. Now, if we fail to extend the Trade Agreements Act, buyers all over the world will interpret this action as a return to the high protectionist policies of the late 1920's. They will lose confidence. They will decide that the American market is closed to them and that they will no longer be able to turn to buying from American manufacturers, from whom they are now buying.

This psychology will in turn be translated to the governments of these nations, and they, in turn, will reflect their uncertainty in many different ways. The net effect will be that Russia will be given an opportunity to move into areas which heretofore have totally and completely resisted this influence.

I previously mentioned the European common market. The treaty establishing this common market will come into being in January. For us to face this new type of Europe without the ability to negotiate with the common market would be a very serious thing from the point of view of our own exporters and importers.

From the point of view of New Orleans, the necessity for maintaining liberal trade policies is obvious. A few days ago, when we had the ceremony marking the beginning of work on the tidewater canal, I saw a great number of oceangoing vessels waiting at anchor near the mouth of the industrial canal because they were unable to obtain berths along the riverfront docks. In other words, business is booming in our port. But this is because nations are trading with us and we with them. If we reverse this policy we won't see all of those ships bringing goods and commerce and progress and work into our city.

So, we face a fight which is a very difficult one, but one which I am proud to have a part in. The battle on trade agreements will begin almost simultaneously with the opening of the next session and will continue through most of the 2d session of the 85th Congress. I know that it will be followed carefully here in New Orleans.

Reds Gain, West Loses, if Atomic Tests Suspended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

REDS GAIN, WEST LOSES, IF ATOMIC TESTS SUSPENDED

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Nikita Khrushchev's offer of technical negotiations on stopping nuclear bomb tests may bring to a head the dispute within the American administration. For strange as it may seem, some important Americans—as well as all Communists—believe the tests should be stopped.

On one side—against stopping—are Adm. Lewis Strauss, head of the Atomic Energy Commission, and scientist Edward Teller. On the other—for stopping at once—are Harold Stassen, former disarmament adviser to the President and, more recently, Hans Bethe, member of the President's Scientific Advisory Committee. (Mr. Teller is called the "father of the H-bomb," which other American scientists would have allowed the Russians to produce first, while Mr. Bethe, an able mathematician, predicted that the A-bomb could not possibly be made.)

The President is of divided mind. Presumably the final vote may be cast by Secretary of State Dulles on the basis of what the Russians have to offer at the technical negotiations.

In my opinion, this decision will be as important as the one to use the first A-bombs against Japan in 1945. It will shape international relations for many years.

I favor continuing tests. The reason is simple: further tests promise to put an end to the present stalemate of terror. It will do so by giving the free world a weapon it will dare to use in its own defense. Today's dirty bombs are so full of lethal fallout that to use them would presumably both kill people by the scores of millions and harm their descendants.

Under these circumstances, the American President might refuse to use present bombs against Soviet forces invading Europe or the Middle East with partly conventional forces. Since the West, for economy reasons, has refused to create equivalent conventional forces, it would be helpless against such an invasion. Once the Russians become convinced that this is the case, why should they hesitate?

The United States administration has wished to continue tests until it has clean bombs of all sizes, down to the smallest. In that case, it would not hesitate to use them since they would kill only those in target areas. Very small ones could be used against enemy forces on friendly territories, as present bombs cannot.

Clean bombs here would compel the Soviets themselves to produce and use only clean bombs or to take the risk that the United States would retaliate against an attack by dirty bombs with its own dirty bombs and destroy the U. S. S. R.

In consequence, any future war would either be limited to clean bombs or, better, would never occur. In fact, one can state that once the Western peoples have an armory of clean bombs to stop any invasion, and shelters against a sneak attack, they will be in a position to checkmate the U. S. S. R.

OPPOSITE REASONS

This unhappily is not what pacifists want and not what the Kremlin leaders want. Both prefer dirty bombs, though for opposite reasons.

Pacifists believe that the horror of present weapons may induce first disarmament and then perpetual peace by removing the element of force from international relations.

This I consider a complete illusion. Fear has never prevented war. History shows that the only alternative to the use of individual violence has been the disarmament of individuals under enforceable law. In the case of nation states, this implies a world authority. Many of those who would ban nuclear tests hope to get the governments to agree to such an authority.

This, in a world divided like ours, I consider utopian. Force—latent or active—will continue to decide disputes among nations as long as these remain sovereign. It therefore behooves the free nations to create preponderant force in the form of weapons which their ethics will permit them to use if they must—in other words, to end the present stalemate of terror.

For the same reason, it is desirable to extend the possession of clean nuclear weapons from the United States, England, and the U. S. S. R. to our strongest allies so that they can defend themselves. For an alliance can endure only among equals. Without NATO—should Europe drift into communism—the United States is sunk and no mistake.

WIN PIECEMEAL

Kremlin leaders also want tests stopped while both sides have dirty bombs.

First, because they are beginning to believe that Washington would be afraid to use such bombs to defend anything but United States territory.

Second, because they would like to get rid of nuclear weapons in order thereafter to dominate the planet by conventional forces.

Third, because Khrushchev desperately wants to prevent France and particularly West Germany from having nuclear weapons, since once they did, a united West Europe would equal the U. S. S. R.

So long as they do not, Khrushchev can hope to divide the West and ultimately take it over piecemeal. (This can also be done by some disengagement scheme that gets West Germany out of NATO.)

One can understand the Russians. It is hard to understand why westerners should play into their hands by stopping atomic tests or banning nuclear weapons altogether.

Alaska as the 49th State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Roscoe Drummond, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 14, 1958:

ALASKA AS THE 49TH STATE: WHY THE OUTLOOK IS BRIGHT

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The outlook now is that Alaska will become the 49th State in the Union before the next Congress has run its course. The statehood bill has cleared the committees. An early vote in the House is in sight. It has been before Congress since 1916, and its supporters are convinced that at last the votes are at hand to make Alaska statehood a reality. Should Congress again say no:

It would be reneging on the most explicit commitment both parties ever put into their national platforms. In 1956 the Democrats and Republicans pledged "immediate statehood" for Alaska.

It would violate the manifest wishes of the American people, who in a series of public opinion polls running from 1946 to 1958 have increased their support of Alaska statehood from 5 to 1 to 12 to 1.

It would dishonor the promise of the 91-year-old treaty by which Alaska became an American territory and in which we pledged to give its inhabitants "all the rights, advantages, and immunities of the United States." The right to self-government is one of them. The right to be free from taxation without representation is another.

The more one examines the merits of Alaskan statehood, the more persuasive the case becomes. Obviously there are great advantages to the citizens of Alaska, whose elected representatives in the Territory Legislature only last year voted unanimously for statehood. There are also many advantages to the United States, particularly when you consider that on this round earth Alaska is the doorstep to the American continent and the most strategic outpost of our defenses as the alert-flights to the Arctic demonstrate.

All may not be familiar with such basic facts as these:

The Alaskan people: Eighty-five percent of the Alaskans are of the stock of the American pioneers who trekked across the plains and mountains to build the Western United States. About 15 percent are Eskimos, Aleuts and Indians. They are a sturdy, worthy and resourceful people.

The Alaskan population: At present it stands at 212,500. But the most significant fact is the rate of growth. Between 1950 and 1956 the population increased by 53,000, or 48.6 percent. Alaska has shown a greater percentage population growth than any State in the Union for 17 years.

At least 22 of our States had fewer people when Congress granted them admission.

Alaskan loyalty: Only in Alaska did the enemy invade North America in World War II. No more loyalty, no more patriotism, no more willingness to sacrifice were displayed by any part of our pepole than by the Alaskans.

Alaskan communism: The last report made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in 1951 stated that there were 10 Communists in Alaska. There is no reason to believe there are any more today, probably fewer. Would that we did as well in continental United States.

The Alaskan land: Business Week puts it this way: "Picture a land mass stretching from Maine to Florida, from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, embracing 20 easternmost States. Wrap around it a coastline greater than that of the United States itself, and you have an image of Alaska, twice the size of Texas and one-fifth as large as all the 48 States together."

Alaskan resources: The United States has already got back 425 times over the $7 million purchase price it paid to Imperial Russia. In metals, minerals, timber, and oil, Alaska is rich in resources. Geologists conservatively estimate that Alaska is 1 of the 4 greater petroleum basins in the world. No wonder Alaska isn't developed when you consider that the Federal Government owns 99 percent of the land.

Latin Press Comment on the Vice President's Tour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following exerpts from various Latin American newspapers commenting on the recent attacks on the Vice President, which the New York Times compiled and published in its edition of Friday, May 16. I found this commentary most illuminating and commend the Times for yet another example of its excellent service to its readers:

RIO DE JANEIRO

THE CAUSES GO DEEP

(Diario Carioca (progovernment))

The demonstrations attending the Vice President's visits are "receiving the strongest disapproval of this continent's public opinion."

"However, we believe it our duty in loyalty to continental unity in the defense of the democratic world to state that any interpretation attributing all the origin to Communist inspiration does not represent all the truth.

"The roots of Argentine, Peruvian, Colombian, and Venezuelan events are deeper and more serious. They go beyond the boundaries of each country because they belong to all South America, if not all Latin America.

"The causes spring from an accumulation of mistakes in policy by the present leaders of the North American Government toward its natural Latin-American allies. This policy amounts to negation of understanding the United States' own national and international interests, which President Roosevelt showed in launching the good neighbor policy.

"The present Government of the United States has been showing progressive inability to understand the crisis which they themselves daily increase. The present Government is placing incapable men to head many governmental agencies to deal with hemisphere and international problems.

"The United States Government has not tried to avoid reasons for friction and crisis, which become points of infection to good continental relations—petroleum and prices of basic commodities which we export and on which we base our economic survival."

SENDING OF TROOPS TACTLESS

(Jornal do Brasil (independent opposition))

"We regret to add our protest to that of all free minds in Latin America against the measures taken by the American Government, which are reportedly the inspiration of President Eisenhower."

The movement of troops "is sadly reminded of the period when Marines constituted the real power in the Caribbean and South America." The present action is an "unimaginative, tactless measure whereby the Department of State collaborates with Khrushchev to create anti-American sentiment."

NIXON PROMISE WELCOMED

(Brazil Herald)

Vice President NIXON's promise to change the trade policy is welcomed by Brazil.

GUATEMALA

LACK OF COMPREHENSION CITED

(El Imparcial (conservative))

"We believe we are far from enjoying a profound knowledge and ample comprehension" between the United States and Latin American nations.

"Undoubtedly, many are errors that can be ascribed in fields of economic cooperation and political interdependence to the United States, a nation which by its very strength constitutes an expansive force which is necessary to contain."

MOST UNFORTUNATE ACTION

(Prensa Libre (leftist))

The sending of troops was "Washington's most unfortunate action."

"It has all the earmarks of an intimidatory act, reminding us of the intervention of Marines in Nicaragua." The United States should review its policy to help solve the hemisphere's economic problems with "equity and collaboration" and to show its sympathies with democratic regimes.

The United States has deluded itself "if Americans content themselves with blaming Communist agents for the outrages against Nixon."

BUENOS AIRES

UNJUST TREATMENT FACTOR

(Blanco (rightist))

"The attack on Nixon (in Caracas) cannot be explained just by saying 'Communist agitation'. * * * Attack demonstrates hemispheric state of mind which should make Washington think twice about the direction its Latin American policy is taking. * * * Inadmissible forgetfulness and unjust treatment seem to be the two dominant factors of United States policy toward its southern neighbors in recent years."

LET US LIVE INDEPENDENTLY

(Propositos (left-wing))

Americans would get on well everywhere "if the United States would stay within its borders and let us live independently without forcing us to accept war commitments, without trying to conduct our international relations, without obliging us to enter into economic blocs, monetary funds, world bank, etc."

BOGOTA

ATTACKS ARE A DISGRACE

(El Independiente (liberal))

The Caracas attacks were "a disgrace." "Things went even beyond physical violence when someone spat in Mrs. Nixon's face, an act of infamy which all America rejects with shame and indignation."

"We would not want a representative of our country to receive in the United States the treatment given Mr. NIXON in some of the cities he has just visited. We would consider it an offense to our country's sovereignty. * * * The people of the United States, whose information about Latin America is traditionally very deficient, are now receiving fullest coverage of news which in no way contributes to betterment of false impressions they have of us. * * * And on the other hand, the manacing and spectacular mobilization of North American troops transported by air to bases near Venezuela will constitute motive for new resentment among Latin peoples, among whom this demonstration of force will produce indignation."

"All the Latin American people have not participated in them. The stones came from small groups of extremist elements. The insults, too. Healthy and free America, respected for its culture and its traditions, actively regrets that it was possible for Mr. NIXON and members of his group to be objects of such unjustified and censurable aggressions and offenses on the part of irresponsible minorities."

PANAMA

NIXON TRIP A FAILURE

(El Dia (independent))

Mr. NIXON's trip was a failure because of United States foreign policy. The Vice President is "a typical example of North American mediocrity." It is usual for the United States to have mediocre Presidents and exceptional when "the White House occupant is a statesman of the caliber of Franklin Roosevelt."

"The United States is a profoundly democratic country that seems incapable of making itself understood to demonstrate the efficacy of this system of government."

ATTACKS NOT JUSTIFIED

(El Panama-American (independent))

All responsible Latin American opinion condemns the incidents, observing that these violent censurable acts do reveal Latin American resentment against the unfortunate United States policy toward dictators, and also its policy toward major Latin American problems while pouring funds into Europe and Asia. This explanation does not justify the use of sticks, stones, and spit in settling issues.

LIMA

SOURCE IS DICTATORSHIPS

(La Tribuna (leftist))

"The Caracas incidents, like the Lima incidents, originated in long dictatorships suffered by both countries.

"The United States recognized the military coups of 1948 too quickly and the dictators in both countries later were decorated by President Eisenhower for their fight against Communist subversives.

"It is significant that in two countries whose regimes received blessings by Washington the most serious incidents occurred."

HABANA

COMMUNIST-INSPIRED

(Havana Post)

The attacks were "Communist inspired." The sending of troops and marines to bases near Venezuela for "the declared purpose of collaborating with the Venezuelan Government if such help should be sought in a crisis brought about by Communists" was completely justified. There could not be any implication of intended intervention in Venezuelan internal affairs.

SAN JOSÉ

COULD HAVE BEEN FORESEEN

(Diario de Costa Rica (progovernment))

"The Venezuelans who have acted like that have elected to leadership persons who cannot call themselves civilized. It is surprising that the United States intelligence service apparently was unprepared for the anti-NIXON outbursts. These could have been foreseen since they arise from well-known causes; namely, the present struggle between democracy and communism."

The United States faces a disquieting dilemma: either to support the antidictator movements that inevitably lead to a period of political anarchy and of which the Communists easily can take advantage, or else approve the consolidation of tyrannical governments, which, at least, have a common front against communism.

"The United States must have observed in Venezuela that if the provisional government there lacks authority to guarantee the lives of Mr. NIXON, his wife, and high officials against brutal and savage mob violence, then neither has it the authority to prevent a coup d'état by a Communist minority which could repeat the spearhead gained by Moscow in Latin America when Arbenz ruled Guatemala."

CARACAS

PAST IS RECALLED

(El Mundo)

In the sending of United States troops to the Caribbean "is Washington returning to the times when battleships and Marines

sealed the lips of national independence in order to collect Wall Street debts?"

HONDURAS

CAUSE IS ECONOMIC CRISIS

(El Dia Independent)

The underlying cause of the attack in Peru was an economic crisis exploited by Communist agitators.

MANAGUA

HIDDEN HAND OF MOSCOW

(La Prensa)

"In Venezuela * * * the hidden hand of Moscow found adequate material for its designs. It is to be hoped * * * that immediate and energetic revisions of United States policy with Latin America will follow."

COMMUNISM IS EXPLANATION

(Novedades)

The attacks implied that Venezuela "has been converted into a camp for the spreading of communism, which is the only explanation for what has occurred."

Our Republican Party and Our Foreign Giveaway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in 1952 when Eisenhower was first elected there was unity and harmony in the Republican Party. Two strong men, Taft and Eisenhower, were teamed up in an effort to establish an efficient, honest, economical government in Washington. That kind of government had been promised in the campaign, and that was the kind of government these two Republican leaders were determined to establish.

An excellent, capable cabinet was selected and installed. A considerable reduction in Federal spending was made during the first 2 years of the new administration, followed by a $7.4 billion tax cut. Besides this the Hoover Commission was set up to point out where efficiency and economy could be made.

After Taft's death the President turned to other advisors, New Dealers all—Sherman Adams, Arthur Larson, Milton Eisenhower, Harold Stassen, and Paul Hoffman. These new advisors prevailed upon the President to repudiate his campaign promises, to repudiate his economy program, to adopt the New Deal-Fair Deal spending program, and to adopt an international foreign policy that will end in financial chaos and national bankruptcy.

From 1946 to 1958 we have handed out in so-called foreign aid $73.7 billion, an average of over $6 billion per year. Since Eisenhower was inaugurated in 1953 we have handed out in foreign aid $30 billion, an average of $5 billion per year. What have we received in return for the billions we have handed out? Has this giveaway program produced the results promised or expected?

Mr. Speaker, our unsound foreign policy has been so well analyzed and outlined by Dean Clarence Manion on the Manion Forum Network in a broadcast on May 11, 1958, that I include the text of that broadcast as a part of these remarks for the edification of my colleagues:

OUR INTERNATIONALIST FOREIGN POLICY: ROAD TO RUIN OF CIVILIZATION

Death is a grim reaper. The bitterness of its random harvest is impressed upon any patriot who thumbs through old issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There was Senator Robert Taft, and Senator Pat McCarran, and finally Senator McCarthy. Think of the difference that their combined presence could make upon the rough course of current events.

Over this microphone last week, we heard the voice of Senator McCarthy urging us to work for a rejuvenated foreign policy. Senator Taft had previously declared that we cannot solve any of our pressing problems until we come to grips with this foreign policy upon which all other policies now depend.

In his very last political speech, released from his sickbed in Cincinnati (May 26, 1953), the Ohio Senator urged the United States to go it alone in Korea and forget about the United Nations. The dramatic news about Taft's fatal illness obscured this final warning to his countrymen.

If we had heard and followed that advice, we would have won the Korean war. North and South Korea would now be united in freedom and the resulting impact upon the Red Chinese Government would have sent that godless despotism reeling into a full-blown anti-Communist revolution.

How many of our frustrating failures at home have been attributable to our persistent stubbornness in following a proved pattern for failure abroad? The answer is: "All of them."

Taft was right. Today all of our policies depend upon our foreign policy, and for at least 15 years, our foreign policy has been a continuous, colossal, catastrophic flop.

Forty-five years ago, our foreign policy was actually and literally as foreign to the average American as it was to the United States itself. Our tax, tariff, labor, money, and other problems were completely homegrown, and we tackled each of them with the practical purpose of doing what was best for the people of the United States.

With that simple, sensible motivation, our governmental policies preserved American freedom and protected our national independence while the prosperity of the country was steadily increased.

It is standard procedure, at this point, for somebody to break in and say that the world began to shrink 45 years ago and our statesmen were consequently forced to lift their sights far beyond our borders. That is something less than a half-truth. Our statesmen were induced to lift their sights to foreign lands but not by any figurative shrinkage in our geographical boundaries.

The force upon our statesmen was applied by professional internationalists who were determined to make American resources support the falling arches of imperialistic interests all over the world. Today these pragmatic propagandists are still on the same job. For them, the facts of international life are the emotionalisms that they fabricate periodically to fit the necessities of each succeeding crisis in their grand design.

It was this phalanx of illuminated intelligence that turned our sauerkraut into "liberty cabbage" while we dethroned the German kaiser and made "the world safe for democracy." Twenty years later, this same cogent coterie persuaded us to lend the Allies some tools so they could finish the job against Hitler.

For the past 10 years, this identical clique of self-serving internationalists has been busy galavanizing the strength of what they call the free world against the menace of international communism.

We are told that the free world countries can win out over the Soviet bloc only if they work together. In the course of this free world togetherness, the United States is expected to abolish its tariffs, repeal its immigration laws, arm its allies, finance the neutrals, conform its internal and external government to international standards fixed by such things as WHO, ILO, GATT, and UNESCO, then proceed to make all of this permanent by periodic assignations in coexistence at the summit with the dreaded Communist enemy.

For 10 years this has been the sustained direction of our foreign policy upon which all of our other policies are made to depend. In the promotion of this program for our national suicide, the liberty cabbage salesmen are just as slick and seductive how as they were 40 years ago.

INTERESTS OF UNITED STATES? HUSH

At this point, they have made it unfashionable for our President or our Secretary of State to express any anxiety about the special interests of the United States. All of our official concern now is with the safety of the free world.

Last October 26, President Eisenhower himself, in concert with the Prime Minister of Great Britain, said this: "The concept of national sovereignty is now out of date * * * the countries of the free world are now interdependent."

This grand alliance of unbreakable interdependence is supposed to strike terror into the heart of the Communist enemy and carry comforting confidence to us and to all other people in this free world. However, when one sets out to measure its boundaries, he finds that for all of the practical purposes, such as paying the check, this big free world, so-called, has suddenly shrunk to the dangerously declining dimensions of the American taxpayer.

It is American money which pays all of the bills and American soldiers who stand guard at the lonely, inhospitable perimeters of the Iron Curtain. Now, at long last, it is our rising national debt and our deepening economic recession which floodlights the fraud of this fatal foreign policy upon which all other policies depend.

The important point is not that this prolonged foreign policy is futile and that it will eventually be fatal to the United States. The important point is that this futile fatal foreign policy is deliberately fraudulent.

Official implications and popular impression to the contrary notwithstanding, the purpose of this foreign policy is not to destroy the big bad Communist enemy but to preserve that enemy and use it indefinitely as a built-in excuse for the progressive destruction of the solvency, the sovereignty and the Constitutional Government of the United States.

For the slick super-salesmen of our present Internationalist foreign policy, the greatest of all possible disasters would be the sudden collapse of the Kremlin dictatorship, the revival of national independence in the subjugated countries of Russia and Eastern Europe and an explosive anti-Communist revolution in China.

If that happened, it would dissolve the whole rationale of the Internationalist crusade against American independence. It is the very real possibility of this eventuality that spurs the present drive for a summit conference and propels the promotion of cultural exchanges with the Soviet Union.

The big disturbing nightmare of the Internationalist cabal is the imminent possi-

bility of another Hungarian revolution that might melt down the whole Iron Curtain from the inside. Thus, when sparks of anti-Communist resistance fly up in Poland, the Internationalists see to it that more American aid is rushed to Gomulka to stabilize his tenuous tyranny.

Tito cannot insult us loud enough to deflect the flood of American money that has kept him in power for years. We constantly ship strategic materials to England and France that are practically earmarked for transshipment to the Kremlin and Red China.

The Internationalists are not afraid of Soviet strength. What alarms these alien-minded fabricators of our foreign policy is the possibility that the Red dictatorships may collapse.

An ever more menacing Kremlin is very useful to the whole Internationalist program. For instance, what would these Internationalist promoters of GATT and its continued control of our reciprocal trade do now without the convenience of this so-called Communist threat to our world markets?

This explains the current nationwide publicity buildup about Russia's growing economic, scientific, and industrial strength. The Internationalists can make everybody believe this, except the Russian people who know better by firsthand experience.

The purpose of another summit conference is not to work out mutual agreements between this country and the Kremlin. Mr. Dulles himself, admits that the Reds regard such agreements as crusts of bread which are made to be broken.

BIG IDEA TO PROMOTE KHRUSHCHEV

The purpose of a summit conference is to provide desperately needed prestige to Khrushchev and Company, inside the Iron Curtain. Once more, the restless slaves need to be demoralized, discouraged and subdued by more official international recognition of their slavery.

The captured Czechs, Slovaks, Poles, Hungarians, Latvians, Lithuanians, as well as the Russian people, need to be assured that resistance is useless, that their hated killer, Khrushchev, is not really a killer but a great statesman who is accepted by President Eisenhower as an equal.

This is the crime against truth and justice that our President is asked to commit as he climbs to the summit with the bloody butcher of the Ukraine—the completely self-appointed jailer of one-third of the world.

President Eisenhower is said to like Wild West stories. For diversionary reading on his way to the summit conference, I recommend a true story of the far Wild East and of the frozen Arctic North—the sensational story of life, death, and mass rebellion in the Communist slave camps. This book is the personal experience of John Noble, an American who was held as a slave by the Soviet Government for nearly 10 years. (I Was a Slave in Russia—Noble, Devin-Adair, $3.75.)

I do not recommend this story to children or to men and women with weak stomachs, but, for those prospective summit conferees who are preparing to deal officially with the Soviet gangsters as if they represented a civilized government, this book is a must.

Personal sin, immorality, even depravity are to be expected in some areas of our tainted human nature, but never in history, before the advent of Soviet Russia, has a whole society of people been corralled and ruled on the basis of beasts.

This book is no series of lectures on law and life in the Soviet Union as they would be delivered by a visiting Soviet professor or by one of our gullible citizens who has been culturally exchanged under the benign surveillance of the Soviet Government.

This is the raw story of one of the 25 million political prisoners now being systematically worked to death in the slave camps of Communist Russia. The author is one of the very few who managed to live and tell about it.

Those who are misled by Internationalist propaganda concerning the great and growing industrial powers of the Soviet Union will be surprised to learn that the Communist leaders distrust labor-saving machines because they place too much power for sabotage in the hands of the operating workman. In a realm where everybody is suspected of disloyalty, and with good reason, the risk is too great.

The compelling point of Noble's harrowing, horrible 10-year experience is this: Any civilized man who consciously aids the continuity of this hell-born system of human degradation called Communist government is inviting the terrible retribution of history here on earth and God only knows what else hereafter.

Those fabricators of our Internationalist foreign policy who use American aid, diplomatic recognition and summit conferences to keep this evil thing alive are accomplishing more than the eventual destruction of American independence. They are planting a short-time bomb under the foundations of human civilization. May God have mercy on their souls.

Statement of Hospital Association of New York State Regarding Community Facilities Administration Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement of the Hospital Association of New York State presented to the House Banking and Currency Committee, urging inclusion of voluntary nonprofit hospitals in the provisions of the community facilities bill which is now before the committee.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES M. ROYLE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, THE HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK STATE BEFORE THE HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the committee, the Hospital Association of New York State is a nonprofit corporation incorporated under the membership corporation law of the State of New York. It represents 308 voluntary and public nonprofit hospitals located in the State which provide in excess of 95 percent of all general and allied special hospital beds and facilities. These hospitals admit and care for almost 1¾ million patients in any one year. This represents in excess of 96 percent of all patients admitted to this class of hospital.

Although inroads have been made in the elimination of obsolescence of hospital facilities; beds and facilities in nonfire-resistive buildings; the expansion of existing acceptable hospitals to measured need; and in the construction of needed hospital facilities where none existed, much more remains to be done if factually, measured need is to be even partially met. What has been done has resulted from local initiative and effort together with, in many instances, assistance from the Federal Government through the medium of the Hill-Burton hospital program.

The New York State Joint Hospital Survey and Planning Commission, the State agency established by enabling legislation to supervise and carry out the Hill-Burton program, reports that its annual survey of need for 1958 indicates a total number of 118 potential hospital construction projects, the majority of which involve voluntary nonprofit institutions, many of which could go to contract by June 1959. The estimated value of this construction at the current level of cost is $177,050,000. Excluded from these figures are those projects which have been approved to receive Federal funds under the Hill-Burton program plus those which are eligible should the President's Hill-Burton budget of $121 million be approved for the fiscal year July 1, 1958.

It is reasonable to believe that some of the 118 projects are not amenable to the provision of hospital facilities with the use of borrowed money and with the lack of sufficient local money and current ineligibility for Federal money under the Hill-Burton program, will not contemplate construction for many years in the future. However, to provide the incentive today through the availability of low-interest bearing Federal loans will, in all probability, initiate immediate action on many delayed projects and will result in the obvious provision of an increase in available jobs.

The hospital association, therefore, respectfully urges that the House Banking and Currency Committee, in its deliberations of the above-captioned H. R. 11474 and S. 3497, give full cognizance to the necessity for the inclusion of voluntary nonprofit hospitals in the provisions of the community facilities bill. To do so will go far in the meeting of two needs.

1. Provide many additional job opportunities.

2. Help overcome continuing hospital facilities shortage and obsolescence.

Signal Hill, the City Within a City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a towering forest of oil wells rises from the southern California coastal plane within the congressional district which I have the honor to represent.

Geographically it is one of the richest oil-bearing areas in the world. Politically it is a 2¼ square mile city, Signal Hill, nested completely within another city, Long Beach. Basically industrial, only 15 percent of the city is zoned for residences. Most of the remaining areas contain over 1,000 oil wells and related activities.

Describing Signal Hill as an "Island City of Gold," Ted Krec, in a recent issue of Westerways wrote as follows:

Deep in the heart of Long Beach is the strangest little community in California—the fiercely independent city of Signal Hill.

An island completely surrounded by Long Beach, Signal Hill is the home of 4,650 persons, yet there is no shopping center. And a number of citizens living on the fringes of the community get 2 tax bills a year—1 from Long Beach and 1 from Signal Hill—for the city lines bisect a good many homesites.

The city has an elevation of 360 feet—the highest spot for miles around—an area of 2.25 square miles and an average width of 1 mile. And packed into this tiny space are a good many virtues. The tax rate is only 77 cents for each $100 of assessed valuation, one of the lowest in the entire State.

The fire department is composed of 14 firemen and 2 pumping engines; but since 75 percent of the city is under some sort of oil lease, these firemen are all oil field specialists, exceptionally well trained.

The police department consists of a chief, 13 officers, 2 crossing guards, and a matron. The police have excellent equipment and their own jail—named Hotel Murphy in honor of a former chief. But there are no Signal Hill courts. Signal Hill comes under the Long Beach area of the State judiciary.

To carry the paradox still further, the happy children of the hill go to school in Long Beach—there is no Signal Hill school system.

Almost every city in America has an industrial area in the center—a core around which a residential area develops. The usual division is 85 percent residential and 15 percent industrial. Not so in Signal Hill. This community is zoned 84 percent industrial and 16 percent residential.

Sixty-five percent of the gross revenue of the city stems directly or indirectly from the production of oil. This means that all the business area of the city basically is oil property, and oil land is expensive. Therefore, homebuilding suffers, for the cost of the property is wrong, householders in a good many areas couldn't afford the fire insurance, it would cost too much to build a house and there are many neighborhoods which would be undesirable because of their proximity to the oil installations.

Yet, during the depression, many persons moved to Signal Hill and settled on the fringes because the taxes were cheaper and the areas were close to but not exactly in the oil fields where many sought work.

The history of this little community is one of southern California's most interesting stories. Naturally, the city takes its name from Signal Hill itself, a misshapen, dry height which juts up from the coastal plain in a most unexpected way.

And the hill got its name from the mission days when the promontory was used as a lookout point. From here the missionary fathers of San Gabriel could see miles in every direction, even across the channel to Catalina. When Indian invaders were sighted signal fires were started.

During the days of the dons, the line between the ranchos of Los Alamitos and Los Cerritos ran through the Signal Hill area. In those days there was a road running down the south side of the hill to the sea. And on this road rival horsemen from the two ranchos used to race, thundering down the steep side of the hill, clattering across the plain to the sea and back up to the height while gaily dressed crowds watched and cheered from atop the hill.

Then came a period of doldrums, during which Signal Hill was just a geological oddity. But on March 23, 1921, oil exploration men began a well at the corner of Hill Street and Temple Avenue. On June 25, 1921, the gamble paid off. Oil was discovered at 3,114 feet and the well began flowing at the rate of 590 barrels of oil a day.

The well, named Alamitos No. 1, became one of the most famous in the world, for it led to the development of one of the most productive oilfields on the globe and helped materially in establishing California as a major oil-producing State.

The Signal Hill area took on all the aspects of an oldtime boom town. Fortunes were made and lost daily, and the rush was on for land on the hill—any land at all!

And herein lies a real oddity. The original subdivision by the Bixby land interests had not been surveyed too accurately. The old-time surveyors had curved the corners and failed to center corner lots in the center of the street, thus creating tiny islands in the middle of intersections. These little patches of no man's land were unimportant until oil was discovered. Then opportunistic promoters filed on them and sank wells. There they stand today—tiny islands of land with towering derricks on them—and pumps going at full speed.

In 1924, the city of Signal Hill was incorporated to prevent its being annexed to Long Beach. It seems that Long Beach was attempting to develop a huge harbor and needed land valuation, so it turned its eyes on the Signal Hill area which overnight had become highly valuable.

The oil companies, realizing that their expenses would be much higher if the area joined Long Beach, promoted and financed the incorporation, even paying a voluntary derrick tax so the new city could operate. The tax rate in Signal Hill was 35 cents, while in Long Beach it was $1—so the oilmen saved millions.

Robert Clark, spokesman for the oil firms, told the Signal Hill folk:

"If you go ahead and incorporate every street will be paved with gold and the streetlights will glow a golden color."

Jessie Elwin Nelson was the first mayor and William Hinshaw was the most famous—serving for 16 years. The oil companies controlled everything. They produced a lot and paid in comparatively little.

Today in Signal Hill there are 970 oil wells in operation, but almost as famous as the oil wells are the water wells from which the little city produces its own water—and it's wonderful.

The city of Signal Hill is prospering, too. Gone are the days of boomtown disorder and huge oil firm profits. Today the city has a total worth of $1,700,000, and there are no fewer oil wells in production than in 1940. Experts say that the field is only 35 percent depleted. Despite the fact that production costs increase as the oil depletes, Signal Hill is going to be solvent for a good many years.

And if there are any doubts about the financial condition of the folks who live on the hill, consider this:

The addition of the 1 percent sales tax which took effect in April 1956, all over the county, will provide the city with enough revenue that a tax boost will not be necessary. The city will be able to finance a 5-year program of paving all residential streets and alleys and renewing and resurfacing all thoroughfares.

It's true that many of the vistas in Signal Hill are drab and industrial, and it's true that the streets aren't paved with gold. The streetlights don't glow with a golden hue, either, but this little community is built on money—and it goes way, way down.

Guiding the destiny of this unique city is Mayor Benjamin A. Moyle and a staff of extremely able elected and appointed officials. The Independent Business Men's News recently recognized them as follows:

Mayor Moyle arrived in Long Beach in 1909 and attended our local schools. He joined the Long Beach Harbor Department as an engineer in 1921 and later was chief chemist and engineer with MacMillan Oil and Rio Grande Oil Cos. In 1924 he entered the military service attached to the United States Army Air Corps. He was elected president of the Signal Hill Businessmen's Association in 1947 and was appointed chairman of the Signal Hill Planning Commission in 1949.

He was elected to the Signal Hill City Council in April of 1956 and was chosen mayor a year later.

Associated with him in guiding the affairs of Signal Hill, are the following city officials: Harold V. Clark, councilman; Nellie J. Combellack, councilwoman; Emil B. Hautly, councilman; Frank B. Vaughan, councilman; Heber M. Chapman, city clerk; Gertrude A. Beebe, city treasurer; Clarence W. Heier, police chief; Lloyd S. Colson, Jr., fire chief; George I. Osborn, street and water superintendent; and Lois Hiatt, deputy city clerk.

Benjamin A. Moyle and his highly efficient staff have been ardent workers for Signal Hill and the Long Beach area. With the efforts being put forth by these people, Signal Hill continues to be a city of destiny.

Like a precious crown, Signal Hill rests atop the center of Long Beach attesting to a successful past and a confident approach to the future.

Approval of Area Development Legislation for the 149 Labor Surplus Areas Is Imperative Since 2,970,000 Unemployed Persons, Among the Nation's 5.2 Million Unemployed, Reside in These Chronically Distressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, since 1955 when I introduced the first area development bill in Congress, I have constantly endeavored to find a means of compromising the different versions of the various bills on the subject. As a result of my continued efforts to secure approval of a sane and reasonable area development bill, I introduced on April 17, 1957, H. R. 6975 which is estimated to cost in the neighborhood of two hundred million dollars and is a fitting compromise to the more liberal and the too conservative versions of the legislation.

It was my privilege to have the opportunity of appearing before the House Committee on Banking and Currency on May 19, 1958, in support of my bill, H. R. 6975, designed to establish a program of financial and technical assistance for the purpose of alleviating conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in economically depressed areas. My statement follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, IN SUPPORT OF THE VAN ZANDT BILL, H. R. 6975, TO ESTABLISH A PROGRAM OF FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE DESIGNED TO ALLEVIATE CONDITIONS OF SUBSTANTIAL AND PERSISTENT UNEMPLOYMENT IN ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS, MAY 19, 1958

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before your committee in behalf of my bill, H. R. 6975, introduced on April 17, 1957, which is designed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in economically depressed areas. In short, if enacted, my bill would be cited as the Area Redevelopment Act of 1958.

Mr. Chairman, as you and many members of this committee know, I represent the 20th District of Pennsylvania comprising the counties of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield,

which, by the way, are located in the heart of Pennsylvania. Before and since the end of the Korean war, 2 of the 3 labor markets in my 3-county area totaling nearly 90,000 jobs have been classified by the United States Department of Labor as labor surplus areas.

Most of the time the area has been classified as being among the major labor surplus areas of the Nation. At one time we had 18 percent of the civilian labor force unemployed and today the average is over 17 percent, or about 15,000 of the 90,000 labor market unemployed.

For your information, the unemployment in my district that has existed prior to and since the close of the Korean war results from depressed conditions in two basic industries; namely, bituminous coal, railroading and related industries such as brickyards, machine shops, and so forth.

The depressed conditions that I have mentioned result principally from substitute fuels such as foreign residual oil from Venezuela which have just about destroyed our eastern seaboard coal market. Then, also, the loss of this coal as freight and the conversion of locomotive power from steam to diesel power, together with other technological developments in the railroad industry are contributing factors.

To be a little more specific, in the central Pennsylvania area, which comprises several congressional districts, the production of bituminous coal has been on the decline since 1948. For example, 58 million tons were produced in 1948 as compared with 36 million tons in 1957 or a loss in production of 48 percent. In manpower, in 1948 these mines employed nearly 49,000 miners while in 1957 the number employed was approximately 23,000, a decrease of 54 percent. In other words, 266,000 coal miners lost their jobs.

In all fairness, the loss of coal production and jobs cannot be wholly charged to foreign residual oil because when the railroads shifted from steam to diesel power and homeowners converted to oil and gas, these changes were reflected in the total loss of coal production and manpower.

In addition to the loss of production and jobs in the coal industry, let me cite some figures concerning the situation at Altoona, Pa., where we have the largest railroad shops in the world. From a peak employment of 14,361 in 1951 in the Pennsylvania railroad shops, today there are only about 4,000 employees working, a loss of better than 10,000 jobs.

In addition, when taking into consideration the loss of jobs in the operating divisions of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. in the Altoona area, the number of unemployed railroaders increases to 12,000.

The unemployment that I have cited is for the period before and after the Korean war. While a percentage of the coal miners, railroaders, and others in related industries have gone elsewhere seeking employment, as I have already mentioned, in my area in central Pennsylvania at the present time we have about 15,000 unemployed. Many of these unemployed have worked off and on for short periods during the past several years, but now are unable to find any type of employment.

Meanwhile, many of them have exhausted or soon will exhaust their eligibility for unemployment-compensation benefits, and, therefore, they must rely upon public-assistance benefits and surplus commodities. Mr. Chairman, while the present business slump is regarded nationwide as a temporary recession, in my congressional district, we have suffered from substantial and persistent unemployment for over 10 years.

For an illustration, in September of 1956 with a civilian labor force of 87,000, we had nearly 8,000 unemployed or approximately 11 percent; in September 1957 we still had nearly 8,000 unemployed even though our labor market increased to nearly 90,000 or approximately 9 percent. As previously stated, today we have over 17 percent, or 15,000 unemployed out of a civilian labor market of nearly 90,000. These figures prove conclusively that our unemployment is chronic and persistent.

Mr. Chairman, many times you hear unkindly criticism to the effect that local communities in labor surplus areas are lax in helping themselves. That is not true in my area of central Pennsylvania. Years ago my communities organized area development groups and have constantly sought to attract new industries in a determined effort to bolster the economy. They have given of their time, money and effort. They have borrowed at the banks to the legal limit and have been aided by the Small Business Administration and the State of Pennsylvania. Frankly, they have gone the limit and need further assistance such as is provided for in the many area development bills pending before this committee.

Many communities through their area development groups have been successful in various degrees. In my hometown of Altoona, Pa., since 1946 as a result of an active industrial development group that raised nearly a million dollars mostly through voluntary payroll deductions, 11 new industries have been brought into the area solely through community, State, and Federal effort.

These new industries have provided 3,600 new jobs and a $12 million increased annual payroll. Seventy percent of the new jobs are for men. This highly successful effort stems from what is commonly known nationally as the Altoona plan.

Mr. Chairman, from what I have said I think you will agree that the citizenry of my 3-county area are entitled to a "well-done" for their effort.

But their effort alone is not sufficient to overcome the unemployment problem. With more State and Federal assistance, in my opinion, the economy of my area can be diversified which means that much of the unemployment will be alleviated.

We recognize that the field for new industries is great, the competition is keen, yet we are ready with additional Federal assistance to take our chances with the remaining 148 labor surplus areas in seeking a definite solution to the unemployment problem.

Mr. Chairman, it is common knowledge that in the history of area development legislation, a stalemate developed over the relative merits of the administration bill, S. 1433, and the Douglas bill, S. 964. Some were of the opinion that S. 1433 was too conservative while others regarded S. 964, the Douglas bill, as being too liberal and too costly.

In a sincere effort to end the fruitless discussions and the resultant delay and confusion that surrounded distressed area legislation, I introduced my bill, H. R. 6975, as a compromise between the administration bill and the Douglas bill, which is identical with the Spence bill pending before this committee.

For the information of this committee, my bill, H. R. 6975, retains to some degree many of the features of the administration bill and the Douglas-Spence bills. In addition, some of the provisions in Senate bill 3683, approved by the Senate last week, are contained in my bill, H. R. 6975.

Mr. Chairman, my bill, H. R. 6975, is regarded as a sane and sensible compromise and should serve as a reasonable and realistic basis for perfecting a legislative measure acceptable to all shades of opinion.

However, I wish to state that I have no pride of authorship. My sole concern is to have the House approve an area development bill that will become a law at the earliest possible date.

It is my opinion that the administration bill, Senate 1433, does not go far enough to meet the needs of chronically depressed areas which need Federal help in forms of grants, vocational training with compensation, and Federal loans. While, on the other hand, the Douglas bill, Senate 964, provides too liberal aid to areas whose economic decline is of recent duration. In this connection, such communities normally have sufficient resources and should not be entitled to the variety of programs offered in the Douglas bill.

AID SHOULD BE PROVIDED ON BASIS OF NEED

I believe that the solution to this difference lies in providing various types of aid that would be available to communities with labor surplus. The extent of the help would be based upon the duration and levels of unemployment. Under my proposal, as embodied in my bill, H. R. 6975, the neediest communities would get the most aid, while the help extended to the less needy communities would be more limited.

This approach would also make it possible to reduce the Federal expenditures, but still leaves sufficient funds for communities which meet the most rigid tests of chronic unemployment and economic distress.

My bill, H. R. 6975, provides for designation of three different levels of unemployment, such levels determining the eligibility of the areas for different types of programs.

The three levels of unemployment are as follows:

No. 1, first level: The unemployment rate in the area is 6 percent or more, adjusted seasonally, and has been 6 percent or more at least 8 months in each of the preceding 2 years.

No. 2, second level: The unemployment rate in the area is 6 percent or more, adjusted seasonally, and either has been 8 percent or more for the major portion of each of the preceding 2 years, or has averaged 12 percent or more during the preceding year.

No. 3, third level: The unemployment rate in this area is 6 percent or more, adjusted seasonally, and either has averaged 6 percent or more during the preceding 5 years, 8 percent or more during the preceding 3 years, or 12 percent or more during the preceding 2 years.

Here is how I would apply these criteria to the various types of programs offered in the administration and in the Spence bills.

I. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

I believe that all communities with labor surplus should be entitled to technical assistance from the Federal Government. But that does not mean that the community which has had just 6 percent unemployment for parts of the last 2 years should be entitled to receive the same aid as the community which has been subjected to chronic unemployment many years.

I would, therefore, limit the extent of technical assistance given by the Federal Government to communities in the first level, mentioned before, to only one-third of the total cost of the needed technical assistance, and would require that the other two-thirds of the needed funds should come from State or local sources.

However, for the most needy communities I would extend Federal assistance to provide as much as $3 out of every $4 needed.

II. LOANS

The administration bill, S. 1433, now provides that Federal participation in loans to labor surplus areas should be limited to 35 percent of the cost of the proposed projects. The Douglas bill, S. 964, would go as high as three-fourths of the total cost of the project.

In this connection, I believe that the administration proposal is amply adequate for communities which meet the criteria of the

first level of unemployment, but is certainly not sufficient for areas which have suffered from chronic unemployment for many years.

My bill, H. R. 6975, would extend Federal participation under the proposed loan program as follows: (a) For the first level areas, up to one-third of the total cost of the project; (b) for the second level areas, up to 50 percent of the total cost of the project; and (c) for the third level areas, as much as 75 percent of the total cost of the project.

In addition to providing loans to labor surplus areas, my bill, H. R. 6975, will amend section 207 (a) of the Small Business Act of 1953, by providing that in making and approving loans first preference be given to small-business concerns which are otherwise qualified and which are located or are about to locate in areas of substantial and persistent unemployment.

Section 207 (a) of the Small Business Act of 1953 is also amended by making eligible for loans local private nonprofit organizations—including industrial foundations, development corporations, and similar groups—formed to assist, develop, and expand the economy of areas of substantial and persistent unemployment as certified under section 4 of the Area Development Act of 1958, but only where the purpose of the loan is to enable such organizations to provide supplementary assistance to one or more small business concerns in such areas which have qualified for loans under the preceding provisions of this subsection.

In making and approving loans under this subsection, first preference at all times shall be granted to qualified small business concerns certified as being located in areas of substantial and persistent unemployment or about to locate in such an area and to local nonprofit organizations previously described under this amendment to section 207 (a) of the Small Business Act of 1953.

III. GRANTS

The administration bill, Senate 1433, makes no provision for grants except in the case of technical assistance; while the Douglas bill, Senate 964, provides for Federal grants for public-facility proects. I do not believe that all the communities that have some labor surplus should be entitled to this type of aid. Therefore, my bill, H. R. 6975, in addition to providing loans for public-facility projects, would allow Federal grants up to one-third of the cost of the public-facility project in level 2 areas, and up to two-thirds of the cost of the project in level 3 areas.

IV. SUBSISTENCE PAYMENTS

The administration bill S. 1433, does not allow any subsistence payments to persons undergoing training for new jobs in labor surplus areas. I believe that this type of program should be used sparingly and in extreme cases only. Therefore, my bill, H. R. 6975, extends Federal subsistence payments to people undergoing training only in areas with the most chronic unemployment; namely, those which are classified in level 3.

My bill, H. R. 6975, would assure that the neediest communities would get adequate aid and in addition, it encourages the several States to establish their own program of area redevelopment and by limiting some of the aid provided by the Douglas bill. S. 964, it would also be possible to reduce the total cost of these area redevelopment programs.

Mr. Chairman, it is my belief that my bill, H. R. 6975, constitutes a genuine compromise between the administration bill, S. 1433, and the Douglas bill, S. 964. This is especially true when you compare the cost of the three bills.

Recognizing the administration bill, S. 1433, as a conservative approach, it will cost about $55 million; while the Douglas bill, S. 964, represents an ultraliberal approach to the subject and would cost in excess of $325 million. My compromise bill, H. R. 6975, would cost in the neighborhood of $200 million and would extend Federal aid to labor surplus areas in a reasonable yet realistic manner.

Mr. Chairman, I have repeatedly stated that I have no pride of authorship regarding distressed area legislation. The time has arrived for the 85th Congress to stop squabbling over details and to unite in providing Federal aid for chronically distressed areas.

Let me repeat again that over 17 percent or 15,000 of the civilian labor force in my congressional district are unemployed. I know that some of my colleagues have a higher rate of unemployment in their congressional districts, because there are 149 labor-surplus areas in the Nation suffering from the unemployment problem.

In pleading for legislative action by this Committee and the 85th Congress, I hope that the legislation enacted will provide real benefits to these 149 labor-surplus areas and not be merely of the stopgap variety, for we have suffered too long from chronic and persistent unemployment.

Mr. Chairman, according to the United States Department of Labor, the Nation's unemployment is 5.2 million of which about 3 million represents minimum annual unemployment, leaving about 2.2 million to be charged to the present business slump.

It is significant that the unemployment figures for the 149 labor-surplus areas reveal 2,970,000 unemployed. Allowing for a portion of this number to be charged to the annual minimum of 3 million unemployed, it means that if the unemployment in the 149 labor-surplus areas is alleviated, the unemployment problem today would be greatly simplified.

Percentagewise, as of March 15, the employment in the 149 labor surplus areas represents 37 percent of the Nation's labor market while unemployment in the 149 labor surplus areas represents 48 percent of the Nation's unemployment today. In other words, the heart of our unemployment problem today as a Nation is in the 149 labor surplus areas.

Therefore, the answer to our unemployment problem is distressed area legislation, and the sooner this committee can get a bill started on its way to the White House, the better it will be for millions of the unemployed, hundreds of communities, many States, and the Nation as a whole.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee for your kind indulgence.

Report of New York County Lawyers' Association on H. R. 10634

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the committee on the Federal courts of the New York County Lawyers' Association adopted, on April 29, 1958, a report recommending disapproval of the provisions of H. R. 10634 which seeks to remove the present provision of law which permits Federal courts to issue writs only in aid of their respective jurisdictions.

The report of the committee is as follows:

NEW YORK COUNTY LAWYERS' ASSOCIATION, COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION, *New York.*

Report of committee on the Federal courts on H. R. 10634 which seeks to amend section 1651 (a) of title 28 of the United States Code, in relation to Federal courts issuing all necessary or appropriate writs where agreeable to the usages and principles of law.

RECOMMENDATION: DISAPPROVAL

While intended to eliminate jurisdiction over cases in which the district courts have no jurisdiction, the bill is too vague and general in its present wording to effect this intention.

Respectfully submitted.

COMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL COURTS.

Testing of Nuclear Weapons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VINCENT J. DELLAY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. DELLAY. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the clamor for cessation of testing of nuclear weapons is an extremely dangerous one and one that is incited by emotion rather by careful analysis of facts. I think we are losing sight of the fact that scientific advances in weaponry have increased, and continue to increase the ability of an aggressor nation to launch an attack which would be very damaging to the United States. Since we are a democracy, we are cast in the role of defenders and the role of aggressors necessarily goes to totalitarian governments.

Targets of attackers are large—our cities. Targets of defenders are small—enemy planes and missiles. Weapons of the defender must therefore be more accurate and more numerous than the weapons of the aggressors and, since many would be used over our own or friendly terriitory they must be designed to perform their function and to produce the absolute minimum of radioactive debris. The interruption of testing would directly affect our development for there is no substitute for tests in determining whether a nuclear weapon or even a conventional weapon will perform as anticipated. It is my belief that cessation without acceptable assurance that the Soviet will not violat the agreement would be to no avail. Cessation should only be taken place if both parties are willing to allow the inspection necessary to reduce to the utmost the possibility of secret violation. This step which when taken will freeze our defensive research, but will do nothing to curtail the improvement of an aggressor's delivery systems.

Disarmament to have a chance of reducing the possibility of disastrous war, must apply equitably to its parties. It must not impair the defensive and retaliatory power of ourselves and our allies without a convincingly compensating restriction on an aggressor's ability to attack. History furnishes too many examples of disarmament attempts in the

past which have been honored by one power and not the other. Thus, the violator has made his attack when he believed the time right and the other side sufficiently weakened and unprepared.

All of us would like to have evidence that the Soviets desire disarmament. But the long record of false propaganda and the use of force to achieve unjust ends since the end of World War II point the other way.

A new positive step in disarmament would be initiated by the cessation of the buildup of the weapons stockpiles, if coupled with the initiation of the return to other uses of already stockpiled fissionable material. It would be the beginning, though only the beginning, of restriction on nuclear armaments. It would be a recognition by both the Soviets and ourselves that we were willing to reverse the trend of building ever larger nuclear weapons stockpiles. It could be a real and substantial start toward disarmament. It would require a monitoring system capable of achieving a reasonable degree of success. This would mean a major outlay of means. It would also require that both parties permit full access to all plants and personnel concerned, and rapid and immediate access to areas wherever the party could engage in the production of material.

In this connection, I would like to commend Assemblyman Frederick H. Hauser, of Hoboken, N. J., for his heroic efforts to have deleted from the New Jersey Democratic platform a proposal favoring an end to nuclear tests as pointed out so poignantly in an editorial in the Hudson Dispatch of Saturday, May 10, 1958.

At this point I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Department of New Jersey, Reserve Officers Association of the United Sates, at its 32d convention on April 26, 1958:

The following resolution was adopted by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Department of New Jersey, at its 32d annual convention, April 26, 1958, Fort Monmouth, N. J.:

"Whereas the Soviet campaign of propaganda aimed at inducing the United States to cease the testing of nuclear weapons has created doubts in the minds of some individuals, including elected representatives, of the wisdom and necessity for continuing such tests; and

"Whereas we believe that if further testing is necessary for the development and perfection of clean nuclear weapons and devices, such testing is not only desirable but vital for the security of the Nation; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to authorize, and the appropriate officers of the United States Government be urged to proceed with, whatever action and testing may be necessary to develop and perfect clean nuclear weapons, in order better to assure the security of this Nation and of the free world; and be it further

Resolved, That Reserve Officers Association of the United States, in convention assembled, adopt this resolution establishing the foregoing as the policy of said association."

Federal Excise Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Arthur S. Boettcher, of Lansing, Mich., chairman of the tax committee of the National Luggage Dealers' Association, has been devoting tremendous time and energy during the past several years calling attention to the inequities of our excise taxes. Mr. Boettcher is particularly interested in the repeal of the excise taxes on leather goods, in accordance with the bill I introduced in February, H. R. 10777.

I respectfully request the consideration of all Members of Congress of a recent statement made by Mr. Boettcher concerning this matter which follows:

FEDERAL EXCISE TAX

(By Arthur S. Boettcher, chairman, tax committee, National Luggage Dealers' Association, May 1958)

This year the travel industry has enjoyed the largest business volume in its history. Logic leads us to believe that luggage sales for 1958 should have increased or at least kept pace with those of last year; but figures gathered from 153 of the leading luggage and leather goods stores in 39 of the 48 States show an average decrease of 23 percent in luggage sales and an average decrease of 17 percent in sales of small leather goods. Individual decreases were as high as 50 percent. We must have relief now—or we will be taxed out of existence.

The loss shown by these percentage figures indicates, without a doubt, that:

1. The excise tax on luggage and leather goods has reached a point of diminishing Government returns.

2. Luggage and leather specialty stores will soon lose their identity by being forced into unrelated lines in order to survive.

3. Business being lost to all other industries not struggling under this high burden of taxation will result in more and more unemployment in the luggage industry.

4. So-called wholesale or discount houses, which do not collect the tax and in most cases do not sell at wholesale, are creating unfair competition against the small, honest, hardworking merchant.

We expect to carry our fair share of the responsibility of maintaining the expense and defense of our Government. We know we are a small industry and that we do not represent a power at the polls or as a pressure group, but should we be discriminated against by the very Government that, in time of war or peace, we are willing to defend and protect?

Eighty-one percent of all travel is being charged to business expense. Bearing this in mind, it is reasonable to believe that 81 percent of the luggage and leather goods sold is for business purposes and only 19 percent for luxury or vacation travel. The items which carry the tax in our industry are as essential to the statesman, the professional man, or the small-business man as a hammer is to a carpenter or a pipe wrench is to a plumber. Why should some, and not all others, be penalized 10 percent for the tools needed to carry on their business?

The administration, Congress, and the Ways and Means Committee claim that they wish to correct all inequities existing in the tax structure. Can anyone cite a more glaring example?

We suggest that the Government either tax all industries' productions at the retail level, or put a broad-base tax on all finished goods at the manufacturers' level to equalize the burden of taxation, or eliminate the tax. The increase in business resulting from the removal of the tax would provide jobs for more people as well as increasing corporation and income taxes paid to the Government.

We respectfully request that this administration and Congress do what other administrations have not done, keep their promise to remove the tax, a promise that was to be effective 6 months after World War II hostilities ceased in 1946. We are still waiting for action in 1958.

We have been patient; we have been loyal; we have been honest. We ask you now, gentlemen, to be loyal and honest with us.

Report on Forest Fires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a report on forest fires recently issued by the Department of Agriculture. This report can be obtained from the Department.

As this report indicates, forest fires on a nationwide base have hit an alltime low, and for this splendid record attained I would like to commend the United States Forest Service, the forestry organizations of the various States, the wood industries, and sportsmen and other citizens who use our forests for recreational purposes.

All of these have cooperated toward the end of using diligence, care, and wisdom in preserving a very vital asset, the forests of America.

A brief of the report follows:

FOREST FIRES NATIONWIDE HIT ALLTIME LOW

Forest fires were held to record low of 83,400 nationwide in 1957, breaking 100,000 mark for first time. Statistics compiled by USDA's Forest Service are based on reports from its field offices, State foresters, Department of Interior, and Tennessee Valley Authority. Last year's record compares with 143,000 forest fires in 1956 and 200,800 10 years ago in 1947. Area burned was almost halved, dropping from 6,605,900 acres in 1956 to 3,409,000 in 1957. Ten years ago fires burned 23,225,932 acres. Much credit for 1957 record is due American public. USDA commended three programs for outstanding contributions to forest fire prevention. One is Smokey Bear campaign sponsored by its Forest Service and State foresters under leadership of Advertising Council. Another is Keep Green programs conducted by forest industries and States. Third is work of American Forestry Association in spearheading Southern Forest Fire Conference in New Orleans 2 years ago which did much to decrease fires in South. In appreciation of their work, president of American Forest

Products Industries, president of American Forestry Association, and chairman of board of Advertising Council were given special recognition at White House today (Thursday, May 8). Greatest reduction in number of forest fires occurred in South where 44,100 were reported in 1957 as compared to 102,700 in 1956.

Reclamation Projects Provide Important Fishing and Recreational Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives and to other interested citizens the attached article from the San Francisco Chronicle dated May 7, 1958. This article refers to the reservoir behind Monticello Dam, which is a portion of the Solano reclamation project in California. It indicates that these reclamation projects provide many additional benefits in the way of fishing and recreation, in addition to making water available for irrigation and domestic purposes:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of May 7, 1958]

MONTICELLO RESERVOIR NEWEST BLACK BASS SPOT

(By Bud Boyd)

California's better black bass lakes had best look to their laurels. A new spot in Napa County is liable to end up top dog in the race for fishermen's favor.

The place is Monticello Reservoir—Solano project—known to some as Berryessa Lake. The reason for this popularity is, of course, black bass. They are thick there and getting even more numerous.

This I guarantee. Just the other day, when prowling in that neighborhood, I took time to check it out. I strung a flyrod, tied on a favorite popping bug, and started casting.

The bug plopped on the surface, and as ripples from its fall subsided the first bass came. One lazed up from the depths to lie motionless below the bug, eyeing it intently as only black bass can.

Then another fish appeared. Then another took up station, and as a cat's-paw wind began to blow the bug across the surface one of the bass was after it. He swirled the surface, hooking himself, and began the crazy jumping blacks are known for.

There, in a nutshell, is the reason why this lake is winning friends. The new, shallow water, is exceptionally fertile, and bass are growing there like weeds. Fat, healthy, and numerous. Right now most fish are small—about 8 inches—but, as many anglers phrase it, "Just wait until next year. These 8-inch fish will be a foot in length, and 2-pounders will weigh in at 4 or better."

So the lake has much to offer, although some of it is hard to see right now. It floods the Berryessa Valley. The great expanse of water spreads out between the khaki-colored hills, filling every creek arm. If you know that country, but haven't been there for some time, you'll be surprised to learn the lake is almost to the mouth of Trout Creek. It has grown that much.

Although fishing promises to get fantastic there, the spot has drawbacks. Biggest hindrance to all-out success is lack of facilities for people. Then, too, although the lakeshore is a pretty sight right now with green grass growing to the water edge, it won't look near as pretty in another month. When summer temperatures arrive that country sizzles.

But, even so, the area around the lake is swarming with recreation-minded Californians. Five hundred cars there Saturday, and over 800 Sunday show the extent of this. Boating fans are wild about the place. Lacking good launching sites, they manhandle their craft into the water.

Campers are everywhere. Tents and trailers have sprung up like miniature cities on the unlovely hillsides. Fishermen are casting from both boats and shoreline.

While fishing there the other day, I noticed most of the boys were using worms or minnows dunked below a floating bobber. Some tossed standard plugs, while some got their kicks from streamer flies and bass bugs.

Of course, black bass are an unpredictable lot, but on the day—and the hour—I fished it, the bass were looking for a floating bug.

The future at this lake holds both a promise and a warning. The biggest stumbling blocks are lack of shade, launching sites, eating and sanitary facilities. Here something has got to give, and probably the State will come to the rescue. Drinking water and other campsite necessities will start a real boom there.

But, in the meantime, black bass fishermen are too busy casting to worry about details. One fellow summed it up neatly the other day. He said, "Man, you could line this shore with broken glass and I'd get here if I had to come on my knees." He pointed at the water where a dozen bass lazed leisurely. "Look," he said. "There are a dozen perfect reasons."

Hawaiian Coffee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BURNS
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, during debate on the State, Justice, Judiciary, and related agencies appropriation bill, 1959, on Thursday last, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] made a statement on page 7955 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that we do not raise any coffee in this country.

I know that the statement by the gentleman from Missouri was made in good faith. However, the facts are otherwise. This statement was not corrected at that time for apparent reasons.

Hawaii does grow coffee. Hawaii is an integral part of the United States; hence, we do raise coffee in this country. I am sure the Members of this House will be interested to know that the Kona coffee crop this season, ending June 1958, is expected to surpass last year's output by 3 million pounds. This season's crop is expected to hit around 12 million pounds and may go even higher, according to the Cooperative Crop and Livestock Reporting Service. The 1957 year total crop was 8,809,000 pounds.

Not only does Hawaii, United States of America, grow coffee, but it grows a coffee known to gourmets as one of the finest coffees grown. While it is packed and sold on the market as a premium coffee in small quantities, its greatest use is as a blend to improve the quality and taste of some of the most widely known brands of coffee on the American market.

A particular feature of this coffee is the fact that it is grown in lava on the Kona coast at an elevation between 1,000 and 4,000 feet. It is estimated that some 25,000 or so acres of good volcanic soil in this favorable climatic belt are still available. A still growing industry, it has made significant contributions to the coffee culture of the world. Hawaii has been favored with the soil and the climate necessary, but, more importantly, she has been endowed with the human skills and talents which are needed to put favorable conditions to work. Coffee farmers of Hawaii have traveled to many parts of the world to give advice and share of their knowledge in this field.

United States and Russian Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD the summary statement made by Prof. G. D. Bodenhorn of the University of Chicago on the subject of Investment and the Price System. Professor Bodenhorn was one of the 45 panelists who prepared papers at the request of the Joint Economic Committee on the general subject, The Relationship of Prices to Economic Stability and Growth. These papers appear in the compendium printed by the Joint Economic Committee, March 31, 1958, and are well worth reading.

All last week and continuing on this week these economic experts have been testifying before the Committee on their papers, in panel groups of 5 to 7.

I was particularly impressed with Professor Bodenhorn's appraisal of the competition we face presently with Soviet Russia. I am more concerned lest the United States make wrong moves in light of Soviet competition than that we will make no moves. In my judgment what we need to do primarily is to keep hoeing our own row; continue with our system of self-criticism; correct errors that come to light; and avoid these alarmists who want to promote crash programs.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT FOR JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE, MAY 16, 1958

(By G. D. Bodenhorn, professor of economics, University of Chicago)

In a free-enterprise economy, investment decisions are made by private individuals and corporations who are seeking primarily to further their own self-interest. It is the function of the price system to draw investment into socially useful projects, and to see to it that the total level of investment is high enough. Public policy requires that we be concerned whether these functions are adequately performed.

In the first place, at the level of the individual firm, investment should flow into firms which can use the resources most efficiently. Efficiency in the use of productive resources is measured by profits which are earned, so that we want profitable firms to attract investment and expand output. Recent studies in this area seem to indicate that, by and large, this function is being performed properly. This does not mean, to be sure, that no mistakes are ever made, but simply that, on the average, profitable firms attract more investment than less profitable ones.

Profits and investment perform similar functions at the industry level. Here again, the society benefits if profitable industries attract investment and expand, while unprofitable ones do not attract investment and decline. Our economy is apparently performing satisfactorily in this respect, even though there are occasional lapses, particularly in agriculture and railroads, where the price system is doing its best to discourage investment in spite of the large amount of interference.

The total investment of the economy as a whole is supposed to perform two functions, and these have been rather controversial in recent years. First, investment should be large enough to maintain the flow of income which is cut off by those members of the society who save, and second, investment must provide for the future growth of the national product. Let us consider briefly the recent performance of our economy in each of these areas.

In balancing the flow of saving, investment provides employment for those people who are not required to take care of the immediate consumption needs of the economy. Instability of total investment, primarily inventory investment, but currently also investment in plant and equipment, has played an important role in our postwar business cycles. However, the postwar cycles either in total output or in investment have been quite mild, and some cycles in business activity are inevitable in a free enterprise economy. The type of monetary and fiscal policy which we have employed in combating such cycles is more appropriate than a policy aimed directly at smoothing out the rate of investment. A policy aimed directly at the investment cycle might easily have the effect of causing a lower average level of investment by inhibiting more investment during prosperous periods than it promotes during recessions.

Concern over the problem of the adequacy of the rate of growth of our economy stems from recent comparisons with Russian growth rates. Here again, I would urge a very cautious approach to public policies designed to stimulate the rate of growth of our economy, and for two reasons. First, it is not clear that the Russians can continue to grow at the rates which they have recently achieved, and produce a national product as large as ours within the next 20 years, as has frequently been predicted. It is much easier to achieve high growth rates by applying production techniques which have already been developed as the Russians have been able to do in the past, than it is when growth depends primarily upon the invention of new products and processes. We may, therefore, see slower Russian growth rates in the future. Second, even if the Russians succeed in continuing their present rate of growth and in catching up with us, we should be very careful of the kinds of measures which we take to counteract this. The great advantage of our social, political, and economic system over that of Russia is not that we can produce a higher standard of living for our citizens, but that our citizens are free men who control their own government. In the past, we have been lucky in that our system has not only permitted freedom and dignity for the individual, but also produced the highest standard of living in the world. If, in the future, we are faced with a threat to our leadership in living standards, we should not sacrifice our freedom in order to try to maintain that leadership, and I am not sure that it would be possible to double our present rate of growth without severe impairments of our basic freedoms.

Extra Long Staple Cotton Acreage Allotments Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. T. RUTHERFORD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 15, I introduced in the House H. R. 12531, a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to permit the State committee to allocate from the acreage of extra long staple cotton reserved under section 344 (e) of the act an amount not to exceed 1½ percent of the State acreage allotment to farms for the production of high quality extra long staple cottonseed.

A companion bill to my measure was introduced on the same day in the United States Senate by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

I would like to point out that only the producers of extra long staple cotton are affected by this bill. All of the extra long staple cotton grown in Texas is in my congressional district, and the only other areas where this cotton is produced are in southern New Mexico and southern Arizona. The bill will in no way have any bearing upon the acreage allotments of upland cotton.

The Agricultural Stabilization Committee would have authority to make this allocation under section 344 (e) of the ASC Act, which allows 10 percent of a State's extra long staple allotments to be set aside for hardship cases and other special purposes.

At the present time the Texas growers must obtain their cottonseed for planting purposes from New Mexico and Arizona growers, who sell it to them at little or no profit. The New Mexico and Arizona growers are completely in accord with the provisions of my bill.

The reasons the extra long staple producers want H. R. 12531 enacted are as follows:

First. It will allow them to properly isolate and cultivate land for the purpose of growing their own cottonseed;

Second. It will eliminate the transportation cost of bringing their cottonseed from New Mexico and Arizona;

Third. By growing the cottonseed in the area where it will be replanted for commercial purposes, a greater yield may be expected as the seeds will be acclimated to the soil and weather conditions there.

Officials of the long-staple cotton growers association tell me there will not be as many as 2 men in the entire State of Texas who would lose as much as 3 acres should my bill be enacted. In fact, the State average is figured at three-tenths of 1 acre. The members of the Supina Cotton Association—made up of growers of long-staple cotton—are solidly behind my bill.

I stress that no acreage will be taken away from any other cotton area; no State's allotment for upland cotton will be affected. The seed-growing area would come out of the existing long-staple cotton acreage allotment.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the Supina Cotton Association have a slogan: "If we grow it, let us sell it." The members have contributed $3 per bale each to contribute toward a fund for promoting their product and expanding their own market.

At their request, I authored a bill last year which dropped their price supports from 90 percent to 75 percent of parity in order that they might compete with foreign imports. This session the House has passed another measure requested by the Supina Association, dropping the price supports on extra-long staple cotton from 75 percent to 60 percent. I believe, Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House will concur that their attitude has been most commendable.

I ask the House to give favorable consideration to H. R. 12531 when it is presented for action.

Schools Need the Efforts of All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Winnsboro News and Herald, Winnsboro, S. C., of May 15, 1958:

SCHOOLS NEED THE EFFORTS OF ALL

The challenge to this country posed by the Soviet Union is not a military and economic one alone. It is also an educational one, and the failure of some of us to actively support better schools is a disturbing sign.

It will be recalled that President Eisenhower's Committee on Education Beyond High School stated that the gap between this country's educational needs and its educational effort is "widening ominously."

While we cannot subscribe to the Soviet formula for teaching, we cannot hide from the fact that the U. S. S. R. is making tremendous strides in education. In the field of science and related courses, the Russians are training far more students than we are today.

We do not agree with some of the critics of the United States school system, but former Harvard President James Conant is correct in saying one of the foundation stones of our system, the liberal arts college, must be retained. However, there is much improvement to be made, all the way from the grammar school level to the college level.

Because of various circumstances, it seems that the Federal Government is handicapped extensively in dealing with the problem. Schools are a local affair, in any event, are

run by the States, or local communities, and not run by the Federal Government. Nevertheless, the task is a many-sided one.

We need to have whatever constitutional Federal support that can be beneficially received, and more support from State and local governments. In brief, we need the backing of all the people—to make our schools better and to offer our children the best possible chance to survive and excel in tomorrow's world, to be equipped to cope with whatever challenges they may face.

We have no specific plan in mind. However, we call the attention of all citizens that it is time for us to stand for better schools, better curriculums, and higher standards even if it costs them time, money, and effort in big quantities. It is a sizable problem which confronts us.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my weekly newsletter to constituents for May 17, 1958.

WASHINGTON REPORT
(By BRUCE ALGER)
MAY 17, 1958.

The Mutual Security Act (foreign aid) authorizing $2,958,900 was hotly debated for 8 days before final passage, 259 to 134 (ALGER against). A 31-page bill, 124-page committee report, and 1,924 pages of hearings documented the debate. The bill provides assistance to 63 nations and 10 territories. Eleven countries get military aid only, 30 countries get military and economic aid, 22 countries and 10 territories get economic aid only. The complicated array of facts, figures, and opinions requires careful study and attention (most difficult to present briefly). Members, all dedicated to what they think best for this Nation, came to widely divergent solutions to the basic question, "How best to achieve or try to achieve mutual security." Hanging over the world, like the sword over Damocles' head, is the threat of atomic annihilation and Communist enslavement.

After study, I joined those Members who wrote the minority or dissentig views. The temperate but documented conclusion of their report states:

"Despite this extension of our interest and unwanted generosity, there has developed among recipient nations no adequate understanding of our fundamental American purpose; no sufficient comprehension that we have undertaken a mutual effort to help men live and govern themselves in terms of freedom, equality, human dignity, and peace. There has, in fact, been little or no mutuality to the program. Merely voting more dollars for the continuation of such a program is not enough. What is needed is more consistent policy, better programing, much better administration; and, what is more important, a complete review of the fundamental policy. To continue, without new direction or directives, a program that has been tried and found wanting is as dangerous as it is ineffective. This minority, which is second to none in its desire to maintain the security and peace of this country and of the world, has long held that the concept of mutual security, the implementation thereof, and the annual enabling legislation should be reviewed and revised. We again call for a review of the program and of the underlying policy.

"In view of this, in view of the fact that Congress has failed to reassert its control over the mutual security program, in view of the failure of the justifications for the program to measure up to critical analysis, in view of administrative laxness in carrying out the program, and in view of the needless authorization of billions of dollars when the pipeline already contains billions, we cannot support the mutual security bill for 1958."

Other selected facts from a long list are revealing: 1. Public Law 480 under which agricultural products are given away (in the billions) is not part of or related to this foreign-aid bill; no reason for it, it just isn't; 2. The new development loan fund is self-perpetuating and outside the control of Congress; 3. Many examples of ridiculous waste and poor planning or lack of policy are shown by (a) Afghanistan's expensive airfields in a country where most travel is still done on camels; (b) aid has financed an underground parking garage in Brussels, gambling casino in Le Havre, luxury hotel in Copenhagen (costing $23,000 per bedroom), highways where there aren't autos, jazz-band travels, and countless other examples, some too ridiculous to believe.

The continuation of our present hit or miss, hodgepodge subsidy of United States industry under the guise of charity to others, I have concluded, is wrong and self-defeating. Military or mutual security is lacking as we help neutrals and enemies more than friends. Charity it is not, as we claim, since we are manipulating others through military aid, economic help, and political diplomacy. First, we must decide what our policy is, then call it what it is. It should be hardheaded, self-interested, looking after ourselves (charity is between people, not governments). A strong United States can attract military allies and command respect from enemies. Giving money away and deficit financing, resulting in higher taxes and inflation, cannot result in security, mutual or otherwise. Weakening ourselves through overspending cannot possibly strengthen the team of freedom-loving nations. Certainly there is some need for mutual military aid for allies, but only as a part of a clearly defined policy and within a balanced budget. United States fiscal suicide is Russia's goal. Finally, from many examples of the self-defeating nature of mutual security spending country by country can be selected the spectacle of our giving almost $1 billion to Yugoslavia, the ruthless Communist dictatorship, whose leader is our self-proclaiming dedicated enemy. Need more be said?

Politics at Any Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the American people have witnessed an inspiring performance of great courage and dignity carried out by the Vice President and Mrs. Nixon. Their conduct was far above and beyond any party line and we have all been justly proud of them. All but one small, narrow, little man, Paul Butler, who can think of nothing but partisan politics in its lowest form. He has been so frustrated that he has completely lost his equilibrium.

I hope the Democrat Party is as ashamed of his statements and his bitterness as the South American people are of the demonstrations of the Communists against the Vice President and Mrs. Nixon.

America commends the Vice President and his wife for their conduct and courage. They will be an everlasting example to the world of our desire for peace and good will to all people.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following letter was written to me, unsolicited, by a patriotic Amercan. Mr. Stilley is only asking that he be permitted to operate his business in the traditional American way. He does not believe that his employees should or can compete with the foreign plywood worker where there is no wage and hour legislation, no laws against child labor, no social security, and no unemployment insurance.

STILLEY PLYWOOD CO., INC.,
Conway, S. C., May 2, 1958.

Hon. W. J. BRYAN DORN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DORN: I am a tobacco grower in Horry County, S. C., and I also have an interest in a plywood plant at Conway, S. C. On April 14, 1958, I attended a meeting of Tobacco Associates at Raleigh, N. C., promoted by Mr. Charles Taft to sell the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Mr. Taft made many statements which he cannot substantiate. He deliberately failed to tell the Southern tobacco growers the facts relating to tobacco production and exports under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

To identify Mr. Taft. He is a high salaried, professional lobbyist for the Committee for a National Trade Policy. This committee has a reported budget of several hundred thousands of dollars. Its principal financial supporters are importers and large industrial concerns with interests in exports or production in plants abroad such as Ford Motor Co., with hundreds of millions invested in plants in England and Germany; Gulf Oil Corp., 70 percent of its 1956 production was abroad; Grace Lines, millions invested in foreign countries; International Harvester Co., with 41 percent of sales from exports and overseas plants; International Telephone and Telegraph, 57.8 percent of their total sales from operations in foreign countries; Standard Oil Company of California, 59 percent of its gross production abroad. Mr. Taft represents the industrial giants which are financially able to build plants abroad to cash in on the low wages. How much genuine interest do you think this group has in the Southern tobacco farmers?

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which Mr. Taft lobbys to extend, has been in effect since 1934. Since 1947, the State Department has used the act to reduce the duty on thousands of American imports, ostensibly for the purpose of increasing exports by reducing foreign country restrictions on imports from the United States.

What reciprocity did flue-cured tobacco receive under the State Department's trade agreements? Between 1952 and 1957, United States flue-cured tobacco production dropped 395 million pounds, or 30 percent; foreign production increased 553 million pounds, or 48 percent; United States exports were 17 million pounds less than 1951; and, world exports of flue-cured tobacco increased 105 percent. United States share of world flue-cured tobacco exports dropped from 69 percent in 1951 to 51 percent in 1956 and was even lower in 1957. United States Department of Agriculture Foreign Agricultural Service publication, January 1958, titled, "Competitive Position of United States Farm Products Abroad" is the source of these figures.

The Department of Agriculture in the same publication, page 30, says:

"The major problems facing United States tobacco exports arise from actions taken by other countries.

"Over three-fourths of all foreign tobaccos (excluding United States imports) entering international trade are covered by bilateral agreements, guaranteed purchase arrangements, preferential import duties, or other controls which virtually exclude United States leaf. * * *

"In some countries, including Japan, Australia, and the Philippines, prices of domestic leaf are well above those received for comparable qualities of United States tobaccos. Self-sufficiency policies of these areas do not permit greater imports of United States leaf."

The Department of Agriculture, in its Foreign Agricultural Service circular of March 14, 1958, says: "Exports (tobacco) in 1958 are likely to drop somewhat from the 1957 level. Quantities of competitive tobacco grown in other producing countries are likely to be larger than for 1957 (early reports indicate a near record crop of flue-cured in the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland for harvesting early in 1958)."

The Department of Agriculture, Foreign Agricultural Trade for November 1957, table 7, shows that the tobacco leaf imports in the year July 1, 1956–June 30, 1957, amounted to $84,284,000.

On April 15, 1958, Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a report on international trade authored by Mr. Ken Miller. Mr. Miller says that Dr. Howard S. Piquet, senior specialist in international trade of the Library of Congress, has expressed the view that the export of some of our products will be seriously hampered by the European Economic Community, but that goods needed to feed the Continent's own industries, like cotton, coal, scrap iron, copper, tobacco will be unaffected. This statement confirms a well-known fact that many of the items we export, such as tobacco, would not be affected by the amendment of Congress of the Trade Agreements Act.

The decline in United States production of flue-cured tobacco, the increase in production in foreign countries, and the failure of the United States to get its share of increased use of tobacco, are the direct results of a policy pursued by our State Department in furtherance of hopelessly intermingled foreign-aid and trade relations. This policy benefits only foreign producers. Until 18 months ago, the State Department and the foreign-aid agencies, such as the ICA, maintained an agricultural-extension program for flue-cured tobacco in many foreign countries, including Rhodesia, Nyasaland, and so forth. This program provided technical aid to the farmers in foreign countries so that they could produce flue-cured tobacco to compete with the tobacco of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Virginia, and Florida in the world markets. The State Department policy was successful, world production of flue-cured tobacco increased 48 percent while United States production dropped 30 percent. How did this benefit the United States tobacco farmers? This program has been continued; the State Department brings people to this country to study our agricultural processes and sends experts to the foreign lands to help increase the production of tobacco. A Department of Agriculture spokesman is my authority for my statement.

As a plywood producer, I know what has happened in my industry with reference to shipments, prices, and employment. The Japanese, operating with 11½-cents-an-hour wages, in the most modern plywood plants in the world, are shipping hundreds of millions of square feet of plywood to the United States each year to be sold at prices less than our cost of production. Domestic hardwood plywood shipments in 1957 were 117 million square feet less than in 1956. Employment is down and dropping steadily. There have been a number of hardwood plywood plants which have closed, maybe some in your area. The hardwood plywood industry is not the only one injured—others are textiles, petroleum, coal, chemicals, pottery, glassware, watches, and many others. The Americans buy 60 percent of the flue-cured tobacco produced in the United States. If the employment in all the industries affected by imports returned to normal, Americans would buy more of our tobacco. If Mr. Taft and his associates are permitted to delude the public into accepting their fairy tale, then our tobacco industry will go the way of textiles and hardwood plywood. Where will our States be then? Your jobs may be up for export by the free traders.

Mr. Taft's claim that only 28,000 jobs were lost because of imports does not coincide with the facts. Just a few days ago, Senator PAYNE, of Maine, pointed out that since 1946, 345,000 Americans had lost their jobs in the textile industry alone. This is but one industry of the many injured by imports. The Department of Labor has been requested on numerous occasions to furnish figures on the number of American workers affected by import competition. The Department has repeatedly stated they are not in a position to submit a concrete estimate for number of workers which are displaced by imports. Mr. Taft's statement is without substance and I am confident that he is well aware of this.

Mr. Taft says 3,100,000 are employed in direct production for export and 1,400,000 in processing imports. Mr. Taft cannot support this statement by statistics. It has no factual basis, Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks said before the House Ways and Means Committee, March 25, 1958.

The proposal before Congress to amend the Trade Agreements Act to provide a minimum means of protection for the American worker will not jeopardize the jobs of anyone; it will help some to keep their jobs. The facts are these: 32 percent of the dollars used to pay for our exports are obtained from foreign aid, private investments, tourist travel, etc.; another 52 percent was earned from the sale of duty-free imports or imports on which there is only a token tariff; this leaves only 16 percent of the total exports which might be affected by astronomically high tariffs. These facts establish one valid conclusion, Mr. Taft's statement that the Trade Agreements Act must be extended or jobs will be lost, is just bunk.

You and I are interested in tobacco exports. I am also interested in maintaining employment for over 200 persons, some of whom have devoted the greater part of their lives to working with my family in our hardwood plywood plant. The Trade Agreements Act has operated to my detriment, both as a tobacco grower and as a plywood producer. I have had to study both sides of the story. Mr. Taft came down here, treated us like a bunch of country boys, told us half-truths and exaggerations, and thinks we are not smart enough to get the facts. Here are the facts from one of your members, if you want more, write your Congressman or the Department of Agriculture for all the publications on tobacco. We should not let somebody with nothing but a name bamboozle us into making a mistake. Study the facts, make up your own mind. I hope you will tell your Congressmen and Senators that you want a true Trade Agreements Act which provides protection for American industry and workers and guarantees the elimination of restrictions by foreign countries on imports of United States agricultural products. Our mutual interests lie in all the people of our State; we should act together to help all of the people as well as ourselves.

Sincerely,

WALTER A. STILLEY.

Cost of Crime $20 Billion a Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I was very much impressed by a recent address by Hon. William P. Rogers, Attorney General of the United States, before the Advertising Council, Inc., at the Statler Hotel, on Monday, May 5, 1958, on the subject of the steps being taken by the Department of Justice to combat national crime.

A $20-billion-a-year crime bill is indeed staggering, and is second only to national defense in terms of cost. This figure points up the magnitude of the job to be done in the field of law enforcement, not only on the Federal level but primarily in the various States and localities. The Attorney General's statement follows:

THE COST OF CRIME $20 BILLION A YEAR

Tonight I want to talk about a problem which I believe requires serious attention. These days, quite naturally, we are concerned with the economy of our country and our national defense. In a very real sense, the problem of crime is related both to our economy and to the future strength of our Nation.

As you know, this year the Nation will spend more than $40 billion on national defense. But how many people know what crime costs our country? Most people are wholly unaware of the staggering proportions to which it has grown—unmindful of the fact that it is second only to national defense in terms of cost. The estimated cost of crime in the United States in 1 year is about $20 billion.

Twenty-five years ago the Attorney General was appalled by the fact that in 1933 1½ million major crimes had occurred, 1 for each 84 persons in the Nation. In 1958, it appears now that about 3 million major crimes may be committed, twice as many as in 1933. This means that in 1958, 1 major crime will be committed for every 60 persons in the United States.

Since 1950 the rate of crime in our country has been exploding at a rate four times as fast as the rate of growth of our population. The rate of crime in 1957 increased 9 percent over 1956.

These statistics only being to tell the story. One of the facts which stands out in bold relief is the alarming increase in the number of crimes committeed by young people.

Almost half of the persons arrested for major crimes last year were under 18 years of age. Somehow there has been a failure properly to inculcate our people, particularly our young people, with a sense of moral values, with an awareness of how destructive crime is to them and to the country. These figures indicate that there is a tremendous job to be done by schools, churches, parents, and organizations such as this in the years ahead.

Tonight I want to talk not about general problems relating to crime but rather about some of the things we hope to do in the field of law enforcement. Let me mention that I would hope too that this influential organization which has contributed so much to solving important problems of our Nation in the past, will want to give its thoughtful attention to what it can do to help reduce the rate of crime in our country.

What is one of the most obvious facts about the growth of crime in our country? It is the growth of organized crime and the success of its operation.

Syndicates made up of criminals have coordinated and extended their operations over many States and in many cases, across national boundaries. Why is this true? It is true because organized racketeers and hoodlums have learned how to make crime pay.

The top echelon of organized criminals have been able to remove themselves from exposed positions and now operate by scheming, directing, and organizing. Organized criminals exert general control over those types of criminal activities that yield the most profits; gambling, narcotics, and extortion, to name the big three. And, obviously, they pay only a small portion of their taxes on these activities because if they paid all of their taxes as ordinary citizens do, a life of crime would not pay.

In order that you may have a better understanding of the problem from the standpoint of a law enforcement official let me make some general observations.

First, I notice that there is a widespread lack of awareness as to the respective roles of Federal responsibility as compared with the State and local responsibility in the field of law enforcement. Generally speaking, responsibility for law enforcement in our country rests in large measure on the States and localities. The fact is that less than 10 percent of all crimes violate Federal law.

Yet almost every time a serious local crime is committed which gets national publicity some Senator, Congressman, governor, or civic group will immediately demand that the FBI investigate it. This is a very fine tribute to the FBI but it demonstrates a lack of understanding of the law and tends to shift the responsibility away from the States and localities where it belongs.

Consider the recent atocious bombings of schools, churches, and synagogues which have occurred in Florida and other southern States. At first there were demands that the FBI take over the investigation. The Federal Government did not have jurisdiction in those cases because no Federal law was involved. The Federal Government does not have jurisdiction merely because the perpetrators of the crimes may have crossed State lines or because a conspiracy may be involved or because a series of crimes are involved. Unless a Federal law has been violated the FBI has no jurisdiction to investigate.

The law enforcement officials of the States and localities involved have recognized their responsibility. Officials from 29 southern cities have conferred for the purpose of taking cooperative action to solve these shocking crimes. Those responsible are to be complimented for taking this affirmative, determined action.

The FBI stands ready to help the local authorities in every way possible. Its laboratories, identification facilities, information from its files, etc., have been made available. It is maintaining the closest liaison with the responsible authorities and will give them every assistance possible.

The point I hope you will remember is that it is important for the public to place responsibility where it belongs. Communities get the kind of law enforcement they deserve and the public must know where the responsibility lies.

Another fact which is not always fully appreciated is that within the Federal Government itself jurisdiction for investigating crime is divided. The jurisdiction of the FBI is limited to general crimes and crimes involving national security. Internal Revenue has its own investigating staff which has jurisdiction of matters pertaining to tax frauds. The Narcotics Bureau in the Treasury Department has primary responsibility for investigating narcotics violations. The Secret Service is responsible for investigating counterfeiting and crimes relating to the public moneys. The Post Office investigates misuse of the mails.

All of these investigating agencies have compiled outstanding records in their respective fields but organized criminals have not seen fit to compartmentalize their activities so as to fit neatly into these niches. The Department of Justice has complete and sole responsibility for the prosecution of all crimes. It seems obvious then that the information obtained by separate investigating agencies must be fitted together more effectively by the prosecutors than in the past if we are to meet today's crafty challenge of the organized criminal.

About a month ago, I announced a long-range program for combating organized crime in this country. Although, as I have mentioned, the Federal Government has a limited jurisdiction, we do have some powerful weapons. The main ones are the income tax laws, the tax laws relating to narcotics, and the Hobbs Act and the Taft-Hartley Act relating to extortions and payoffs in union activities.

Let me briefly sketch the three main points of the program.

First. The program will be concentrated. We will give top priority to 100 of the top racketeers in the United States. That is not to say we will ignore the others for we plan to attack crime on as many fronts as we can. It does mean, however, that we will give immediate and concentrated effort to the 100 worst hoodlums and racketeers in the country.

The list of names will not be made public for two reasons. In the first place, it would tip our hand and make the investigative work more difficult. In the second place such publication of the names might be attacked as prejudicial in the event of trial. After there have been convictions or deportations we will announce the names and will replenish the list with others who are deserving.

You may wonder why a list of 100. Of course, it is an arbitrary figure to be used principally for purposes of concentration of effort. A brief discussion of how organized crime functions today will indicate why this concentration, I believe, will be effective.

Last November at Apalachin, N. Y., a meeting of 64 top racketeers and hoodlums took place. A majority of those in attendance came from New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, but there was a fair representation from the South, Midwest, and even the west coast. A few of those in attendance had been in a similar meeting as far back as 1928 in Cleveland. Many of them were in attendance at a meeting in 1952 in the Florida Keys, in 1953 at Miami, in 1954 at Chicago, and in 1956 at Binghamton, N. Y. Meetings such as these at Apalachin, attended by what amounts to the board of directors of organized crime for a given area, serve many nefarious purposes. Lines and means of communication are established, methods of distribution are agreed upon, territorial arrangements are made. As a result, gang wars of the 1920's and 1930's have been almost completely eliminated.

The members of these top level planning boards are also the key figures in organizations with headquarters in New York, Miami, Chicago, and other cities in the United States. Here the multi-million-dollar businesses take shape. Those on top seldom come in contact with the local hoodlums who are responsible for maintaining discipline, bribing local officials, or actually dispensing the products of crime. But through strong-arm tactics carried out through subordinates in a chain of command and with the power to shut off necessary financing, production, and sources of supply, they exercise control over most of the profitable forms of illegal activities. The dope peddler, the bookie, the numbers runner, the vendor of obscene magazines, are all largely dependent for their illicit merchandise and for permission to engage in these activities upon these overlords of crime.

These overlords of crime in many instances have invested their ill-gotten gains in hotels, night clubs, coin-operated machines, scrap iron trucking, etc., and hide behind these legitimate fronts while directing their criminal activities.

It is our purpose to concentrate on these overlords. We plan to find out everything that we can find out about them—their sources of income, their present activities, how they invest their money, and how they avoid paying their taxes. Without in any way denying them any of the rights which our citizens have under our system of justice, we will attempt to find out what Federal law they have violated and to obtain the necessary evidence to prove it.

2. The program will have a government-wide coordination of effort.

After consultation with the Secretary and Under Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the FBI, the Commissioner of Narcotics, the Commissioner of Immigration, the Secret Service, and the other investigative agencies we concluded that we would turn the combined strength and resources of all Federal investigative and law enforcement agencies in a common effort against the organized criminal.

Of course we have not been oblivious in the past to the activities of organized crime and the need for cooperation. What seemed to be lacking and what we are in the process of establishing is a unified prosecutive command, where all information on racketeers from all investigative agencies will be correlated, studied and acted upon.

Let me cite an illustration of what I mean. The distribution and sale of narcotics, particularly to young people, is one of the most reprehensible of all crimes. Almost all of it is imported and it lends itself peculiarly to the control and distribution practices of the organized criminal conspiracy. Most heroin comes from Turkey, Syria, and Iran, in the Near East and China in the Far East. Organized crime has built up a giant transmission belt for securing this drug, for providing for its safe importation, and ultimately for its distribution to the dope peddlers. One pound or heroin is worth about $150,000. The Bureau of Narcotics seized about 1700 ounces of heroin in 1957.

Most marihuana comes from Mexico. Over 26,000 ounces of marihuana were seized at ports and borders, and over 11,000 ounces were seized within the United States in 1957. So you can see that the sale of narcotics is a huge business.

In many instances it is possible to identify top racketeers who traffic in narcotics but not to obtain the necessary evidence to seek an indictment. Now the important thing is to put this criminal out of circulation—the crime for which he may be convicted is of secondary importance. So we will study all

the evidence which the Government has in its possesion from all the investigative agencies. Perhaps we can prove a tax fraud case, possibly he may be subject to deportation, the FBI may have information which placed together with all other information obtained from the Narcotics Bureau may show the violation of some other Federal law, or in some instances we may be able to supply local law enforcement officers with evidence sufficient to convict for a local crime.

3. It will be a long-range, sustained program.

From my experience in law-enforcement work I have noticed that efforts directed on organized crime are apt to be sporadic. A series of vicious crimes occur or a congressional investigation is held and a drive on crime is started. When the excitement dies down the drive is apt to die down.

The program we have in mind is not intended to produce quick or sensational results. Rather it will be a long-range program built on policies which will be lasting and intended to meet a continuing and constantly changing problem.

Recently we have seen instances of how effective racketeers have been in taking over control of a few powerful labor unions. They not only steal money from the union treasury but they use the unions to extort huge sums of money from contractors.

Obviously the efforts of the racketeers to penetrate these unions are well planned and sustained. A few years ago the most powerful racketeer in southern Illinois was Evan Dale, who was president of a union of hod carriers and common laborers. For years he exercised complete control over the rank and file of his union, responsible to no one. During his trial for extortion Dale described himself in the following language:

"I am a Chicago boy. When I left Chicago I threw away my shovel for a blackjack and I have been using it effectively ever since. I came to southern Illinois 15 years ago to carve out an empire. I have carved out an empire. I have 38,000 laborers and 28 business agents under me."

For his part in the multi-million-dollar shakedown of contractors during the construction of a power plan for the Atomic Energy Commission, he was sentenced to 15 years in jail.

There is only one way to combat successfully the activities of such racketeers who have taken over a few labor unions—and that is with a sustained and long-range program of law enforcement. Of course it is not possible or desirable to spell out in any detail all the plans of the Department in this field. What I have said represents a general approach to the problem.

The policy of the Department of Justice can be expressed this way:

1. We will attack the problem of crime on all fronts within the limit of our jurisdiction.

2. We will give top priority to concentrating on the top 100 racketeers.

3. We will urge the courts to impose maximum penalties and within the procedures laid down by the law will seek to expedite the trial of cases.

4. We will urge Federal legislation to give the Federal authorities more weapons to cope with organized criminal activities that have interstate ramifications.

5. We will cooperate with State and local authorities to the greatest extent possible.

The program which I have discussed this evening deals only with one phase of the crime problem in the United States. The problem is a much broader and more serious one than anything that improved law enforcement alone can solve.

There are many things which must be done. For example, the public must be more alert to the tieup between crime and local politics. Experience shows that organized crime on a profitable basis cannot exist for long in any area without the connivance of local law enforcement officers.

Then, too, the public must be made more aware that their support and cooperation in giving information about crime especially in the field of extortion is essential if our law enforcement agencies are to cope effectively with the ever-increasing rise of crime in the United States.

Finally, there is a heavy responsibility which rests on all of us more effectively to instill young people with the basic traits of character which are so vital to our free way of life.

The advertising council which has given so generously and so successfully of its time and talents to programs for human betterment may want to give some of these and other broader aspects of the problem its future consideration. If you do I assure you that all of us in the Department of Justice will give you our enthusiastic cooperation. I can think of nothing which would be more helpful to the Nation than to have the benefit of your thought and counsel and your active participation in helping to solve this grave national problem.

Our International Intelligence Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Gary (Ind.) Post Tribune raises the question as to whether our State Department through its intelligence branch, were efficient in not warning the executive department as to the dangers involved in Vice President NIXON's trip to certain countries in South America:

[From the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune of May 18, 1958]

HOW GOOD A NEIGHBOR ARE WE?

Walter Lippmann made a strong point yesterday when he recommended an official inquiry into how it happened that Vice President and Mrs. Richard Nixon were exposed to such an outrage on their South American trip.

It is clear now that the trip should not have been made. But what was so wrong in our diplomatic and intelligence services that they did not know the situation sufficiently in advance to call off the Nixon tour? Are we as ill informed generally about the economic and political situations in South America as this situation would indicate? We'd better find out.

Nixon and his wife are deserving of the praise they have received for the way they comported themselves in the face of the violent anti-United States demonstrations. Nixon demonstrated personal courage and a fine ability to maintain his composure. If there is criticism, it is that he was too courageous; he gave the mobs extra opportunity to demonstrate. But we would prefer that to any indication that he was lacking in fortitude.

President Eisenhower displayed again the personal affection he is known to have for the Nixons. His action in sending Marines and paratroopers to Caribbean outposts was something like that of a fond father determined that no harm should come to a son. Perhaps the South American people can be induced to view his action in that light.

But they are more likely to regard it against the background of the past, the period of dollar diplomacy, the time when we sent the Marines into Nicaragua and Haiti. The United States must have appeared again as the colossus of the north flexing its muscles. The troops hardly could have arrived in time if NIXON had been in peril; they were more a threat of retaliation than a security to the Vice President. If it was regarded as essential to shift them to Caribbean outposts, the move could have been made quietly rather than in a flamboyant and menacing manner.

The President did better in discussing the matter in his press conference. He played down the troop movement. And he accepted that economic troubles were at least partly responsible for the rioting directed against the Nixons; he did not put the full blame on Communist agitators.

The whole affair is a lesson that our relations with the Latin American countries are not nearly so satisfactory as we had believed. The demonstrations were not against NIXON personally; they were against him as the symbol of the United States. It has been suggested that the Peruvian and Venezuelan Governments were remiss in not squelching them before they got out of hand, that they might have abetted them in the beginning. But if that is true, it only shows further the deterioration of our relations.

Our Government has trouble on its hands in other parts of the world. But it should not fail to act on the storm warnings from Latin America. More than at any other time in years, there is need to make the good neighbor policy work effectively.

Stan Musial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article which appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Wednesday, May 14, 1958, entitled Stan Musial.

The article follows:

STAN MUSIAL

Stan Musial has joined the most exclusive society that baseball has to offer, the organization of players who have achieved 3,000 hits in their career.

He is only the eighth man in the history of the game to gain admission, joining Ty Cobb, Tris Speaker, Hans Wagner, Eddie Collins, Nap Lajoie, Paul Waner and Cap Anson. He is the first in 16 years to make it and is likely to be the last for at least that long a time again.

No player in the game today is even close to 3,000 hits. Ted Williams might have made it had he not been deterred by two long service hitches and a succession of prolonged injuries.

Perhaps it is easier to note what an achievement is Musial's by a listing of great players who did not make it. Rogers Hornsby didn't get 3,000 hits. Neither did George Sisler nor Lou Gehrig nor Joe DiMaggio nor Al Simmons.

What is it that makes the 3,000-hit club so exclusive? It demands perfection; it demands consistency. It does not allow for the occasional good year, the platooned player or the Sunday soldier. It demands year-in, year-out concentration on the job.

Stan Musial has always been such a perfectionist. He loves the game of baseball and works at it every day. The recent words of Chicago White Sox Manager Al Lopez are significant. "Musial wasn't hitting a lick on the way home from Florida," Lopez said, "but he took special batting practice during a snow storm in Denver and look at him now."

Look at him indeed. This is the boy out of Donora, Pa., who survived a crippling arm injury deep in the minors in 1940, fought his way up the ladder and was with the Cardinals in September of 1941.

He has been here ever since. We in St. Louis take pride in Stan Musial not only as a great player with the Cardinals, one of the most respected and admired men in the history of the game, but also as a distinguished business and family man of our city.

Congratulations to one of our most illustrious citizens. When the day inevitably comes that he must shed that famed number 6 uniform, he'll still be Stan the Man to all of us. And forever more.

Heroic Rescue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, we hear so much about juvenile delinquency that sometimes we lose sight of the vast majority of our young people who reach maturity without the fanfare often given to wrongdoers. Among that majority are many, who, under stress and strain, react in a manner which should give pause to any who are quick to find fault in young people. Early this year a 15-year-old girl named Sharon Boero acted heroically in rescuing from fire five children who had been left in her care. I am requesting that an account of that rescue which appeared in the Independence (Wis.) News Wave be made a part of the RECORD. It follows:

FIRE LEVELS CHIMNEY ROCK STORE; BABYSITTER RESCUES CHILDREN

Fast thinking by a plucky 15-year-old babysitter, Sharon Boero, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Ernest Jacobson, was credited with averting tragedy as a fire roared through the Chimney Rock store and attached residence about 8 miles north of here, early Sunday morning.

Two children of the Robert Eversons, operators of the store, were reported improving at Whitehall Community Hospital, following close brushes with death.

Sharon Boero, 15, was napping on a davenport while babysitting with the Everson's four children when she awoke about midnight and smelled smoke.

Sleeping upstairs were the Everson children—Ellen, 4; Virginia, 5; Ronald, 7; and Peggy, 8—as well as Sharon's half sister, Marie Arneson, 9.

The babysitter ran upstairs, awoke the sleeping youngsters and began to lead and carry them to safety. Marie smashed a window in the smoke-filled bedroom and ran out on a porch roof. She tried to get the boy to accompany her, but he was afraid, so she made her escape down a drainpipe.

After making two trips upstairs, Sharon discovered that Ronald was still somewhere in the house. Turned back by smoke and flames she raced to the road and stopped a car driven by a neighbor, Bernard Colby.

Colby sped home and quickly returned with a ladder. The smoke turned him back on his first attempt to find the boy, but on the second trip through the bedroom window he found Ronald and lowered him to safety.

In the meantime, another car driven by Ralph Bautch of Independence had stopped. Audrey Stuve of Whitehall attempted artificial respiration on the unconscious boy, who was then rushed to the hospital by Colby.

Since the telephone line had been burned, Bautch sped south to call the fire department at Independence. Fire Chief Willie Smieja reported that he heard the alarm at about 12:55 a. m., and that the entire building was ablaze when the equipment arrived.

Ronald was listed in critical condition when brought to the hospital, but had begun to show improvement 24 hours later. One of his sisters, Virginia, was also a patient, being treated for burns on the hands, feet, and face. The babysitter also sustained burns on her feet, hands, and face, and had her hair badly singed, but neither of the girls was listed as critically burned. Nine-year-old Marie was treated for cuts she received when she smashed the window, but was later released.

The Eversons, who were at Independence, were notified of the fire about 12:45 a. m.

Independence firemen were assisted at the scene by the arrival of a 1,200-gallon-tank truck from Whitehall which aided them in keeping the fire from nearby sheds and the gasoline pumps.

Seventieth Anniversary of Jewish Publication Society of America: A Call for 100,000 Members

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud and happy to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial by Mr. Philip Slomovitz from the Detroit (Mich.) Jewish News announcing the 70th birthday of the Jewish Publication Society of America. The author of the article entitled "Purely Commentary," appearing in the Detroit (Mich.) Jewish News of April 25, 1958, is a member of that fine organization. Two other distinguished Detroit citizens, also members, are Judge Theodore Levin of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, and Mr. Leonard Simons, a well known and widely respected citizen of our city of Detroit, whom I have known for many years and whose friendship I cherish highly.

It is with considerable pleasure that I insert this article into the RECORD and wish the members of the Jewish Publication Society of America and their many friends well on its anniversary.

The article follows:

SEVENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF JEWISH PUBLICATION SOCIETY OF AMERICA: A CALL FOR 100,000 MEMBERS

American Jewry will mark a very important anniversary on June 7. It will be the 70th birthday of the Jewish Publication Society of America, and it should serve as an occasion to inspire increased interest in this publishing venture.

The Jewish Publication Society program must be viewed as the book publishing project of the entire American Jewish community. It is a nonprofit venture that undertakes to print the most acceptable books of Jewish interest by our ablest writers and keeps in print the outstanding Jewish classics.

This society has pioneered in many fields. It sponsored the first authorized translation of our Scriptures into English a generation ago and now is sponsoring a revised Bible translation, outstanding scholars being engaged in this important task.

It introduced to the English-speaking communities the works of Israel Zangwill and published, in an English translation, Heinrich Graetz's History of the Jews.

It has published, and continues to issue, books on Jewish history, sociology and Philosophy. It is, indeed, the backbone of Jewish publishing efforts in this country.

The latest Jewish Publication Society venture is the publishing, together with Farrar, Straus & Cudahy, of a series of children's books, to be known as the Covenant Books. We wish especially to commend this venture which seeks to instruct and inspire our youth with stories about outstanding Jewish personalities in America.

The first two books in this series, Silversmith of Old New York: Myer Myers, by William Wise, and Border Hawk: August Bondi, by Lloyd Alexander, deserve commendation at the very outset. Under the imprint of the Jewish Publication Society and Farrar, Straus & Cudahy, these Covenant Books delineate the lives of two charming personalities.

Myer Myers, son of Dutch Jews who settled in New York at the beginning of the 18th century, became a great silversmith. He became a leader in the first Jewish congregation in New York, Shearith Israel, and he took a deep interest in Jewish activities. His Jewish ceremonial objects, his love for his art as a silversmith, his experiences with the British during the Revoluntionary War, are eloquently described in this charming story.

Similarly, the story of August Bondi will enchant the reader. It is a tale about a young Jewish boy who fought on the Vienna barricades in 1848, came to the United States and became a leading opponent of slavery, having been shocked by the activities on the New Orleans slave market. Bondi became an outstanding citizen and community leader in Salina, Kans. Not only his adopted country, but his birthplace as well—Vienna—recognized his genius, and he was honored in Austria on a return visit there towards the end of the last century.

These two stories are for children who will be enlightened by knowledge about outstanding Jews in this country. By the same token, they will inspire the parents who will read these books with their children as well as the youths, and will throw light on interesting chapters in our history.

The joint effort of publishing such volumes is so commendable that we link it with the overall 70-year history of the Jewish Publication Society, as an interesting development in the society's 70th year. The fact that it joined forces with so enterprising a publishing house as Farrar, Straus & Cudahy in the Covenant books project lends added importance to its leaders' vision.

The Farrar, Straus & Cudahy group was recently analyzed in the Trade Winds column in Saturday Review by John G. Fuller, who pointed out:

"This yeasty house (Farrar, Straus & Cudahy) is now only in its 12th year, but already has an imposing list of authors developed under the overall guidance of John Farrar, chairman of the board, Sheila

Cudahy, vice president and secretary, and Robert Giroux, vice president and editor in chief.

"Farrar, Straus & Cudahy owes a lot of its energy to its fireball president, Roger W. Straus, Jr. He is direct, outspoken, dynamic.

"'We started the company on a capitalization of $300,000,' he said. 'And we lived on raw nerve for awhile. You couldn't do the same thing today for less than a million. But we've been in the black for 8 out of our 12 years—and this year our volume will be about a million and half. About a third of this will come in from our backlist books—which is the life blood of many publishers.

"'I believe in pushing the subsidiary rights of every book we publish, and I get pretty unpopular because I hold out for everything I can get for the author. I hate like the devil to see authors starve between books, and publishers would get better results if half their novelists didn't have to teach school in East Overshoe, Ark., to keep alive.'"

More power to this type of enterprising publishers.

To return to the Jewish Publication Society:

The 70th anniversary of this very constructive organization deserves a great deal of attention from all of us.

The event will be truly great if a large number of American Jews, who are now unaffiliated with it, will become members.

There is a lot of talk about the need for advancing American Jewry's cultural status. One way of doing it is to encourage people to read. At this time, the Jewish Publication Society has only 10,000 members. The 5,500,000 Jews who form the American Jewish community should provide at least 100,000 readers of JPS books. This may sound like a fantastic figure—since we are starting with the small number of 10,000—but if we are to rise to higher planes that should be our goal.

This is an objective for the 70th anniversary year of the Jewish Publication Society of America. Will our communities respond to such a need?

Public Health Service Position on Water Fluoridation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have received a considerable amount of correspondence from my constituents relating to the problem of fluoridation. A review of this correspondence indicates a great deal of misunderstanding about the many local fluoridation programs. Accordingly, I wrote to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to find out what studies that Department had made on the subject of water fluoridation and what statements had been issued by the Department for public guidance.

I was happy to receive a statement by Dr. Leroy E. Burney, Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service, dated April 25, 1958, which had been released by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service. This statement needs wide dissemination and so I am placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Fluoridation was approved by the United States Public Health Service in 1951 after a thorough examination of all scientific evidence relating to its safety, effectiveness, and practicability.

Since that time, many communities throughout the Nation have instituted local fluoridation programs. Careful study of their experience with this measure plus continuing scientific research have provided additional evidence of the dental health benefits of fluoridation.

Fluoridation causes no bodily harm; it is remarkably effective in reducing the incidence of tooth decay by two-thirds; and its cost is minimal, about 10 cents per person per year.

The Public Health Service has, therefore, recommended the adoption of fluoridation to all communities interested in progressive health measures.

Unheeded Words of Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I read with a great deal of interest the article headed "Unheeded Words of Warning" which appeared in the Sunday Star on May 18, 1958, and I think this should be called to the attention of the Congress. The article consists of excerpts of the testimony by Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín, of Puerto Rico, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last March and follows herewith:

UNHEEDED WORDS OF WARNING

(Last March 10 Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín, of Puerto Rico, discussed relations between the United States and Latin America before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Excerpts from his testimony, which has taken on new significance in the light of events of the past week, follow:)

One does not have to look around the world much to come to the inescapable conclusion that the more authoritarian the government, the more nationalistic its behavior. In Latin America we have an often undervalued counterbalance to that in the natural spirit of democracy and freedom that all Hispanic, all Iberian people possess. Too often it is throttled into temporary voicelessness by ambitious and unscrupulous leaders, but it is always there and I am glad to note that recently it has made very much progress, and has been very much in the ascendancy.

It would serve the interests of the United States if it took greater care to encourage this inherent will toward free institutions. There needs to be some greater distinction than in the past between the United States attitude toward friendly peoples with friendly democratic governments and friendly people with tyrannical governments that find it to their interest to play along with the United States.

I do not mean that the United States could intervene in the internal affairs of any Latin American country or that it should decide for its neighbors what form of government they shall have. This, of course, would not be proper, nor to the best interests of the United States. It is a matter of degree, and the degree is most important. When you give the same consideration to dictators and tyrants as to proven democrats you cannot help but discourage democracy.

In the field of economic development, it is the hope of many of us, in the States and in Latin America, that the United States will develop a vital policy, as distinguished from a merely friendly and well-wishing one, for Latin America, to which Latin America should respond wholeheartedly. This would be a policy that would have validity even if Russian communism did not exist, and that consequently will have greater validity because Russian communism does exist.

We should set for ourselves, North and South, the urgent goal—urgent though it may take years—of reasonably diminishing the tremendous gap between the standards of living prevailing in the United States and those prevailing over enormous areas of Latin America.

The complaint is heard that the United States devotes much more attention and much more economic resource to other regions of economic scarcity than to Latin America.

Is this because the region is considered of relatively minor importance to the security of the United States and to the maintenance of the peace of the world? Obviously not. In peacetime the United States economic machine could hardly run at any level that could be called prosperity without the natural resources of its southern neighbors—the tin, copper, oil, and so forth, that Latin America supplies. In wartime the situation becomes many times more acute. * * *

Certainly, the importance of Latin America to the United States is out of proportion to the comparative aid and attention it receives. Why? Is public opinion in the United States unacquainted with this massive fact? Probably. But can the same be said of the leaders of public opinion? I believe not. What, then, is the explanation? The explanation, I fear, is a form of thinking that takes the following lines:

"Yes, Latin America is of great importance in peace or war, but we can count on it anyway. They are our friends and neighbors. They are as much against Communist despotism as we are. We can take them for granted. Of course, we should and do help them, but the situation in other parts of the world is more urgent."

The experience with colonialism and imperialism which accompanied capitalism into Asia and Africa was not a happy one for the peoples there. Even in Latin America former policies of the United States Government have left a sediment of memory that can be very easily stirred into a sense of grievance to be exploited by political forces.

Since private investment must carry the ball for the bulk of development, and since it is easy to stir suspicion against it, as a device inimical to local justice and local interests, it is of paramount importance that the United States or the developed Western Powers avoid seeming to try to ram a doctrine down the throats of those who wish to receive their aid.

In a democracy, there must be a record of the reasons for arriving at a decision to aid other countries. The Russians, because of the kind of government that Russia has, need no such record. They can pretend, with naught but opinion and precedent to dispute them, that every ruble they give is out of the goodness and generosity of the Soviet heart.

The United States, as a democracy must do, records the arguments that lead to its decisions. And the record contains the emphasized and reemphasized assertion that aid policies are proposed to serve the selfish interest of the United States.

Now, as a Puerto Rican and as a citizen of the United States familiar, I believe, with

the spirit of the American people, I would like to question this. I do not believe that selfishness is a notable ingredient of American character. I believe that the American people are generous, that they take a real interest in their neighbors, that they are endowed with a spirit of sensible idealism. I believe this has been shown in many ways, many times.

But for some peculiar reason there seems to be a certain feeling of shame about this, shame of not being practical, shame in using money in ways that may not be considered basically motivated by selfishness. It is a most peculiar trait of a most generous people, and it makes for misunderstanding throughout the world of the aims and policies of the United States.

I would earnestly recommend to the Congress, to the schools, to the universities of the United States, that each do something in its own sphere to make the American people feel more natural in their goodness. Let us cease to pretend that the American people are extraordinarily hardheaded in order to hide the altogether creditable fact that they are decently kindhearted.

TVA Helps Heal Farms and Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the 25th anniversary of the TVA, I ask unanimous consent that the following article by the Honorable James P. Pope, entitled "TVA Helps Heal Farms and Forests", be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article follows:

TVA HELPS HEAL FARMS AND FORESTS

(By James P. Pope)

When Senator Ellison D. ("Cotton Ed") Smith, of South Carolina, introduced a bill during World War I providing for Government ownership and operation of nitrate munitions plants, he almost certainly had no notion of the eventual impact his proposals would have on the Nation's agriculture. Nor did he have any idea that he was planting a mustard seed that would grow into TVA, an integrated resource development with nationwide benefits and worldwide fame.

"Cotton Ed" was interested in agriculture, and primarily Southern agriculture which consumed great quantities of nitrogen fertilizer, then practically all imported, in growing cotton. His idea was that after the paramount demands of national defense had been met, the Government nitrate plants should be used in peacetime to produce fertilizers for American agriculture. His proposals became section 124 of the National Defense Act of 1916, and under this act the War Department built Wilson Dam and the nitrate plants at Muscle Shoals, Ala.

In the happy heyday after World War I, when other Government surplus wartime properties were being auctioned off for a song, the mandate that the nitrate plants should be used for the benefit of agriculture saved the Muscle Shoals properties from the common fate. Not that private interests didn't eye them covetously. The hitch was that, in the Senate, all bids and proposals came before the Committe on Agriculture and Forestry, headed by Senator George W. Norris of Nebraska. Norris not only objected to disposing of the properties for a fraction of their cost—one proposal he described as "the greatest gift to mortal man since salvation was made free to the human race"—but he saw them as a great public asset, the start of a vast program to develop the water and land resources of an entire river valley.

It took nearly a decade and a half of debate, in and out of Congress, before TVA was set up not only to control the river through dams and reservoirs but to concern itself with the problems of agriculture and forestry, with conservation of soil and water on the land.

In the operation of the Muscle Shoals properties, it was recognized in the act that research, development, and demonstration of new and improved fertilizers would be more important than simple production. Moreover, although TVA is best known as a regional agency, in one respect—the operation of the fertilizer-munitions facilities—the region it serves extends to the national borders. In the 25 years since 1933, the fertilizer research and demonstration activities centered at Muscle Shoals have extended their benefits to three-quarters of the States of the Nation. A few examples will illustrate.

In Washington and South Carolina last year, practical farmers, using TVA fertilizers, were demonstrating how productive, soil-healing pastures could be established. In Minnesota, a wholesale fertilizer company and its retailers conducted dozens of farmer meetings, published pamphlets, and sponsored radio programs on the proper use of fertilizers as recommended by State agriculutral experts.

Minnesota farmers are buying plant food of high analysis—20 pounds of nitrogen, 30 pounds of phosphate, and 10 pounds of potash in each 100-pound bag. The fertilizer is about double the concentration of the average material used in the United States. Private distributors make some of it by mixing ordinary fertilizer with a new TVA research product, diamonium phosphate, which contains 74 percent plant nutrient. Private industry is turning to its production.

In Idaho, a farmers' cooperative was planning a new fertilizer factory. The design was developed by TVA and made available for commercial use without charge. The plant is planned to produce calcium metaphosphate, developed by the TVA, containing an unusually high proportion of phosphate plant food. Nearby in the same State, private chemical companies are smelting rock phosphate in electric furnaces. Much of the technology they use was developed by TVA.

More than a hundred fertilizer plants in the country today are mixing plant foods with a machine called a continuous ammoniator granulater, a product of TVA chemical engineering research. Its use produces fertilizer mixtures more cheaply and results in a better product.

TVA's development and demonstration activities have been conducted over a period in which farming has steadily become more complicated. Today's farmer must be a manager in the most modern sense. He must test his soils and apply the right fertilizers in the right amount, weighing carefully the efficiency of his operations. Moreover, this has been a period when the use of fertilizers has expanded geographically. Fertilizer use today is no longer principally a southern practice, but is nationwide and growing fast.

The TVA's chemical engineering research and its demonstration programs have played a pioneering role in this development over the past quarter century. TVA's fertilizers, produced experimentally in plant-size units at Muscle Shoals, amount to less than 2 percent of the fertilizers produced and used in the United States. But they are used in ways which stimulate the interest of farmers and fertilizer manufacturers and dealers to make and use fertilizer in new ways and with greater efficiency. New practices, recommended by the various state agricultural colleges and extension service experts but not generally accepted by farmers, are stressed.

The farm problem was considerably different in 1933 from what it is now, southern farmers to a large extent depended on row crops such as corn, cotton, and tobacco for their living. Such agriculture was wasteful, leaving the ground bare much of the time to rains which washed away the topsoil. Science at the time knew how to end this waste. College experiment stations had shown that phosphate and lime would make clover, alfalfa, and grasses grow on hillsides, making livestock farming and better balanced farming systems feasible.

It was in accordance with this knowledge that TVA undertook first to work on phosphate fertilizers and to develop the techniques of electric furnace processing of phosphate ores to produce higher concentrations of plant nutrient. The new materials were brought to the attention of farmers through TVA's first educational program, the farm test-demonstration program, based on the belief that seeing is believing. Administered by the State extension services and aided by county organizations of farmers, the program brought the facts of fertilizer use to farmers through actual use of TVA fertilizers by individual test-demonstration farmers. One of the important results has been the establishment of a decided trend in southern agriculture away from row crops to pastures and forage crops and livestock production.

However, the problem was not confined to the South, but was national in scope. As chairman of a joint congressional committee on phosphate resources and use in the United States in 1938, I heard soils scientists testify that four-fifths of the soils of America were deficient in phosphorus. More than this, we had testimony that phosphorus deficiency had been noted in farm animals in several States. The committee concluded that the use of phosphates in agriculture should be drastically increased and that efforts should be made to tap the huge, but then virtually unused, phosphate resources of the western States of Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, and Utah.

The development of new and improved fertilizer in laboratories and plants is only the first step in the process. To bridge the gap between fertilizer technology and the farmer on the land, TVA has carried on two widespread educational programs which are guided by the agricultural colleges in the various States. One of these programs has been mentioned—the farm test-demonstration program, started in 1935. Some 71,000 farms in 38 States, covering more than 10 million acres, have participated.

The other program, affecting more farmers in more States, is the distributor demonstration program. The most important feature of this program is the fact that private and cooperative commercial distributors and their dealers participate in getting fertilizer use information to the farmers and themselves undertake experiments to improve industry processes, products, and distributor methods. Some 70 wholesale distributors—53 cooperatives and 18 industrial firms—are taking part in the program under contracts providing for major educational activities in introducing new fertilizers and improving their use. Their retail outlets, numbering more than 2,000, operate in 31 States.

TVA's primary interest is in the farmer, but this leads automatically to an interest in aiding the fertilizer and chemical industries, on whom the farmer must depend for his fertilizer supplies, to improve their manufacturing machinery and techniques and their products. The results of TVA's chemical engineering advances are made freely available to industry through licensing of

TVA patents. The licenses are royalty free and nonexclusive.

In all this, the dual purpose of the Muscle Shoals facilities—agriculture and national defense—has not been lost. Rather, the two aspects of use of the facilities are complementary. TVA's electric furnace developments enabled it in World War II to supply large quantities of elemental phosphorus to the armed services.

In the Tennessee Valley, only about half the land problem, geographically at least, is accounted for by agriculture. More than half the valley land area is in forests and woodlands. Not only are they important as an economic asset, for the production of lumber, pulp, and other wood products, but also for watershed protection, augmenting underground water supplies, and slowing the rush of rainwater into the streams.

Tennessee Valley forest products today are valued at $450 million a year. The forest products industries employ about 50,000 persons earning $100 million a year. Valley forests, once cutover, depleted, and on the downgrade, today are growing at the rate of 1.5 billion board feet a year.

These evidences of the productive use of the forest resource and of its future potential are the result of a long period of concentrated effort in which forestry and agriculture agencies of the seven valley States worked hand in hand with the TVA, the United States Forest Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the forest-products industries, and many other regional, State, and local groups.

When TVA was set up a quarter of a century ago, the forest resource, outside of the national forests, had received inadequate attention. Nearly a million acres of land in the valley burned over each year. Only a few private landowners were practicing systematic timber management. The State forestry budgets were low, and the 7 States together employed only 36 foresters.

One of TVA's first contributions to forest improvement was an extensive fire-prevention campaign which would build up public awareness of fire damage and bring more forests under protection. TVA helped State foresters in selecting sites for fire lookout towers, installing and operating fire danger measuring equipment, and making surveys of fire causes. Today more than 95 percent of the land is protected from fire by the States and 111 of the 125 counties in the Tennessee watershed cooperate financially in fire control.

In 1933, erosion had taken a half million acres out of production, and only about 1,000 acres had been reforested. TVA developed large nurseries, streamlined operating techniques, and began producing seedlings. Over the years, close to 45,000 valley landowners have planted about 366 million seedlings on 326,000 acres. Of the total seedlings, TVA nurseries supplied 314 million. Today the situation is different; State forestry agencies are much more active and in the past couple of years the State nurseries have supplied more tree seedlings than TVA for planting in the Valley. Moreover, the reforestation activities have spread over the entire seven-State area.

Forest management demonstrations set up through the cooperation of TVA, State forestry agencies, and forest landowners have led the way toward improving use of the forests. Today there are 285 such demonstrations in the valley covering 562,000 acres, and an additional 1.2 million acres are being put under management by industry and consulting foresters working with landowners.

Thus, on the agricultural and the forest lands of the valley, as well as in the multiple-use of the Tennessee River system, the resources of an important region are being developed into fuller productivity through the cooperation of a Federal agency, the TVA, and the people of the valley and their institutions.

A Prime Human Responsibility of Our American Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I read with a great deal of interest and appreciation the fine statement of Dr. Arthur H. Compton wherein he concludes nuclear test dangers are slight compared to atomic war. Dr. Compton is a distinguished service professor of natural philosophy at Washington University in St. Louis, and he is its former chancellor. He devoted a great deal of his time, energies, and talents to the study of physical properties of X-rays, cosmic rays, and other ionizing radiations. He has been recognized for this work by many scientific organizations at home and abroad. He was awarded the Nobel prize in 1927 for his work with X-rays. Without question, Dr. Compton is one of the most distinguished and dedicated Americans in his field today.

I am placing in the RECORD today Dr. Compton's statement together with an editorial which appeared in the same edition of the St. Louis Globe Democrat. In closing I would but reaffirm Dr. Compton's statement that it would be a tragedy for the world and a major hazard for America if our Nation should reduce the effectiveness of its nuclear armament without firm assurance that Russia is not left in a position to exercise military dominance over its neighbors.

The statement follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of May 14, 1958]

DR. COMPTON'S LETTER

The Globe-Democrat is privileged to be able to present, with Dr. Compton's and Senator SYMINGTON'S permission, the copy of the letter the celebrated nuclear physicist wrote the Senator on the subject of the continuation of testing of nuclear weapons.

In our view, it is the most thoughtful and penetrating analysis of this vital subject ever presented. It should be required reading for every American.

Dr. Compton's contributions to mankind are far too well known to be detailed here. He is one of the greatest men in the world today, and for these reasons, his views on a subject in which he is so thoroughly qualified take on added meaning.

Dr. Compton's views on the necessity for the continuation of tests should do a great deal to dispel the fuzzy thinking and the hopelessly visionary and unrealistic attitude of those who, by urging the halting of nuclear tests, wittingly or unwittingly mirror the Moscow line.

Dr. Compton's logic is so exact and his thinking so crystal clear that his letter should serve as a text reference for those whose own lack of knowledge of the subject necessarily dictates that they must be guided in their opinions by those best qualified by knowledge and experience to speak.

In his views, Dr. Compton is joined by many others of the most distinguished and dedicated Americans in their field today, including Dr. Ernest O. Lawrence, Dr. Edward Teller, and Dr. Wernher von Braun.

Dr. Compton's letter is but another in a long series of valuable services to America, the free world, and, most important of all, to the dignity of man.

TEXT OF DR. COMPTON'S LETTER—SAYS NUCLEAR TEST DANGERS ARE SLIGHT COMPARED TO A-WAR

MAY 8, 1958.

The Honorable STUART SYMINGTON,
United States Senator from Missouri,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SYMINGTON: The point of this letter is twofold. First, I want to express my congratulations for your recent (Apr. 22) testimony before the Senate favoring a continuation of the testing of nuclear weapons. Your testimony showed careful study, mature balance of judgment, and a high degree of moral courage. I hope your recommendations prevail.

Second, because the question of what should be done about nuclear tests comes to me repeatedly from many quarters, I want to summarize for the record my present views on this matter. At your invitation I presented testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, meeting here in St. Louis on December 12, 1956. This letter may be considered as an extension of this earlier statement. Such further testimony seems appropriate at this time because of the sharply divided views regarding the value of nuclear weapons tests as expressed recently by various scientists, and particularly in view of the vigorous opposition to such tests currently publicized by certain of my esteemed colleagues at Washington University.

I favor a vigorous extension of the American work needed to enable our Nation to use nuclear explosives effectually for either military or peaceful purposes. To the best of my knowledge this agrees with your own views.

QUALIFICATIONS

The study of physical properties of X-rays, cosmic rays, and other ionizing radiations was my primary professional task from 1913 until 1942. Recognition of my work in these fields has included many medals and honorary citations by scientific organizations in this country and abroad, including the Nobel Prize in 1927 for work with X-rays. I served as President of the American Physical Society in 1934 and as President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1942.

The physiological effects of ionizing rays have also been a matter of active concern for me. I was a member of the National Cancer Advisory Council from 1937 to 1944, and served as its representative in supporting the construction of a cyclotron at Berkeley, Calif., for the study of the biological effects of neutrons, and in the building of a cyclotron at St. Louis designed especially for producing artificial isotopes for medical purposes. I also helped to organize the Chicago Tumor Institute and served on its Scientific Committee from 1937–49.

I had the responsibility for initiating and organizing (in 1942) the health and safety program for the use of radioactive materials in connection with the American nuclear reactors. I worked closely with the officers of the Manhattan District in setting up the procedures for health and safety and also the radio-biology research for the entire atomic energy program. This program of safety precautions has resulted in an exceptional record for safety among those working with nuclear reactions. The research we began on the biological effects of radioactive materials continue to be carried on, with extensions and improvements, by the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

I personally made the first estimates of the hazards from radioactive fallout from the nuclear reactors at Oak Ridge and Hanford, recommended precautions for their safe operation, and assisted in developing an organization to give this matter continued competent and responsible study. I consulted regarding the fallout dangers with those responsible for the postwar nuclear tests at Bikini. I have also discussed cases of radiation damage with radiologists and geneticists in both Japan and the United States.

POLITICAL PROBLEM

It will be widely agreed that two world issues are today of greater importance than any others. The most immediate is the avoidance of major war. More fundamental is the concentration of the efforts of civilization on the full personal development of all men and women. The United States will meet its great responsibilities of leadership to the extent that it helps the world achieve these two great goals.

A major source of our present confusion is the announced and demonstrated goal of Russian communism, namely, to bring the world under a kind of imperial domination that in the view of the great majority of men would make impossible for most men and women a satisfactory human development. As long as such is the Russian objective, the rest of the world has no alternative but to protect itself against falling under Russian domination. While such protection is a world problem, today's realities mean that without the effective cooperation of the United States the defense of the world's freedom for encouraging the full development of persons would be impossible. Thus it becomes a prime human responsibility of American citizens to maintain a defensive strength adequate to meet the aggressive power of the Russian empire.

In order that such defensive strength shall be maintained, effective atomic armament is essential. This follows from the fact that Russia's first objective is to bring and keep its immediate neighbors within its political orbit. In order to be effective in defense, the United States must therefore be prepared to fight at a long distance from home. But nuclear weapons are now the engineer's best answer to delivering heavy blows at a distance. If by any means, as through world political pressure, the United States could be induced to make her nuclear arms ineffective, there would remain nothing to prevent the massed armies, tanks, and planes of the Russian empire from taking over complete control of Europe, Asia, and nearer Africa. Reduction of American nuclear strength is thus to Russia of critical importance. By the same token, American nuclear weapons are the key to the strength of NATO, and in fact to the defense of the world.

As you are well aware, this critical importance of nuclear weapons is fully recognized in all military circles, including not only the United States and Russia but also such traditionally neutral areas as Switzerland and Scandinavia. The reason that nuclear weapons are more important to the United States than to Russia is because, as all the world knows, it is Russia, not the United States, that is a military threat to its neighbors. It is the United States, not Russia, that is concerned with protecting the interests of nations that are far from its borders.

It would thus be a tragedy for the world and a major hazard for America if our nation should reduce the effectiveness of its nuclear armament without firm assurance that Russia is not left in a position to exercise military dominance over its neighbors.

There are those, however, who believe that by arming our Nation with the most effective weapons we are exciting the world toward war. My own appraisal of history is the reverse. I believe lack of adequate preparedness for defense has proved itself an invitation to aggression, and that the reactions induced by aggression would be such as to make war inevitable even though the outcome would be disaster.

Thus my basic reason for advocating a continuation of tests of nuclear explosions is because I do not see how we can be confident that our weapons are adequate for defense unless tests continue to be made.

FALL-OUT HAZARDS

A consideration must be given, however, to the dangers that inhere in the tests themselves. As I stated in my testimony before your committee a year ago, these hazards are real, and must be carefully guarded against. Yet in my judgment the magnitude of the hazard has in certain quarters been grossly exaggerated. To my mind, the danger that would surely be done in case war should occur is so much greater, that to hesitate in making important tests because of the relaticely small damage they may do would be a tragic error of judgment.

This is not the place to present the technical arguments; but I note this contrast: On the one hand Professor Pauling and others have stated that each nuclear explosion introduces radioactive materials into the atmosphere that will shorten the lives of thousands of people through such effects as genetic mutations, leukemia, and bone cancer. On the other hand, as of this date, there is only one case (that of a Japanese fisherman) where good evidence exists that a person's life was shortened by fallout. Statistical evidence on populations living in areas where they are exposed to substantially greater differences in ionization than are induced by the usual radioactive fallout show no significant genetic or cancerous effects. Considering the evidence that I have seen, it is my own expectation that when really thorough tests shall have been made, it will be seen that the worldwide effects on people's health of nuclear tests continued at the level of the past few years are small as compared with many other hazards to which we are exposed.

To set the record straight, may I pause to note two points. The first is that the attention recently called to the hidden hazards of radiation has stimulated radiologists to improve greatly their techniques of use of X-rays and radium in diagnosis and therapy. These improvements have already resulted in a reduction in the exposure resulting from fallout. That is, the net result of our work with ionizing rays during recent years has been to reduce substantially rather than to increase our chance of being injured by such rays.

The second point is the very great debt we owe to these ionizing rays in terms of health and human life. Radiologists working independently in the United States and Germany have estimated "roughly but reliably" that the use of X-rays and radioactive materials in diagnosis and therapy has saved the lives of as many persons as have been killed in all the wars fought since 1895 when these agencies were discovered. While it has been salutary to have our attention called to the very real dangers in the peaceful as well as military uses of nuclear rays, we should remember that when properly used such rays are of great human value.

WEIGHING HAZARDS

On the one hand, we recognized the likelihood that some persons will be injured, perhaps even fatally, by the long-time effects of nuclear explosions. On the other hand, we see the chance that a slackening in our work on nuclear weapons may so weaken our defensive strength that the world may be baited into the fatal trap of a major war. In my own judgment, the possibility of drifting into war is by far the greater danger.

If this judgment is correct, we should continue to exert every effort to maintain our defenses. This means that we should continue the development of the nuclear weapons needed to insure the success of the aims of the free world in case war should be thrust upon us. In such work, however, continued care should be taken to avoid endangering people, whether citizens of our own or other nations.

Unfortunately, there exists today no responsible body that can say what experiments are in the interests or contrary to the interests of mankind. This is one of the more obvious duties that the United Nations should be authorized to perform. Until, however, it has a police force of adequate strength, putting such a judgment into effect is beyond the power of the United Nations. Until the United Nations develops such power, the responsibility for conducting nuclear experiments in the best interest of mankind must be accepted individually by every sovereign nation and carried through in accord with its own best judgment.

The policy that guides the United States Atomic Energy Commission is obviously to carry on the experiments that it finds necessary for both military and peaceful purposes, while keeping human risks to a minimum. The responsibility for the broader national and international implications of this work cannot, however, be avoided by the Congress. It is at this point where I should be glad for assurance that the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy is fully alert to the issues involved.

As a matter of military judgement, it would seem to me wise for emphasis now to be laid on the development of nuclear explosives of lower caliber. It seems evident that if war should come again it is the smaller nuclear bombs that will be most useful as tactical weapons. The relatively limited area of destruction by such weapons would raise far fewer political problems than the use of larger bombs. Superbombs, of over 1 megaton rating, will always be difficult to use in war without raising serious political issues.

We cannot afford to be caught unprepared with the most powerful weapons in case of a real power showdown. Yet, we may hope that only an occasional test of such huge weapons may be adequate for the very unlikely event that their use may be called for. It is thus in the area of superbombs that we may advantageously negotiate regarding reduction of bomb tests. For example, it would probably be within the bounds of prudence to state unilaterally that we will not be the first to use in war a bomb more powerful than a certain specified size. As you are aware, the fallout hazards are thousands of times less for the small caliber bombs, so that their tests are of relatively little international concern.

It is probably fortunate for the world's peace of mind that it is American citizens, rather than those of any other nation, who are exposed most strongly to the radioactive effects of the nuclear explosions that have so far been made. It is this fact also, however, that gives especial point to our taking every possible safety measure as we proceed with our own crucially important experiments.

DIRECTION OF PEACE

I am by no means hopeless with regard to avoiding another major war. For the immediate future I believe the likelihood that such a war would bring atomic weapons into use is recognized by all concerned. No nation would expect such a war to end without itself suffering more damage than its possible gains would be worth. Establishing an enduring peace thus would seem to require most careful and prudent negotiations during the next decade or two. By this time one may hope that the growing strength of new nations, the increasing need for economic and cultural cooperation and the rap-

id strengthening of other international ties will prevent the revival of a will to war.

As I see it, our best means of promoting such an atmosphere in which peace will develop and endure is for us to accept as our firm national policy what we have recognized for generations as "the American Dream," that is, that we shall make it possible for all of our citizens to grow to their fullest stature as men and women, and that we will cooperate with other nations in their efforts to do the same for their citizens. To this end, we would do well, I believe, to negotiate with Russia, intensively and with full determination, working preferably through the United Nations, regarding means of advancing cooperatively with the nations involved, the health, economic condition, and cultural status of men and women everywhere. As this becomes recognized as our consistent and sincere intention, we shall gain the support and confidence of the world. In such world confidence lies finally our only safety.

This, as I see it, is the direction in which we must move—but with every sense alert, lest eager on the way toward peace we fall into some trap that we must expect to find carefully laid for us.

Yours sincerely,

ARTHUR H. COMPTON.

Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, in the May 14, 1958, issue of the Austin American, Austin, Tex., there is a splendid editorial on the outstanding public service rendered by Texas citizens on the board for hospitals and special schools. Specific mention is made of the notable service rendered by Dr. Raleigh Ross, who is completing his service as chairman of the board, and also another outstanding Austin citizen, Judge W. W. Heath, former secretary of state who has just been chosen as chairman. The editorial is as follows:

PUBLIC SERVICE

The board for hospitals and special schools was created when it became clear that earlier administrative machinery was inadequate. In its earlier years, it was a favorite target of sniping from some quarters in the legislature. It had to get started on something of a trial and error basis; but the important thing is that it has moved into effective operation, in handling 1 of the 3 or 4 biggest programs of State operation.

The board through the years has gained the services of outstanding and unselfish Texas citizens. It has built up executive, administrative, and professional staffs of ability, and has broadened its scope of service to afflicted and handicapped persons. It has provided better treatment and care for the mental patients; has begun to meet much of the demands for care of tuberculars, and, within the few years of its existence, has finally made provision for care of the infirm aged without placing them in overcrowded mental hospitals. Its provision for treatment of the cerebral palsy victims has been outstanding.

Several Austin citizens have rendered notable service on the board for hospitals and special services, past and present. This is emphasized by the fact that Dr. Raleigh has completed a rather long service as chairman of the board, and continues as one of its members; and now another Austin citizen, former Secretary of State W. W. Heath, has been chosen as chairman.

The board is made up of distinguished Texas citizens, typified by Mrs. H. E. Butt, of Corpus Christi, member, and Howard Telepsen, Houston, the board's new vice chairman. And the board always has been fortunate in having outstanding members of the medical profession among its numbers.

This board has the unpaid services, and claims substantial amounts of the time of patriotic Texans in its vital service to State government. It serves the afflicted and the unfortunate, the people who need attention most; and in shaping policies and daily administration to care for these, it is serving the entire citizenship.

The Proudest Happy Birthday Greeting on Record: Hearty Shalom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Jewish Daily News of April 25, 1958. The article is by the editor, Mr. Philip Slomovitz, a close friend of mine and a distinguished journalist and member of our Detroit Jewish community.

The article is entitled "The Proudest Happy Birthday Greeting on Record: Hearty Shalom." It sets forth the best wishes of all men of good will, Catholic, Protestant, Moslem, and Hindu, to Israel on the 10th anniversary of its independence:

THE PROUDEST HAPPY BIRTHDAY GREETING ON RECORD: HEARTY SHALOM

(By Philip Slomovitz)

One need not be a Jew to feel elated in this historic hour which marks the beginning of the second decade of Israel's existence. Catholics, and Protestants, and many realistically minded Moslems and Hindus, have expressed their respect for Israel and their sense of satisfaction over the triumph of fighters of liberty and for autonomy.

Israel's first 10 years were very difficult ones. An uphill trek marked the economic and social struggles involved in welcoming a million new settlers and fusing them into a single, Hebrew-speaking society. While the builders of Medinat Yisrael constantly marched forward, they nevertheless were compelled, as their ancestors were in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, to manipulate the plow with one hand while holding on to weapons of defense in the other.

It was a struggle for life against great odds—and the battle goes on. The Israelis are, indeed, creating new industries. They are keeping their gates open for new settlers—every Jew who desires to join them has the opportunity of immediate acquirements of citizenship. They are creating universities and are opening new cultural and scientific vistas. They are building new roads and are opening new theaters. They are preparing for a very full life for themselves and their children.

Their most sacred hopes and aspirations are being fulfilled. Yet, their neighbors remain antagonistic. War threats continue to plague them. Their salutation is shalom—they virtually beg for peace—but their pleadings meet only with hatred.

It need not be so. Long ago, it could have been otherwise, all battles between the Semitic cousins could have been averted, for the simple reason that the masses among the Arab peoples are kept in ignorance, else they would have supported every peace move made by Israel. There are many Arab leaders who pray for the day of peace for their people and for Israel, but they fear the assassins' threats that emanate from the ranks of a handful among the ruling element who desire to dominate and to continue to rule in their medieval, tyrannical fashion.

Indeed, there is recurring evidence that many Arabs, like nearly all the Israelis, desire peace and would like to negotiate it through direct talks with Israel. Only a week ago, the JTA reported an Arab refugee leader's statement, at a press conference in Istanbul, of his readiness to meet with Israel's Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion to discuss a permanent solution of the refugee problem.

In his most informative book, The First 10 Years, Walter Eytan, director-general of the Israel Ministry for Foreign Affairs, offers many examples of Arab peace overtures to Israel. A typical example was his experience at the armistice conference in Rhodes. While Israelis then met in one room with the Egyptians, the latter at first addressed their remarks only to the mediator, Dr. Ralph Bunche, as if the Israelis never existed. But the atmosphere improved and the delegations soon argued directly. During the 6 weeks at Hotel des Roses, Eytan writes, "we became quite friendly with the Egyptians. Their earlier attitude may have been due to insecurity and shyness, or to instructions; I am certain it was not caused by any deep-seated hostility. We did not meet socially much, but when Abdul Moneim Mustafa, the chief political adviser on the Egyptian delegation, fell ill, we sat at his bedside and comforted him. * * *"

There was more socializing later on, and the Israelis thought, after the party arranged by Dr. Bunche, upon the signing of the armistice, that we had not only brought the fighting phase to a formal end, but had laid the foundations at least of normal relations between our two countries.

Yet, the very Abdul Moneim Mustafa whom the Israelis had comforted in Rhodes became Minister of Egypt at Berne and an assistant secretary-general of the Arab League. Early in 1957 he turned up in a new part, as a member of King Saud's entourage on the state visit to Washington.

How are we to account for it? Very simply: the lack of encouragement to Israel's peace efforts by the world's great powers, notably the men who have become so blinded to the actual Middle Eastern situation in our State Department Walter Eytan's story of the conciliation efforts at Lausanne proves it. The Arabs might have met face to face with the Israelis, had they been seriously urged to do so. But, by that time, unlike the actions of Dr. Bunche at Rhodes, the great powers already had begun to appease the oil interests, and there never was a direct meeting between Israel and the Arab states. But privately, representatives of every Arab state sought meetings with the Jewish representatives. Almost the only relief, we learn from Eytan, was afforded by the efforts of each Arab delegation to make secret contact with that of Israel. Each was determined to meet the Israelis, but only on condition that the others should not know about it.

That is how it has been going on ever since Israel was reestablished as a sovereign

state. King Abdullah was assassinated because he planned to make peace with Israel. Every Arab politician who dared to encourage peace with Israel merely risked his life. Every time the news leaked out that Arabs were negotiating peace talks, the reports were repudiated because the pacifists only risked their lives. It may well be that Naguib's elimination from power in Egypt was his conciliatory attitude toward Israel.

Illustratively, Israel's three major officers—President Itzhak Ben-Zvi, Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion, and Foreign Minister Golda Meir—emphasized their craving for peace, in their messages just released on Israel's 10th anniversary.

President Ben-Zvi prays to the Almighty "that real peace may reign in this country and in our relations with all peoples, near and far."

Premier Ben-Gurion says "we look to the future with confidence in the Rock of Israel, depending on our strength, and on the justice and purity of our cause, believing in the brotherhood of world Jewry, and hoping for the good will of all nations who seek peace and justice and freedom."

Mrs. Meir makes this emphatic assertion: "We fervently hope that in our second decade, our Arab neighbors will abandon their futile efforts at our destruction, and peace will come to our tormented region. But be that as it may, we shall persist in our work of reconstruction and development, in the rebuilding of our land and in the ingathering of our people."

That is how Israelis have been speaking throughout the 10 years of the state's existence. Unfortunately, the Arab not only shunned peace but even averted talking about it. The only word on their lips in relation to Israel has been "war," and their chieftains truly sought it. But they have never been able to prove that their people desired it. That is why they have failed and must continue to fail. Therein lies the solution for the rest of the world: in the best interests of the Arab peoples, they must demand direct negotiations between Israel and her neighbors for peace. Then we shall surely have peace.

In spite of the militant pressures from Arab quarters, there is good reason to believe that they could never have grown to their present grotesque proportions if it were not for the tacit encouragement the Arab militarists and feudalists were given by the Western powers. It is such encouragement that lends strength to Nasser, the defeated general who has become a triumphant statesman.

We are dealing with realities on Israel's 10th birthday, only to indicate that there is much hope for peace, that the current celebration is by no means clothed in fears stemming from threats from Israel's neighbors. Even if there should be a partial renewal of hostilities, it will not prove the emergence of serious dangers.

Israel is here to stay. The eternity of Israel has been determined long ago, and has been reaffirmed by the will to live of the people of Israel.

This is the dominant note in the Israel celebration. It is the heartening element in the life of the Jewish people.

Israel has reason to be proud, her people can hold their heads high. They are building and creating well. They are making friends. They have formed an indestructible partnership with the Jewish people. They have formed a warm friendship with great nations, notably the United States, France, and others.

All these developments have led to a glorious anniversary. Never before has the happy birthday greeting meant as much as it does now, in the joyous state in which we acclaim the growing child of 10 among the nations of the world whose creative spirit has elevated it to the status of more than a prodigy—rather to that of administrator of Altneuland (as Theodor Herzl termed it)—the oldest land clothed in the newest and youngest attire. A young and enthusiastic spirit rules an ancient nation. All who desire to see the survival of justice and peace on earth must wish it well.

A Message From the Mayor, Thomas J. O'Connor, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the New York Sunday Times yesterday published a particularly outstanding supplement focusing attention on the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and appropriately entitled "Massachusetts Means Progress."

The entire supplement was devoted to the manpower, capital resources, governmental climate, and natural resources of our great Commonwealth. I want to compliment Commissioner John T. Burke, of the department of commerce, for the cooperative effort his department made in making this supplement possible, and for the beautiful display of colored pictures of some of the finest areas of Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues in Congress, and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to the message of Mayor Thomas J. O'Connor, Jr., of my home city of Springfield, which appeared in the supplement. Under permission heretofore granted, I include Mayor O'Connor's message in the Appendix of the RECORD:

A MESSAGE FROM THE MAYOR, THOMAS J. O'CONNOR, JR.

Whether you're expanding, moving, or starting a brandnew enterprise—you can't beat Springfield.

Springfield is the focal point of a metropolitan area of half a million customers—the largest of a cluster of 3 cities—with 5 cities within a 20-mile radius.

Springfield is located on four railroad lines serving all points. Springfield is located on the Massachusetts Turnpike, with three access roads in the area. You can ship direct by truck via turnpike to Boston or west to Chicago. City hall is 12 miles from 2 major airports.

Springfield has unsurpassed industrial sites suited to every industrial need—and Springfield has a building, improvement, and expansion program that guarantees continued progress:

A 503-car parking facility in the heart of downtown.

An east-west expressway, connecting the Massachusetts Turnpike with Springfield's north-south expressway, providing rapid transit direct from all outlying areas to the heart of the city.

A multi-million-dollar urban renewal program—integrated with the expressway and off-street parking program—with promises of more to come.

A completely modern 110-acre industrial park, complete with railroad siding, parking, and easy access to the Massachusetts Turnpike.

Springfield's economic strength is based on business, insurance companies, and industry, and Springfield's industrial structure is thoroughly diversified—the best cushion against nationwide economic fluctuations—a structure that guarantees skilled personnel of every description, augmented annually by graduates from Springfield's specialized training schools.

Springfield is on the march. Businessmen and industrialists looking for the best location will find Springfield poised and ready for expansion as the metropolitan center of western Massachusetts.

The mayor's office and the entire city government are determined to help you in every way possible. Come in and see us. Come to Springfield and look around—talk it over.

And you'll agree with us, "You Can't Beat Springfield."

The Real Story of TVA—A True Partnership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the 25th anniversary of the TVA, under unanimous consent I insert the following article by the Honorable Barrett C. Shelton, entitled "The Real Story of TVA—A True Partnership," to be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD.

THE REAL STORY OF TVA—A TRUE PARTNERSHIP

(By Barrett C. Shelton)

In this, the 25th anniversary year of TVA, many could point to its spectacular achievements—its system of great dams and unified control of a river system, its towering steam plants, the development of the largest electric generating system in the world, its tremendous contributions of power to atomic development and the national defense. My story concerns itself with people—the people of the TVA region and what they have accomplished in a quarter century of working partnership with TVA.

Years ago, in 1943, my paper, the Decatur Daily, editorially summed it up this way: "We can write of great dams * * * of the building of homegrown industry, and of electricity coming at last to the farms of thousands of farm people in the valley. Yet the significant advance has been made in the thinking of a people. They are no longer afraid. They have caught the vision of their own powers."

The best place to start a story is at the beginning and at home. For years before TVA, the progressive citizens of Decatur had tried to improve conditions, to establish a sound economy for the city and for its surrounding trade territory. The assets, the resources for growth were here, but we couldn't take advantage of them. Our agriculture was based on one cash crop—cotton, which drained soil of fertility and opened it to erosion. Past our door flowed the Tennessee River, majestically broad but largely useless. Its power was untapped, its navigation chiefly a local affair of no significance, its waters often dangerous in flood. Industry came hard, and it came for the wrong reasons—subsidies and low wages. Then came the great depression. Cotton was down to 5 cents a pound. The railroad shop, our major industry, closed down, putting 2,000 men and women out of work. Another industry, brought to the city in earlier years with a considerable subsidy,

went bankrupt. Most of our banks were closed.

Then came TVA. In the beginning I was against it. Perhaps I feared the superstate which some people mostly outside the valley, had tried to call it. I knew I wanted no Government control over me or my people. Others felt the same way. Into this almost frankly hostile atmosphere walked David Lilienthal, one of the TVA directors, one midwinter afternoon. When we met in conference, our attitude was: "All right. You were not invited, but you're here. You are in command. Now what are you going to do?"

Lilienthal's answer took us by surprise: "I'm not going to do anything. You're going to do it."

TVA had no intention of taking command. It had no powers beyond those traditional functions exercised elsewhere by the Government through other agencies. It would, Lilienthal explained, provide the tools of opportunity—a navigation channel, protection from floods, low-cost power, better fertilizers, and farm test demonstrations to show how they could be used. "What you do with these tools is up to you," he said.

Dr. Harcourt Morgan, another director, brought us the same word. He talked of the relationship of people to the land, of the need for building the soil with phosphate, lime, and legumes, of the need for farm markets and processing plants, of making the most of our own natural resources rather than reaching out into other regions for industry.

Here was a new insight into our problems and how to solve them. We looked about us, and we started to chart new courses. We saw we needed agriculture with a stable, year-round income, and we induced the local ice company to install packing plant facilities to provide a market for livestock, a step toward more diversified agriculture. We scraped together the capital for a small milk plant, not hoping for a profit but simply to provide a pay check every 2 weeks for farm families in our section. The plant was a success almost from the start. It paid substantial dividends to its rather surprised stockholders.

As the dams went up, navigation became a reality. Taking advantage of it, Nebraska Consolidated Mills Co., established Alabama Flour Mills at Decatur. Besides bringing in midwest grain, the mills provided a market for local grain—$2 million worth in 1955. Grain barges now ply the length of the Tennessee, to mills and elevators at Guntersville, Ala., and Chattanooga and Knoxville, Tenn. Tennessee Valley Fertilizer Cooperative established a fertilizer mixing plant serving 10 counties. The possibility of selling seed commercially led to establishing a modern seed-cleaning plant. Other industry has found the city attractive, and today, instead of a single major industry, there is a diversity of plants producing many products. The city has doubled in population, from 12,000 to more than 24,000. It feels it is on a stable foundation, confident of its powers.

In all this development, the TVA has been a helpful adviser, never the dictator. It has provided technical services and facts about our resources, or about the requirements of industry, that we needed to know. "Here are the facts," has been its attitude, "and what you do with them is up to you."

That has been the story, all up and down the valley, in almost infinite variety. Far from taking the prerogatives of States, counties, cities, and citizens, the TVA has persistently urged them to take more and more responsibility to themselves. Its fertilizer and agricultural development activities has been channeled through the State extension services. TVA has operated in the confidence that once the facts and the tools were placed in the hands of the people, they would know what to do with them.

How well this yeast has permeated is perhaps epitomized by the comment of a mountain preacher who attended an agricultural extension meeting for farmers and ministers in a North Carolina county. "From now on," he said, "I'm going to preach less hellfire and brimstone, and more phosphate and limestone."

About 50 miles upstream from Decatur, another small Alabama city, Guntersville, faced what at first seemed to its citizens an insurmountable problem. It was a trading center for surrounding farmers. When TVA began the construction of Guntersville Dam, 10 miles downstream, the people of Guntersville learned that the rising reservoir waters wolud cover much of the farmland and on which their trade depended.

For many of the 3,000 people in the town, there seemed to be only one answer to this dreary prospect. Town officials, businessmen, bankers, and just ordinary citizens appealed to the TVA to buy the entire town, so they could take the cash and move.

Instead, TVA suggested the formation of a local planning commission to take a hard look at the problem and see what steps the town could take. TVA provided funds to the Alabama State Planning Commission to finance expert assistance to the local commission, and it cooperated by providing detailed maps and other data. The studies indicated that the town's income might be reduced as much as 30 percent. How could this be replaced? The answer was found in the new reservoir itself.

The commission set to work on a scheme to make the new reservoir an asset rather than a liability. It saw possibilities of industrial development and trade resulting from the new navigation channel, along with the opportunity of making the town a recreation center for a wide area. This called for detailed and careful planning in order to make the most of the waterfront. The town, after filling of the reservoir, would be on a peninsula, surrounded on three sides by water. A deep and navigable embayment on the east side of the town was set aside for commerce and industry; instead of purchasing and flooding low lying land on this side of the town, the TVA built a protective dike. West of the peninsula, a shallower embayment was planned for recreation.

When an oil company approached TVA for use of a small level area created by the dike at the north end of the town, jutting into the lake, for a bulk storage terminal, the decision was referred to the planning commission. The land, the commission decided, should be developed as a waterfront park, but it did not stop at this point. It worked with TVA and the oil company to find a suitable site on the industrial embayment for the terminal. Other similar decisions on detailed, practical matters were made.

The real test was yet to come, when Guntersville Dam was closed and the reservoir encircled the town. The doubts of all skeptics were soon resolved. In connection with the dedication of the dam, the town sponsored a program of motorboat races. It was hoped that several thousand people would be attracted to the event. More than 50,000 came. By 11 o'clock in the morning, all food and soft drinks were gone, highways were blocked with parked cars. None could miss the point of the demonstation. Guntersville's future as a recreation center was assured, and shortly its citizens were improving eating and housing facilities for guests and embarking on the sale of fishing tackle and boating gear.

Today Guntersville is a busy river port and recreation center. What seemed like impending ruin has been transformed into a prosperous present and a promising future. Huge three deck automobile barges regularly flood the town's docks with automobiles for distribution through the Southeast. An elevator receives Midwest grain. Far from withering away, the town has doubled in population.

The case of Guntersville was typical of the way TVA enlisted the talents, energies, and resources of State and local agencies and of citizens. Wherever communities were faced with readjustments because of the building of dams and reservoirs, TVA urged the responsibility on State and local planning commissions, using the money it would otherwise have had to spend doing the job itself. The TVA funds helped set up the agencies. In 1933 there were no State and only two city planning agencies in the Valley. Today there are six State planning bodies and 65 local agencies, all operating independently and supported by State and community funds.

The same with libraries. Instead of setting up its own libraries at construction camps, TVA contracted with existing city libraries to provide service which was also open to nearby communities. When the construction jobs closed down and TVA's support was withdrawn, the libraries remained, supported by State and local funds. Moreover, they provided the seeds for expansion. Figures from Tennessee tell the story. In 1942–43 the State provided no funds for regional library service; TVA funds amounted to $13,800 and local funds a little over $4,000. Ten years late TVA provided no funds, the State contributed $170,000, and local sources $125,000—a total of $295,000. Library service spread out to new territories.

Why this opportunity was seized is illustrated by the statement from one county facing the loss of library service when TVA support ceased: "We have 6,000 people—no telephones, no railroad, and no newspapers. The bookmobile and the grapevine are the only means of communication. Talk about country people not reading? In this county we read 4,000 books a month."

Take the forest resources. Forests and woodlands cover half the Valley land area. But in 1933 they were neglected, burned over, sometimes abandoned and eroded, seriously depleted. State forestry agencies were virtually inactive, no reforestation was going on, and protection against fire, except on Federal- or State-owned land, was practically nil. TVA moved in all these fronts. It began supplying seedlings for planting. It helped States and counties set up effective fire-prevention organization. It made periodic and systematic inventories of forest resources.

State and local agencies pitched in. More than nine-tenths of the forests now have fire protection. Nearly 300,000 acres have been reforested. Today TVA, which once was the only source of seedlings, produces less than half of those planted by landowners each year. State forestry agencies have grown and the scope of their activities has been enlarged. Where they expended only half a million dollars in forest work in 1939, the same 7 States invested nearly $15 million last year in promoting forest improvement.

This activity has paid off in better forest management and more forest income. New wood-using industries are appearing. Landowners are eager to plant trees, and local bankers and businessmen are eager to help them by buying and loaning mechanical tree-planting equipment.

Full use of the forest resource also depends on other developments. The location of a multi-million-dollar paper and pulp plant by Bowaters Southern Paper Co. illustrates how the various phases of integrated development mesh together to promote industry. When Bowaters became interested in a southern location in the 1940's, TVA statistics showed that the forests and woodlands could supply a large plant in addition to the

existing use. Pine plantations had reached the stage of thinning for pulpwood. Interest in forest management was gaining momentum. Electric power was available. Due to the multiple-purpose system of dams, a flood-free plant site could be found on the Hiwassee River arm of Chickamauga Reservoir, upstream from Chattanooga. Ample water was available for processing. The navigation channel offered opportunities for transportation of raw materials and finished products. In 1953, Bowaters had completed a $55 million plant which has since been expanded. It provides a market for wood over a $300-mile radius and, to round out the circle, this promotes more intense interest in forest development on the part of the valley people.

Local pluck and perseverance, plus the tools provided by integrated resource development, have paid off in the past few years for Calvert City, a town of some 300 population in west Kentucky. The town and its trading area fell into decline after World War I, when the market for dark tobacco, the only kind that would grow well on its lands, disappeared. In 20 years, the county lost 5,000 population.

The Draffen brothers, Luther and Art, operators of the general store, kept pushing for something to be done about it. Resources were there: The Tennessee and Ohio Rivers, the Cumberland, and only 70 miles away, the Mississippi formed a network of waterways for transportation and potential sources of power. Power was needed for industry to balance agriculture, but Calvert City couldn't even get electric lights until local citizens set up a generator in a flour mill. From the 1920's on, the Draffens and their fellow citizens sought, through Federal and State and private sources, for the kind of power they needed, and they plugged away at pointing out the advantages their area could offer industry. In the late 1940's, their dreams were realized. The Pennsylvania Salt Co. built a plant to be near the fluorspar deposits it had acquired in Kentucky and to take advantage of the power available from TVA. It was followed a few years later by the Air Reduction Co., and the National Carbon calcium carbide and acetylene plant. B. F. Goodrich Chemical Co. set up a plant to make basic vinyl chloride for its polyvinyl plastics from basic materials provided by the other plants.

Today Calvert City is struggling to keep abreast of the new industrial development, based on a chemical manufacturing complex it had sought so long, and it looks forward to a population of 10,000 by 1960.

So it goes, all up and down the valley region. Is it any wonder that we are sometimes astonished to learn, from outside critics, that we are obviously under the heel of an autocratic government agency, or at best, are the wards of a paternalistic socialism?

The real story of the past 25 years is a practical demonstration of the way the combined cooperative work of a forward-looking Federal agency, State and local agencies, educational institutions, and private citizens—farmers, labor, business and professional men—can make the most out of the basic resources of a region. No State, no city, no county, no private enterprise could have developed the Tennessee River in a unified way to capture all the multiple benefits it offered, from its sources in the mountains to its mouth. Only the Federal Government, through the TVA, could have done it. At the same time, our experience over this past quarter century has shown that huge planning and engineering tasks can be undertaken and carried out without a loss of democratic values or freedoms. Quite the contrary; the combined efforts of the Federal Government and the people have opened up new and wider opportunities, have given scope to individual talents, intelligence, and enterprise. The result has been a richer, more productive region, and a richer, more productive Nation.

An Appeal to the People of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting into the RECORD the text of an appeal to the people of Italy which I am making at this time on the eve of very important parliamentary elections to be held there on May 25. This statement is being circulated there in the press and through other mediums of information. It is as follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO

On the eve of a very crucial election in Italy, I appeal once again to my forebears, and particularly to the youth of that country, to cast their lot on the side of freedom and independence by voting against the Communists and their fellow travelers.

I do so as one who was born in Italy, who is at all times interested in the welfare of its people, and who is anxious that it remain an independent and sovereign state with the freedom to determine its own destiny. I do so because I have very close relatives who still reside in Italy, and I am anxious that they and their children and all the people of Italy may continue to live in freedom and dignity instead of enslavement and degradation foisted upon them by an outside godless power.

Just a decade ago, in the parliamentary elections of 1948, I made a similar appeal to the people of Italy to repudiate communism. In fact, I urged thousands of others of my fellow countrymen to do the same by calling on their relatives and friends in Italy to support the parties which stand for democracy. The victory of the people at that time laid the basis for a strong alliance and a close friendship between Italy and the United States which resulted in the restoration of Italy as a formidable power in the West and a leader in the family of nations.

There were other achievements, too, which inured to the benefit of all Italians. The most striking of these is the fact that from the depths of depression and discouragement, which followed in the wake of World War II, Italy has accomplished an economic miracle which is practically unparalleled in modern times. With the aid of America, but primarily through the indefatigable energy, determination, and zeal of the Italian people, Italy has attained great economic progress coupled with political democracy. Economic growth and political freedom go hand in hand in Italy today.

A decade ago the sinister aims of international communism were not too well known. In their despair and disillusionment after the war, millions of Italians were misled to join the Communist Party as a protest against existing inequities and in search of a better life. By now, it is quite clear to many that this was a false and elusive hope. Years of experience with international communism has convinced thinking men and women in Italy and in other countries that the promises of communism are both worthless and dangerous, that freedom and liberty are the bases of a true democratic form of government, and that they are too great a prize to sacrifice for a regimented Communist way of life.

One need only recall the revolt of the Hungarian people in 1956, when their efforts to attain political freedom and independence were drenched in blood by Russian troops and tanks. The murder of hundreds of Hungarian freedom-fighters, men, women, and children, horrified the whole civilized world. Here was an instance where communism removed its mask and showed its true and ugly face for all the world to see.

The Yugoslavian situation is no better. On the one hand, a rigid Communist dictatorship has been set up in the country which has deprived the people of all freedom and has forced many to flee into neighboring countries. On the other hand, Yugoslavia is struggling to shake off the yoke of Moscow's domination and control.

It is no wonder that neutral nations are ever more alarmed over the Yugoslav situation than over the Hungarian situation in 1956. Prime Mnister Nehru of India put it very bluntly when he recently obeserved that the Communists in any country are not bound by the national interests of their country, but are guided by a totalitarian power emanating from Moscow. An example of this occurred in Italy in the about-face of the Italian Communist Party, which first supported Tito's Communist Party in Yugoslavia and then rejected it on orders from Moscow. Similar instances can be recited time and again when the Communist Party of Italy changed its course at Moscow's directions.

This interference on the part of Moscow should be compared with the attitude of the United States. In addition to extending the fullest possible measure of aid, the United States has never made any demands on Italy, other than that it remain a free and democratic country for the benefit of its people; it has promoted Italy's admission to the United Nations; it has always recognized Italy's right to voice its opinions as a free nation in a free society; and it has respected the wishes of the Italian people in every way.

I am particularly concerned over the fate and the future of the youth of Italy. I should not like to see them because the puppets of a totalitarian regime, going through the agonies of Communist brainwashing, facing enslavement and human degradation, becoming the prisoners of the Kremlin leaders who are not really interested in their welfare but are exploiting them for their own selfish purposes. The hope of Italy's youth—and of the youth of all nations—lies in a free society, where they will have opportunities to advance themselves, to attain a good education, to live in a better world. By following the leadership of power-hungry Communist despots, they will only rob themselves of all freedom and all opportunities for a better life.

Communism's lack of faith in a supreme being, its defiant challenge of the eternal power of God, and its disregard of the dignity of man, are among its greatest weaknesses which eventually must and will lead to its disintegration. It cannot forever go on to ignore basic precepts of God and man.

The time has come when the youth of Italy, together with the youth of other countries, must begin to build a better and a happier world. This is the challenge of the hour. In Italy, the youth now has a golden opportunity to help rout communism at the polls and thus safeguard the future of their country and their own survival as free men and women.

In my own country, the United States, I have urged my Government to call a conference in the near future of youth and youth leaders of all countries, including those of Communist countries, in order to

obtain their views and opinions on many pressing problems and to cooperate in preparing for a better and more peaceful tomorrow.

Perhaps my own case is the best example I can cite to the youth of Italy, in order to impress them the threat to the individual under communism. Had I in my youth migrated to Russia, I would today either be dead or in a slave labor camp because I could never accept the denial of free speech, freedom of worship, and all other freedoms to which we are entitled as human beings. Only in America would I find the opportunity to rise from a humble beginning to become a judge and now a Member of the United States Congress, the greatest deliberative body in the world.

During all these years I have never lost interest in Italy, the land of my birth, and in its people. In World War II, I served as an intelligence officer in Italy. Since the end of the war, I have followed with utmost interest all developments in my ancestral home, its economic growth, the political parties, etc. I have watched with the deepest of interest the change to a republic, the development of free institutions, and the participation of the Italian people in their Government, in elections, and in every phase of life as free citizens.

It is my considered judgment that a two-party system is more preferable. It was the two-party system which has advanced the United States to the position it occupies today in world affairs, while countries having a multiple-party system have been relegated to an inferior position. Too many parties in a country are apt to cause confusion in the minds of the people regarding major issues, they account for disunity, and for all practical purposes it does not provide the government with the required strength and authority which it must have in its dealings with other nations.

I should not like to see Italy reach such a position in world affairs. There must be no confusion in the minds of the Italian people regarding their present problems and their hopes for the future. They must and can solve their own affairs in the interests of Italy and the people of Italy, not in the interests of Moscow and its power-hungry leaders.

It is for this reason that I call on the citizens of Italy, and especially on its youth, to express their support for freedom and democracy by casting their ballot for the Christian Democratic Party. This party is the greatest single force against communism in Italy today. A substantial victory for the Christian Democratic Party will enable it to form the kind of a government which will have the interests of the Italian people at heart, will better guide the destiny of Italy in the years ahead, and will add strength to the free world for a better tomorrow.

Citizens of Italy, the survival of your people as a free nation is at stake. Will you rise to the challenge? True friends of Italy all over the world will await your reply on May 25.

Foreign Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication addressed to all Members of the House of Representatives by Miles D. Kennedy, director of the national executive committee of the American Legion under date of May 16:

Referring to the proposed extension of the Trade Agreements Act, I enclose a copy of Resolution 41 adopted at the April 30–May 2, 1958 meeting of the national executive committee of the American Legion, our governing body between national conventions.

This resolution urges Congress to enact legislation and the Government to adopt a foreign trade policy that will prevent injury to and liquidation of industries essential to the defense and the economic welfare of our country.

We would appreciate it very much if this resolution could be given favorable consideration by you at the appropriate time.

The American Legion supports a truly reciprocal trade policy, one which will not do mischief to our economy and defense potential.

Barre Falls Dam Project Is Dedicated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the first flood-control dam and reservoir to be completed by the Army Corps of Engineers since the disastrous 1955 floods in New England was dedicated Friday at Barre Falls, Mass. The Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, was the principal speaker. I wholeheartedly agree with Secretary Brucker, who said in his speech that flood protection for the Connecticut River Valley must be prosecuted vigorously.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have printed in the RECORD news stories from the Springfield Daily News of Friday, May 16, and the Springfield Union on May 16, telling of the Barre Falls dam dedication, and including my statement on this event:

[From the Springfield Daily News]

BARRE FALLS DAM PROJECT IS DEDICATED—SECRETARY BRUCKER IS SPEAKER AT $2-MILLION RIVER CONTROL WORKS

BARRE, May 16.—Army Secretary Wilber M. Brucker said today that Federal flood-control work in New England must be prosecuted vigorously.

Brucker led a delegation of dignitaries attending today's dedication of the $2,030,000 Barre Falls Federal flood-control dam and reservoir. The Barre Falls complex is the first project finished under the Army Corps of Engineers New England flood-control program since the 1955 floods.

"In the light of the tremendous damages caused by the 1955 flood," Brucker said, "the Corps of Engineers is now engaged in another review of the flood-control needs in the New England area. We of the Army are convinced that flood protection for the Connecticut River Valley and other flood-producing basins must be prosecuted vigorously."

Brucker said flood-control problems in this area trace back to 1639, but it took the 1955 floods, claiming 90 lives and damage of half a million dollars, to revive interests in Connecticut Valley flood work.

He contrasted flood projects here with those in Russia, where 17 reservoirs on the Volga River already have been completed but done ruthlessly by excluding people by edict and without recompense from their homes in river flood plains.

Lt. Gov. Robert F. Murphy said the project adds so much to both the safety and scenery of this section of our Commonwealth.

He said all of about a dozen planned dam-reservoir projects are part of a needed and vital program designed to control floodwaters in the Connecticut River Basin and prevent any repetition of our flood horrors of 1955.

The Barre Falls dam rises 62 feet from the Ware River bed and stretches 885 feet. Three 48-foot high dikes, extending a total of 3,215 feet, straddle the river upstream from the dam. The dam controls a drainage area of 55 square miles, and the reservoir has a storage capacity of 7,900,000 gallons.

Thirty industrial plants, 300 homes, 62 business concerns, and 90 farms are within the project's shelter area. In the 1938 flood-damage in that area amounted to $4 million.

The dam is situated 32.7 miles upstream on the Ware River from its confluence with the Chicopee River at Palmer, and 49.8 miles above the junction of the Chicopee and Connecticut Rivers.

[From the Springfield Daily News]

BOLAND STRESSES SUCCESS OF FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS—UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE PRAISES WORK IN NOTING DEDICATION CEREMONY FOR BARRE FALLS DAM

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 16.—Representative EDWARD P. BOLAND, Democrat of Springfield, noted the dedication of the Barre Falls flood control dam and reservoir today and pledged his continued efforts to "help guarantee our valley against disastrous flooding."

A member of the all-important congressional Appropriations Subcommittee for Public Works which was responsible in providing funds for flood control projects, including Barre Falls, Representative BOLAND expressed regret that he was unable to attend the ceremonies. His Committee on Public Works met in session today.

ANOTHER STEP

The Second Congressional District Representative issued the following statement:

"The dedication of the Barre Falls flood control dam and reservoir today marks another step forward for providing flood protection for people and property along the Chicopee, Ware, and Connecticut Rivers.

"The Barre Falls Dam is another link in the chain to provide adequate flood control in the Connecticut and Chicopee River Basin. The harnessing of water by means of dams and reservoirs is the most effective way of guarding against the ravishes of floods.

"I am happy to note that the comprehensive plan for flood control in the Connecticut River Basin is now moving ahead at a pace that assures the completion of the plan in the not too distant future.

"We have witnessed and are now witnessing the effectiveness of controlling floods. The extremely heavy snows of the past winter, melting into spring freshets, have dumped millions of gallons of water into the river basins."

LITTLE DAMAGE THIS YEAR

"All of the cities and towns in our valley have felt the damaging results of uncontrolled floods in the past. This year's thaw of the mountain and high land snows produced little damage to the localities. A great dam, floodwalls and dikes have paid off to stop the flooding of property and danger to lives.

"As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Public Works, responsible for providing funds for flood control projects throughout the United States, I intend to continue to push for the completion of the plans for dams, reservoirs and dikes that will help to guarantee our valley against disastrous flooding."

[From the Springfield Union of May 17, 1958]

DEDICATE BARRE FALLS DAM AS FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT—ARMY SECRETARY WILBER BRUCKER HEADS NOTABLES AT CEREMONY PUTTING RESERVOIR IN SERVICE

BARRE, May 16.—Once the favorite picnic grounds of Barre folks, Barre Falls Dam was formally dedicated today by Secretary of the Army Wilber M. Brucker. The President's cabinet member said that the $2 million reservoir is the first step to helping people of the Ware and Connecticut Rivers valley to wipe out floods and disaster. The completed dam has been in operation since the first of the year.

FLOOD CONTROL PROGRAM

Barre Falls Reservoir is the initial unit in a comprehensive flood control program designed to control waters in danger periods in the entire Connecticut River watershed to prevent repetition of the floods of 1955, 1938 and 1936. The reservoir will provide protection to sections of the Ware and Chicopee River Basins within which are some 30 industrial plants employing about 5000 persons, 300 homes, 62 stores and commercial enterprises and 90 farms.

The dam and reservoir which will protect portions of the Ware and Chicopee River Basins, is the first such project to be completed by the United States Corps of Engineers as part of the reactivated New England flood control program. Construction of the project was supervised by the Springfield area officer of Army Engineers with Lane Construction Corp. of Connecticut as the contractor.

Greetings at the dedication ceremonies at 10 a. m. were extended by Lt. Gov. Robert F. Murphy of Massachusetts. Joining Secretary Brucker on the speaking program were Gen. Alden K. Sibley, Division of Engineers, United States Army, New England Corps of Engineers with offices in Boston; Maj. Gen. Sidney C. Wooten, commanding officer, Army Engineer Corps Reserve at Fort Devens and Lt. Gen. Blackshear M. Bryan, commanding officer, First United States Army, at Governor's Island, N. Y.

INDUSTRIAL PLANTS HIT

In the flood of 1936 there were damages estimated at $6.5 million on the Chicopee River and its tributaries below the present Barre Falls dam site. Losses to industrial plants and to individuals in the 1938 flood that preceded the hurricane was many more millions of dollars. It was pointed that flood damage was not too extensive in the Barre area in 1955, but that the disasters experienced in the Connecticut had their origin in tributary uncontrolled waters such as the Ware River.

The Barre Falls Reservoir will be operated along with five reservoirs constructed in the Connecticut River Basin by the Army engineers in the past 15 years and with flood protection works in Chicopee, Springfield, West Springfield, Hartford, and East Hartford, will help to prevent future great flood damages.

The Flood Control Acts of 1936 and 1938 authorized the construction of Barre Falls flood control project and in 1946 Congress appropriated $55,000 for the first planning of the reservoir. In 1956, $1,450,000 was appropriated for this project and work was started at once by the Army engineers. Ground breaking ceremonies were held on the site on June 15, 1956, with Maj. Gen. Charles B. Holle, Deputy Chief of the United States Army Engineers, principal speaker. Completion date was scheduled for December 13, 1957.

CONSERVATION POOL

In the event of flood the reservoir will hold back 8 billion gallons of water. In addition to serving as a flood control dam it can serve as a conservation pool, holding back water, and which could be diverted to the metropolitan district commission reservoir.

Serving as a gateway to the reservoir are two old mill wheels which were moved from the riverbed.

Rev. J. Marcus Murtough, pastor of St. Thomas-a-Becket Church of South Barre, asked invocation and the Rev. Edwin W. Alexander, pastor of Hast Congregational Church Ware, gave benediction. About 300 residents attended the dedication ceremonies. Among them were Ware and Connecticut River Basins town officials and the mayor of Chicopee, Walter J. Grocki.

John F. Shaw, vice president of the Chicopee Manufacturing Co., was chairman of the dedication committee and master of ceremonies. The Army band from Fort Devens furnished the music.

They Can't Run Your Farm From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Benson is resisting pressure to place price supports on livestock, made a great contribution to our farm economy and to the freedom of our farmers. Had Mr. Benson succumbed to this pressure, our livestock farmers would be in the same plight as the cotton, tobacco, wheat and corn farmers.

Years of Government regulations, price supports, redtape and regimentation has resulted in confusion and a substandard of living for many of our farmers. The time has come for a new farm program—one that will permit our farmers to use imagination, incentive, self-reliance, and the free enterprise concept.

The American farmer can compete in the markets of the world. He cannot compete in the world markets with regimentation, small acreage and the Federal Government breathing down his neck. The American farmer is, by nature, creative and ingenuous. Let us free him from his Government shackles and turn him loose.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend, Dr. Earl Butz, when he was Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, came down to the Union Station here in Washington and spoke to a breakfast meeting of South Carolina cattlemen. He made an eloquent speech and warned the cattlemen to fight against price supports and regimentation of the cattle industry. This was 4 years ago. Dr. Butz speech was timely and prophetic. Now, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Butz is again looking ahead. As Dean of Agriculture at Purdue University he has written an aricle for the Farm Journal which I commend to the Congress and to the country:

THEY CAN'T RUN YOUR FARM FROM WASHINGTON

(By Dr. Earl L. Butz)

I've been asked many times what impressed me the most when I served as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in the Nation's Capital from August 1, 1954, to July 31, 1957.

My answer is that, after 3 years of observing hard, hand-to-hand political infighting, after exchanging ideas and matching wits with Congressmen in committee hearings, after fighting my way through a tangled thicket of farm laws and regulations, after wrestling with staggering farm surplus, after personally discovering how unbelievably intense political pressures can become, after all this—my answer is that I learned you can't run agriculture from Washington. Nobody can.

The plain truth is that for almost a quarter of a century, we have fashioned a fantastic maze of Federal farm programs. Now 25 years and more than $25 billion later, these Federal farm programs are in a capital mess.

The program is supposed to bolster farm income. But income has declined in all but 3 of the last 11 years.

The program is supposed to protect farm and small town life. But farm dwellers have become fewer almost constantly during the last 10 years, and small-business men are hard pushed.

The program is supposed to keep the farmer free. But more and more farmers are being told by the Government how much to plant, how much to harvest and how much to sell.

Much of farm management itself has moved from the individual farm to the banks of the Potomac.

The program is supposed to limit production. But it doesn't. Uneconomic support levels piled up huge surpluses.

It's clear that political attempts—from Washington—to legislate farm relief haven't solved the farm problem. The Federal Government has "thrown the book" at farmers—extending through several Congresses, 4 or 5 Presidents, half a dozen Secretaries of Agriculture, and with both political parties in charge,

Yet we're still searching for the answer to the farm problem.

Why haven't we succeeded? Government programs try to help farmers by maintaining farm prices at artificial levels, and by restraining production and marketing. But about all this has done is dislocate production. It hasn't restricted it. Production has merely been shifted from some crops to others—mainly to feed grains that compete with corn.

Look what allotments have done: They ration your right to produce. And your ration has been getting smaller and smaller. This raises the cost of producing each bushel, bale, or pound.

Nor has the harm stopped there. A cotton farmer with a 3-acre allotment, a tobacco farmer with his half-acre "ration" or a wheat farmer who's allowed to grow only 60 percent of what he used to—each needs something besides 90 percent of parity. He needs an opportunity to expand, to get bigger, to grow, to do what he wants to do. His Government now prevents him from producing enough to make a decent living.

A young man who wants to raise wheat, cotton, tobacco, rice, or peanuts can start farming only by buying a farm with an allotment; or by inheriting a quota from his father or father-in-law. For all practical purposes, he must get a permit from his government to go into farming.

The answer to the farm problem is not more complex and costly Federal programs, especially when they bring on more regulations and restrictions.

What's the alternative? Our American economic organization is based on freedom of choice. When we have relatively free prices, the dollar bill is the ration ticket. Each

individual is issued tickets roughly in proportion to his contribution to society.

There's a strong urge for each person to get as many of these dollar tickets as he can. But when the government rations the right to produce or the right to consume, it is using a new yardstick to distribute such rights.

Politics dictate that we move in the direction of equal shares for everyone. Under this system our individual incentive to produce and grow is stifled. We get acreage allotments, based not on how good a farmer we are, or how energetic or how low our costs. But rather on some historical standard that impedes desirable adjustments to changing know-how.

In a free economy, the price system does the rationing, even though sometimes harshly. If we throw it overboard, we have one thing left: Governmental supervision of production and distribution—with somebody in Washington deciding who produces and who gets what.

We need a vigorous farm program, but we need the kind that has less dictation from Washington.

We need the four freedoms we all know so well. But we also need a fifth freedom that men have fought and bled and died for: The freedom to go where you want to, to earn what you want to, to produce what you want to, to do what you want to.

This is a precious freedom—one that we often lose when we go after this illusory thing called security.

It's a freedom that we on the farm lose when we try to run agriculture from Washington.

Decent Southerners Denounce Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the widespread interest in developments in the South, I wish to call the attention of the Congress to a presentation of the facts about Jews and non-Jews in the South and the recent synagogue bombings. This material is gratifying in that it makes known how decent people throughout the South have denounced anti-Semitism.

This material has attracted wide attention, particularly in the South. It has been reprinted in such important southern daily newspapers as the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, the Tampa (Fla.) Daily Times, the Norfolk (Va.) Ledger-Dispatch and Star, and others. It has been quoted in the U. S. News & World Report and elsewhere. It is a syndicated column by Milton A. Friedman, Washington correspondent of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, a news service that serves over 50 countries.

According to Mr. Friedman, the so-called Confederate Underground which dynamited synagogues in the South is repudiated by the many southerners who cherish the true Confederacy. According to the facts cited by Mr. Friedman, the Confederacy was actually less anti-Semitic than northern abolitionists. I wish to submit this report which describes popular southern indignation over the recent bombing incidents. Evidence of such indignation is encouraging to all those throughout the Nation, regardless of region, who cherish human rights and the American tradition.

CAPITAL SPOTLIGHT

(By Milton Friedman)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Millions of southerners sentimentally linked with the Confederacy are fighting mad. They are angered by the use of the name "Confederate Underground" by hoodlums dynamiting synagogues.

Southerners with authentic attachment to the old South are indignant that the new self-styled Confederates are giving the Confederacy a bad name. By dynamiting respected Jewish religious institutions, including synagogues founded many years ago, the unknown terrorists have offended southern sensibilities. Many who revere what is to them the dignity and grandeur of the former Confederacy are outraged.

Such sentiments have been voiced in newspaper editorials throughout the South. They have been reflected in official Washington by southern Members of Congress. Most southerners oppose the integration of Negroes in public education. But they see the bombing of synagogues as uncouth and inexcusable. To them, such violent anti-Semitism is alien to the southern tradition.

Senators from States where synagogue bomb incidents occurred have taken a stand. They are Senators HOLLAND and SMATHERS of Florida, KEFAUVER and GORE of Tennessee, and SPARKMAN and HILL of Alabama. They urged FBI action, suggesting that the conspiracy crossed State lines. But the United States Attorney General ironically cited States' rights arguments, claiming the FBI could not legally intervene.

Senator HOLLAND was especially moved. He personally talked with J. Edgar Hoover, urging the F.B.I. to aid local police in apprehending the synagogue attackers. Generally, southern legislators dislike Federal intervention in local matters. But agitators simply went too far when they lit bomb fuses in Jacksonville, Nashville, Birmingham, and elsewhere.

Governors, mayors, and police chiefs throughout the South would like nothing better than to expose the so-called Confederate Underground.

Chapters of such groups as the United Daughters of the Confederacy have indicated considerable embarrassment.

Southerners have mustered history books to support a case that the Confederacy was freer of anti-Semitism than the abolitionist North. There is evidence. Horace Greeley's abolitionist New York Tribune read like the Der Sturmer of its day. Anti-Semitism among abolitionists was such that the northern Jewish leader, Simon Wolf, sought action against these (anti-Semitic) manifestations * * * radiating from the highest official circles.

A scholarly Jewish study of the Civil War concluded that the volume of abolitionist anti-Semitism exceeded southern bias, and its proponents were sometimes men of stellar prominence.

An anti-Semitic harangue delivered in the United States Senate in Civil War days was such that the Jewish community of Washington held a mass protest meeting. The speech was made by Senator Henry Wilson, of Massachusetts. Gen. U. S. Grant, northern commander, was ordered by President Abraham Lincoln to withdraw an anti-Semitic order issued to troops. The anti-Semitism of Yankee Gen. Benjamin Butler was notorious. Jews under his command were court-martialed in the manner of France's Dreyfus trial.

Like Americans of all faith, Jews were found on both sides in the Civil War. Loyal to their region, the Jews of the South served the Confederacy to the extent that a Jew was Secretary of State and later actually premier of the Confederacy. He was Judah P. Benjamin. He is praised in the memoirs of Mrs. Jefferson Davis, widow of the Confederate President.

Moses Cohen Mordecai, of Charleston, S. C., operated one of the most famous blockade runners. Dr. Daniel de Leon was surgeon general of the Confederate Army. Abraham Charles Myers was quartermaster general.

The Memphis Daily Appeal reported in 1861 that the Israelites of Memphis are behind none in showing their devotion to the South, both by liberal contributions and by taking up arms in her defense.

At the Battle of Seven Pines, a 19-year-old Jewish youth, Albert Moses of North Carolina, seized the Stars and Bars from a dying flagbearer and rallied his company. He died heroically.

Judge A. T. Watts of Dallas wrote of Max Frankenthal of the 16th Mississippi Infantry. He said that Frankenthal, "a little Jew, had the heart of a lion. For several hours he stood at the immediate point of contact, amid the most terrific hail of lead, and cooly and deliberately loaded and fired, without cringing. I observed his unflinching bravery and constancy." Frankenthal later became a leader of the United Confederate Veterans.

Maj. Adolph Proskauer of Alabama was wounded several times. The Confederate ranks included many Jews. From North Carolina came six Cohen brothers. From Georgia, Raphael Moses and his three sons. The five Moses brothers enlisted in Georgia. The three Levy brothers of Virginia served under Robert E. Lee.

The history-conscious South is not ready to permit hoodlums to attack the places of worship of a group that participated in the Confederacy. Nor will the South allow its dream of past glory to be shattered by individuals with a Nazi mentality who hide behind the name "Confederate."

Federal Educational Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1958

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress know, the orbiting of Sputnik I resulted in the administration submitting to Congress a 4-year plan for Federal educational aid in the form of grants to States for scholarships, fellowships, and assistance to expand and improve the study of science, mathematics, and foreign languages. It appears that legislation to carry out the President's recommendation implemented with a more extensive basis of scholarships including the humanities, as well as science, may soon be reported by the House Education Committee and come up for House consideration.

I wish to address myself to what appears to me to be weaknesses in scholarship legislation which would be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. First, however, let me point up that the President proposed meeting the Soviet challenge and need for more highly trained scientists and engineers by other means as well.

His budget proposed $140 million for the National Science Foundation in 1959 of which $58 million, double the 1958 appropriation, was for research grants—most of which would be for projects carried on by university scientists and, as the President stated, would contribute importantly to the education of graduate students. The balance of $82 million, or 5 times the present amount, would go largely to expand high school and college science educational programs; also, to stimulate interest of able students in science careers, improving courses in mathematics and science and supplementing the training of teachers; also fellowship funds for highly qualified graduates and scientists for advance study.

Expenditures for basic research and research projects mostly by university scientists and educational aid to graduate students in addition are included in the budgets for the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and the Department of Defense. All these call for increased amounts over the 1958 appropriation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to return to a discussion of the President's so-called scholarship recommendations to authorize the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide grants to stimulate State, local, and private action. Principally, this Executive request is embodied in H. R. 10278 and was for matching grants to strengthen State school systems for improvement in the teaching of science and mathematics. Title I of the bill is for testing, counseling, and guidance of elementary or secondary schools—grades 9, 10, 11, and 12 in public or other nonprofit scools under an approved State plan. In addition, $7,500,000 for fiscal year ending June 30, 1959; $15 million for the year ending June 30, 1960; $22,500,000 for the year ending June 30, 1961; and $30 million for the year ending June 30, 1962, are authorized for financial assistance to able students in need at institutions of higher education.

Title II of the bill authorizes grants up to $15 million to strengthen, on a matching basis, programs by expanding State agency supervision of elementary and secondary science and mathematics courses. Also, it authorizes $150 million in grants on a matching basis to assist local educational agencies to improve teaching standards and increase the number of, and raise the pay of, science teachers; also, to provide laboratory equipment.

Title III is for grants for implementing the teaching of modern foreign languages. A National Advisory Committee on Foreign Languages would be established.

And title IV covers expansion of graduate education by providing for grants to institutions of higher education to expand graduate education for students who have their bachelor's or master's degree and desire a doctor's degree.

As stated, Mr. Speaker, this is supposed to be a temporary program but I do not believe any of my colleagues will be so naive as to honestly think the legislation will not be renewed.

Also, it should be emphasized the President pointed out that in harmony with the tradition of keeping the Federal Government out of educational matters, which are a State responsibility, he proposed that his program should not be overemphasized so that later on local educational systems could carry on. However, I predict that once a scholarship bill with all its ramifications is enacted, the program will grow and no one in Congress today will live to see it terminated in favor of the States. This is nose-under-the-tent legislation even though its objective is meritorious.

However, Mr. Speaker, aside from any such speculation, I wish to address myself to the merits or demerits of the administration Federal scholarship aid proposal. Frankly, scholarships as such seem to me to be the least undesirable form of Federal school assistance, and I could support a scholarship program. But, Mr. Speaker, my studied and most considered judgment, and the advice of thoughtful educators, does not confirm the fact that the provisions of H. R. 10278 are the answer to our problem which is more a need of quality than quantity of scientists as far as competition with the Soviets is concerned.

I wish every Member could read the testimony sent to the Committee on Education and Labor. I refer to a carefully thought-out letter and statement from Dean Harold E. Wessman of the University of Washington engineering department in which this educator discussed the educational aid program. He pointed up in this letter that most of those connected with engineering education have serious doubts whether the administration's program would raise the quality of technology in this country. Dean Wessman, incidentally, is not only dean of the largest engineering college on the Pacific coast, but also is secretary of the Engineering College Administrative Council which represents the deans of 150 engineering schools of the country. So, he speaks with some background and authority and points up the fact that 78,000 high school seniors enrolled as freshman students in engineering in the colleges of America last September. He says there is no need to increase this number. Rather, the need is to increase greatly the number of senior engineering students who go on into graduate study for master's and doctor's degrees. It is at the highest educational level, he states, that help is needed.

The statement of Dean Wessman called for 2,000 scholarships for engineering alone with annual stipends of $4,000 of which $1,000 should go to the university to cover tuition and incidental costs, all of which would be at relatively modest annual cost.

Place yourself—

Dean Wessman's letter reads—

In the shoes of the bright young senior engineer. He may want to enroll in graduate study, but has an offer from industry of $6,000 a year. He learns that a graduate fellowship or a teaching assistantship will give him $1,800 a year, if he can get one. Is it any wonder he accepts the industry offer?

In 1957—

The letter continues—

Five thousand two hundred master's degrees were awarded in engineering fields. Six hundred doctor's degrees were awarded. The number of master's degrees should be doubled. The number of doctor's degrees should be quadrupled.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, it will be seen that if the real need is to raise the quality of engineering in our country, then emphasis in any scholarship legislation enacted by Congress should be toward aid to graduates of our colleges rather than on undergraduate scholarships. An incentive to induce more bright seniors to enroll in graduate study for the master's program will result in greater numbers continuing on for the doctor's degree. I think an important aspect of our scholarship program is that industry has need of engineers with only a bachelors' degree, whereas young physicists and chemists know they must go on into advanced graduate work to succeed, so engineering scholarships are especially needed. In other words, title IV of the bill would seem to me to cover the objective of meeting Soviet ballistic missile and satellite scientific competition. I feel the States themselves can and should carry the rest of the program, especially elementary and secondary school aid.

As a layman and one who is opposed to any program which could lead to Federal intervention and control of education, I repeat my general view that scholarships are the least objectionable of any form of Federal support, and that I am prepared to vote for legislation to fill our technological deficiencies of an emergency caliber. But, I reserve the right to vote against any measure which only qualifies because it is extensive and expensive. The views of Dean Harold E. Wessman which I have cited supporting graduate fellowships as against large-scale undergraduate aid seem to me to be sound and I hope any scholarship bill that is reported out of the Education and Labor Committee will be modified in line with this thinking. As I said earlier, quality of scientists and engineers should be our objective, and the issue is not simply how much we spend—but how we spend what we do spend if we do spend.

The Great Shepherd of the Sheep

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following: Today in the city of Houston, Tex., a distinguished leader in the Southern Baptist Convention is delivering an address to the Pastor's Conference, an auxiliary of that great organization, which I believe would be of interest to the Members of the House. This ad-

dress is given by a former acting Chaplain of the House of Representatives, the Reverend James P. Wesberry, of Atlanta, Ga., pastor of the Morningside Baptist Church. Dr. Wesberry also has the distinction and the honor of being the president of the Georgia Baptist Convention. This sermon conveys the spirit of Christian compassion which characterizes this great and beloved minister.

The sermon follows:

THE GREAT SHEPHERD OF THE SHEEP—AN ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST PASTORS' CONFERENCE IN HOUSTON, TEX., ON MAY 19, 1958, BY JAMES P. WESTBERRY, PASTOR, MORNINGSIDE BAPTIST CHURCH, ATLANTA, GA.

In one of the most beautiful benedictions ever inspired by the Holy Spirit, Jesus is referred to as that great shepherd of the sheep. We find it at the close of the Epistle of the Hebrews: "Now the God of peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of an everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do His will, working in you that which is well pleasing in His sight through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory forever and ever. Amen."

There is no more beautiful figure in the Bible to represent God's thought and feeling for us than the shepherd's tender care over his flock. Sheepherding in our country, where flocks often number into the multiplied thousands, and where the shepherd rides horseback, and where he drives rather than leads his sheep, does not give us as good an idea of the love and tenderness as was conveyed to those to whom Jesus said, "I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd layeth down his life for the sheep."

The glory of the shepherd's calling is rooted deep in the history of Israel. Looking back over the history of mankind we find that the shepherd held a highly significant place in the framework of society. Today, the place of the shepherd is of minor importance. The shepherd's task may seem humble but to the shepherds came determinative religious revelations, and some of them provided the noblest religious leadership the world has ever known.

To the true Israelite tradition, no higher calling than that of shepherd was recognized. Abraham and Isaac were shepherds, so were Jacob, Moses, and David. It is truly significant that when Moses, the great hero of Israel, left the courts of Egypt and adopted the life of a nomadic shepherd, there came to him the revelation that was to influence his people's development more perhaps than any other single event in history. It was the man who was faithfully discharging his duties as a shepherd in the loneliness and dangers of the wilderness who was chosen to be the leader and pastor of God's people in the emancipation from slavery and their establishment as an independent nation. The keeper of the sheep in those days was so prominent a character that he became a type of the highest servants of God. The priest was called a shepherd, and so, also, was a prophet, and later a king. At last men dared to apply the title to God. Kings and princes, priest and prophets, came to be regarded as under-shepherds on earth serving one shepherd over all in Heaven. No title more plainly revealed to them the character of their relation to God than that which spoke of Him as a shepherd of Israel. In their difficulties they cried out: "Give ear, oh Shepherd of Israel, Thou that leadeth Joseph like a flock." And, Israel was taught to sing: "The Lord is my Shepherd, I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; he leadeth me beside the still waters. He restoreth my soul: He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake. Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for Thou art with me; Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me. Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of my enemies; Thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over. Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever." While there was a good shepherd in Heaven there was no good shepherd on earth. All the shepherds of Israel, one after another, proved disappointing. They failed to feed the flock. So, in turn prophets like Jeremiah, Ezekial, and Zachariah condemned them as hireling shepherds. "Woe unto the shepherds that destroy and scatter the flock of my pasture," saith the Lord. But the Hebrew heart did not despair. They dared to dream of an ideal shepherd who would surely come of whom the prophet wrote: "He shall lead His flock like a shepherd; He shall gather the lambs in his arms and carry them in His bosom and shall gently lead those that are with young".

And so when Jesus came, He was the Great Shepherd of the Sheep. The shepherd idea was often in our Lord's mind. No human calling seemed to Jesus so adequate to represent His own vocation within the divine purpose as that of the shepherd. No more elevated title is applied to Jesus anywhere in the New Testament than that which is the subject of this message, that Great Shepherd of the Sheep. His great heart was moved in spirt with compassion as He looked upon crowds of people in Galilee because, they fainted, and were scattered abroad, as sheep having no shepherd. To His eyes men were as sheep having no shepherd. They had gone astray like lost sheep. In the words of Isaiah, the 53d chapter: "All have gone astray, all have turned to their own way." And, in the first Peter, we read: "You were as sheep going astray; but are now returned under the shepherd and bishop of your souls." The sheep has not wittingly turned his back on the green pastures. Rather, he has kept his head down and followed his nose wherever it might lead him. He has taken no bearing; he has listened to no voice; he has simply been at the mercy of his appetites. So he finds himself lost, without direction and without hope. This describes the situation of multiplied millions of people today.

Christ told men repeately that He had been sent to the lost sheep of the House of Israel. As He thought of Himself in the world to come, seated upon the throne, with all of the nations assembled before Him, even then He is the Great Shepherd separating the sheep from the goats. "I am the Good Shepherd," He said. "The Good Shepherd layeth down his life for the sheep." When Peter, after the resurrection, received the final charge from the Great Shepherd of the Sheep, it was in these words: "Feed my lambs; tend my sheep." In other words, Jesus said to Peter: "Be a shepherd and do a shepherd's work."

The church loved the thought of the shepherd and dwelled upon it continually. One of the earliest Christian books of the second century, read in the churches, is entitled, "The Shepherd of Hermas." It was a shepherd whom early Christians loved to paint upon the walls of their churches or to chisel on the tombs of their dead. The shepherd idea appeals to all of us. Surely the most beloved of all the Psalms in all the world is the 23d Psalm. Multiplied millions of people have been moved and stirred by the pathos of the story of Jesus told of the 99 and the 1 lost sheep.

Never has there been a hymn written that touches the heartstrings as deeply as The Ninety and Nine:

"There were ninety and nine that safely lay
in the shelter of the fold,
But one was out on the hills away, far off
from the gates of gold—
Away on the mountains wild and bare, away
from the Tender Shepherd's care,
Away from the Tender Shepherd's care.

"But none of the ransomed ever knew how
deep were the waters crossed,
Nor how dark was the night that the Lord
passed through,
Ere He found His sheep that was lost—
Out in the desert He hears its cry, sick and
helpless and ready to die,
Sick and helpless and ready to die."

Almost every Sunday congregations sing The King of Love, My Shepherd Is, and Saviour, Like a Shepherd Lead Us. And, into our prayers as well as our hymns the shepherd idea has been woven. Many people find relief in the confession, "We have erred and strayed from Thy ways like lost sheep."

Nowhere do we find a more beautiful portrayal of the Great Shepherd of the Sheep than we do in the tenth chapter of John's Gospel. No words in any language can be compared in striking symbolism, in beautiful imagery and sublime simplicity to these spoken by Jesus as He describes Himself as the Good Shepherd. This is, indeed, one of the most beautiful chapters in the Bible. It is to the New Testament what the Twenty-third Psalm is to the Old Testament. No commentary or sermon could be more eloquent than this picture Jesus paints of Himself as the Great Shepherd of the Sheep. There is a unique relationship between the shepherd and his flock, a unique bond of tenderness, a very sacred and beautiful friendship.

Let us think of Jesus as the Great Shepherd of the Sheep and of ourselves as the sheep of His pasture. Let us say of Him, "The Lord is my Shepherd." Let us examine some of the qualities of the Great Shepherd of the Sheep. What kind of shepherd is He? And as we think of these qualities let us also bear in mind the relationship of ourselves, as pastors, to the sheep of our flocks. Every pastor will always want to be as much like the Great Shepherd as possible and will model his earthly ministry after His. Here are the secrets of a great pastor. Let us look at them and apply them to our own lives.

In the first place Jesus claims to be "the Good Shepherd", not "a Good Shepherd". There are many good shepherds, but Jesus says, "I am the Good Shepherd," as if to say, "I am the only Good Shepherd." He claims to a preeminent degree every quality that belongs to a shepherd's interest in his flock, watchfulness, tenderness, courage, love, so that he is the ideal, perfect shepherd. The word means more than good, in the sense of being morally excellent and inwardly fulfilling God's purpose that the sheep be shepherded. The expression "good" here means "fair", "lovely" and "beautiful". He stands before us infinitely lovely, perfectly fair, and draws the admiration of all who can appreciate beauty and admire that which is good.

Jesus appears in strong contrast to "False Shepherds" who "entereth" not by the door of the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same as a thief and a robber. "They are unworthy shepherds". The hireling is one of them. "He that is an hireling, and not a shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep and fleeth: and the wolf catcheth them, and scattereth the sheep. The hireling fleeth because he is an hireling, and careth not for the sheep." The hireling has a careless and irresponsible attitude. He has not experienced the joy of ownership with a sense of treasuring that which belongs to him. He has been hired to lead the sheep to pasture, not to fight the wild beasts. He

has no warmth, no passion, no readiness to go beyond that which is written into the contract. He has no real sense of obligation. He cares not for the sheep. All he wants is money. He seeks his own safety and welfare, not the sheep's. He feeds himself rather than the flock.

He is indifferent to the weak, to the sickly, the cripple, and to the straying. He exploits them to the very limit. The hireling is symbolized by the Pharisee, who gained his position by evil methods; like thieves, by violence; like robbers by hypocrisy and greed. They were false shepherds. They said, "we see," but they were blind. They did not know the way into the fold. Like the Pharisees there are some shepherds today who are not worthy. They feed themselves and not their flocks. They perform their duties mechanically rather than compassionately. They act as hired men. There are some preachers, no doubt, who are wolves in sheep's clothing. But the real sheep will not follow them, for they know not the voice of strangers. The Bible condemns worthless shepherds. The Bible says, "Woe to the worthless shepherd that leaveth the flock." But in contrast to these unworthy shepherds, is Jesus, the Good Shepherd, the Perfect Shepherd, that Great Shepherd of the sheep. He is the Good Shepherd, and he is the type of shepherd that every pastor would like to be of his people.

The Good Shepherd knows His sheep. "He calleth his sheep by name." He says, "I am the Good Shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine." He is with the sheep alone. He is their only companion. He knows them intimately. He has time to study them. He knows them from each other. He knows all about them. He knows each one of them. He knows each of their peculiar traits and characteristics. He knows each particular mark and spot on its fleece. He knows when such a one fell over a rock and broke its leg and he carried it home on his shoulder and nursed, bandaged, and brought it back to health. He knows when the wolves chased another and tore a gash on its flank. Thus alone, among desert hills, there comes to be deep, tender sympathy and understanding between the shepherd and his sheep. Between them is woven by night and by day, by summer suns and winter frosts, a living network of sympathy, and friendship. The shepherd comes to know the sheep and they know him. There is a mutual acquaintanceship, a mutual knowledge based on mutual recognition and love, "even as the Father knoweth me, and I know the Father." Such is the relationship which the pastor bears to his flock.

Each sheep has a name; some sheep have nicknames, as we do. We well know that people rather hear their own name than anything else in the world. They love to be called by their name, even by their first name. Some people are rather peculiar about their names, they do not want to be called by another name, and they do not like for their name to be mispronounced or misspelled. You and I may have difficulty in remembering names; but Jesus does not. He knows us before we know Him, He knows all about us, He says, "I know My sheep." If Jesus had not known His sheep, then how could He have missed one of them? How could He have missed one out of a hundred? The good shepherd counts and recounts his sheep. Thus it is that the good pastor usually knows his people; he knows them by name. And more than likely, he knows more people by name than any other person in his town or community.

The Great Shepherd of the sheep also cares for the sheep. This is one reason why He knows them so well, because He cares for them so greatly. The hireling cared not for the sheep. Jesus cares for them tenderly; He feels the burden of responsibility; He is deeply concerned, and is interested in the minutest detail of their lives. This is the purpose for which a shepherd exists, to care for his flock, to make up for their foolishness, by his knowledge, and for their weaknesses by his strength.

The Good Shepherd really cares for His sheep, that is the mark that distinguishes Him from all others who may in any way be related to the sheep. He takes a deep and intimate concern for them. One who cares for another takes the weight of the others' condition upon his own heart and bears it steadily and unflinchingly. One who cares has a deep regard which causes him to spend and be spent for another. To care is a costly thing. The Good Shepherd has a deeper interest in His sheep than a physician in his patient, than the teacher in his pupil, and even more so than a mother has in her child. From early morning until late at night the Tender Shepherd cares for His sheep and watches over them by day and night. He spends many sleepless nights; He carries them in His heart. From early morning until late at night He tends them; the lame, the diseased, the disabled, the aged, those that are with young, and the little lambs. When they come to the fold at night He refreshes them by rubbing oil on their heads, binds up their wounds, and sometimes He has to use a staff, or sling, or stone which is always good for the sheep. One of the great artists, Plockhurst, has painted a picture of the Good Shepherd bearing in His hands a little lamb, while the mother sheep, presses close against Him, looking up with anxious solicitude and love. This is a beautiful picture of how Christ cares for His sheep. He cares for them in all kinds of weather. He risks His own life to rescue them.

In a certain book a writer has a vivid sketch of some gypsies he met one stormy winter day, trudging along ankle deep in water, with hair plastered over their faces. One woman carried her baby on her back, wrapped in a shawl, while one man had a 3-year-old girl mounted on his shoulders. When asked if he had carried the girl all day nodded. "Are you not tired?", he was asked. The woman said, "He always carries her when the going gets rough." How true this is of the Good Shepherd. He always carries His sheep when the going gets rough. The Saviour bears with us, is patient, long suffering, and kind. He is a shepherd for love's sake and His love makes all burdens light.

A little lad was undergoing a surgical operation. It was impossible to give him chloroform due to his heart's weakness. His father asked him, "Do you think you can stand it my son?" The boy replied, "Yes, father, if you will hold my hand." There is no pain in suffering or sorrow which cannot be borne with strength and fortitude and peace, with the Good Shepherd to care for us. He bears the heavy load of our sins and of our sorrows because He cares for us. Where else in all the world do we find a more beautiful picture of the care which a pastor has for his people than we do here?

The Good Shepherd talks to His sheep, "The sheep hear His voice, for they know His voice—for they know not the voice of strangers." The sheep can distinguish between the voice of the Shepherd and strangers. His is a wonderful voice. He speaks in many ways to His sheep. Sometimes He speaks through the still small voice. He speaks through the Holy Bible, He speaks through nature, and He speaks through us.

He speaks through the great hymns, and in all of life's experiences, as His undershepherds, we voice His voice. We must listen for his voice, that we might speak to others.

"He speaks and the sound of His voice,
Is so sweet the birds hush their singing,
And the melody that He gave to me,
Within my heart, is ringing,
"And He walks with me, and He talks with me,
And He tells me I am His own;
And the joy we share, as we tarry there,
None other has ever known."

The Good Shepherd leads His sheep. He says ,"My sheep hear My voice, and I know them, and they follow Me." He goeth before them. The Shepherd is forever leading His sheep. The psalmist says, "He leadeth me beside the still waters," and "He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake." The Good Shepherd leads from the fold to luscious pasturelands, from green pastures beside the still waters, through valleys and shadows of death back into the fold at night. How does He lead them? He always leads them gently, tenderly, and lovingly. The Good Shepherd does not drive His sheep. He does not use a whip. He does not pull or tug them down with a rope or chain. He does not go behind to push them. But, ever before to lead them. A leader's place is in the front. The Good Shepherd is so attractive that His sheep follow Him. He has magnetic drawing power, and keeping close to Him, we can never lose our way. He is the guide who never falters, and He not only knows the way; but is the way.

A gentleman traveling in Syria stopped to watch three shepherds, who were at a well, watering their flocks. As the three flocks mingled together he could see no difference between them. He wondered how in the world the shepherds would ever get them properly separated. But, presently one of the shepherds stood forth and called out, "Men-ah," which in Arabic means, "Follow me," and 30 sheep immediately separated themselves from the mass of sheep and began following the shepherd down the hill. Then the second shepherd did likewise, and a second flock separated themselves and followed. While the third flock remained as unconcerned as if they had not spoken a word. The gentleman standing by was so astonished, that he stepped up to the third shepherd and said, "Would your sheep follow me if I called out?" The shepherd shook his head. "Give me your shepherd's cloak and crook, and let me try," the traveler said. And even though he put the turban around his head and stood forth and cried, "Men-ah!" "Men-ah!" not a single sheep stirred. They only blinked at him in the sunshine. "Do they follow anyone but you?" ask the traveler. "Only when the sheep is sick, then the silly creatures follow anyone," said the shepherd. What a true story this is. It is a sure indication that we are sick with the deadly disease of sin when we refuse to heed the voice of the great Good Shepherd, and go recklessly following strange voices in the dangerous ways of wickedness.

"He leadeth me! O blessed thought!
O words with heavenly comfort fraught!
What'er I do, where'er I be,
Still 'tis God's hand that leadeth me.
Sometimes 'mid scenes of darkest gloom,
Sometimes where Eden's bowers bloom,
By waters still, o'er troubled sea,
Still 'tis God's hand that leadeth me."

The good pastor leads his flock even as Jesus, that Great Shepherd of the Sheep, leads His sheep.

The good shepherd also feeds his sheep. "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want." He leads them into green pastures, and beside the still waters. He supplies their every need, they would starve to death without the shepherd. His wisdom and skill find for them the choicest pastures and the most re-

freshing streams. "Thou preparest a table before me." But God shall supply all of your needs according to His riches and glory through Christ Jesus, Our Lord. Yes, Jesus cares for His sheep and He wants them well fed. He said to Simon Peter, "Feed My sheep." He wants His sheep nourished. He desires that they be fed upon the truth. All of us who teach or preach have a part in feeding His sheep, and our humble prayer is that He may feed us that we may feed others the bread of life. Jesus says, "I am the Bread of Life, he that eateth this bread shall never hunger."

Then, too, the great shepherd of the sheep defends his sheep. "Neither shall any man pluck them out of My hand." He guards, defends, and protects them against all dangers. They are exposed to much hardship, many dangers, and to the extremes of heat and cold. They have to encounter the attacks of wild beasts—sometimes the very largest species—such as lions, wolves, panthers, and bears. You remember that David, as a shepherd, killed a bear and lion in the protection of his sheep. There are also many poisonous serpents and a shepherd has to keep a watchful eye on the paths. When the robbers and the thieves descend upon the flock the hireling flees, but the true shepherd remains and fights the enemy away. The shepherd is the protector of the flock. Thus we see that the great shepherd of the sheep gives protection and security to his sheep. He is the door. He says, "By Me, if any man enter in he shall be saved." He guards them carefully less any harm befall them. The wolves may howl, thieves may lay their strategems, lions may push and roar, and all of the evil forces of the universe may be hurled against the fold, but they are safe and secure from every harm and danger, and every foe. Tempests beat against the sheep in vain. Storms of adversity, and sorrow may rage, but "No man is able to pluck them out of the shepherd's hands."

The Great Shepherd of the sheep loves the sheep sacrificially; He lays down his life for them. He suffers, bleeds and dies, that they might have life. "I lay down my life for the sheep." "Greater love hath no man than this than that a man lay down his life for a friend." "I am come to seek and to save that which was lost." The Good Shepherd gives his life for the sheep. He loves his flock so devotedly, that he submits himself to every humiliation for their sakes. He makes of himself no reputation, takes upon himself the form of a servant and is found in the likeness of man. He humbles himself and becomes obedient unto the death—even to death on the cross. Yes, Christ died because he cared for the sheep. He cares for the sheep far far more than He cares for himself. His death was needful for the redemption of the world. The New Testament goes much further than the Old Testament. The psalmist never thought of the shepherd giving his life for the sheep. This is the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ.

He is the seeking Shepherd. He is not willing that any should perish. If one is lost or strayed away from the fold, He will go and seek that wandering sheep until it be found. The great artist, Sourd, has painted a picture entitled "The Lost Sheep." A friend of mine reproduced it and gave it to me. It hung in my home for many years. It is a picture of the night; the canyon depths are still sleeping in the darkness, and dawn is barely tipping over the mountain rim. All night long the Shepherd has been in search of the lost sheep; its piteous cries at last are heard as they echo through the caverns. Vultures are seeking for their prey. The poor sheep is caught in the brambles upon the ledge of a rock. It is impossible for the sheep to escape without help. The Good Shepherd has come and he leans far out over the precipice to rescue the lost sheep. His face is unseen in the painting, but His character and love is revealed in his posture. He leans far over to risk His own life to rescue the lost sheep. No dangers are too great for Him to run. He says, "What man of you having a hundred sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and go after that which is lost till he finds it?" And, calls his neighbors and friends saying, "Rejoice with me; for I have found my sheep which was lost."

One sheep is not many, but it is one. With 99 safe in the fold, why should the shepherd care about 1? But to him one is of infinite value. It makes no difference if there are a thousand or 10,000 in the fold, as long as 1 is lost, he must go in search of it, until it is found. No man can say, "God does not love me" but rather he must say, "He loved me and gave Himself for me." It matters not how the sheep was lost, whether he intended to be lost or not, whether he went on nibbling away taking the wrong path, or wandered carelessly away. When the alarm is sounded, the Great Shepherd goes in search of it until it be found. "He giveth His life for the sheep." No matter where people are lost amid the mountains of sins, or what deadly wolf or lust or passion is pursuing them to destruction, the Good Shepherd is ever seeking them. If they will, they may be saved. He says, "I am the Good Shepherd, I lay down My life for the sheep." No risk is too great and no peril will ever keep Him from seeking the sinner. Scarred and bleeding from the cross where He suffered for us, He comes to lift all lost sinners on His shoulders to bear them home to God with the joyful cry, "Rejoice with Me, for I have found My sheep that was lost."

St. Francis saw a mountaineer in the Alps risk his life to save a poor lost sheep. He said, "O God, if such was the earnestness of this shepherd in seeking for a mean animal, which had probably been frozen on the glacier, how is it that I am so indifferent in seeking my sheep?"

Let us, like that Great Shepherd of the sheep and the good pastors which we want to be, go in search of the lost until they are found. And, in so doing may we receive this beautiful benediction from Jesus. "Now the God of Peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus that Great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of an everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do His will, working in you that which is well-pleasing in His sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.

The Achievements of TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the 25th anniversary of the TVA, I ask unanimous consent that the following article by Mr. Miles McMillin, entitled "The Achievements of TVA," be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF TVA
(By Miles McMillin)

John Gunther once said: "Quite possibly the TVA is the greatest single American invention of the century, the biggest contribution the United States has yet made to society in the modern world."

If TVA were just an idea—and not the reality it is—Gunther might find his evaluation accepted these days even at the White House. The Eisenhower administration has shown that it is sufficiently impressed with TVA to export the idea to foreign lands. But to President Eisenhower TVA in actual operation at home is a disease called creeping socialism which should be treated with applications of old-fashioned power trust snake oil bearing the Dixon-Yates label.

The paradox of TVA is that, while we proudly export its principles, it is the one New Deal achievement which has to continue to fight at home the hammer blows of those who have long since accepted, in varying degrees, the other accomplishments of perhaps the most socially creative era in our history. Hardly a session of Congress goes by that the friends of TVA do not have to ward off another attack. And the propaganda campaign, organized and financed by the power trust to persuade the American people that what has made the Tennessee Valley livable is communism or worse, continues unabated, day after day, year after year.

The reason is simply that TVA produces and sells electric power at prices people can afford to pay.

The other functions of TVA—flood control, navigation, fertilizer development, recreation, soil erosion control—have come to be accepted. But the power program is still treated as if it were proscribed by the Ten Commandments.

When Louis V. Sutton, chairman of the board of the Carolina Power & Light Co. submitted a statement for the United States Chamber of Commerce last year to the Senate Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors opposing legislation to give TVA authority to issue its own revenue bonds, he was careful to distinguish between TVA's power and nonpower functions:

"TVA," he said, "should conduct only its authorized nonpower functions. The TVA power facilities should be transferred to local ownership and operation. This transfer should include transmission lines, steam plants, and hydroelectric plants at TVA dams, but not the dams or other related river control facilities."

What Sutton almost said right out loud was that TVA is a great idea if the utilities can have the power produced by the dams. The more closely the anti-TVA propaganda is examined, the more clear it becomes that the utilities have only one aim in their attacks: to get their hands on the power-producing facilities of this great public asset.

The enemies of TVA have not always been willing to grant the wisdom and legitimacy of its nonpower functions. In the earlier stages of the fight against TVA, the utilities were willing to finance any argument that would discredit TVA—almost to the point of defending the anopheles mosquito whose life has been made more difficult by TVA's malaria control program.

One of the earliest campaigns against TVA—then under the chairmanship of Arthur E. Morgan—was an attempt to persuade the public that the multiple-purpose dams could not do all the things they were constructed to do. Numerous authorities were cited in an effort to prove that flood control and navigation were not compatible with power production, but enthusiasm for this argument waned under the weight of contrary evidence.

As late as February 1948, TVA's detractors were praying for a great flood in the valley—the kind that in pre-TVA days regularly ravaged the countryside. On February 15 of that year the Associated Press carried a story out of its Atlanta bureau saying: "On the Tennessee River the floodwaters were too much for the great dams set up by the TVA.

The huge reservoirs filled and the water was released to rush over the low country."

Anti-TVA papers whooped up the story, bellowed for photographs—and then settled back into a deep funk when the AP's Atlanta bureau contritely explained it had not bothered to check rumors concerning the flood-breeding rains in the valley. Actually, as the New York Times reported, the "great reservoirs of Norris, Cherokee, Douglas, Fontana, and Hiwassee on the tributary streams, took all the water that was poured into them and had plenty of room left. By this means the flood crest at Chattanooga was cut 10 feet with an estimated saving of $6 million."

TVA's flood control program has succeeded because it has adhered faithfully to the mandate of Congress to regulate the streamflow primarily for the purpose of promoting navigation and controlling floods. While private power companies must necessarily give primary empasis to power production, power production by TVA must be consistent with the operation of its dams for flood control and navigation.

As the flood season (late December to early April) approaches in the Tennessee Valley, the TVA dams are controlled to reserve 12 million acre-feet for water storage. Near the end of the flood season the reservoirs are allowed to fill and are fed out during the dry season for power production and stabilization of navigation. The average annual benefit from flood reduction is estimated at more than $11 million. In February of 1957 the valley had its second largest flood of record. TVA's control of the water prevented damage of an estimated $66 million. TVA has helped also to control floods along the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, into which the Tennessee's waters flow.

The 630-mile navigation channel is a national investment, making the Tennessee part of a 19-State 9,000-mile inland waterway. Sixty-eight percent of the shipping is either from outside or destined for outside the TVA region. In 1933 traffic on the Tennessee was 33 million ton-miles. In 1956 it was about 2 billion ton-miles. Transportation savings, now $20 million a year, return over 10 percent on net navigation investment when measured against the cost of maintaining and operating the waterway.

This is a success story that the foes of TVA cannot ignore. If the late George Norris and the others who dreamed the TVA dream had not tacked on the authority to produce power, TVA would be as acceptable today as Federal bank deposit insurance. But they had the practical idea that as long as dams had to be built, the power potential should be used for the benefit of the people who were paying for the dams.

The nonpower functions have changed the history of the valley. But it is the power program which is primarily responsible for raising the productive level of the region. And it is the power program that has made TVA the target of one of the most relentless propaganda campaigns in the history of the Nation.

TVA power has not only changed the way of life for millions within the seven-State region it serves; its price yardstick has jutted out of the valley to drive down the rates for other millions of consumers served by the private power companies.

TVA power is distributed by 151 distributing systems, 149 of which are publicly or cooperatively owned. In fiscal 1957 they sold 15½ billion kilowatt-hours and earned revenues of $163 million, of which $25½ million was net profit.

There are 1,460,000 customers buying TVA power for the use of 4 to 6 million consumers. In the pre-TVA era, the private power companies served 275,000 in the same area. The average annual consumption of electric power in valley homes has jumped from 600 kilowatt hours to 6,000—twice the national average. The price has dropped from an average 5.7 cents per kilowatt-hour to 1.2 cents, less than half the national average of 2.6 cents.

Less than four percent of the valley farms were electrified when TVA's turbines started rolling and its first highlines leaped the mountains. Today 95 percent have electricity. The customers of these rural co-ops are buying power at less than 5 mills per kilowatt-hour. Except for the Pacific Northwest, where Bonneville, and Grand Coulee are transforming the energy of the mighty Columbia, this is the lowest rural electric rate in the Nation.

TVA power has made the valley a strategic defense area for the Nation, accounting in large measure for the rapid expansion in steam-produced power. More than half (57 percent) of TVA's power goes to the atomic energy projects at Oak Ridge and Paducah. It is estimated that this power at private utility rates would cost the Atomic Energy Commission from $50 to $60 million more each year than it pays to TVA. The Air Force wind tunnel plant at Tullahoma is supplied by TVA, as is the Redstone missile program. Huge amounts of aluminum and chemicals vital to the defense program are produced by private industry using TVA power.

It is worth speculating, considering the power shortage of World War II, whether the United States would have taken the lead in the development of atomic energy had not the power facilities of TVA and the Columbia River program been available to pour out the staggering amounts of electricity needed for the Oak Ridge and Hanford projects.

The utility propaganda which seeks to inspire sectional jealousy against TVA is always careful to hide from the American people this monumental record of service to the defense program of the whole Nation. Also ignored in these sectional appeals are the expenditures made by TVA with industry located outside the valley. In the years 1934–56 TVA made purchases of $1,024 million from businesses located outside of the 7 States in the TVA area. Almost a billion has gone for manufactured articles. Here is where some of the money went: Pennsylvania, $311 million; New York, $156 million; Ohio, $127 million; Illinois, $112 million; Wisconsin, $60 million.

Add to that the $1,750 million the users of TVA power have spent on appliances—most of them manufactured in other States—and you get a fair notion of how TVA is helping business in the rest of the country. Workers in Milwaukee and Schenectady are living better because farmers in the Tennessee Valley are living better.

No assessment of what TVA has done for the country as a whole would be complete without mentioning what has happened to the valley's tax contribution to the Federal Government since TVA lifted it to a level more comparable with the rest of the Nation. In 1933, 3.4 percent of total Federal individual income-tax collections came from the 7 States which embrace the TVA region. Recent studies show the proportion of tax contribution has almost doubled. During the 1933–56 period $21,900 million was collected. At the 1933 rate only $12,200 million would have been collected. That $10 billion difference is almost 5 times the amount the Government has invested in all of TVA's functions.

If TVA is doing these things for the Valley and for the rest of the Nation, then why the incessant campaign to wreck it? Has TVA done so much damage to the private utilities that they should continue to spend millions of their customers' dollars in a campaign to destroy it?

TVA has forced the utilities to sell power more cheaply, it is true. In 1932 some of the highest electric rates in the Nation were paid in the TVA area cities, according to studies made of cities of 50,000 population and over. By 1956 the situation was reversed. In cities of 50,000 and over, the lowest rates are now in the TVA area and the area serviced by the Bonneville program. The influence of these two great public power projects is shown by the fact that rates get progressively higher as the distance from TVA or Bonneville increases.

Significantly, the private utilities in the areas bordering TVA have not been hurt. They have found that the TVA theory of power distribution works profitably for them. As they reduced rates under the impact of the TVA "yardstick," they reaped the financial benefits of the resulting increase in demand. Studies of the period 1937–1955 show that earnings available to common stockholders of the big profit utilities across the country multiplied by less than three times—yet companies bordering TVA multiplied similar earnings 6½ times.

The utilities claim that TVA is unfair because it is subsidized. If the utilities themselves weren't subsidized by the Federal Government on a scale more staggering than TVA, this argument might have some appeal to fair-minded citizens. The truth is that under the fast tax writeoff policy the utilities have been handed subsidies over a 2-year period that exceed the total investment in TVA in more than a quarter of a century.

The Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee recently issued a report quoting R. C. Rainwater, chief accountant of the Federal Power Commission, as saying that the tax writeoff policy has benefited utilities in the 1955–57 period by $2,621,318,000. The report made it clear that consumers receive no benefits from these subsidies, because of Government rulings that they need not be passed on in decreased rates.

Are these tax write-offs subsidies? Let Walter H. Sammis, president of the Ohio Edison Co., a large utility with offices in Akron, Ohio, testify. Sammis appeared before a Senate subcommittee in opposition to the bill to allow TVA to issue bonds to help finance its operations. Senator ROBERT KERR, Oklahoma Democrat, was presiding. The following exchange took place:

"Mr. SAMMIS. It should be the policy of the Federal Government to cooperate with taxpaying businesses and to encourage their participation to the fullest extent in the power features of water resources instead of engaging in unfair competition through the advantages of Government subsidies.

"Senator KERR. Let's talk about Government subsidies. Has your company received any certificates of accelerated depreciation [tax write-offs]?

"Mr. SAMMIS. Yes, sir.

"Senator KERR. How much?

"Mr. SAMMIS. $46 million as of February 28, 1957."

There followed several minutes of argument about depreciation formulae and other matters and Senator KERR returned to the tax write-offs.

"Senator KERR. I asked you if that was in the form of Government subsidy?

"Mr. SAMMIS. Oh, surely.

"Senator KERR. That is all I asked you.

"Mr. SAMMIS. That is right. Surely. I am sorry. I didn't get your point earlier."

Senator KERR commented that the utilities really have no objection to subsidies as such. Their complaint seems to be that others get bigger subsidies. The testimony of the Federal Power Commission's chief accountant would seem to indicate that if anyone has cause to claim discrimination in the matter of subsidies, it is TVA.

TVA's power operations are often criticized by the power trust as unsound and unbusinesslike. But when the critics are examined on this point they are usually found retreating to another point which permits them to make vague charges about

socialism or to cry out that TVA pays no taxes or interest.

By law, TVA's power operations have to be self-supporting and self-liquidating. The record shows that the law has been obeyed. Gross power revenues from 1933 through fiscal 1957 amounted to $1,474,000,000, of which net revenues amounted to $424 million.

Here is a summary of TVA's power operation through fiscal 1957:

	Millions of dollars 1933 through 1957
Revenue	$1,474
Expense:	
Operation and maintenance	736
Taxes	46
Depreciation	268
Total expense	1,050
Net income before interest	[1] $424
Investment assignable to power (24-year average)	$442
Annual return on investment (24-year average) (percent)	4

[1] Of the $424 million net income before interest shown above, $10 million has been used to pay interest on bonds, $65 million has been used to retire bonds, and $175 million has been paid into the Federal Treasury as an offset to appropriations previously made. The remainder, $174 million, has been reinvested in power facilities.

From a cold business viewpoint, Uncle Sam's stockholders would have a difficult time finding a better investment.

The law imposes on TVA another obligation—one that distinguishes its power operations from the exclusive profit motive of the private utilities. TVA's objective is the widest use of electricity at the lowest possible price to consumers. This aim is achieved by utilizing more economical sources of power and by keeping operation and maintenance costs below the national average of the industry. The distributors of TVA's power also operate at costs far below those of other utilities. As the use of electricity by consumers goes up, the cost per kilowatt-hour of delivering it goes down. Many of the distributors have been able over the years to reduce rates.

The utility industry insists that these low rates are made possible because of TVA's tax exempt status. This is the argument most frequently made in the propaganda of the utilities. Of course, TVA pays no income taxes to the Government. Income taxes are based on profit and all of TVA's profits belong to the Government—not just the part paid in taxes by the private companies. TVA's net income in fiscal 1957, after allowance for the cost of money to the Government at 2½ percent, was approximately $21 million. Uncle Sam claims all of it. If it were the income of a private utility, the Government could claim only half of it, in the form of income taxes.

If TVA had been privately owned over the last 24 years, it would have paid Federal income taxes of about $170 million. TVA earned $424 million—a 4-percent return on the investment. The average cost of money to the Government over this period was 2 percent. Had that rate of interest been charged against the power investment, it would have amounted to half the 4-percent return, or $212 million, leaving a margin of $212 million for the Government. This is $45 million more than the $170 million that would have been paid in taxes under private operation.

Despite the sweeping claims that TVA pays no taxes, it does pay local and State taxes or tax equivalents. They amounted to $4,744,000 in fiscal 1957. Its distributors paid $7,646,000 in taxes or equivalents in 1957. In 1937, when power in the TVA area was distributed by private companies, taxes paid to local and State governments by the utilities amounted to $3,350,000. The total under public ownership in 1957 was $12,390,000. In the intervening 19½ years the increase in State and local taxes was 270 percent. In roughly the same period the State and local taxes paid by private utilities across the Nation increased by 232 percent—a difference of 38 percent in TVA's favor.

Furthermore, the utilities' argument that the difference in tax payments accounts for the difference in rates doesn't stand up in the light of practical experience. Two of TVA's distributors are private utilities, selling power at the same low rates as TVA's publicly owned distributors. Yet they are able to make a profit just as if they bought power from private sources for resale at presumably higher rates.

If a lot of water has been spilled over TVA's dams in the last quarter of a century, it is perhaps exceeded in quantity only by the volume of words that have been spilled attacking and defending TVA. TVA has endured, not because the words of the defenders have been wiser or more forceful. Its own record of achievement for the people of the valley and the people of the Nation is its stoutest shield. The avalanche of utility propaganda has not been able to dent that record. It has stood up through 5 years of an administration which has been steadily probing for weaknesses—indeed, has tried to create some.

This record was made possible because TVA produced power at prices people can afford to pay. If its power program is allowed to be pillaged and turned over to the profit utilities, TVA's service to the people of the valley and of the Nation will be ended. But, more than that, its service to democracy would be destroyed. For TVA has come to mean something to the rest of the world. It was best expressed by the people of the valley who belong to the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association in a letter to President Eisenhower in April of 1957:

"TVA is more than a regional agency—more than just a Federal power system. It is an international symbol to people of free nations all over the globe—a symbol of democratic methods and democratic ingenuity and enterprise applied to one of mankind's most challenging problems—how to develop natural resources for the benefit of the most people. TVA carries a vital international message—a message that people from all over the world can see and study and carry home to their own lands."

Our Salute to Israel: May She Grow From Strength to Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I proudly insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Our Salute to Israel" appearing in the Detroit (Mich.) Jewish News of April 25, 1958, whose editor and publisher is Mr. Philip Slomovitz, my good friend and a distinguished author and newspaperman:

OUR SALUTE TO ISRAEL: MAY SHE GROW FROM STRENGTH TO STRENGTH

Humbly, with a sense of pride in the Jewish State's achievements, conscious of the great humanitarian objective inherent in Israel's rebirth, we salute the Israelis. May they acquire peace speedily, may their economy grow, and may their people hold fast to that courage and dignity which has elevated their autonomous State to a position of international significance.

Israel's accomplishments are manifold. Out of an inexperienced people has developed an able and effective diplomatic force that plays its role well on the international scene, within the framework of the United Nations.

Its population has grown from 650,000 in 1948 to nearly 2 million today—its immigrants having come from East Europe, from Moslem countries, from lands of oppression. The new settlers now possess the freedom of citizenship in a land they can call their own. The homelessness of hundreds of thousands has ended, no longer are they persecuted, now they can strive for peace and for the dignity of man on a par with free men everywhere.

Israel has established a vast network of industries. She has expanded her educational system and she is proudly developing higher schools of learning and scientific research projects.

American Jewry has good cause to be especially proud of the share it is playing in Israel's upbuilding and development. We have contributed, through the United Jewish Appeal, for the settlement and integration of immigrants into Israel's economy. We have assisted in establishing new industries, through the purchase of Israel Bonds and by means of private investments. We have redeemed the land through the Jewish National Fund and have made Israel a healthy area through Hadassah media.

This work goes on. We dare not stop in the middle—for, Israel is in the midst of completing her task of acquiring self-sustainment. Our greetings, our expressions of pride, must, therefore continue to be expressed in the form of continued devotion to the Allied Jewish Campaign—the major fund-raiser for Israel; to the Israel Bonds and other efforts in support of Israel.

We greet Israel with confidence that American Jewry will honor the obligations we have accepted as the partner in Israel's upbuilding. May Israel's growing stature soon be silhouetted in a peacefully brightened world.

JEWISH PUBLICATION SOCIETY'S 70TH ANNIVERSARY

This Sunday, the Jewish Publication Society of America will mark its 70th birthday, at the annual meeting to be held in Philadelphia.

It is an event to be marked on the calendar of activities of every Jewish community in America and by English-speaking communities elsewhere.

This is the major nonprofit Jewish publishing movement in the land. While there are a number of private Jewish publishing ventures, and several of the theological seminaries also sponsor the publishing of books of Jewish value, the Jewish Publication Society of America specifically functions for the purpose of making available to English-reading Jews the outstanding Jewish classics, the Bible in improved and accepted translations, works dealing with Jewish history, the best in fiction, poetry, sociology, and philosophy.

Because it is nonprofit-making and was organized specifically for the purpose of providing the best works in Jewish literature, the members of the society benefit from the venture and secure the membership books at low costs.

The importance of the society lies in its pioneering efforts. It sponsored the first traditional translation of the Bible 30 years ago and is now in the process of producing a revised translation of the Bible in English.

It introduced Israel Zangwill to the Jewish reading public and it made available the English translation of the Heinrich Graetz's "History of the Jews." It published Prof. Louis Ginzberg's "Legends of the Jews," and the histories and essays of Simeon Dubnow. It made available scores of other outstanding Jewish classics.

These efforts have placed the Jewish Publication Society in the position of being one of the major important culture-sponsoring movements in America. They have earned for the society the support of every American Jew.

Under the leadership of the Society's president, Edwin Wolf II, many important new projects have been undertaken.

Together with Farrar, Straus, & Cudahy, the society is publishing a number of children's publications, in the series that is being popularized as Covenant Books.

Another very commendable undertaking is the new series of paperbooks, published cooperatively with Meridian Books. Already, the Jewish Publication Society, together with Meridian, have reprinted three outstanding Jewish Publication Society classics—"A History of Mediaeval Jewish Philosophy" by Prof. Isaac Husik, Students, Scholars, and Saints by Prof. Louis Ginsberg and For the Sake of Heaven by Dr. Martin Buber.

These efforts show initiative and an understanding of the needs of American Jewry, and the Jewish Publication Society continues through these means to endear itself to English-reading Jewries everywhere.

On the occasion of the Society's 70th anniversary, we renew again the appeal we have made previously for at least 100,000 members in this movement. The present membership of 10,000 represents a strong element of support for the Society, but it would be to the greater glory of American Jewry if the response to the Society's needs would be at least tenfold.

We congratulate the Jewish Publication Society on its anniversary and wish it increasing strength in the months and years to come. And we wish for American Jewry that it, too, should share in such growing cultural status by a mounting interest in the society's worth and values.

Nuclear-Powered Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding Member of this body, our colleague from California, the Honorable CRAIG HOSMER, has written a revealing article entitled "Nuclear Power for the Navy" for the United States Naval Institute proceedings.

Mr. HOSMER is a commander in the United States Naval Reserve and is an articulate authority on nuclear energy as a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

I commend this article to your attention. The article follows:

NUCLEAR POWER FOR THE NAVY
(By Comdr. CRAIG HOSMER, United States Naval Reserve)

Fast becoming a reality is a powerful new nuclear-powered United States Navy—a Navy backboned by atomic-bomb-carrying 85,000 ton super-carriers, fast striking guided-missile cruisers and destroyers, and specially designed submarines for high-speed attack, hunter-killer, radar-picket, guided-missile and other new missions.

Already more than $2 billion have been spent or programed for research, development, and construction of such a Navy. The table on page A4599 sets out what is on hand and what is on order. Another $500 million a year for at least 8 years ahead will be needed to bring it into full being.

It began in 1948 with a small but ambitious joint Navy-Atomic Energy Commission program aimed at submarine nuclear propulsion and later expanded to include design and development of a full spectrum of naval nuclear propulsion plants for new naval construction from small submarines to the largest aircraft carriers.

By early 1954 the basic question of feasibility of naval nuclear propulsion was affirmatively answered by successful completion of all critical tests of the *Nautilus* land-based prototype plant. That answer made possible continuous cruising at top speeds, unlimited cruising radii, and practically absolute freedom from fuel logistics. It has revitalized the role of seapower in geopolitics.

At the beginning of naval reactor development 10 years ago, even the most imaginative nuclear propulsion enthusiasts hardly foresaw such a future. Nor did even the most practical amongst them envisage the full scope of difficulties ahead. Neither the technical problems nor their solutions were well understood. In fact, many of the problems were not even known.

The task was to devise a safe, reliable plant within naval space and weight limitations. It began with an examination of various possible reactor cycles. Gas-cooled reactors were discarded as involving too much space and too many technical problems. Other types were in turn rejected for various reasons. Finally left as promising to meet naval requirements were but two: a reactor utilizing liquid sodium as its coolant, or one utilizing pressurized water.

Liquid sodium seemed to offer the best approach because it permitted high steam temperatures and pressures, with consequent greater efficiency. But the physics and chemistry of liquid sodium were little known and insurmountable development problems might be encountered. Although pressurized water involved lowering steam temperatures and pressures, more was known of the characteristics of water. That could mean fewer problems of basic research and faster development of the plant.

Decision was made to pursue both approaches and preliminary design began. So dissimilar are the physics and chemistry of water and sodium that in effect two simultaneous but essentially independent projects were involved. Both were carried successfully through land prototype and shipboard installation stages.

Liquid sodium leakage problems appeared in the *Seawolf's* land prototype plant which were not in themselves insurmountable. However, they were considered in combination with other factors in an eventual decision favoring the *Nautilus'* pressurized water type reactor system as the accepted approach to practical naval nuclear propulsion.

The men who carried on the work had no experience or rules of thumb to guide them. No power reactor had ever been designed before. They had no science of reactor technology to apply to the job. They created it as they went along.

From the beginning they applied a "can of worms" description to their work, for each component and function of a nuclear power plant, from the reactor vessel through the turbine and all auxiliaries, are wholly interrelated and interdependent.

For example, raising turbine exhaust temperature or back pressure in a conventional plant is felt primarily in fuel economy. Such a reduction in thermal efficiency in a nuclear plant affects each of its complex components. The necessary increase in heat output requires size, capacity, and weight increases in the condensate, feedwater, and heat-generating systems, and equipment. Size of the reactor, steam generator, coolant system and auxiliaries is increased. Proportionate increases in radiation shielding must follow. These in turn affect the size, design, and characteristics of the hull into which the plant is to be placed, or, as a practical matter, thrust back upon the plant designer the necessity of selecting every characteristic of design in relation, not only to each function and component of his plant, but in relation to hull space and weight limitations as well.

Development of the two original naval, nuclear reactor plants, and to only a slightly lesser extent today's plants, involves creation not only of the total concept, but individually of each of its components. It demands tremendous and concurrent basic research into unexplored fields of the new science. Maximum assurance that all parts individually will work and that they will work as a unit when coupled together, and function with a high degree of safety, dictates what might otherwise be wasteful overdesign and overtesting.

Few, if any, off-the-shelf items exist which can be incorporated in nuclear plants. Canned pumps are but one entirely new concept brought into being to make nuclear power possible. Prolonged successful effort to develop as complex a component as this often has to be discarded when efforts fail to develop another which is interdependent. Fresh starts must be made on the problems of both.

Reactor design develops the need to know undiscovered properties of common substances under conditions of reactor chemistry and irradiation. Requirements are generated for rare metals and alloys concerning which the full spectrum of chemistry, physics, and metallurgy need be researched and industries found or formed to produce them in quantities required. For example, such diverse enterprises a the Carborundum Co., National Distillers Corp., Wah Chang Corp., and National Research Corp. had to be persuaded to engage in large-scale zirconium production.

Not only has the naval nuclear reactors program faced mountainous technical problems, but it has been burdened from the beginning with a continuing necessity to seek answers to a variety of nontechnical questions affecting its ultimate success.

Wholly new and workable administrative and funding relationships, to be discussed later in detail, had to be evolved and must be continuously perfected between the Navy and the AEC, amongst naval personnel in and outside the reactors program, and between the Government reactors group and industry.

As operations expand, new personnel must be broght in; techniques must be developed for their rapid specialized training; and new facilities established for the basic research, design, and engineering functions involved in the work. Progress from design to construction of plants involves large-scale training of industry personnel. The design and construction of new ships for the new plants brings in a whole new group for specialized instruction; manning those ships brings in another.

During the process a basic philosophy on security of information had to be evolved, continuously adapted to an ever-increasing body of knowledge, and the mechanics of implementing it amongst public and private groups engaged in the program kept efficiently in motion. The approach has been to distinguish between specific design and dimensional characteristics which are classified, and technology as such which is unclassified. Communicating the latter has

involved the writing of up-to-the-minute technical handbooks by scientific personnel engaged in the work concurrently as they do it. Six such handbooks have been published and another eight are currently in preparation.

Another essential task of those engaged in the program has been to translate difficult scientific concepts into information meaningful to the layman. It is fundamental to obtaining policy decisions from legislative and executive leaders of Government underlying financial support of the naval nuclear program. It is also vital to the public, which in a democracy ratifies those decisions at the polls.

The foregoing enumerations barely hint at the multiple technical and nontechnical problems involved in the naval nuclear reactors program from the beginning and which will continue to plague it for years ahead. Yet they are ample testimony to the outstanding devotion and qualities of the officers and civilians who carry it forward. Within 6 years from the start they produced the basic pressurized water nuclear propulsion plant illustrated on the following page which is now standard for all new nuclear naval vessels.

The plant arrangement shown approximates that developed for submarine propulsion, and it will vary only in details for the supercarrier with four dual reactor powerplants, and the cruiser *Long Beach* and submarine *Triton*, each with dual reactors.

The naval nuclear propulsion plant consists of a nuclear reactor core contained in a pressure vessel; a primary coolant system utilizing fast-flowing pressurized water to remove the heat generated by nuclear fission in the core and transfer it via a steam generator to the secondary, or steam system; a steam machinery plant for propulsion and auxiliary electric power generation; and radiation shielding.

The reactor consists of a pressure vessel housing a core of enriched uranium fuel encased in a protective metal, such as zirconium, which passes heat to the coolant; a moderator, in this case the coolant itself, to slow down neutron emissions to efficient fission speeds; and rods of a neutron absorbing metal such as hafnium, together with machinery to insert and withdraw them from the core, to control rate of fission and thus amount of heat produced.

The primary coolant system consists of one or more loops, each having one or more coolant pumps; a steam generator (boiler); a pressurizing vessel; and connecting piping with appropriate valves.

Since the coolant water becomes radioactive in passing through the reactor core, shielding is required around the portion of the plant containing the coolant in order to protect personnel from radiation. A separate reactor shield surrounds the pressure vessel. It affords sufficient protection against radiation from the reactor core to allow access to the reactor compartment when the reactor is shut down. All shielding designs incorporate enough protection to meet civilian radiation exposure tolerances established by the AEC.

The steam produced in the separate secondary circuit by the steam generator is nonradioactive, and the steam propulsion machinery need not be shielded. This machinery and the necessary auxiliaries for electric power are arranged in a conventional way in the engine room. However, arrangements within the reactor compartment must of necessity be strongly influenced by considerations of accessibility in relation to radiation and the continuous necessity of removing heat even after the reactor has been shut down. The latter phenomenon, known as radioactive decay heat, results from the constant breakdown of radioactive materials even under normal conditions.

Penetrating to all parts of naval nuclear powerplant design are intensified requirements for ruggedness, reliability, and easy maintainability dictated by safety, the extreme endurance of nuclear plants, and higher average sustained ship speeds.

These various special nuclear plant considerations also complicate the work of designers of hulls into which they will fit. Gone are the days when minor weight allocation errors can be overcome by pumping fuel between tanks. Crew living and working spaces must be allocated with radiation hazard in mind. Stacks are eliminated, but vertical free spaces must be arranged for removal and renewal of reactor cores. Stowage space for consumable supplies and ammunition must be enlarged to take full advantage of the ship's longer range cruising capabilities. Many other specialized considerations are involved. A byproduct of tackling them has been experimentation with novel hull configurations that may substantially increase speed-power ratios of future ships.

Another byproduct of naval nuclear propulsion has been the evolution of a unique, hybrid military-civilian research and development organization that may well set administrative patterns for successful missile research and development and any similar future large-scale Government projects. Without it, there would probably be no nuclear powered naval ships in existence today.

Its antecedents are in the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 assigning responsibility for research and development in the theory and production of atomic energy, including processes, materials and devices related to such production, to the newly created Atomic Energy Commission.

Soon after passage of the act, Navy communications to AEC began setting out potential nuclear propulsion requirements in connection with the submarine program as defined by a small, cross-sectional group within the Bureau of Ships. AEC's response, in part, was to turn back to the very Bureau of Ships' group that generated the requirements for manpower assistance in meeting them.

By 1949 the Commission's activities in this field were sufficient to justify inclusion of a Naval Reactors Branch in its Division of Reactor Developments established that year. Also by that year it had become apparent in the Bureau of Ships that the activities of the cross-sectional group were sufficiently unique and unconventional to warrant special treatment. A period of organizational experimentation began, culminating in formal establishment in 1955 of Bureau of Ships Code 1500, designated as the Nuclear Propulsion Division and headed by a new assistant to the Chief of the Bureau for Nuclear Propulsion.

Code 1500, however, did not mean a separate Navy reactors program paralleling the AEC's program, because Code 1500 had by this time also developed into the Commission's Naval Reactors Branch, unofficially referred to as the "headquarters organization" by both Navy and AEC. Naval officers ordered to the program report to both AEC and BuShips. Navy and AEC civilian employees are utilized interchangeably. Rear Adm. H. G. Rickover, United States Navy, is both Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ships for Nuclear Propulsion and Chief of the Naval Reactors Branch, Division of Reactor Development, United States Atomic Energy Commission. So complete is the Navy-AEC integration in this "two-hat" organization that neither AEC nor naval personnel need switch headgear during the course of their work.

Possibly the only persons who can distinguish the military from the civilian characteristics of headquarters organization are the Government accountants who must assess its cost of operations between the AEC and the Navy. Even here the line of demarcation is often blurred; but, in general, nuclear research and development costs, including construction of land prototype powerplants, are paid for by AEC, while the Navy pays for research and development on steam parts of the plants and construction of nuclear ships. During the current fiscal year (1958) research and development money amounts to around $86 million from the Commission and around $11 million from the Navy. The prototype aircraft carrier propulsion plant has consumed the lion's share of these current funds.

Inherent in the headquarters organization setup is a flexibility and freedom in both administrative and funding action essential to rapid progress in complex scientific operations. This has speeded civilian as well as naval reactor development. No new group had to be organized from scratch to develop the $110 million civilian pressurized water reactor at Shippingport, Pa. Naval Reactors Branch, long experienced in that type of reactor, was assigned the job and went to work without delay. Additionally, the organization's dual nature avoids duplication of effort and facilities, such as purchasing offices, inspection groups, and so on. For example, purchase of nuclear cores on competitive bidding for which the Navy pays is done through AEC purchasing offices.

The organization is unique in a number of other respects and bears substantially the image demanded by its strong-minded chief, and founder, Admiral Rickover.

In discussing the qualifications of some 90 officers and civilians assigned to Headquarters, Rickover told the Joint Atomic Energy Committee:

"By qualification I do not mean, necessarily, their technical ability, but their desire to work long hours and to be dedicated to the job as well. We adopted the procedure of getting only young people. If we get in people with more experience, it takes too long to have them unlearn the bad things they know. We haven't got time for that. We don't try to get top-flight scientists. A lot are top-flight scientists by reputation only. We can't afford to have people around who have reputations who don't work hard. We would rather have people who work hard and don't have reputations."

New recruits for Headquarters Organization come from a number of engineering and scientific schools which recommend their best graduates. After a series of 5 interviews, about 1 in 4 is accepted. A similar procedure applies to naval officers. Some 40 engineering duty officer applicants are screened annually and 4 or 5 finally accepted. Several naval reservists selected have stayed on in Headquarters as civilian employees on completion of their duty tours.

Once selected for Headquarters duty, officers as well as civilians are given at least six months' special training at schools and on projects, followed by assignments on the basis of ability, not rank, and irrespective of military or civilian status. "The best qualified man gets the job," Rickover states, "and in my opinion it is the only way you can run any kind of technical organization."

The Organization also operates on a principle of retaining major control rather than assigning substantial areas of responsibility to contractors. This in effect draws contractors into an integration with Headquarters which expands the naval nuclear propulsion program from the "two hat" Navy-AEC concept to a "three hat" Navy-AEC-contractor concept. Headquarters control extends even as far as employment decisions on contractor personnel. "Anyone responsible for a reactor program," Rickover explains, "must take on the problem of see-

ing that his contractors hire the right sort of people and train them. Unless he does, he is in for trouble."

The centralized method of headquarters operation eliminates considerable redtape and memorandum writing. It permits quick decisions. But it violates generally accepted sound management criteria by overburdening key personnel with a large volume of both technical and nontechnical minor decisions. Justification for it is claimed not only from the inherently complex design interrelations within the powerplant itself, but in another circumstance explained to the Joint Atomic Energy Committee by Comdr. R. V. Laney, United States Navy:

"Each naval reactor project has a specific end in view. It is intended to be installed in a definite ship at some definite time. Because the building time for a ship and that for a reactor and the reactor plant components are different, the ship is partly built when the reactor and reactor equipment are still being designed. Its characteristics, its length, beam, its speed—all are determined, frozen. The task is very sharply defined, and there is a very high premium on success. The reactor designer must conceive, develop, design, and produce a reactor, which, when delivered to the ship, will fit into the reactor vessel which it has never seen before. That reactor vessel is resting in a ship which is a stranger, and the reactor, the vessel, the pumps, the heat exchangers, and the intricate control equipment must, the first time they operate in unison, operate correctly, so the ship will have the necessary amount of power to produce the speed for which she was designed."

Projects such as Laney describes, together with necessary basic research, are presently carried on under close headquarters organization control at 3 development centers, 2 (Bettis Plant and Knolls Laboratory) operated for AEC by contractors, and 1 privately managed.

The Commission maintains Bettis Plant at Pittsburgh, operated by Westinghouse Electric, employing some 1,300 scientists and engineers, and Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory at Schenectady, operated by General Electric and employing another 500. Combustion Engineering, Inc., operates its own center near Windsor, Conn., employing approximately 200.

The centers, together with headquarters personnel, and close to 1,000 scientists and engineers on contractor payrolls, total nearly 3,000 highly skilled technicians at work on naval nuclear propulsion. Another 250 to 300 BuShips personnel engage in closely interrelated work.

Today bringing a new reactor concept into being takes about half the 6 years needed to produce the original *Nautilus* and *Seawolf* plants. A year is consumed by preliminary analysis and design studies to fix the essential nature of the project; another year is needed for detailed design and analysis, including mock-up critical experiment in the physics, chemistry, and metallurgy of the reactor. During the third year engineering, construction, and installation of the core, components, and machinery completes the work.

Throughout such a project weekly lists of critical items delayed, in trouble, or needing help is submitted by the development center to headquarters for priority attention. Detailed monthly reports on each phase of the project assist overall coordination. All major design and technical decisions in a program are made by agreement among the principals, that is, AEC, the Navy, and the development center. If there is strong dissent from any party, it is talked through until essential agreement is reached. Lesser technical decisions which derive from major ones, extending even to the contractor level, are made in somewhat the same way by being referred back to headquarters, the principal technical source of direction.

This pattern of vertical relationships between the development centers, contractors, and headquarters in its capacity as the AEC's Naval Nuclear Reactors Branch, does not, however, pertain to its intra-Navy relationships as Code 1500. These are substantially horizontal, particularly with the Preliminary Design Branch and with the Hull and Machinery Design Branches of the Bureau of Ships, where discussions are informal and close.

In general, code 1500 is responsible for research, development, engineering, and installation of an entire nuclear plant of a new type. Reactors for subsequent plants remain a code 1500 responsibility, but repeat machinery now comes under cognizance of BuShips Machinery Branch, the same as machinery for conventional ships. This shift back to conventional from task group administrative procedures as the program progresses from its research and development to production is a wise one.

Just as the development of naval nuclear propulsion created demand for special ships to utilize it, so has it created demand for specially selected and trained men to man them. The intricacies involved inevitably drew the Bureau of Ships into this field as a technical adviser to the Bureau of Naval Personnel. Large numbers of submariners have received the training and already some 200 men and 12 officers are being trained in anticipation of commissioning nuclear-powered surface ships.

Nuclear ship enlisted personnel are selected by forces afloat, but in accordance with strict standards of intelligence, ability, and conduct. So outstanding is this group that about 6 percent are further selected each year as officer candidates—20 times the overall Navy rate. Officers submit to a series of comprehensive interviews by Admiral Rickover and others before final acceptance for training.

Following selection both officers and men undergo 6 months' intensive schooling in physics, mathematics, and various nuclear subjects, followed by another 6 months' further study and practical operation of prototype plants at the National Nuclear Reactor Test Station, Arco, Idaho.

Officers are more intensely trained than enlisted men. All officers must, and a number of enlisted ratings do, qualify as nuclear plant chief operators before completing the course. Qualification establishes proficiency in all phases of reactor operation, particularly in everything pertaining to safety. It requires at least 1,000 hours practical work on a prototype plant and is said to be several times as difficult as qualifying for submarine command.

In addition to regular training, prospective commanding officers are assigned several months' duty at Headquarters Organization and in the development centers. Each is placed in contact with the designers and developers of the powerplant destined for his command and acquires the same intimate knowledge of its capabilities as the men who created it.

The policy of building a land prototype of each naval nuclear plant type pays dividends, not only during development, but during the careful and meticulous training program as well. Crews go aboard ship fully experienced in operating a plant identical to the one which they must safely control to protect the lives of themselves and their shipmates. These factors, as well as care in design, are responsible for the excellent safety records of presently operating nuclear submarines.

The advent of naval nuclear propulsion has, indeed, brought about as major a change in naval men, material, and methods as it has in concepts of naval tactics. It has placed on naval policy planners the difficult burden of allocating available naval funds to costly commitments for seapower in being to meet the crises of today and at the same time carrying forward the bold nuclear research, construction, and training programs needed to meet the crises of tomorrow.

But if Congress appropriates hoped-for funds, by 1966 the Nation will have in being 5 or 6 superflattops, half a dozen guided missile cruisers, the beginnings of a destroyer fleet, and some 45 submarines, all nuclear powered.

The substantial shift over from steam to naval nuclear power will have been made during a brief 18 years, compared to more than 50 years needed for the shift from sail to steam.

Naval nuclear ships and reactors

Ship	Purpose	Builder	Completion	Reactor [1]	Remarks
SSN571 *Nautilus*	Attack	Electric Boat	Sept. 30, 1954	S1W	Land prototype, Arco, Idaho.
				S2W	First nuclear-powered ship.
SSN575 *Seawolf*	do	do	Mar. 20, 1957	S1G	Land prototype, West Milton, N. Y.
SSN578 *Skate*	do	do	Dec. 23, 1957	S2G	Preliminary acceptance for limited service.
SSN579 *Swordfish*	do	Portsmouth	1958	S3W	Twin screw, conventional hull.
SSN583 *Sargo*	do	Mare Island	1958	S4W	Do.
SSN584 *Seadragon*	do	Portsmouth	1959	S3W	Do.
SSGN587 *Halibut*	Guided missile	Mare Island	1959	S4W	Do.
				S3W	Hull modified for Regulus.
SSRN586 *Triton*	Radar-picket	Electric Boat	1959	S3G	Land prototype, West Milton, N. Y.
SSN585 *Skip Jack*	Attack	do	1959	S4G	Twin screw and twin reactor.
SSM588 *Scamp*	do	Mare Island	1960	S5W	Single screw, *Albacore* hull.
SSN589 *Scorpion*	do	Electric Boat	1960	S5W	Do.
SSN590 *Sculpin*	do	Ingalls	1960	S5W	Do.
SSN591 *Shark*	do	Newport News	1960	S5W	Do.
SSN592 *Snook*	do	Ingalls	1960	S5W	Do.
SSN593 *Thresher*	do	Portsmouth	1960	S5W	Do.
SSGN594 *Permit*	Guided missile	Mare Island	1961	S5W	Fiscal year 1958 program. Regulus.
SSGN595 *Pollack*	do	Portsmouth	1961	S5W	Do.
SSGN596 *Plunger*	do	Unassigned	1961	S5W	Do.
				S1C	Land prototype. Windsor, Conn.

[1] In naval reactor code first letter indicates ship type, numeral indicates precedence in design series, second letter indicates developer: W, Westinghouse; G, General Electric; C, Combustion Engineering. All are of pressurized, water-cooled, water-moderated types except S1G and S2G, cooled by liquid sodium and moderated by beryllium.

Naval nuclear ships and reactors—Continued

Ship	Purpose	Builder	Completion	Reactor	Remarks
SSN597 *Tullibee*	Attack	Electric Boat	1961	S2C	Fiscal year 1958 program. Small hull.
SSGN(P?)598	Polaris	do	1960(?)	S5W(?)	Fiscal year 1958 supplemental.
SSGN(P?)599	do	do	1960(?)	S5W(?)	Do.
SSGN(P?)600	do	Mare Island	1960(?)	S5W(?)	Do.
CLG(N)9 *Long Beach*	Guided-missile	Bethlehem (Fore River)	1960	C1W	2 reactors.
				A1W	Land prototype, Arco, Idaho.
CVA(N)65 *Enterprise*	Supercarrier	Newport News	1961	A2W	8 reactors.
				D1W	AEC Knolls Laboratory assigned light weight design.
DLG(N)	Frigate			D2W	Not yet authorized.

The Critical Shortage of Culture in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I insert in the RECORD my remarks delivered in Cleveland on May 10 to the Rumanian-American organizations on the occasion of Rumanian Independence Day, on the Critical Shortage of Culture in Russia:

It is a great privilege for me to be able to join with you in commemorating Rumanian Independence Day. May 10 of each year has long held special significance for me because May 10 is Rumanian Independence Day. In my youth I was inspired by Father Trutza, who was so worthy and representative of the true Rumanian cause. Father Trutza was a friend of my late father, and between them there existed a warm and hearty friendship. In the years that have passed, in my duties as a Member of Congress, I have fought to bring justice to the cause of the Rumanian nation. Father Hategan, together with George Dobrea, your national president, have fought to carry on the inspiring work of Father Trutza as advocates of the cause for Rumanian national independence. This is the cause in which all America joins, because we Americans take pride in the fact that the spirit of national independence was born here in the United States and the roots of democratic representative government were given life and meaning by our Founding Fathers.

All of us are saddened by the unhappy subjugation of the Rumanian nation by the Russian imperialists. The once free and independent Rumanian nation has no official voice in the affairs of the nations of the world. This right has been denied the Rumanian people by the greatest curse which has ever beset humanity—the plague of Russian communism.

Freemen the world over are heartened in the knowledge that the Rumanian people, despite alien occupation, in the face of the worst tryrannies and inhumanities which have ever been visited upon them, remain true and loyal to the cause of human freedom. No one better knows this to be a fact than the Russian occupiers of Rumania. They have applied all their evil devices in an effort to break the spirit and the aspirations of the Rumanian people. This effort began when Vishinsky handed his Kremlin ultimatum to the legal ruler of Rumania, King Michael, on May 6, 1945, and arrogantly said: "In this case I am Yalta and I tell you what to do." In the years that have passed the Russians and their proconsuls have attempted to make Russians out of the Rumanian people. In this ignoble task they have failed miserably. Today the Rumanian people are more determined and more dedicated to being Rumanians and winning national independence for their country than ever before in their history. This is the answer the Rumanian people have given to the Kremlin objective of world conquest. In this task Rumanians in all walks of life will continue to remain dedicated to the preservation of their rich culture, their glorious traditions, and their attachment to civilized mankind.

All Rumanians, like the other non-Russian people of the present-day Russian empire, are keenly aware that among many other deficiencies, the Russians have never possessed a distinctive culture or folklore of their own. Today when the Kremlin is attempting to put their best foot forward in an effort to propagandize the western world, all thinking Americans are amused by the recent exhibition in New York City of the Moiseyev ballet. The typical Russian ballet would lack entertainment that would suit the tastes of the American people, therefore it adopted Rumanian, Polish, Ukrainian, Byelorussian, and other non-Russian dances and music as the basic part of their repertoire. The most characteristic old Rumanian popular dances and tunes, the hora and joc, and the ciocarlia, are being danced and sung by Kremlin puppets in an effort to create the impression that the Russians are a cultured and musical people. Only a few years ago the Russians attempted this same propaganda maneuver in Paris, and the Paris press promptly exposed the exhibition as a fraud. Today the American people are enjoying the same entertainment, as the Russians feverishly attempt to claim as their own the rich culture, songs, and dances of the Rumanian people. It has long been a popular joke among Rumanians and other non-Russians to refer to the grandiose, but futile efforts of the Russians to demonstrate that they are cultured people. This is a new sport and source of amusement on the American scene, but which will surely grow more popular as the Russians attempt to disguise themselves as a cultured and happy people. The American people have long been acquainted with the amusement provided by marionettes. They now see the Moiseyev ballet as a Russian extravaganza of a marionettte show with all the strings being held by the leaders in the Kremlin.

I have singled out this particular effort of the Russians to propagandize the western world because I feel it well expresses the most desperate needs of the leaders in the Kremlin. Their uncertain and precarious position within their empire, together with their concern for the political awakening to the realities of life which is taking place in the free world, has caused them to go to ridiculous extremes. We can be confident that the more ridiculous the Russians become in these efforts, the more certain it is that their present-day empire is reaching a state of disintegration.

The Russian czar Khrushchev has been very vigorous in the past year in pressing the western powers to recognize a status quo. With the usual heavy hand of Russian approach, he has attempted by rattling the atomic bomb, to intimidate some of the western leaders into accepting his proposal. Only a few days ago at the foreign ministers conference of the NATO powers, decisive action was taken, by unanimous agreement, that Khrushchev's proposal for recognition of a status quo must be rejected. Once again the Russian spirit of desperation caused their leaders to overplay their hand and thus alert the leaders of the western world to the realities which lie behind the latest Russian proposal. Khrushchev has stated that there can be no summit conference unless the western powers first agree to recognition of a status quo. The western powers have now made it clear that they will not assist the Russians in their ignoble task of tightening the noose of slavery around the necks of the many non-Russian nations now held against their will within the Russian empire. This action coincides with the valiant efforts of the non-Russian people behind the Iron Curtain. The struggle of the non-Russian people is to throw off completely the Russian imposed noose and regain their national independence. In this inspiring and noble cause all men of good will must join.

I have often felt that one of the greatest obstacles to Russian occupation of Rumania is the rich and ages-long culture of the Rumanian people. As I examine the present-day Russian empire, which now flies the banner of Communist ideology, I see this to be an insurmountable problem for the Russians from the Baltic Sea to the Pacific Ocean. No method of despotism and no tactic of propaganda can overcome this obstacle. This is the basic problem which confronts the Russian imperialists. This also is the greatest asset possessed by the cause of free men. The people of Rumania and the other subjugated nations behind the Russian imposed Iron Curtain surely no less than the awakened peoples of Asia and Africa, are on the march for the inevitable goal of national independence and self-government. This is a political movement which is beyond the capability of the Russians to control and one which the United States, by its historic traditions, must support with a firm faith and certainty of victory in the future.

All of us can take encouragement from the political trends which are now taking place throughout the world. With certainty this vast movement of human aspirations will sweep all mankind forward toward the goal of peace, justice, and freedom for all nations for all time.

Fantastic Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to draw the attention of the Members of the House to a thought-provoking pamphlet entitled "Fantastic Foreign Aid." It was prepared by Kent

Courtney, publisher of the Independent American, a national newspaper of conservative political viewpoint.

The pamphlet points out that our people are taxed to fight communism but at the same time, various agencies of our Government are actually giving economic aid to our enemies, the countries whose leaders have openly declared that they intend to crush us.

The article follows:

FANTASTIC FOREIGN AID

FOREIGN AID DOLLARS HELP OUR ENEMIES

The advocates of foreign aid state that its prime purpose is to defend the free world against communism by sending economic and military aid to our friends overseas.

If this is true, then why are we sending foreign aid to our mortal enemies—Communist nations?

Below is a list of Communist countries who have received foreign aid from the United States. These billions of dollars of foreign aid to Communist nations were paid for by your income-tax dollars.

Here is where some of your tax dollars went:

Foreign aid to Communist countries, July 1, 1946–June 30, 1957 [1]

Country:	Total
Albania	$20,444,000
Czechoslovakia	215,410,000
East Germany	17,339,000
Hungary	31,938,000
Poland	442,698,000
Soviet Union	687,929,000
Yugoslavia	836,354,000
Total aid to Communist nations	2,252,112,000

[1] Source: Legislative reference service of the Library of Congress.

Recent figures on foreign aid to Reds [1]*—Aid during fiscal year July 1, 1956–June 30, 1957*

East Germany	$21,000
Hungary	10,166,000
Yugoslavia	45,241,000

Not only has the United States sent more than $2¼ billion to aid Communist countries since 1945, but, in addition, Communist Poland has recently received $193 millions in gifts from the United States—$95 millions in 1957 and $98 millions in February 1958. The transfer of these United States dollars to Red Poland was handled in a special transaction.

Your tax dollars strengthen grip of Communist dictators

Poland, East Germany, Hungary, and Yugoslavia are each controlled by loyal-to-Moscow dedicated Communists. Foreign aid to such countries merely strengthens their control of the slave-citizens of these countries.

Mark well that the United States gave over $10 million in foreign aid to Communist Hungary, where the Red army crushed the valiant freedom fighters.

FANTASTIC WASTE OF FOREIGN AID FUNDS

Not only have your income tax dollars aided Communist nations abroad, but millions of foreign aid dollars have been scandalously wasted on fantastic projects.

A few examples of the wanton waste in foreign aid

Your tax dollars were spent to pay for:

1. Sending high-priced "rock and roll" jazz bands to South America and the Far East, weight lifters to the Near East, and opera singers to Western Europe.

2. Five expensive airfields in Afghanistan, where most inhabitants can only afford to travel on the backs of camels.

3. Grass seed to Great Britain.

4. Direct support of Communist-sympathizer Nehru's second 5-year plan for India.

5. An $18 million highway for the 9,000 automobiles of Siam.

6. Electronic microscopes to the Philippines where there was no power to operate them.

7. Paving highways in Saudi Arabia so that billionaire King Saud can drive his 100 gold-plated Cadillacs to and from his winter and summer palaces.

AMERICA'S ECONOMIC STRUCTURE BEING WEAKENED

No nation can continue to squander its money abroad—giving aid to its enemies and its fair-weather friends—and still remain financially strong and able to defend itself in time of war.

Eugene Castle, author of the Great Giveaway, stated in a recent speech that we have given away approximately $70 billion dollars in foreign aid in the last 13 years.

Seventy billion dollars is equal to:

(a) Seven times the money we have spent on all atomic energy projects.

(b) It is equal to the total assessed value of our 26 largest cities.

(c) It is equal to the increase in our national debt in the last 13 years.

So, not only are American taxpayers now saddled with supporting the world via foreign aid programs at the rate of about $4 billions per year, but also we taxpayers must continue to pay interest on the national debt for these $70 billion squandered abroad. This interest is now costing us about $2 billion each year.

Foreign aid must be stopped if America is to survive as a nation.

YOUR INCOME TAX DOLLARS FINANCE TAX CUTS ABROAD

Socialist Great Britain and former enemy Japan have both recently reduced the personal income taxes of their citizens. You, Mr. and Mrs. American Taxpayer, made this possible because millions of your hard-earned tax dollars have been used to bolster the financial structure of Great Britain and Japan.

Congressman NOAH MASON of Illinois puts it this way: "American foreign aid has helped European nations reduce their own national debts, balance their annual budgets, and reduce taxes for their citizens."

CUT FEDERAL SPENDING SO OUR TAXES CAN BE CUT

Continuation of the present policies to tax and spend and waste, will result in a ruinous inflation for this country, and a devastating depression.

You can help to stop this fantastic waste of your hard-earned tax dollars.

Congressmen and Senators will vote against foreign aid provided the folks back home deluge Congress with letters and telegrams demanding an end to foreign aid to Communist and Socialist countries abroad.

The billions of dollars that would be saved would give a tax cut to every citizen in the United States.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*—Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*—Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo.*—The Woodner
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah.*
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*
Bricker, John W., *Ohio.*—The Mayflower
Bridges, Styles, *N. H.*
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*—The Shoreham
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*—The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*—Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo.*
Case, Clifford P., *N. J.*
Case, Francis, *S. Dak.*—4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex.*—3327 Cleveland Ave.
Church, Frank, *Idaho.*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*
Cotton, Norris, *N. H.*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho.*
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*—5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C.*
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt.*
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*
Hoblitzell, John D., Jr., *W. Va.*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y.*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y.*
Jenner, William E., *Ind.*
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C.*
Jordan, B Everett, *N. C.*
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*—4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla.*
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*
Langer, William, *N. Dak.*—2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio.*
Long, Russell B., *La.*
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham
Malone, George W., *Nev.*—The Mayflower
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*
Martin, Edward, *Pa.*
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*—5020 Lowell St.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky.*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*—122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont.*—The Shoreham
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I.*
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine.*
Potter, Charles E., *Mich.*
Proxmire, William E., *Wis.*
Purtell, William A., *Conn.*
Revercomb, Chapman, *W. Va.*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J.*—Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala.*—4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C.*
Thye, Edward J., *Minn.*
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah.*
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*—2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del.*
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex.*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*—Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, Potter, and Ives.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Barrett.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Monroney, Clark, Proxmire, Capehart, Bricker, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Payne, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Clark, Proxmire, Beall, Morton, Javits, and Hoblitzell.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, Bennett, and Jenner.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Green (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, Lausche, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Martin of Iowa, Curtis, Revercomb, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, Goldwater, and Allott.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Bible, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Purtell, Payne, and Cotton.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Butler, and Hruska.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Thurmond, Yarborough, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Allott, and Cooper.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Church, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Martin of Iowa, Morton and Hoblitzell.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Church, Jordan, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Kuchel, Cotton, Hruska, and Revercomb.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Talmadge, Curtis, Cooper, Javits, and Case of New Jersey.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Place.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John T. Fey, 2931 Cathedral Ave.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Road.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Drive, Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Death of Charlie Peace, Greenville, S. C., Newspaperman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the death of Mr. Charlie Peace last Thursday brought an untimely end to the career of one of South Carolina's finest citizens and ablest newspapermen. He was a man of rare vision and foresight who contributed a great deal to his community and region. He was an extremely friendly man and he had a great number of devoted friends who mourn his death.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials which express the sadness felt over his passing throughout South Carolina. The editorials are: Newspapers Are People—Charlie Peace, from the Greenville News of May 6; Charlie Peace, from the Columbia State of May 17; and Charlie Peace, from the Charleston News and Courier of May 17.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville (S. C.) News of May 16, 1958]

NEWSPAPERS ARE PEOPLE—CHARLIE PEACE

(By Wayne W. Freeman)

Throughout most of his career as a newspaper executive, Charlie Peace was concerned primarily with the business and mechanical side of the complex publishing operation. Since his days as a youth in his late father's commercial printing plant, machinery had fascinated him.

As vice president and general manager of the News-Piedmont Co., he had personally shopped for most of the multitude of machines required to produce the two newspapers, and he probably knew more about them than anyone other than the men who operate and maintain them.

But as valuable as was this contribution to the common task and as much as it was appreciated, it is the memory of another side of his character that his associates will cherish as long as they themselves live: Charlie Peace, the generous, hearty, fun-loving, understanding, and compassionate human being.

In discussing newspapers and what makes them, Mr. Peace almost invariably would observe, "newspapers are people."

For all of his preoccupation with other matters, he never forgot nor let anyone else forget that the men and women who write and edit the copy, run the machines, and produce and deliver the final product were the most important element in the success of the paper as a community institution.

Thus it is that in the death of Charlie Peace the officers, executives, and employees of our publishing company have lost more than a business and professional associate. The greater loss is that of a close and beloved friend.

Part of this characteristic, too, was his boundless love for children and, invariably, children who came within range of his radiant affection for childhood returned his love.

His friends of all ages were literally legion, not only in this community and State but throughout the United States and even in Canada, where he had many dealings with manufacturers of newsprint. Wherever newspapermen gathered in their professional conferences, Charlie Peace was known. Usually he was there and, when he wasn't, members of the News-Piedmont staff were greeted on all sides with, "How's Charlie?"

Mr. Peace was a newspaperman from his boyhood. As a youth, he and his brothers were instrumental in their father's acquiring The Greenville News to make it a forceful influence in the Piedmont Carolinas. From the old Peace Printing Co., he went to the News as a proofreader and set out to learn all phases of the operation.

It was natural that he should move gradually into the business and production side exclusively. He played a big part in the steady growth in the circulation of the News and in the renovation and expansion of the Piedmont after the company acquired it in 1927.

Production, however, was his first love, and as the years passed he devoted more and more of his time to the expansion and improvement of the mechanical plant. He literally roamed the country in search of new ideas, better techniques and better machines for doing the job.

And wherever he went, on a business trip or to the beach home he loved, each edition of the papers was sent to him and he read them meticulously.

As far as we know, Mr. Charlie never wrote an editorial or a news story, but he knew when they were done right and he was quick to spot a mistake. Reporters and editors alike found him a kindly critic and a strong backer when controversy arose or the going otherwise got a little rough.

After the News-Piedmont Co. acquired the Asheville Citizen-Times Publishing Co., he became its president and gave to that responsibility the same sort of devotion he had given to the Greenville operation. His basic tenet there, as here, was that the newspapers belonged to the community and that the publishers should give the community the kind of newspapers it wanted and needed.

Although the press was his great love, Mr. Peace gave much of himself and his substance to the community and region in other ways. Many were his acts of charity and philanthropy, and as often as not those who benefited never knew the identity of their benefactor.

Many years ago he saw the importance of aviation to Greenville's future. He accepted appointment to the Greenville Airport Commission. He participated in the vision of a modern airport which became a reality with the cooperation of other officials and the public. And with his colleagues he was looking to the age of the jet transport.

Such at a glance was the 54-year lifespan of a man who loved life more and lived it more fully than most who are spared long beyond the allotted three score and ten.

Those of us who lived with him, worked with him and played with him are conscious of a great loss. We are comforted by the knowledge that the loss is shared by the community and that he might say, in the words of George Crabbe in The Village:

"Life is not measured by the time we live."

[From the Columbia (S. C.) State of May 17, 1958]

CHARLIE PEACE

Charlie Peace was a newspaperman by inheritance and by love. He came from a newspaper family; he would have been unhappy in any other work.

Jovial—given to being in a happy mood—he was nonetheless serious when the occasion demanded it. His fellow journalists recognized his leadership by making him president of the South Carolina Press Association; he held important committee appointments from the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association, and his own family called upon him to assume responsible executive duties as vice president and manager of the Greenville News-Piedmont, and president of the Asheville Citizen-Times.

In the last year or so, ill health had curbed Mr. Peace's activities, but this did not lessen his keen interest in successful operation of the newspapers, and other properties with which he was identified, nor did it cause him to lose his enthusiasm for Greenville and for South Carolina, in which he had so much faith, and in whose upbuilding he had done his share.

There are many to mourn the loss of Charlie Peace. He was a friend, indeed; a man with a big heart whose fine qualities were appreciated by those of us who had the privilege of knowing him and evaluating his real worth.

May God rest his kindly soul.

[From the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of May 17, 1958]

CHARLIE PEACE

Three sons of the late B. H. Peace have carried on the newspaper business he bought in Greenville and expanded it through the years. The death of Charlie Peace at the age of 54 has removed one of the brothers from a successful family enterprise.

Jovial of manner and friendly in approach, Charlie Peace was well known among newspaper people not only in South Carolina but elsewhere in the profession. He had been assigned to all departments of the Greenville News and Piedmont, and was general manager of the two papers since 1939. When the Asheville Citizen and Times were bought in 1953, he became president of the enterprise. Mr. Peace also was a director of the company operating the Peace radio and television stations.

Fond of jokes and a good time, Charlie Peace was good company when newspapermen got together. We shall miss him.

Tax Legislation To Benefit the Small-Business Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the small-business man is facing a serious threat through excessive taxation which stifles growth. This is a

situation which concerns all of us here in Congress, for it is often said, and rightfully so, that the small-business man is the backbone of our economy.

There is much talk of tax reduction in the air, but the future of legislation in this field is at best uncertain. Meantime, small business finds it increasingly difficult to experience growth due to high taxes on success. Furthermore, every small business faces the problem—often insurmountable—of estate taxes due upon the death of a principal in such business.

I believe we in Congress should not wait for or count on tax reduction to relieve the plight that many of our small businesses are in. I am introducing a bill today to give needed relief to business in two important fields—expansion and estate tax.

Section one of my bill is designed to reward success and growth of a small business. It allows a person in business to deduct a portion of the additional investment in his business during a taxable year. Under section 1, a business which shows a $10,000 increase during a taxable year in the value of its property, equipment, stock, and so forth, will not be forced to pay tax on the entire gain. Section 1 allows a deduction before taxes of 20 percent of this gain (or $30,000, whichever is smaller). This would result in a $2,000 deduction for a company showing a $10,000 increase in the value of its assets during a year. The balance of the increase would be subject to normal taxes.

Sections 2 and 3 face the problem of high estate taxes and the effect on a small business of the death of a partner or sole owner. Section 2 establishes noninterest-bearing estate-tax certificates for small businesses. By using such certificates, a businessman, in effect, may prepay his estate taxes, thus lessening the effect of his death upon a business in which he has a large financial stake.

Section 3 provides for installment payments of estate taxes over a 10-year period. This avoids the serious and sometimes catastrophic financial effect on a business when estate taxes must be paid following the death of an owner or partner.

These steps form only the most basic plan for relief of small business. Some action must be taken which will benefit the thousands of small-business men who are literally on the brink of disaster. Talk of tax cuts does not keep the wolf from the door, and I urge my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee to use these recommendations as a basis for legislation of real benefit to the small-business man.

The President Scores

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, as a firm believer in the plans submitted by the President for reorganizing the Defense Department, I have been heartened by the favorable action taken by the House Armed Services Committee in reporting a bill which fulfills a major portion of the recommendations made by the administration.

I believe the following editorial of May 19, 1958, from the Wheeling Intelligencer, a leading newspaper in the First Congressionad District of West Virginia, indicates that the sentiment of the people back home is definitely in favor of Congress approving the Defense reorganization plan in substantially the form recommended by the President. Consequently, I am hopeful that Congress will have an opportunity at an early date to work its will in regard to this important legislation.

The editorial follows:

THE PRESIDENT SCORES

The fact that the House Armed Services Committee has devised a defense reorganization bill which Mr. Eisenhower likes so well that he has sent congratulations to Chairman VINSON and his associates is ample proof that the President and his critics are not so far apart as at first indicated.

While making certain reservations, the President agrees that the committee's version of the reorganization plan submitted by administration represents "constructive efforts to correct the main difficulties which have troubled our Defense Establishment in recent years." This approximate meeting of minds encourages the hope that a workable plan of reorganization which will go a long way toward achieving that unity of effort so essential to a capable defense posture will emerge from this session of Congress.

That the committee bill still leaves something to be desired, however, is indicated by the suggestion of the President that two quite important changes be made. For the purpose of allaying the fears of those who foresee the day when the several arms may be abolished as separate entities, the committee inserted a stipulation that the Army, Navy, and Air Force shall be separately organized under civilian secretaries. It further provided that these services function under the direction, authority, and control of the Defense Secretary, exercised through the respective secretaries of such departments. The President would like to have this last stipulation removed. He also objects to a provision which would give Congress the power to veto, by a simple resolution, any plan of the Defense Secretary to transfer, reassign, abolish, or merge combat functions of the services.

This latter provision would seem particularly objectionable. It would substitute the judgment of Congress for that of the Secretary of Defense in matters of pure military strategy. The mischievous possibilities of such interference would appear to be unlimited. As for the President's other objection, while less serious, it does go to the heart of the whole theory of reorganization, which is to centralize the authority and coordinate the defense effort. In the natural course of administration the authority of the Secretary of Defense is exerted through the respective secretaries. To stipulate this procedure by law, however, suggests an advisory relationship of the Defense Secretary to the several department secretaries which is not or should not be the intent of the law and which, in operation, might tend to defeat in large measures the purpose of reorganization.

There can be little doubt that the overwhelming public support which has lined up back of the President on this issue is responsible for the change of heart in the House Armed Services Committee which moved it—to go as far along with the administration as it has gone. This same factor, it seems reasonable to believe, will exert a powerful influence in having the language of the committee bill suitably adjusted on the floor of Congress, as the President has requested.

Speech by Dr. Frank Stanton at the Missouri School of Journalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, at the 50th anniversary of the University of Missouri School of Journalism on May 2, Dr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, delivered a challenging speech on the tremendously heavy responsibility of all mediums in these critical times to inform our people of what is going on in the world. Our people, he points out, are faced with making vital decisions quickly—decisions which "must be based on increasingly wide foundations of accurate, understandable information at the very time when the issues are far more complex and difficult to make both accurate and understandable."

Without attempting to minimize the importance of editorialization, Dr. Stanton maintains that "editorialization without the context of objective, factual reporting, is personal opinionating in a vacuum." American journalism, he believes, faces a great and urgent responsibility in providing this factual, background information.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD, the text of Dr. Stanton's speech of May 2, when he received the Missouri School of Journalism Honor Award for Distinguished Service in Journalism.

The address follows:

THE CHANGING ROLE OF JOURNALISM

(By Frank Stanton, president, Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.)

I am happy to be here tonight, and very proud of the honor you do me.

No one can come to Missouri and to this university without being reminded of the great contributions made here both to journalism and to American letters. The roots of a wholly American literature are here. Missouri has bred a vigorous and venturesome press. And it has sent our journalists who have made their constructive influence felt all over the world.

The company whom you have honored in this way over the years includes some very great figures. I cannot escape the fear that you have made a mistake in adding my name to that group. At any rate, perhaps the most appropriate response is that we in this relatively new and still not wholly matured field of electronic journalism share with all journalists a deep concern that we do not miss our common opportunity in an age of crisis.

I have listened with great interest to Eugene Pulliam's stimulating comments on freedom of the press. This is not a subject we can ever afford to take for granted. Indeed, for electronic journalism, the task is not so much to hold to the freedoms we

have, but to fight to expand them so that we can share with journalists from the printed mediums at least some of their liberties. Essentially, the constitutional recognition of the fundamental role of journalism in a democracy is merely the formal expression of the attitude of the people. That attitude ought to be revitalized, from time to time, in terms of current needs. Otherwise, its formal expression is in danger of becoming merely a slogan.

It is also a good thing for us to take a look, from time to time, at journalism's attitude towards the people. Actually, the Constitution could confer upon journalism only its freedom. It provides neither a positive objective for journalism nor a roadmap for getting there. It confers the right to talk, it imposes a moral, though not legal, duty to be responsible; it obliges no one to listen. It provides for the one sweeping condition under which journalism can reach its highest usefulness; all the rest it leaves to journalism itself, and to the people.

Like other institutions in our democracy, journalism has from the very beginning been subject to a long, bumpy process of trial and error. It has had periods of great usefulness when it has made the critical difference, I think, between our advancing toward the realization of popular aspirations and slipping back into an easy rut. But it has also had some pretty thin times when many people cared little about what journalism was up to.

By trial and error the press has found that it has had to respond—sometimes very slowly—to the needs of the people. As popular needs changed from one generation to another, the press also had to change. If it failed to do so, there would be no one listening. And when that happened, any right to freedom conferred by the Constitution amounts to little more than the right to be ignored.

The concept of the press as propaganda—epitomized by the party press of the early days of the Republic—proved to be suitably short-lived in America. Journalism moved on into the great days of the 19th century. The rise of the penny press—which reacted to the party press by containing no political opinion at all—was a peculiarly American institution. It reflected the insatiable thirst of a youthful Nation for news about its own mores and social behavior at a time when there were few pressing problems of a threatening nature.

The penny press was, in its time, an economic as well as a journalistic phenomenon. But when its publishers and editors failed to recognize the disturbing issues growing out of our territorial expansion and the slavery conflict—when the needs of the people changed—it lost its place to a whole new crop of journalists: Greeley and the Tribune, Bryant and the Post, Bowles and the Springfield Republican, Carl Schurz and the St. Louis Westliche Post, among them. These were the years in which journalism first became a determining force in American life. They carried out with real vitality the role that the Constitution makers must certainly have had in mind when they envisioned a free journalism as a necessary ingredient of the democratic process.

Yet the giants of personal journalism came to see a decline in their influence and effectiveness—not because they had changed, but because the society they served had changed. The new needs were met by a new journalism that flowered in such great papers as the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the New York Times, a journalism that did not depend solely upon the driving force of a single mind and personality. And under this stimulus, the horizons of the average American became broader as the march of events became more rapid and complex, for the climate of life had become less hospitable to the moral force of the reflective article and more conditioned by what was happening in many places at the some time.

The War Between the States also taught some lessons—among them the primary role of the newspaper as a reporter. It focused attention on the concept that the real strength of a newspaper lies in its reporting staff.

All this is familiar to you. I remind you of it now only because we are, I think, again at one of those pivotal points in American journalism where its basic role is undergoing a tremendous change: a change in opportunity, a change in responsibility, a change being visited upon us whether we like it or not.

Moreover, I am convinced that never before has the roles of journalism in America assumed proportions of such staggering dimensions and urgency as the events of the last decade—indeed, the last few months—have given it.

If we are to cope successfully with this change, all of us need to go back to the root of the problem as Jefferson saw it: that you cannot have a government by the people unless the people are informed. This dictum, which has never been disputed in our history—even in time of war—has always imposed on journalism a challenging and never-ending responsibility.

Even in slower-moving times, in the midst of far less pressing events, this responsibility has not always been easy to carry out. But in the past we have always had time on our side, and sooner or later in periods of great change, the evolving role of journalism has been spelled out by the people themselves in the slow certainty of the gradual change that is characteristic of the democratic process.

Today, time has become a luxury we can no longer afford. The people of this country are called upon to make decisions—and to make their decisions known and felt—fast and unmistakably. Moreover, each decision must be based on increasingly wide foundations of accurate, understandable information at the very time when the issues are far more complex and difficult to make both accurate and understandable.

Now I cannot see how journalism can have the ghost of a chance of contributing what is absolutely essential to this fundamental process, under fearfully accelerated conditions, unless it begins with a clear sense of its own destiny. Governments in democracies move in tandem with public opinion. Our constant goal must be to come to a better understanding of the relationship between journalism and public opinion—what the essential role of journalism is in the molding and ultimately the expression of public opinion.

This is a much larger order than it seems at first glance. Philosophers and political scientists for centuries have been trying to discover what molds public opinion, what influences it, what changes it Although the poll-takers have sought to dispel some of the mystery surrounding the subject they have thus far been able only to nibble at the fringes of the mystery. The physiology of public opinion remains still largely unknown, still an enigma.

Yet we do know certain things about it One of the most important findings of the pollsters over the last 20 years is that public attitudes are rarely changed by mere exhortation without all the facts, on all sides, to provide the context and to assure the reader or listener that he agrees, rather than that he is being pushed. The concept of mobilising opinion by a campaign of hortatory solgans is fallacious. For all of us in the profession of journalism that point has vital significance, no matter what media we serve. It suggests that public opinion is crystallized or changed by the force of persuasion and argument only if, as a condition precedent, entirely different forces have first been at work. People generally resist being told what to do or think. They want to know all the facts and then make up their own minds about the merit of the opinions of others and of suggested courses of action.

This may well be the lesson we can draw from the Cincinnati experiment, conducted by the American Association for the United Nations and the United Nations Association of Cincinnati, aided by the Stephen H. Wilder Foundation. Their objective certainly represented an essential goal of a democratic people in a shrinking world: "To demonstrate how a community may become so intelligently informed on world affairs as to be a dynamic force in the creation of an ordered, eventually a peaceful world."

The campaign started in September 1947—a period of relative serenity, with the United Nations heavily involved in procedural debates. Literature on the United Nations was given to every public school child and every teacher. Church and PTA meetings were devoted to the subject. At more than 225 meetings special speakers appeared, documentary films were shown, and thousands of pamphlets were distributed. Newspapers and radio gave special emphasis every day to information about the United Nations. Everywhere in the city slogans urging support for the United Nations were exhibited in enormous numbers: on blotters, matchbooks, streetcar cards, and billboards.

Yet this mammoth campaign descended upon the people of Cincinnati with all the impact of a whisper in a boiler factory. On two central aspects of the United Nations—its main purpose and the existence of the veto power—almost exactly the same percentage of the population had knowledge after the 6-month campaign as before it. The same percentage of people who praised the United Nations before the campaign praised it afterward—and for the same things; so did an unchanged percentage blame it—and for the same things. The citizens of Cincinnati were just not susceptible of mobilization by exhortation alone, even of the most concentrated, disinterested and saturating kind.

I suspect that these results are not wholly surprising to you who are students of the history of American journalism, for you are aware of the immense gaps between the vigorous editorial support of some presidential candidates in our history and the popular vote at elections.

I cannot agree that this has anything to do with a so-called decline in the power of the press. The press in this country was at its weakest by far when the mainspring of its existence was held to be a persuasive power over the people. Such a power seems to me to hold no promise for the effective workings of self-government, because it does not imply an informed people at all. It implies a suggestible one, very apt to turn to the next most artful persuader that comes along. The opinions of a people easily persuaded rest on very weak foundations indeed.

Opinion can never be mobilized in this country, unless there is first—and unless there continues to be—prompt, clear, and arresting news of events. We can sense this all through our history: in the response to the British march on Concord, in the siege of Fort Sumter, in the attack on Pearl Harbor. The danger today is that, in the traditional working of democracy, we live at the mercy of a population capable of mobilization only after the impact of a disaster. Today, such a disaster may be so great and so swift that mobilization after the fact will be little more than the desperate wanderings of a few survivors among the wreckage.

I think, however, that we have hopeful and strong evidences that this will happen only if there is inadequacy in the constant flow of information to the people. Manmade disasters do not burst out of a vacuum. Lex-

ington, Sumter, Pearl Harbor—all were culminations, not beginnings. The great event which marks the end of a chain reaction is explosive only because the lesser events leading up to it were inadequately known and hence imperfectly understood.

Even if the reporting of these lesser events cannot be counted a wholly new role for modern journalism, it must certainly be counted as a role wholly new in urgency and emphasis in this ICBM age.

That is the major job that faces journalism in America today. And we are not talking about our survival as a profession now. We are talking about any survival at all.

We can be comforted by evidence that prompt, thorough and good reporting does work. In the fall of 1956, every form of journalism in the United States—press, radio, and television—reported fully and arrestingly on the Hungarian revolt. Before this a Roper survey of a cross-section of American adults found that 72 percent of them opposed any immigration allowance beyond the fixed quota. After the revolt, but when the immediate emotional reaction was over, 72 percent were in favor of lifting the immigrant restriction.

Also in the fall of 1956, despite the preoccupations of a presidential election, journalism in America in all media did a job of incisive effectiveness in reporting the Suez crisis. In a survey before Suez, less than a third of the people were unqualifiedly in support of a United Nations police force in troubled areas. After the Suez crisis, 57 percent of the American people, in a similar survey, were unqualifiedly in support of a United Nations police force—including its use of American soldiers.

In March 1957, when the $72 billion budget for 1958 was submitted to Congress, a survey showed 60 percent of the American people in favor of cutting it. After the dramatic job of reporting the flight of the sputniks, another survey showed 65 percent of the American people in favor of increasing the budget.

Now all these issues were the subject of arguments, orations, and repeated exhortations for years. But information brought quickly, fully, and well on events relating to the issues accomplished the mobilization of opinion that years of persuasion and argument failed even to start. I find this very heartening. To me it means that exhortation does not move without the facts.

This has an obvious bearing on the role of journalism in our time. It emphasizes the importance of better, faster information to the people. The speed, clarity, accuracy, and thoroughness with which we report events that inevitably shape public opinion constitute the very essence of our responsibility as journalists.

I do not mean to minimize the role of editorialization. It is of vital importance But editorialization without the context of objective, factual reporting, is personal opinionating in a vacuum. Unless the people have confidence that they have all the facts without bias, they will tend to dismiss the editorialization. But if they are persuaded that the opinion is based on all the facts—facts which the journalist has first given to the people—then the editorial will be accepted as thoughtful and helpful guidance.

Newspapermen have many of the same problems we do in the younger, newer branch of the press—electronic journalism. We both recognize a special responsibility to the public interest that world events have imposed upon us. We in broadcasting have additional unique problems of our own that relate to the very newness of our kind of journalism: radio reporting as we know it today is scarcely 20 years old, and television reporting is barely beyond its tenth year.

Each medium—the newspapers, radio, television—has its own individual capabilities.

Newspapers can present news in a great wealth of detail. The reader can peruse at length those things in which he is most interested, and ignore, or treat lightly with, the remainder. But in broadcasting the listener—or viewer—lacks this option of selectivity. In the electronic medium where time is the only dimension, the news must be presented sequentially. A further element is the inelastic nature of the dimension we call time. There are 60 minutes to the hour, 24 hours to the day. No matter how compelling the news may be, there simply is not enough time in a broadcast day to treat in detail the full panorama of news; not if we are to do the other jobs which we must do in order to make possible the fulfillment of our news functions. Completeness in the sense of detailed coverage, therefore, is one of the major advantages of the daily press and one of the technical limitations of broadcasting as a news medium.

On the other hand, radio and television brought an exciting new dimension to journalism. Ours is the strength of immediacy in reporting, often in transmitting the very event as it is happening. Combining sight, sound, and action, television has brought the world into almost every American home, giving remote places reality and revealing the important figures of the world as both more and less than legendary names. Moreover, by their very natures, radio and television are the mediums that often first trigger the interest of people in new events, new personalities, new problems—sending them to the printed mediums for further and continual information.

In the decade or so that we have had television as a great new presence in journalism, we have organized ourselves to meet our job as reporters. This is not to say that we have arrived at any plateau of effectiveness or thoroughness that calls for no more effort or ingenuity. But we have joined the older mediums in fulfilling the reporting function so that a certain level of performance is expected of us. We are getting the major stories, and we are getting them to the people.

But we cannot be content to rest on our oars for we are still far from getting to where we ought to be. We must constantly remind ourselves, I think, that the role thrust upon journalism today requires a far graver view of our total responsibilities than that which any of our predecessors had to take. Democracy rests on public opinion, and democracy succeeds only to the extent that public opinion is intelligent, well informed, responsive. The facts of life in the world today make this need for an informed public far more urgent than ever before.

There is mounting evidence that public opinion is shaped more clearly and more swiftly by the impact of events than by the power of propaganda. Propaganda in mid-twentieth century is self-limiting. On the other hand, people adequately informed can act and act fast to make their wishes known, and compel leadership to action. Upon the basis of full information which they can trust, people can make up their own minds about the conclusions of others, and if those conclusions—whether programs of Government leaders or editorials of journalists—are well founded on known and understood facts, people will be stimulated and influenced by them. Only, however, because they understand, and hence respect sensible opinion.

These circumstances put journalism on the threshold of the toughest job it ever faced, with the most serious issues hanging on its success or failure.

For our ability to report swiftly and thoroughly the events of our time in a way to compel the attention, interest and understanding of tens of millions of people is essential to the very survival of democracy itself.

A Tribute to Lloyd W. King

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, at the 1958 annual meeting of the American Textbook Publishers Institute held earlier this month, announcement was made of the retirement of Lloyd W. King, for 16 years the executive secretary of the institute. Mr. King is to be succeeded by Dr. Austin J. McCaffrey, former State commissioner of education in New Hampshire.

Lloyd King became the first executive secretary of the institute in 1942, after serving for 8 years as State superintendent of schools in Missouri. He has made an outstanding contribution to education in this country in both positions.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following tribute to Mr. King by the editors of the well-known educational journal, Scholastic Teacher in the May 16 issue of that publication:

"A crazy idea that'll never work," was the verdict in some circles 16 years ago when a group of 12 publishing companies proposed formation of a textbook publishers' association. The small, individualistic, highly competitive industry stood only to suffer, critics argued, under the restraints of cooperative effort.

Supporters, however, saw real benefits to education in the idea. They sought higher editorial and manufacturing standards throughout the industry; broader cooperation with professional educators and lay groups; better understanding among school people, publishers, and the public alike, as to the purposes and best uses of textbooks and other materials of instruction. In a real sense pioneers (although today they would likely smile at the word), the founding group went ahead. June 1942 marked the official beginning of the ATPI.

Chosen as its first executive secretary, and charged with transforming its ideals into reality, Lloyd W. King came to the institute from Missouri, where he had previously served for 8 years as State superintendent of schools. He brought to the fledgling organization a wealth of experience in both practical and theoretical education, together with rare skills in administration and human relations. On his shoulders has rested ever since, to a very large degree, the success of the ATPI.

As the reader is by now aware—and to borrow from an earlier man from Missouri—forecasts of a quick demise for the institute were greatly exaggerated; yet those early prophets of doom can be excused by pointing out that they did not know Lloyd King. With resolution, vast energy, and tact—supported always with the underlying conviction that the institute would endure only as long as it served both education and educational publishing—Lloyd King went to work.

That he succeeded in this ambitious undertaking, beyond even the fondest hopes of its proposers, is seen in a record of Institute accomplishment over the years, which record would far exceed the space available here. Membership has grown to a present total of 75 educational publishers supplying more than 95 percent of the Nation's teaching materials. (Scholastic has belonged to

the Institute since 1948.) Of even greater significance is the vast superiority of today's textbooks and other instructional materials over those of 16 years ago; in better printing and binding; wider, more imaginative uses of color and illustration; improved editorial techniques; better methods of selection and distribution.

Finally, the ATPI has achieved notable success in interpreting and explaining the industry's objectives. It is safe to say that the role of textbooks and periodicals—second only to the teacher as the most important influence in the classroom—is better understood than ever before by teachers, principals, administrators, and lay people.

These and countless other achievements—together with the universal respect, gratitude, and affection he has earned among publishers, legislators, school people, and Institute colleagues—offer profound testimony to Lloyd King's contribution over the years to education and educational publishing.

We salute him.

Now That Mr. Nixon's Home He Can Educate His Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, a rather enlightening editorial appeared in the Nashville Tennessean the other day anent Vice President NIXON'S visit to Latin America. Under the unanimous consent rule I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as follows:

NOW THAT MR. NIXON'S HOME, HE CAN EDUCATE HIS CHIEF

There are two important phases to the story of Vice President NIXON'S return from his tour of Latin America yesterday.

One deals with the extraordinary reception that awaited him and his brave wife at the Washington Airport. Just how much good will he had built on the trip which ended disastrously in Venezuela was beside the point. He had done his best to carry out a difficult assignment which confronted him with danger on more than one occasion, and he met every test with the kind of courage that appeals to all Americans.

The welcoming turnout was exceptional, and it marked an occasion when partisanship was put behind. Making a special concession, President Eisenhower was on hand, and so was everybody else. There was no bitterness in Mr. NIXON'S impromptu remarks, and the motor ride to the White House was an event of high importance.

In an expansive mood, Mr. Eisenhower chose this occasion to say that the riots against the Vice President would simply strengthen inter-American friendship.

And that brings us to the second part of the story, as yet untold, which deals with what Mr. NIXON may have told his chief after he had arrived in triumph at the White House.

We can believe that many Latin Americans bear Mr. NIXON nothing but good will and are ready to praise his admirable conduct under fire. To that extent relations may have been improved.

But if Mr. NIXON is as smart as we believe him to be, and if he was frank with the President, he did not overlook the underlying causes of the animosity he encountered.

Here was his opportunity to inform Mr. Eisenhower that a colossal mistake was made by ditching the Roosevelt-Hull Good Neighbor policy and trying to substitute something called the good partners, expounded by Dr. Milton Eisenhower and then filed away to gather dust.

And here was his chance to cite the criticism of our best Latin American friends who do not hesitate to point out flaws in Eisenhower administration policies in dealing with nations to the South.

Restrictive trade policies have had their inevitable effect on Latin American reaction to the United States, and this applies as much to free enterprise countries as others.

But there is even greater resentment over Washington's readiness to give sanctuary to the deposed dictator, Gen. Marcus Perez Jiminez, and his hated secret police chief Estrada. For freedom-loving Venezuelans who risked their lives to remove these menaces, such solicitude cannot be understood.

Furthermore, Latin Americans resent the United States active support of the Trujillo regime in the Dominican Republic and that of Batista in Cuba. As Governor Muñoz of Puerto Rico recently told the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee, "When you give equal consideration to dictators and tyrants as to proven democrats you cannot help but discourage democracy."

One can but hope that Mr. NIXON briefed the President well and that the facts will trickle through to the State Department while yet there is time.

Of course, there is no call for reprisals against Latin American countries, most of which are well disposed toward us; and there is also no need of keeping shock troops in an area where the possible need for them has disappeared.

Good neighborliness in the best sense of the term is the all-important requirement, after more than 5 years of neglect. And if Mr. NIXON can contribute to that end, he again will have acquitted himself well.

A Letter From Two Youthful Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in commendation of two of my young constituents who have written me requesting a job to help protect our country. Joe Lind, of 1664 West 106th Street, Chicago, and Bob Norman, of 1616 West 104th Place, Chicago. Joe and Bob attend Barnard School which is located at 10345 South Charles Street. These young gentlemen are 9 and 10 years of age.

As I read their joint letter, I could not help but be touched by their desire to protect their country without any request for pay. As adults, we are quite occupied with how much and what we are going to get out of things. In Bob and Joe, we find a willingness to serve without pay, a spirit much more prevalent in the days past than now. Few of us enter into something unless we have almost a guaranty that we are going to get a reward. Today there is a great need for selflessness in the world.

I believe the families of these two boys should be praised since it is quite obvious that the parents have instilled a willingness to give instead of take. The teachers at Barnard should be commended likewise since I am certain that the teachers in our Chicago schools are stressing the importance of students learning about their Congress which is dedicated to serving the well-being of the citizens of the United States.

Answering the letter from Joe and Bob is going to be a pleasure and I predict a bright and successful future for them if they keep the ideals expressed in their letter to me. The letter reads:

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 6, 1958.*

DEAR SIR: Joe Lind and I, Bob Norman, request a job with the Government. We are only 9 and 10. We hope we will be eligible for a job protecting our country. You may think we are too young. We would like to have identification papers if we can have your approval on the papers. Here are some things about Joe Lind. Joe goes to Barnard School. He lives at 1664 West 106th Street, his phone number is Pr 9–4760, his age 9, he speaks a little Espanol.

Bob Norman, I go to Barnard School. I live at 1616 West 104th Place. My phone number is CE 3–3555, my age is 10. If there is anything else you want to know, tell us in your answer. We both collect stamps so you see we know different countries.

Bob Norman, I know Espanol, a little Swedish, a little German, a few words in French. If we get the job we will start June 28, 1958.

We don't want a salary. Bob Norman, I will be down in Washington, D. C., in the early part of July. You see my aunt is taking me to Washington, D. C., for a tour. That's all for now.

ROBERT WALTER NORMAN.
JOE LIND.

Views of Marriner & Co., Inc., Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter from Mr. Kenneth W. Marriner, of the Marriner & Co., Inc., Lawrence, Mass., which will interest the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The letter follows:

MARRINER & CO., INC.,
Lawrence, Mass., May 15, 1958.

The Honorable THOMAS J. LANE,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANE: I thought you would be interested in knowing that our Government, through ICA has granted Pakistan $2,200,000 for the purchase of wool tops, which business our industry badly needs at this time, but we cannot get due to the funds being available for worldwide purchase, meaning foreign competition will get the business.

This is the sort of things that makes us business men mad when we see our Government giving away billions of dollars of taxpayers' money to foreign countries while our

own industries are running on short time. It would seem to me that the least our present administration could do would be to specify that the money for foreign aid must be spent on merchandise purchased in the United States.

This, incidentally, would be another way of helping the present recession.

Kindest regards.

Yours sincerely,

KENNETH W. MARRINER.

American Prisoners in Russian Slave Labor Camps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the radio broadcast of Friday, May 9, over radio station WLS, Chicago, by Mr. Bob Siegrist, contained an interview with Mr. John Noble, who has returned to this country after being held in a Russian slave-labor camp for 9½ years.

Mr. Noble, in his radio interview with Mr. Siegrist, has brought out the fact that he believes there are many thousands of American citizens who are still alive and still held by the Russians in slave-labor camps.

Mr. Noble's information, as detailed in Mr. Siegrist's interview, is as follows:

As we promised last night, our guest tonight is John Noble, the American citizen who was seized by the Soviet gangster regime and held in slave labor for 9½ years before finally being released in 1955.

As we mentioned last night, John Noble has now condensed the highlights of his fantastically horrible experiences into a gripping 180-page book aptly titled "I Was a Slave in Russia."

It's good to have you alive and with us tonight, John Noble.

Mr. NOBLE. Well, it certainly is a pleasure and a privilege to be here with you, having heard your broadcasts so often, and admiring the fact that you are certainly handing down to the American people in a way which they should understand, the dangers of communism. It is only too bad that some of these that listen to you do not yet realize the complete and satanic natures that confront our Nation.

Mr. SIEGRIST. Well, John, you know how completely barbaric and satanic communism can really be, since you certainly suffered terribly that barbarity, under the hands of the Communists.

Mr. NOBLE. To me, Bob, even worse is the fact that still today under Communist slave-labor conditions, there are many Americans who still suffer as I suffered.

Mr. SIEGRIST. You mean, that there are many Americans actually in Communist imprisonment, today, John?

Mr. NOBLE. Yes; there are many Americans that have been declared dead, many of them from World War II.

Mr. SIEGRIST. You mean, some American soldiers officially declared dead by the American Government are actually in slave labor in Soviet Russia today, John?

Mr. NOBLE. Exactly. But, you, as well as the American people, know that very little is being done by the American Government to force the Kremlin gangsters to release them.

Mr. SIEGRIST. Now, what would you, from your experience, John, like to see our Government do to gain the release of these Americans?

Mr. NOBLE. I would like to see the American people so properly aroused by this knowledge that they would bring every conceivable legitimate pressure upon our Government to, in turn, bring every conceivable pressure upon these same Kremlin gangsters with whom our leaders insist upon dealing in so-called diplomacy and so-called cultural exchanges.

Keep in mind, Bob, that all information about all American citizens missing behind the Iron Curtain is channeled to one office of the Russian desk of the State Department which, in turn, does little more than merely place that vital information about American lives in a file.

Mr. SIEGRIST. And, needless to say, you want to see that information pulled out of that State Department file, where it does no good, and activated, to facilitate the release of these unrightfully imprisoned American citizens.

Mr. NOBLE. Of course. These are American citizens. To the Kremlin gangsters, their only crime is that they are American citizens. And the Government of the United States has the grave responsibility to gain their freedom.

Mr. SIEGRIST. You feel it's time the Government of the United States did so in a vigorous manner, John; is that right?

Mr. NOBLE. That's right.

Mr. SIEGRIST. How did you gain your release, John, if it's so difficult? How did you gain your release?

Mr. NOBLE. Despite constant pleas on behalf of my mother to the State Department, as well as the pleas contributed by my father after his release in 1952, the Soviet Government denied holding me. It was only after I was able to submit evidence through a post card that I was still alive that my case was brought to the attention of the White House which, in turn, forced the Communists to release me.

Mr. SIEGRIST. You and your father were seized and imprisoned by the Communists at the same time?

Mr. NOBLE. Yes, we were arrested together in Dresden, Germany, where the Germans had held us in local internment throughout the entire war and we were then separated at Buchenwald, the infamous Hitler concentration camp which the Russians took over for their use. My father was imprisoned in Germany for 7 years, but I was moved into Russia, where I served the last 4½ years of my imprisonment at the infamous Vorkuta slave-labor camp 50 miles north of the Arctic Circle.

Mr. SIEGRIST. How did your father gain his release, John?

Mr. NOBLE. The prisoners held by the Russians in Eastern Germany were turned over to the East German Communist regime in 1952. They, in turn, had no jurisdiction over foreign nationals, and gradually released them. My father was one of them.

Mr. SIEGRIST. Well, now, John, the Russians have no jurisdiction over foreign nationals either—but they act as if they did. What's the story there?

Mr. NOBLE. The Kremlin gang is not only disregarding international law, but disregarding all standards of morality and decency.

Mr. SIEGRIST. Are you suggesting that the Communists in Eastern Germany are more moral and more decent their their Communist bosses in Moscow?

Mr. NOBLE. Certainly not. To release men held in Eastern Germany like my father was to the political advahtage of Moscow and its East German stooges.

Mr. SIEGAIST. You mean it was to their political advantage at the time of the release in 1952 as you saw it.

Mr. NOBLE. That's true, the East German Government wanted to show the world that they had some independence.

Mr. SIEGRIST. Which, of course, they did not and they do not have now.

Mr. NOBLE. That's right.

Mr. SIEGRIST. But, this again was a propaganda maneuver on the part of the Communists in Moscow through the Communists in Eastern Germany to release prisoners and to put up a bit of a show. Is that the idea, John?

Mr. NOBLE. That's right.

Mr. SIEGRIST. Well, now, you say that your release was actually triggered by a post card which you sent out from Vorkuta Slave Labor Camp. Is that to suggest then that you were permitted mailing privileges?

Mr. NOBLE. No; of course not. Any connection with the outside world was strictly prohibited, except for a few people which had mailing privileges in our camp. There were only about 35 prisoners out of the 4,000 in our section, which again was only a small section of the massive Soviet slave labor system.

Mr. SIEGRIST. There at Vorkuta. Now you say there were 4,000 prisoners. There were more actually in other camps within Vorkuta. Vorkuta has many camps is that right?

Mr. NOBLE. Vorkuta has approximately 200 to 250 camps holding approximately a half a million prisoners.

Mr. SIEGRIST. How were you able to send out that card?

Mr. NOBLE. A prisoner with mailing privileges into Germany permitted me—at the risk of his life—to use his privilege on this one occasion. I sent the card to distant relatives in Western Germany. It bore a single clue to my imprisonment—with the line—"your noble nephew"——

Mr. SIEGRIST. And your relatives in Western Germany recognized that; is that correct?

Mr. NOBLE. Yes; they forwarded it to Detroit, believing that the card was from me. My parents in turn forwarded it to the State Department as concrete evidence that I was still alive and imprisoned in Vorkuta.

Mr. SIEGRIST. In other words the Russian maneuver, in this case, which was a propaganda maneuver, this idea of being able to say they gave, a very cynical thing, they gave mailing privileges to their prisoners. That one propaganda maneuver, you were able to just almost by good fortune take advantage of it and gain your release really in that way; is that right, John?

Mr. NOBLE. Yes.

Mr. SIEGRIST. Well, now, John, what was it like being a slave laborer?

Mr. NOBLE. First of all, you are deprived, completely deprived of all freedom. It meant constant starvation diets which reduced by weight from 155 pounds to a mere 95 pounds. It meant brutality, constant fear and intimidation—long hours of extreme physical hard work in a primitive coal mine above the Arctic Circle under constant armed guard, with almost no hope of ever coming out alive. In short, it meant being reduced from a human being to the status of a beast of burden.

Mr. SIEGRIST. Well, and of course, these were very inhuman people treating you as if you were inhuman. Isn't that right, John?

Mr. NOBLE. That's right.

Mr. SIEGRIST. John, tell me this, you and your father were in business in Eastern Germany before the war and as I recall, when the war came, you were interned there by the Nazi regime. Is that right—that's how you happend to be there?

Mr. NOBLE. That's correct.

Mr. SIEGRIST. And, John, did you have any idea that the Communists would do what they did or were you told by American officials that you could stay in Eastern Ger-

many because everything would be all right? The Communists were our allies.

Mr. NOBLE. The American officials told us that we would not be able to return to the United States before early 1946 due to a lack of shipping space. On the other side, they told us that the Russians were our allies and that the Russians couldn't harm us. They told us, furthermore, that Dresden in Eastern Germany would eventually become British territory so there was no need to have any fear.

Mr. SIEGRIST. So the advice of the officials of our American State Department proved not very good because quickly thereafter you were seized by the Russians and that began your nightmarish existence as a slave laborer for 9½ years.

Mr. NOBLE. That's right, Bob.

Mr. SIEGRIST. Well, John, if you had a message to put across in the remaining moment or so, here, to the people listening as to what communism really means as a man who has suffered it in the most barbaric manner and if you had a warning to give the American people, how would you put it, John Noble?

Mr. NOBLE. First of all, I would like to say that I've experienced on my own body as well as all of the things that I saw over there that you cannot trust the Russians. No agreement which is made with the Russians has any value at all. The present situation in Russia is in my eyes, and the opinion also of those millions of people behind the Iron Curtain a lot worse than at the time of Stalin. Mainly, because of the smile—it's a false smile—it's intriguing.

Mr. SIEGRIST. How did it feel when the news filtered down to you people enslaved there at Vorkuta to know that President Eisenhower was meeting with Khrushchev and company at the summit conference in Geneva?

Mr. NOBLE. For us prisoners as well as for the free people in Russia, every firm stand on behalf of the Western nations was tremendously encouraging. On the other side—when they began their meetings—the Yalta meetings and so on—it certainly took every bit of hope out of the Russian people ever to get rid of their system.

Mr. SIEGRIST. Well, now, when you said free people of Russia, you meant the people who were not enslaved and were working for the Russian regime.

Mr. NOBLE. That's true.

Mr. SIEGRIST. Did you find hostility to the Communist regime among the so-called free people, among the Red Army and so forth?

Mr. NOBLE. Yes; there was some, very little though.

Mr. SIEGRIST. Very little. At least as far as you could see it on the surface.

Mr. NOBLE. Yes.

Mr. SIEGRIST. John Noble, thank you very much, and, of course, as we promise, we are certainly going to make your great book—it is a great book—I Was a Slave in Russia, available to our listeners at $3.75. All they have to do is write in care of the station. Thank you, John Noble. Bob Siegrist, good night.

American Legion Warns of Communist Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, veterans who fought to protect the United States in war are, in peacetime, carrying on their vigilance through the American Legion.

American Legion, New Hyde Park Post, 1089, which I am proud to say is within my congressional district, has passed a resolution urging the Federal Government to strengthen its forces, which protect this Nation against communism, a resolution I am pleased to be able to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Whereas an intensive campaign of political subversion, directed by a nationwide apparatus of Communist agents, menaces the entire security system of the United States of America; and

Whereas the objectives of this campaign is to destroy the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act; the Internal Security Act; the Smith Act, and all other legislative and executive action aimed against communism in this country; and

Whereas these forces would weaken or destroy the Federal Bureal of Investigation and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover; and seek to abolish the House and Senate committees who are investigating Communist subversion and espionage: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the American Legion, New Hyde Park Post, 1089, of New Hyde Park, N. Y., respectfully urges the Attorney General of the United States, and other duly elected representatives, to exert all efforts to prevent this deliberate weakening of our national security agencies; and urge the enactment of all necessary legislation which will strengthen these agencies in order to be able to meet the Communist threat facing our Nation today.

Adopted May 15, 1958.

HAROLD A. SANDFORD,
Adjutant.

The Employment Picture in the Los Angeles Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the most recent report, dated May 14, on employment in the Los Angeles area published by the State of California Department of Industrial Relations. While similar statistics are available from a myriad of sources, I believe that these, being compiled by a governmental agency are most realistic. The impact of the recession on the durable goods industries is illustratedd as continuing in an alarming downward trend, and points up the need for firm, speedy antirecession measures:

LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH METROPOLITAN AREA—MANUFACTURING EMPLOYMENT

Factory employment continued to decline between March and April in the Los Angeles-Long Beach metropolitan area, Edward P. Park, California Director of Industrial Relations, announced today.

The number of wage and salary workers in area factories totaled 692,000, off 9,200 from March and at the lowest level since mid-1955.

The March–April loss was concentrated in durable goods manufacturing. The largest cutback in April was in the automobile industry, where employment was down by 4,400. Cuts of nearly 1,000 each occurred in aircraft and in machinery manufacturing.

Within nondurable goods groups, there was a post-Easter reduction in apparel plants of about 2,000 workers and a loss of 1,200 in the rubber industry.

Employment in electrical equipment manufacturing rose by 500 in April, reversing a 7-month downtrend. The work force in food processing increased seasonally and small additions were recorded in ordnance and instruments manufacturing.

Measured from April a year ago, factory employment was down 75,400, or 10 percent. Of every 10 manufacturing workers released since April 1957, 5 came from aircraft and 4 from other durable goods industries. Only 1 in 10 came from nondurable goods plans.

Federal Versus State Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting editorial which appeared in the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., on May 17, 1958:

FEDERAL VERSUS STATE RIGHTS

A public hearing is scheduled at State house early next week on Governor Furcolo's recent request to have the Massachusetts Legislature extend the duration of unemployment compensation benefits 13 weeks beyond the present 26-week maximum.

A number of other States are tackling recession problems in the same manner because it is quite certain that whatever action the Federal Government takes along this line will be through the medium of a loan rather than a grant.

Federal extension of State unemployment benefits could usurp the rights of States by permitting the arm of federalization to reach out and seriously affect State employment security systems.

In addition, State administrators and legislatures are close to current economic conditions and are aware of local problems.

The Massachusetts employment security law was enacted in 1935, and through periods of high and low unemployment it has provided benefits to the unemployed at a total cost to Bay State employers in excess of a billion dollars.

Any Federal law which would impose an added burden upon the Massachusetts system could result in Massachusetts employers paying a contribution rate beyond any reasonable expectation. Thus, any such change in the system in this State should come about only through the due process of a change in the State statute.

A 13-week extension of such benefits in Massachusetts will put a dent in the fund but it will not wreck it. At last reports it had a reserve balance of well over $200 million. In the 1948–49 recession, before recovery came, the balance had dropped to $79 million.

There are 200,000 persons out of work in Massachusetts and many of them need something to bolster their economy because they have exhausted these benefits. As far as industry's thoughts on the subject are concerned, one of its top spokesmen admits there seems to be sufficient money in the unemployment fund at present to finance a reasonable extension.

It is one thing for some Massachusetts legislators to await the course the Federal Gov-

ernment will take. The truth of the matter is that Federal action on the jobless aid issue has been so slow that some States already have grabbed the ball and have done something about the unemployment benefit situation.

It could become a question of Federal versus State rights in the administration of the program. The Federal administration's plan would just about force States to borrow from the Federal Government to prolong unemployment benefits. This would amount to Federal encroachment on State responsibilities.

The system, generally, has gone through previous recessions without difficulty largely because its founders cautiously provided for an accumulation of reserves. Fortunately, Massachusetts has a healthy reserve.

Fortieth Anniversary of Independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to ask permission to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to the Honorable John Foster Dulles, our Secretary of State, from the executive board of the Lithuanian American Council.

The president of the council is Leonard Simutis, who is also publisher of the Draugas, a Lithuanian daily newspaper located in my district at 4545 West 63d Street.

I have previously indicated my genuine concern and interest in the plight of Lithuania and the sister nations of Latvia and Estonia. These valiant countries were among the first victims of the Communists. They are still under the complete domination of Russia. Recently Lithuanians here and in other parts of the free world observed the 40th anniversary.

Our country believes Lithuania and the peoples of Latvia and Estonia should have the right to choose their own economic, cultural, and political way of life. The letter follows:

MAY 19, 1958.

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Lithuanian American Council in presenting its observations on some recent events, wishes, first of all, to convey to you the congratulations of the council on the successful NATO meeting at Copenhagen which was achieved mostly by your courageous stand, exceptional ability and extreme patience. The unanimous support of your position by the Foreign Ministers of the NATO Council was most gratifying.

Permit us to recall to you the telegram which the executive board of the Lithuanian American Council sent you February 8, expressing its gratitude and support for your consistently maintained position on problems of conflict between the western democracies and the Soviet Union.

Much has been said and written about the Soviet Russian summit conference proposal. It has aroused apprehension among Americans, particularly those of central eastern European descent. We, therefore, feel it our duty to approach you on this subject.

THE ALLEGED PEACEFUL INTENTIONS OF THE SOVIETS

The Soviet Russian dictators have been insisting for a long time that the heads of state should meet to lessen international tension and prepare the ground to stop the armament race, to establish cultural cooperation and widen trade relations between the East and the West. This agitation found a favorable response in wide circles of many countries, because of the fear in people everywhere, believing themselves living under the constant threat of an atomic war which could become a terrible reality if production and improvement of nuclear weapons continue.

We agree with you, Mr. Secretary, that those who know Russian communism not only from the declarations of their spokesmen but also from Soviet deeds, doubt the sincerity of the dictatorship. A recent, typical example reaffirmed this skepticism when Moscow suddenly charged the United States with endangering international peace by the flights of American bombers carrying nuclear warheads in the Arctic region. This malicious charge without foundation was subsequently withdrawn by the Soviet delegate himself in the United Nations Security Council, but not until its aggressive propaganda had made its point.

We applaud the able manner in which you exposed the insincerity of the peaceful intentions of the Soviets which forced their own delegate to veto the honestly peaceful proposal of the United States to establish a system of supervision and inspection to prevent sudden nuclear attack in the Arctic area from any quarter. If the Kremlin masters do not want such security then who will believe that they really want to preserve peace?

THE POLICY OF THE BIG LIE AND DECEPTION

We agree with your able analysis of Soviet intentions and methods. Why did the Soviet rulers so loudly and consistently agitate for a summit conference? Mainly for two reasons.

First, they knew that the Government of the United States saw no reason to hold a summit conference with Stalin's successors as long as they did not show the slightest inclination to stay their aggressive designs against the free world or to rectify the injustices committed by the late dictator against their U. S. S. R. neighbors. And we believe, Mr. Secretary, that you foresaw quite accurately that the Kremlin rulers were proposing a summit conference solely for the purpose of propaganda—not peace—with the intention of discrediting the United States, of trying to place it in a position of appearing to be an enemy of peace and a warmonger, while at the same time attempting to create the impression in the mind of the world that they themselves were champions of international peace.

But since the intentions of the Kremlin were unmasked the summit conference has lost value as means for their propaganda.

If Nikita Khrushchev does not entirely reject it, it is because of the internal situation in the Soviet Union. The summit conference—a meeting with President Eisenhower and other heads of state—would enhance Khrushchev's prestige, and strengthen his position in the Kremlin.

A DICTATOR'S PRESTIGE

Not long ago, Khrushchev climbed to the top of the Soviet Communist Party and the Soviet Government over the heads and bodies of his rivals (Beria, Dekanozov, etc.). But the struggle for power goes on, as the opponents he defeated still have many followers who continue their efforts to unseat him. To strengthen his dictatorial position he must acquire an international authority similar to that enjoyed by Stalin. He does not yet have that authority. At the summit conference in Geneva in 1955, Khrushchev was demonstrating his power by rudely pushing around Premier Bulganin; but Bulganin, and not the First Secretary of the Communist Party was then acting officially as the representative of the U. S. S. R. Government and signing documents. Therefore, Khrushchev, desiging to meet the President of the United States as his equal, removed Bulganin and took over his duties.

Why should the United States support the ambitions of this despot who murdered thousands of Hungarians fighting for freedom? And a despot who does not conceal his utter contempt for international agreements?

Last month, Anastas Mikoyan, First Deputy of Prime Minister Khrushchev, quite frankly admitted to the representatives of the press in Bonn that Soviet Russia had agreed at the conference in Geneva, in 1955, to the western proposal to unite Germany by free elections of the German people; but now times changed declared Mikoyan, and the plan of uniting Germany by general election is unacceptable and cannot be applied any longer.

So the Soviet Government arbitrarily rejects the agreement, and the Western Powers must abide by its decision. Just as simple as that.

THE NATURE OF TOTALITARIAN DESPOTISM

An idea is being spread among the people of the democratic West and in the neutral countries of Asia, that the Communist regime of Russia will gradually become softer and will develop in the direction of liberalism. This idea finds wide acceptance each time the Kremlin rulers begin to talk about peaceful coexistence. Some people even believe that Stalin himself might change and abandon his hostile attitude toward the democracies, but now everyone knows it was a vain hope.

This illusion was revived again when Nikita Khrushchev strongly denounced Stalin's crimes and grudgingly conceded some rights to the Communist parties in the satellite countries. In line with the new-found liberalism of the Kremlin, Mao Tse-tung of Peiping proclaimed freedom for contending different schools of thought in China.

Those who believed this profession of liberalism by Communist leaders now feel bitterly disappointed, as Khrushchev and Mao are turning back to Stalinism.

This development should not surprise anyone who understands the nature of Russian communism. A despotic regime, and especially one of the totalitarian type of the Kremlin, is unable to evolve in the direction of freedom, because it is based on the denial of freedom and self-determination to people in every sector of life; consequently any sign of independence or opposition anywhere endangers its existence. The totalitarian dictatorship cannot make peace with its subjects, or seek an honest reconciliation with the free nations because a lasting international peace as a result of such reconciliation would deprive the Soviet Government of any justification for its policy of suppression of the people at home.

As long as the totalitarian regime is in power in Russia, there will be a cold war, and a constant danger of a general war. The Western democratic nations have no choice but to arm in order to be prepared to repulse aggression.

NEW WARNING TO THE FREE WORLD

We agree with you, Mr. Secretary, that the aim of the Communist dictatorship to destroy freedom in the world did not change with Stalin's death. And Nikita Khrushchev, just as his former chief, considers the United States of America the principal obstacle of world communism, and all his efforts are di-

rected toward destroying the power, harming interests and defaming the reputation of this great Democracy and he is using the most despicable means at his command.

A striking example of this was seen recently in South America on the occasion of the good-will visit of RICHARD M. NIXON, the Vice President of the United States. The outrageous acts of violence and insults by hate-filled mobs in Lima and Caracas against this representative of the Government of the United States were Communist inspired, organized and directed.

Clearly established facts and documentary evidence prove that the leaders of those mobs were carrying out direct instructions of the Communist Center in Moscow. This center is under the personal control of Nikita Khrushchev, the man who unceasingly talks about peaceful coexistence and bombards Washington with his appeals for mutual understanding and cooperations.

The masters of Soviet Russia long ago assured the United States that the Comintern, the international Communist organization, has been dissolved. But it is evident now, that this instrument of world Communist conspiracy still exists.

This new evidence of the Kremlin's treachery should be a warning to all those who long for rapprochement and friendly relations with the rulers of the Soviet empire.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE SOVIETS

We further agree with you, Mr. Secretary, that from the above it does not follow that all negotiations with the Soviet Union must be rejected. A complete refusal to negotiate would leave no alternative but war.

Democracies abhor war. They want peace, a just and durable peace, based upon the principles of law and morality.

By firm adherence to these principles the representatives of the democracies can turn negotiations with Moscow into an effective weapon for the cause of freedom. They can use the negotiations to expose Moscow's lies and deceptions, to reveal the truth about Communist rule in Russia and the satellite countries, and to inform millions of people behind the Iron Curtain about the free world.

OUR POTENTIAL ALLIES

Soviet Russia enslaved 90 million people in eastern and central Europe who, until 1939, lived under their own national governments. These millions are natural allies of the West, and they will ardently support the cause of freedom if the western democracies will not abandon their cause.

The yearning for freedom of the enslaved people and their opposition, even their passive opposition, to the oppressors, is of inestimable value to the democracies. The Kremlin knows that they constitute a constant threat to its rule and is forced to maintain in those countries many divisions of the Red army.

The notion of the apologists of Soviet despotism that the fate of the enslaved peoples would be ignored in order to win the consent of Soviet Russia for a peaceful settlement of world problems must be rejected emphatically. These proposals of the advocates of the status quo not only violate the principles of law and morality, not only would they undermine the foundations of modern civilization, but would also dangerously weaken the security of this country by alienating countless friends and potential allies of the United States among the people subjugated by the Kremlin.

It is not by moral capitulation that this country will assert its leadership in the struggle against Communist tyranny, but by courage and firmness.

THE FATE OF THE BALTIC STATES

The Lithuanian American Council, an organization of Americans of Lithuanian descent, does not need to remind this Government of the fact that Lithuania, as well as the other two Baltic States—Latvia and Estonia—were among the very first victims of Soviet aggression executed in conspiracy with Hitler. The Soviets, against the will of the overwhelming majority of the people of the Baltic States, illegally and forcibly incorporated them into the Soviet State. These three Baltic Republics are still held under the cruel yoke of Communist Russia.

The Council is deeply grateful to you, Mr. Secretary, for your message to the Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians on their 40th anniversary of the restoration of independence wherein you stated, "The United States Government believes that the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have a firm right to choose their own political, economic, cultural systems."

We are grateful to the Government of the United States for its sympathetic attitude maintained through all these years regarding the aspirations of the Baltic peoples.

We conclude by asking you, Mr. Secretary, to use every opportunity to bring the facts of their enslavement to the attention of the world and to insist that their right to freedom and national independence should be restored to them.

EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL,
LEONARD SIMUTIS, *President.*
Dr. PIUS GRIGAITIS, *Executive Secretary.*

Hon. F. Edward Hébert, of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL VINSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include three citations received by our distinguished colleague, Mr. HÉBERT, from the State of Louisiana, city of New Orleans, and the Association of the United States Army.

On Sunday, May 18, our distinguished colleague and long-time member of the Naval Affairs Committee and of the Armed Services Committee, the Honorable F. EDWARD HÉBERT, of New Orleans, representing the First Congressional District of Louisiana, was signally honored by his State, by his city, and by the Association of the Army.

On that day, he received the Distinguished Service Medal of the State of Louisiana from Maj. Gen. Raymond F. Hufft, The Adjutant General of the State of Louisiana. This is the first time that a civilian has received this medal in the long years of its existence; and the first time it has been awarded to a Member of Congress.

The citation accompanying the award is this:

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
MILITARY DEPARTMENT,
JACKSON BARRACKS,
New Orleans, La.

CITATION: LOUISIANA DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL

The Honorable F. EDWARD HÉBERT, Member of Congress, is presented the Louisiana Distinguished Service Medal, awarded per General Orders No. 29, Military Department, State of Louisiana, in recognition of his significant unselfish, and untiring interest in the Louisiana National Guard and in furthering the security and welfare of the State of Louisiana and the United States of America.

Congressman HÉBERT's long and distinguished service to the State of Louisiana and the United States of America, both in peace and war, stands as a symbol of integrity, faithful service, and devotion to duty and country, and, for his untiring efforts in behalf of the State of Louisiana in securing title to Jackson Barracks, the Louisiana National Guard and the people of Louisiana are grateful.

For his unstinting devotion to the National Guard of the United States and his profound wisdom in securing the activation and construction of Alvin Callender Field as the first joint-usage Reserve Air Force the National Guard is deeply indebted.

His diligent and devoted service to the State of Louisiana, his wise counsel and steadying influence, and his intelligent and practical approach to military problems have fostered a genuinely harmonious relationship between the military elements located in the New Orleans area and the people of Louisiana, and all members of the Louisiana National Guard are deeply grateful and appreciative of his efforts in their behalf.

RAYMOND F. HUFFT,
Major General,
The Adjutant General.

Mr. Speaker, at the same time, the mayor of New Orleans, the Honorable deLesseps Morrison, awarded our colleague that city's International Order of Merit for his outstanding services in promoting international cooperation and fostering good will among South American and other countries.

That citation reads:

Greetings: Be it hereby known to all that the Honorable F. EDWARD HÉBERT has on this 11th day of May 1958 been awarded the International Order of Merit and made an honorary citizen of New Orleans, the international city, air and sea gateway between the Mississippi Valley and the world, second port of the Nation, home of the Mardi Gras, Sugar Bowl, and spring fiesta, and city with a colorful past, a progressive present, and a promising future.

DeLesseps S. Morrison, Mayor, City of New Orleans; Glenn P. Classen, Councilman at Large; Victor H. Schiro, Councilman at Large; Henry Curtis, Councilman, District A; Paul V. Burke, Councilman, District B; James E. Fitzmorris, Jr., Councilman, District C; Fred J. Cassibry, Councilman, District D; Theo Hickey, Councilman, District E.

Mr. Speaker, then followed an award from the Association of the United States Army presented by Wallace M. Davis, its president, for our colleague's outstanding leadership on the House Armed Services Committee.

That citation reads:

In grateful recognition—the Honorable F. Edward HÉBERT, Member of Congress, First Congressional District, Louisiana, a distinguished and illustrious Member of the Congress of the United States—for faithful service to his country and his community; with the respect of his colleagues and his fellow citizens; outstanding for his leadership on the House Armed Services Committee and deserving of our highest commendations.

NEW ORLEANS CHAPTER,
ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY.
MAY 11, 1958.

Mr. Speaker, we are proud of the accolade received by our colleague on the Armed Services Committee of the

House. He has long and consistently distinguished himself. We join in the tribute which he has so rightfully received and justly earned.

The Advantages of the Free Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a high-school student in Angleton, Tex., D. Herschel Mills, 17-year-old son of the Reverend and Mrs. John W. Mills, has just won the $1,000 first-place award in an annual essay contest sponsored by the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons.

His essay was written on the theme of The Advantages of the Free Enterprise System. The essay reflects the characteristics for which we strive in our American way of life, particularly in free education.

Herschel is a product of the Angleton public-school system.

It is with a great deal of pride that I invite the attention of the House of Representatives to the fact that young Mills expects to use the money which he has won in this grand prize and various other lesser prizes, a total of $1,205, to further his education as a minister.

It is with great pleasure that I place the essay in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all to read and to study in years to come:

THE ADVANTAGES OF THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

The greatest monument I have ever seen to free enterprise is the modern American supermarket. On a single shelf may be found 1 product under 15 different labels, every one on those labels proclaiming its product to be the best made. Fifteen manufacturers, each trying to convince the public that only he can produce green peas capable of satisfying hunger. This is free enterprise.

Many denounce this system by which man earns according to his desires and capabilities, but they would destroy man's ambition, making him a robot with no incentive for advancement. What a flimsy, weak-willed creature man would be.

The main advantage of socialism, according to its staunchest advocates, is the security it provides. Under socialism, they say, poverty could be destroyed and man could live in peace, assured that no twist of fate could force him down into the gutters of life and prevent his rise. All would be equal, the socialists claim, despite their intelligence, ambition, and initiative. The drunken bum could be placed on the same level with the most distinguished statesman. This, they say, is security.

This may really be security, but while security may be one of the most universally pursued goals, it is also one of the most universally deceptive goals. Few would actually want security if they got it. There is something about sweat and toil and tears that appeals to a man's soul. To be deprived of the right to advance would tear man away from himself.

Man is a competitive being. All progress, whether intentional or not, has been derived from this competition. When man betters himself, he often betters humanity. Competition also provides better qualities. The man who must produce a better product than his neighbor will naturally produce a better product than someone who is not subjected to these pressures. The truth of this statement can be proved by comparing an American car and a Russian car. The American car is ahead by at least 10 years in all respects. Nowhere, except in a free-enterprise system, can man progress so far in so short a time as he has progressed in 20th century America.

This brings us to another important point: Democracy. To bring us democracy, to bring us freedom, our ancestors lived and worked and fought. The blood of America's sons was shed on Bunker Hill, at Gettysburg, at the Marne River, Iwo Jima, Normandy, and Porkchop Ridge; shed so that the light of democracy might shine on our land forever. Our common heritage of democracy makes us all zealous in protecting that democracy.

And what could be more democratic than free enterprise? What could be freer than for a man to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow? Abraham Lincoln referred to this Nation as a Nation "of the people, by the people, and for the people". But how can a Nation be of the people and deny the right of private ownership of property? How can a nation be by the people if it thwarts individual initiative? And how can a nation be for the people if it restricts individual opportunity for advancement? Freedom is impossible without a system of free enterprise.

One of the biggest advantages of the free enterprise system is that it permits private ownership of property and business. We all know that a man will take more pride in something he owns than he will in something owned by somebody else. The destruction of an individual's right to own property also destroys his ability to achieve, curbs his initiative, and decreases his productivity and usefulness. Free enterprise is necessary for man to perform to the best of his capabilities.

To see it in its proper perspective the difference between a country that has a system of free enterprise and one that does not, we must compare the United States with the Soviet Union. The United States has been one of the most prosperous nations in the world. The Soviet Union has been referred to as the "world's biggest poorhouse." The American free enterprise system has produced better than an average of seven times as much coal per worker as the Soviet Union. Opponents of free enterprise say that socialism, communism, and all the isms created to destroy mankind would eliminate poverty and tend to build up the standard of living among the masses. Yet the average Russian worker must labor 5½ times as long as the average American worker to earn his daily bread. Without free enterprise, not poverty, but prosperity, is eliminated.

Technical ability under any other system besides free enterprise would be practically nonexistent. What would be the use of gaining technical skills? The unskilled, the uneducated, would all earn as much as the most highly trained and highly educated men a nation could produce. The genius could accomplish no more than an idiot. The college professor would be more than an illiterate bum. Invention would reach a standstill. Scientific advancement would be thwarted. Production would be slowed to a snail's pace. There would be no dreams, only drudgery. How could man progress in such a stagnant atmosphere?

Free enterprise is the world's backbone. Ludwig Erhard, West German Minister of Economics, credited with the success of the German economy, has said, "Where there is a free market, there are sound currencies." The most industrious man is the man with the highest goal in sight, a goal that will lead him higher and make him better. The most perfect position for the head is tilted upward looking at the sky, and all those who have advanced the human race, regardless of the political system under which they labored, were laboring under an economic system of free enterprise which encouraged individual initiative.

What is free enterprise? It is a steel mill in Pittsburgh, an oil well in Texas, an orange grove in Florida. It is a man wiping the sweat from his brow in the cornfields of Iowa, a doctor preparing for surgery. It is a one-room schoolhouse in the mountains of Kentucky. It is a wadded section of the stock market reports from a morning newspaper, and yes, it is the grin on a little boy's face as he tries to sell lemonade, "Only a nickel, mister." That's free enterprise. That's why our forefathers died, and it's what we must live for.

Congressman McCormack on Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include an editorial on the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, concerning his views on the need for a tax cut, which appeared in the Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., on May 15, 1958:

CONGRESSMAN MCCORMACK ON TAXES

No matter how vital or complex the issue, Boston's renowned gift to Congress, Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, can never be accused of not making his views or feelings known.

This week, Congressman MCCORMACK called for a cut in personal income taxes as an antirecession measure. While the Congressman made it plain that he was speaking for himself and not for the Democratic majority of the House, his views unquestionably carry great weight.

"The economic situation is such that a tax reduction should be put through at once," the veteran Democrat stated.

Congressman MCCORMACK envisages a tax reduction as something giving a badly needed shot in the arm to industry. Aside from the extra income it would afford middle-class families, the Congressman believes it would spur a new business cycle by inducing a wave of buying.

As the eyes of the United States look upon Washington this week, it is heartening to see Boston's great leader once more placing himself definitely on the record in such a controversial issue.

It would take volumes to list the good accomplished by Congressman MCCORMACK in his public career. He is one of the great statesmen of the day, a man who not only knows what is going on all over the world but is equally conversant with the problems affecting the working man and woman.

During his long and notable career, Congressman MCCORMACK has had the sympathetic understanding and cooperation of a wonderful wife, Mrs. Harriett McCormack. Mrs. McCormack has emerged over the years as one of her husband's most trusted and capable advisers. She is a brilliant, intellectual woman with a complete grasp of goings on at home and abroad.

Edward McCormack, nephew of the Congressman, an able and brilliant lawyer, who is slated to be the next attorney general of the Commonwealth, is an ardent advocate of a reduction in personal income taxes.

Address by Alexander Campbell at the Thomas Riley Marshall Democratic Dinner, Wabash, Ind., April 29, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by Alexander Campbell at the Thomas Riley Marshall Democratic dinner in Wabash, Ind., the evening of April 29, 1958:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS OF ALEXANDER CAMPBELL AT THE THOMAS RILEY MARSHALL DEMOCRATIC DINNER, WABASH, IND., APRIL 29, 1958

Thomas Riley Marshall, Hoosier Vice President, philosopher, and governor, though a man small in physical stature, was a man of powerful intellect, sparkling wit, and Christian integrity. His grandfather was one of the pioneers and pathfinders who came to Indiana when it was a primeval forest. His grandfather had youth, a stout heart, a sharp ax, a young wife, and courage. It took him 6 weeks to get from Virginia to Indiana. Tom Marshall inherited a stout heart, great courage, and it is conceivable that from the sharp ax of his grandfather came the sharpest wit to ever grace the public life of Indiana.

In his own book entitled "A Hoosier Salad," Tom Marshall tells about his grandfather being the first clerk of Grant County, Ind., where the courts were held in his house for several years.

In this book he says, and I quote: "I have met nearly all the men and women in America who have been prominent in the last 40 years; I have seen and conversed with a great many of the illustrious ones from across the sea, and I do not hesitate to place the wreath upon the tomb where rests the ashes of my father and my mother. Among all the sons and daughters of men that I have known there may have been many of larger vision; many of finer education; many of more potent influence in the affairs of men, but there have been none with finer spirits, greater consecration to duty, love of humanity and veneration to God, the match of the perfect man and the perfect woman."

These sincere words from the pen of a great trial lawyer, sparkling speaker, and dynamic personality attest to a philosophy of greatness. Any man who will thus testify as to his mother and father has the quality of true Christian integrity.

Dr. Daniel Marshall, father of our Democratic patriarch was a practicing physician in North Manchester, Wabash County, in the 1850's and I am honored to be invited to the county of his birth to review with you, to point with pride the great record of a distinguished son of Indiana, the Hoosier Vice President, philosopher and Governor.

It is interesting to note the strong belief which the pioneer Marshall family had in the Democratic Party. In a chapter in his own book entitled "Hell or the Republican Party", Marshall says that "my grandfather and my father were notified by the Methodist preacher whose church they attended that they would have to strike their names off the roll if they continued to vote the Democratic ticket. My grandfather as a former Virginian announced that he was willing to take his chance on Hell but never on the Republican party. My father compromised by joining my mother's church. Many of the people of the South suffered deep privation and agony untold during that long period but the thousands of Democrats who went into the Union Army from Indiana and Illinois left at home families that suffered far more. Perhaps, he said, it was the experience of these youthful days that has led me to be rather charitable in my judgment of the political opinions of other men. I have always been a staunch adherent of the Democratic faith and a devoted follower of the Democratic party, but I have never been able to as yet, make myself a politician, because a politician, I have discovered, must not only be convinced that he is right, that his cause must prevail if the republic is to survive, but that the man on the other rank is not only a bad American but that if his cause prevails the fabric of democracy is likely to be torn in twain. I never have had a doubt as to my being right, but I have never been so sure that I desired unqualifiedly to condemn anyone who happened to think otherwise.

Tom Marshall had great faith in the Constitution of the United States, in order through law, and in the American people. He once said, "Don't worry about the overthrow of the vital principle upon which the American Government rests. So long as 10 million Fords are driven by 10 million Americans, God is in his heaven and the Government in Washington will continue to live."

In the campaign of 1872 Tom Marshall organized the Democratic Club of Wabash College where he was a student. At this time he was able to gather together about eight members of his club, although he himself was not a legal voter. This club was honored with leading the procession when Hendricks, a candidate for governor, came to Crawfordsville and Tom Marshall astride an enormous horse acted as escort for the man who was to become the next governor of the Hoosier State.

The Vice President was a true Democrat in his philosophy that government is designed to serve the people and the masses and not to rule over them. He was very much concerned with the fact that in 1913 every income in the German Empire was paying a 10-percent tax to the Government, that socialism was growing by leaps and bounds in the empire and that one of the principles of socialism was its abhorrence of and opposition to war. There was great agitation in Germany also for universal manhood suffrage. In those days Tom Marshall liked dictatorship no better than we like dictatorship today and it was Tom Marshall who predicted in December 1913 that there would be war in Europe within 5 years and that we might be drawn into it. He was laughed at by the Senators who were present in the Senate cloakroom at the time and some of them even ventured to inquire what sort of liquor he had been drinking—these Senators assured the Vice President that the peace of Europe was permanent.

It was not 5 years, it was only 9 months until the awful cataclysm came and World War I became a reality. World War I became a reality because the American people and the free people of the world could no longer stand by and watch the heel of the Kaiser being pressed down upon the backs of the great people of Germany in a similar manner as did the heel of the Nazi Adolf Hitler repeat the catastrophe—a catastrophe which brought to the defense of men and women in virtual servitude, the freemen from around the world who challenged the Axis triumvirate of Nazi Germany and imperialistic Japan and Fascist Italy.

Is history to repeat itself again? What is going to happen to the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain in this world of 1958 in which the world is half free and half slave. I say to you tonight that the world cannot endure half free and half slave in the space age in which we now live anymore than a nation could endure half free and half slave in which the world is half free and half slave? These great, abiding and undergirding principles which well up in the minds and hearts and souls of free men everywhere will keep alive forever the breath of freedom in the world and in the universe.

And speaking of the universe, this Nation faces its greatest test in the days that lie ahead. The Democratic Party faces its greatest test in these immediate years because we are witnessing the spectacle of the totalitarian government of Communist Russia gobbling up piecemeal defenseless nations and placing them behind the Iron Curtain, sending sputniks into outer space, and refusing to negotiate with this Government or any free government in the world on the control of outer space.

In our democratic processes, our Anglo-Saxon civilization had developed living by the rule of law and not the rule of men. We have had the development of the law of the sea, the law of the air, and now there must be implemented in the framework of nations, the law of outer space. Communist Russia refuses to discuss the law and the rule of outer space by law because Communist Russia seeks in its international program of aggression and infiltration to dominate not only the free and the enslaved world but outer space as well.

It is the Democratic Party that has fought communism to a standstill in its tracks not the Republican Party. It was a great Democratic Attorney General who laid out the blueprint for the prosecution in the Federal Courts of the land, with all of the constitutional guaranties afforded them, the 12 top Communists Board of Directors, United States of America. Alger Hiss, Judy Coplan, Harry Bridges, and 50 others who were indicted, prosecuted, and convicted between 1948 and 1950. These Communist prosecutions were the first of their kind in the history of the United States since the time of George Washington and they were carried on successfully by a Democratic Attorney General under a Democratic President. I know—because I was there.

President Harry Truman stopped Communist aggression in its tracks in Korea and saved Europe from communism during his administration. Who has been soft on communism? My friends, we are losing the cold war. As Communist aggression continues around the world, as the Communist international program for domination of the earth and space engulfs nation after nation and the influences of the godless totalitarian form of government reaches out to subjugate the peoples of the world, let me point out tonight that there has been no move to stop them. In the hope of peace at any price, this administration cringes beneath the lash of Communist Russia; in Egypt, in Indochina and Syria, in the Satellite countries, and Africa is next. You say it cannot happen here, it is happening here in this little world on which we live. The rape of Hungary accounted for the starvation of millions of people behind the Iron Curtain, the subjection of free people to a police state—and there is no cry from Washington to encourage the enslaved people behind the Iron Curtain who look and listen and linger for a ray of hope from their free brothers around the world.

Why does our State Department not call upon Communist Russia to liberate the enslaved peoples in the satellite countries, to grant free elections to people everywhere within their domination, the answer is be-

cause the administration is afraid. The administration is afraid of losing votes and as a result we are losing the fight for freedom around the world.

Here me tonight—arise democracy—carry on the torch of freedom held so high by Woodrow Wilson, Thomas Riley Marshall, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and Harry Truman.

Vice President Marshall served in high public office under one of the greatest men in the history of the world—Woodrow Wilson. The administration of Wilson and Marshall was a very progressive one which saw the enactment of long needed reform and all during the 2 terms as Vice President, when Marshall differed with the President, which he occasionally did, he gave his loyal support to his Chief in the White House.

The story is told about the days when President Wilson lay stricken in the White House—and selfish men urged Marshall to sieze the reins of government for himself—and how the Vice President steadfastly refused. He took the position, as a great lawyer, that such an act would be unconstitutional. There was no legal provision for such an act, and history has shown that he was right.

Even now, in 1958, Congress is fighting, but doing nothing with the problem, while NIXON waits on the 19th hole.

Our illustrious Hoosier was an active Democrat all of his life and I am pleased to say that he was an organization Democrat. After organizing the first Democratic club at Wabash College, he returned to Columbia City to become a leader in the community, a great trial lawyer and a faithful and prominent member of his lodge. He served as 12th district chairman and a member of the Democratic State Central Committee in 1896.

Governor Marshall, like Governor Schricker brought to Indiana a refreshing administration of rugged honesty, fairness and economy. There were no tumultuous highway scandals to blacken the pages of the Democratic administrations in our great Hoosier State under either Marshall, Ralston, McNutt, Townsend or Schricker.

Do you realize that tonight in Indiana there stands more public men under grand jury indictment and prosecution than any time in the history of the State of all of the State administrations put together from the time we transcended from Indian territory to statehood—to this present hour.

The Democratic Party in Indiana is on the march—the people are eager to vote for a new profile in the Hoosier State. Let us tonight resolve to lift high the torch of democracy which thus far has given us 73 out of Indiana's 106 mayors—the highest percentage in the history of the State and I am proud to acknowledge that your great Democratic mayor of Wabash is one of them. Let us join hands with one resolution, that we may go forward together and elect a Democratic United States Senator, full congressional delegation from Hoosierland and then continue through the mayors elections of 1959, on to the State House in 1960 with a Democratic governor who will rid the State of its bad name tarnished by the greed and plunder of the Craig administration. That will give to the people of Indiana the kind of efficient, sincere and honest government that the Democratic Party has always given to the great Hoosier people under such administrations as Marshall, Ralston, McNutt, Townsend and Schricker.

Isn't it great to be a Hoosier?—Isn't it inspiring to be a Democrat and to point with pride to the wonderful record of public service of such stalwart sons of democracy?

"PRIDE IN THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

From the Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette editorial page of April 29, 1958:

"One short week from today the primary election will be held in this community.

"We urge all Democrats to go to the polls on that day—next Tuesday—and vote for the candidates of their choice.

"It is their privilege to help select the candidates who will be on the Democratic ballot in the general election on November 4.

"They should take advantage of this privilege.

"They are proud that it has given the Nation in recent times such Presidents as Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman. These men faced tremendous problems and met them with courage and devotion to the cause of the people.

"The Democrats of Indiana are proud of such Governors as Thomas R. Marshall, Samuel M. Ralston, Paul V. McNutt, Cliff Townsend, and Henry F. Schricker. Their names will live through the years to come as leaders who added luster to the fame of our great State."

When You Are Sick and 65

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, two developments of widespread interest to those concerned over the health needs of our elderly recently occurred and were the subject of an editorial in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

In one development, the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, the American Nursing Home Association, and the American Dental Association set up a new national agency, the Joint Council To Improve the Health Care of the Aged.

In Missouri, a great step forward was taken in the area of health care for the aged when the Missouri Medical Service, which sponsors the Blue Shield insurance plan, and the Group Hospital Service, which sponsors Blue Cross, removed age ceilings on nongroup applications.

The Globe-Democrat editorial commenting on these developments follows:

WHEN YOU ARE SICK AND 65

How can 15 million Americans who are 65 and over take care of their doctor and hospital bills? They are at an age when their earning power has probably hit bottom, while their health expenses may be at a peak.

Last month, four national medical and health associations set up a new agency to tackle this problem. It is called the Joint Council To Improve the Health Care of the Aged. The four associations in it are the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, the American Nursing Home Association and the American Dental Association.

"The new joint council will work to bring into being more medical facilities with costs tailored to the limited means of the aged," Dr. Robert Peden of St. Louis told members of the St. Louis Academy of General Practice over the weekend.

"In that connection," he said, "I am happy to say that Missouri Medical Service—the Blue Shield medical-surgical plan sponsored by the Missouri State Medical Association—recently announced a new development of great importance and benefit to the health care protection of our senior citizens.

"This new development was to make nongroup membership in this Blue Shield plan available to everyone, regardless of age. Group Hospital Service—the Blue Cross hospitalization plan—has also removed its age ceiling on nongroup applications."

Giving men and women over 65 the opportunity to have the insurance protection of Blue Cross and Blue Shield is a development of great importance and benefit. Although it does not and cannot solve the problem of paying for long, expensive illnesses, it still goes a long way toward providing for many illnesses.

The medical and health association should be applauded for taking the lead in tackling this problem for it is not a problem that can be ignored.

By 1975, nearly 1 out of every 10 Americans will be 65 or over. If there is no other way for these 22,500,000 men and women to meet their health needs, the demand for Washington to do something will be irresistible.

And 2,500,000 Americans may be wrong, but they won't be ignored by men who have to run for office.

McGregor Will Hold Conferences in District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, since I have been in Congress I have always attempted to keep in close contact with the people of the 17th Ohio District, whom I represent.

While a Congressman is expected to have a broad grasp of national and international matters, and to give information on many troublesome subjects, I deem it most advisable to keep in touch with the people of our district so that I might have their views and endeavor to be of service to them in their personal problems.

Having been assured by the leadership that the Congress will not be in session, I will again, this year, follow the procedure of holding meetings in the courthouses of the seven counties in my district.

I have established the following schedule:

Tuesday and Wedneday, September 2 and 3, Ashland, Ashland County.

Thursday and Friday, September 4 and 5, Mansfield, Richland County.

Monday and Tuesday, September 8 and 9, Delaware, Delaware County.

Wednesday and Thursday, September 10 and 11, Newark, Licking County.

Friday and Saturday, September 12 and 13, Millersburg, Holmes County.

Monday and Tuesday, September 15 and 16, Mt. Vernon, Knox County.

Wednesday and Thursday, September 17 and 18, Coshocton, Coshocton County.

Weekdays 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. Saturday conferences will last only until noon, when the courthouse closes.

It is surprising how much can be accomplished when a citizen and his Congressman can sit down and talk over national and personal problems.

No appointments are necessary for these conferences and I urge any or all of my constituents to meet with me on the date most convenient to them.

With the knowledge thus obtained, I know I will be better able to truly represent them in the Congress of the United States.

Hon. Arthur Sherwood Flemming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am very pleased to include a recent editorial of the Kingston Daily Freeman bearing on the recent Cabinet appointment of a native son of my district, the Honorable Arthur Sherwood Flemming:

IN NEW CABINET POST

Kingston's illustrious native son, Arthur Sherwood Flemming, son of Judge and Mrs. Harry H. Flemming, of this city, has been called again to Washington as a member of President Eisenhower's Cabinet as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Mr. Flemming previously served in the Cabinet as Director of Defense Mobilization.

Mr. Flemming's long experience in Government service, his administrative ability and his dedication to office make him an excellent choice to direct this important governmental function. It is unusual for one individual to serve in two different Cabinet positions under one Presidency.

This new Cabinet post now places Mr. Flemming in a position of foremost responsibility in the administration. The department is one of the large governmental services, having some 20,000 employees. A man of unusual ability and energy and an experienced Government administrator, with a practical working knowledge of the job, Mr. Flemming's appointment is an excellent one.

Prior to his selection in the first Cabinet post as Director of Defense Mobilization, Mr. Flemming gained nationwide distinction as a member of top-level Government commissions under three Presidents—Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower.

When Mr. Flemming resigned his Cabinet post as defense director to resume the presidency of Ohio Wesleyan University and become a private citizen, President Eisenhower expressed his regrets in one of his most complimentary letters, which, in part, read as follows:

"I have drawn constant reassurance from the fact that your many abilities were devoted to the vital task of preparing our Nation against any eventuality. In this complex and exacting work, your vision and sound judgment have been of the highest value. The Nation has indeed profited by your dedication to this service over the past 4 years.

"Along with my appreciation of your services as Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, you have my thanks for your great contribution to the work of my Advisory Committee on Government Organization. I am glad you can continue as a member of the committee and will be available for further consultations from time to time."

Before accepting the presidency of Ohio Wesleyan University, Mr. Flemming served for 9 years as a member of the United States Civil Service Commission and later as chief of labor supply, OPM and the Manpower Survey Board, Department of the Navy. He also served on the Commission on Organization of Executive Branch of Government, and Chairman, Advisory Committee on Personnel Management, Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. Flemming's contribution to the general welfare of the country has not been limited to Government service. Besides his presidency of Ohio Wesleyan, he is a trustee of the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association and a member of the Hoover Commission. He served as president of the Washington Federation of Churches and was awarded the Traveling Fellowship, Washington branch, of the English Speaking Union in 1928. He has been prominent in Methodist Episcopal Church movements and he is a member of that church.

Mr. Flemming's qualities and his knowledge of Federal Government administration have been recognized by three presidents. Eminently qualified for even greater responsibility, he may be called upon for higher office and Kingston one day may be the birthplace of the President of the United States.

Welcome to Port

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has heard much in recent years, relative to the Calumet-Sag Channel, which is located in the district it has been my honor to represent. It will be welcome news to all to learn that the harbor has been opened to seagoing commerce. The Calumet Channel is the connecting link between the St. Lawrence seaway and the midcontinent of America. There is much progress yet to be made. However, the fruits of our labors are beginning to appear. There follows an editorial from the Chicago Daily Calumet carrying the glad tidings that the first foreign vessel has sailed into the harbor at Lake Calumet.

The editorial follows:

WELCOME TO PORT

Today is a special day for Calumet Harborland.

Today the newest world port—the harbor at Lake Calumet, is expected to greet its first foreign sailing vessel of the season which will be steaming in to take honors in the traditional race that starts at Montreal.

This is the second full season of activity for the port at Lake Calumet and 1958 bids to be the biggest and best yet.

After the hubbub of feting the victorious captain and his crew of the winning ship things will get back to normal and then we will begin seeing ships from all parts of the world steaming into the port.

We already are used to seeing ships whose home ports are in Sweden, Canada, Norway, the British Isles, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Italy and several other countries.

The port at Lake Calumet is now a true world port.

But we must not forget that just because we are a port of major prominence that our American shippers should not be slighted or forgotten.

Our great ore and grain boats have plied the lakes between South Chicago and other major harbors for years. Every day, from now on, we'll have the opportunity of seeing these sturdy "bread and butter" ships plying the Calumet River.

We also must realize the major importance of barge traffic on the expanding Calumet-Sag channel. This type of traffic comes to us all the way from the gulf and on the vital Illinois Waterway.

Business in this great and vital area of the Midwest is bound to get better from now on—thanks to the waterway traffic and its attendant business.

Italy: The True Republic With American Dreams Realized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, it was only a mere decade ago that Italy, the gateway to Central Europe, and the strategic control of the Near East, Africa, and the Mediterranean by air and sea power, faced the political crisis of its existence as a free nation.

Not only was unemployment a critical problem but a spiritual revolt against the Catholic Church was spurred by Communist conspiracy progagandists throughout all of Italy and especially among the tradesmen of the northern provinces where unemployment took its greatest toll.

It was immediately before the eve of election that the Italo-Americans and their many American friends here began the letter writing called the Postal Cavalcade for Freedom that turned the tide. Thousands upon thousands of appeals were written to friends and relatives in Italy.

It could be honestly said that nearly every American who served in Italy as well as all the service organizations including the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Amvets, together with the Military Order, 40 & 8, 8 & 40, Congressional Medal of Honor, the Order of the Purple Heart, Knights of Columbus, YMCA, Red Cross, and all their women auxiliaries deluged Italy with prayers and supplications to reverse this dangerous trend to undermine and sacrifice and destroy the Italian Republic—free elections were on trial. The result of this concerted program wrote the future history of a freedom-loving people—the followers of freedom won the day.

I can remember the joy this victory brought to my brother Ellidore (deceased), who worked untiringly for this result, serving then as chairman on the Department of Illinois American Legion Americanism Commission, which post he had held for 15 years until his death, June 1954.

So today we see the great progress made by Italy in the past 10 years since that memorial election day when freedom was sustained.

And so we congratulate Italy on the 10th anniversary of her free elections. For on the 25th of May 32,506,339 citizens of whom 16, 931, 263 females and 15,575,076 males will cast their votes for their favorite candidates. Of this num-

ber of voters only 29,225,687 can vote for the Camera—House—deputy candidates. A lesser number are qualified to vote for the senatorial candidates—the voters over 25 years of age are so qualified. There are 3,500,000 who are eligible to vote for the first time in this election of which only 500,000 are eligible to vote for the senatorial candidates.

We are happy to salute Italy, the strongest of the free Republics, next to West Germany, on her accomplishment to effect a free suffrage. The following list shows the true spirit of the Italian electorate from L'Italia, a Chicago Publication, by J. La Franco, editor and publisher.

There are, exclusive of Valle d'Aosta, 324 political divisions with 5,977 candidates—certainly an American forum.

Valle d'Aosta, 67,803; Lombardia, 4,789,698; Liguria, 1,230,700; Trentino e Alto Adige, 490,219; Friuli e Venegia Giulia, 864,014; Veneto, 2,513,096; Emilia e Romagna, 2,566,000; Toscana, 2,318,-241; Marche, 925,789; Umbria, 557,184; Abruzzi e Molise, 1,082,820; Lazio, 2,360,-449; Campania, 2,733,765; Basilicata, 386,170; Calabria, 1,207,519; Puglie, 1,967,248; Sicilia, 2,879,371; Sardegna, 800,012.

We need not emphasize the importance of Italy in the American plan of defense for freedom. The great American Army base at Leghorn—largest in the world—can supply all of Western Europe. The bases at Verona—combat—and Foggia—atomic—our NATO base at Naples, 6th Fleet operations center.

So that it can be readily said that whatever way the elections go, the American-defense program in Italy is thereby affected.

The help we gave to Italy surely has brought us a friend we can depend upon. Italy is our true friend in all of Europe. Even the Fascists, monarchists,. and left-wing Socialists cannot change it. The Democratic Christians Party support the ideas of American influence in Italian politics. Giuseppe Saragat, leader of the Social Democratic Party and friend of the United States, who has supported the Christian Democrats at times keeping the Government in pro-American control, is a leveler for American control and watches closely public sentiment to warn the United States of its fallacious attitudes on foreign policies.

We hope that this young Republic, Italy, will continue in this, its 10th election, to elect candidates to sustain us in this global cold war and, with us, maintain the freedoms of all peoples against the oppressive aggression of atheistic governments.

The progress of Italy can be best determined by the Drew Pearson report on his present coverage of the Italian elections in Rome:

GREAT PROGRESS IS MADE BY ITALY

(By Drew Pearson)

ROME.—Two big things impress you about Italy today. They are:

1. The forthcoming election will be completely free, with every shade and segment of political opinion not only able but required to vote. It will be a purer demonstration of democracy than in United States presidential elections because only 60 percent of Americans vote. When you contrast this with complete suppression of democracy under Mussolini you get some idea of Italy's tremendous political progress since the days when partisan bands began knifing Mussolini after Salerno.

2. Italy has made more economic progress than any other European nation except West Germany. Her gold deposits in New York of $1.4 billion are now behind only England's and Germany's.

ECONOMIC MIRACLE

From the depths of depression and discouragement as I saw it after the war, Italy has accomplished a modern economic miracle. The American people can take a little credit for an assist in this recovery. But basically it goes to the indefatigable energy and determination of the Italian people.

Today Italy receives no foreign aid from the United States except for a barter deal by which Secretary of Agriculture Benson gets rid of some of his surplus tobacco and cotton in exchange for local lira, some of which are used for the expense of the American Embassy in Rome.

DIFFICULT REFORMS

It has actually been Italian land reform, tax reforms, oil development, and highway improvement that have revamped the nation's economic structure. The Christian Democrats who have governed Italy since the war deserve credit for these difficult and sometimes unpopular reforms.

It was ex-Premier Antonio Segni, himself one of the biggest landowners in Italy, who largely wrote the land reform bill and wrote it in such a way that his own land would suffer severely. Many of the big estates in Italy are owned by Christian Democrats or the Catholic Church. However, the law was passed and is being carried out.

Last week, driving through southern Italy, I visited some of the new developments made possible by irrigation, reclamation, and by a series of loans from the World Bank. Along the Mediterranean where the Tifata Mountains drop abruptly to the sea, the erosion of the centuries has piled up silt along the river beds, while the pounding of the Mediterranean has washed sand and silt against the shore.

This created a mosquito-breeding morass somewhat like our New Jersey swamps which for years was wasted.

It remained for the Christian Democrats, with help from the World Bank, to accomplish the overall job of draining these swamps, damming the rivers, irrigating the land, and putting people back on the land.

A total of $340 million has been advanced by the World Bank, the latest loan of $75 million being subscribed by 7 West German banks and 14 banks in New York, Chicago, Toronto, Philadelphia, and Boston. The loan will go toward reclaiming 96,000 acres along the Volturno River, another 158,000 acres near the Adriatic, building 2 power plants, mineral development in Sicily, a clothing factory in Salerno, and 2 tin-plate and electric refrigerator factories in Naples.

A new throughway, the Highway of the Sunshine, is being built from Milan to Naples.

Michael J. Boyle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, Mike Boyle is dead. He was a pioneer in the early labor wars for recognition. He was known as "Umbrella Mike"—always carried the sun and rain protection with him. He died while in Florida last Saturday, May 17. He had a turbulent career in the labor movement—when it was really tough to keep the flock together. Through his indomitable will and courage he built the Chicago Electrical Workers Union into a formidable organization and was its leader for 50 years. Everyone knew that Mike Boyle's word was good. He was loved by his men and was one of the most powerful leaders in the union circles both nationally and locally. The electricians lost a faithful father and labor lost a powerful son.

We from the congressional districts identified with labor problems feel this terriffic loss to the men of the laboring classes and send our heartfelt condolences to his widow, Helen, and two daughters, Mrs. Frederick P. Geyser and Mrs. John Sheridan.

Fourth Annual Model Congress of Genesee County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the schools of Genesee County in western New York hold a model congress each year for the purpose of providing high-school students with a better knowledge of the procedures and activities of the Congress and of our system of representative democracy. I consider this to be a very excellent and worthwhile program which might be carried out with profit in any school system.

The fourth annual model congress was sponsored this year by the Robert Morris Council for Social Studies and was held in the Oakfield-Alabama Central School, Oakfield, N. Y. A number of bills were submitted by the student delegates and referred to proper committees. Six were acted upon by the congress.

Two bills were passed. They were:

Bill No. 5, submitted by Loretta LaRussa, of Notre Dame High School, Batavia; a bill to improve the social status of migrant workers by requiring the Federal Government to license and regulate agencies engaged in the contract of migrant workers; to regulate the method of interstate transportation of migrant workers; and to extend the benefit of social security and the protection of the Labor Management Relations Act to the migrant workers if they are citizens of the United States.

Bill No. 6, submitted by Douglas Fiero of LeRoy High School, LeRoy; a bill to amend the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 to include the following statement: It shall henceforth be unlawful for any labor union, or other organization of workers to force workers either by threat of violence or strike or agreement with the employer to join or pay dues to that

union. Be it also recognized that a worker who does not join a union is in no way deprived of rights of equality of opportunity by his action.

This amendment shall be carried out and enforced by the National Labor Relations Board.

Three bills were defeated: They were:

Bill No. 1, introduced by Ted Schultz of Oakfield-Alabama Central School; a bill to abolish the personal income taxes by imposing a national sales tax of 10 cents on a dollar on all products bought by people in the United States, with the exception of domestic foods, medicines, home fuel, necessary clothing, automobiles used for work, and home lights for reading and homework; a motion was made to accept this as an amendment to the Constitution instead of a bill.

Bill No. 2, introduced by Chester Gabriel of Elba Central School, Elba; a resolution declaring that it is the sense of the Model Congress that the Government of the United States officially recnogize the Government of the Peoples' Republic of China, and furthermore look with favor upon the admission of the Peoples' Republic of China into the United Nations but not as a permanent member of the Security Council.

Bill No. 4, submitted by Douglas David and Clarke Aspinall of Pavilion Central School, Pavilion; a bill to repeal the National Fire Arms Act.

One bill was tabled:

Bill No. 3, submitted by Paul Dickinson of Batavia High School, Batavia; a bill to discontinue the operation of the Post Office Department by the Federal Government, but instead to permit private businessmen to operate the Post Office under the supervision of the Federal Government.

An Increase in Income Tax Exemption for Persons Over 65

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the problems of our older people today are well known. In many cases they live on fixed incomes, such as pensions or annuities, and the cost of living increase in the past two decades has caused great harm to these plans.

The income or retirement plan which was set up 20 years ago provided an adequate income for 1940 prices, but it often is tragically short of covering more than the most basic needs in 1958 prices.

I am introducing a bill today to increase the additional $600 exemption allowed persons 65 and older. It is next to impossible for most persons 65 or older to find jobs to supplement their retirement income, and they should be allowed to retain enough of this limited income to take care of their basic needs.

My bill would allow an additional $900 exemption to persons 65 or older, allowing a single person over 65 a $1,500 income or a married couple, both over 65, a $3,000 income before income taxes are levied. This is not a large income, but many older persons are living on just this or less. It is not fair to them to tax any portion of their income below these levels. Our country is not so badly in need of revenue that we must take money from older persons who have only these small amounts to live on.

Virginia Will Continue Massive Resistance to Racial Integration in the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, in the Richmond News Leader of Friday, May 16, 1958, there appeared two editorials on the subject of public education in Virginia. The editor states his unyielding position to the unwarranted decision of the Supreme Court in the school case, and I am in wholehearted agreement with him in his determination to continue massive resistance to the persistent effort to force integration upon us. I hope the editorials will be widely read, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following text thereof:

YIELD, NOW?

The week that brings the fourth anniversary of the Supreme Court's segregation decision brings Virginia significantly closer to the showdown that has been inevitable all along. On Monday, Federal Judge Paul directed Charlottesville, in effect to begin integration in September. Federal Judge Hoffman is expected to impose the same mandate upon Norfolk and Newport News. Prince Edward and Arlington Counties are not far behind.

It is possible, of course, that new avenues of litigation may yet be found, by which these orders could be further delayed. In the interests of domestic tranquility, Governor Almond and Attorney General Harrison will want to explore these fully.

If no such recourse can be found, the question before Virigina will be:

Do we yield? Now, do we yield?

Every Virginian has a right and a duty to answer that question for himself. We have had a long time to think about it—4 years to reflect upon some towering problems of law, and education, and the preservation of a whole way of life.

Many a Southerner, long conditioned to respect the judicial process, was at first reconciled to accept the Supreme Court's decision with little protest. It took time to understand that the Court had not acted judicially, but rather legislatively. It took months to comprehend that the Court, in interpreting the Constitution, had done an unconstitutional thing: It has usurped the power reserved to the States themselves to amend the Constitution. Many persons have yet to grasp the plain truth that what is loosely called "the law of the land," in speaking of school decisions, is not a statute law at all.

Many of us have thought, too, of education. Four years ago, it seemed unthinkable that public education, meaning tax-supported education, might ever be abandoned anywhere. So great a catastrophe, we declared, would have to be forestalled at any cost. Now we have come to believe that the important end is education itself, and that it is of no consequence whether the end is achieved by public institutions, financed from taxation, or by private schools.

Most of all, many a Southerner has thought hard about the future of the South, and tried earnestly to weigh the alternatives before us now. One alternative, surely, is to surrender. The other is to maintain a massive resistance.

Considering the first of these alternatives, we have sought to appraise some of the affirmative arguments. One of these is that "the Negroes don't really want integration; they only want an end to legal segregation, and if schools were desegregated, they would stick to their own schools." A second argument is that school segregation should be abandoned because school segregation is immoral and un-Christian. A third is that the Supreme Court must be respected. A fourth line of argument goes to the unworkability of a private school system. There are other arguments also, among them the curious contention that integration in the south would please the Venezuelans and gratify Mr. Nehru.

Most of these arguments (and indeed, the same thing is true of arguments on either side) are based on conjecture, or upon opinion. They are not susceptible to direct rebuttal. We do know that in Baltimore and Louisville, where desegregation has been instituted on a voluntary basis, Negroes have flocked to white schools; there has not been the slightest evidence to support the theory that no more is desired by the Negro than an end to some legal barrier. Questions of morality or Christianity cannot be responded to in nonsectarian, political debate; on this point, surely, each man is entitled to his own opinion here on earth. Neither is there satisfaction to be found in arguing whether a contemptible decision merits respect; who is to say that when judges act lawlessly, law-abiding men are bound to abandon lawful alternatives to object compliance? As for international relations, a short answer is that we would all be better off if Mr. Nehru would tend to his knitting and let us tend to ours.

The consequences of surrender, in our view, far override the uncertain and arguable gains that are urged by integrationist spokesmen. To surrender would mean to accept the disruption of schools over much of the South, where white citizens, who provide the overwhelming bulk of tax support, would refuse to contribute longer toward school maintenance. Where public education were continued, integrated schools would be conducted in an atmosphere of tension, hostility, and bitterness. Has nothing been learned from Little Rock's Central High School this year? To surrender would be to invite the very conditions of interracial violence that have appalled the people of New York, Philadelphia and Chicago. To surrender would be to risk, a generation hence, a black-and-tan society—a society in which a Gresham's law of genetics, acting inexorably, as bad money drives out good, had expelled white culture and white characteristics in favor of the African. And at ever step along the way, we could anticipate social, familial and political conflicts that would rip the fabric of our whole lives, and react disastrously upon our economy.

What are the consequences of continued resistance?

They are not happy either. In localities where suits are filed by Negro plaintiffs, and litigated, and finally lost by the defense, some public schools—perhaps all public schools—will be closed. Some children, perhaps all children in these localities, will have their

education disrupted for a time. There will be great bitterness under this alternative, too, and there may be violence. For parents in some localities, resistance will mean financial sacrifice. Unless private schools can be made genuinely workable, the economy in these areas will suffer also. The physical act of closing a school will unleash a fresh torrent of abuse upon the South. We may anticipate, where schools are closed, an effort to maintain Federal schools with Federal taxes, or to compel the acceptance by private schools of students of all races. Endless litigation may be expected.

In choosing between these broad alternatives, Virginians cannot, or should not, confine themselvs to their personal situations here and now. If the dyke is breached anywhere in Virginia, then ultimately all Virginia must topple, for no State policy will remain. And if a small degree of integration may seem tolerable in 1958, we have some obligation to think of Virginia 20, 30, or 50 years hence.

Every Virginian, we have said, has a right and a duty to form his own opinions, conjectures and predictions, and to reach his own decision on the general alternatives now before us. These alternatives, again, are to accept race-mixing in the public schools of Virginia, or to resist race-mixing even if it means the closing of some public schools. In brief, the alternatives are to yield, or not to yield, to the judicial and political forces demanding integration.

Let there be no slightest doubt of this newspaper's choice.

Speaking for those of like mind, let us say this: We do not yield. We do not expect to yield ever.

PLAN PRIVATE SCHOOLS NOW

This newspaper believes, on the basis of all the evidence at hand, that a policy of continued resistance to racial integration has the overwhelming support of the voters and taxpayers of Virginia. Public opinion polls have shown this to be true; the people repeatedly have sent representatives to the General Assembly whose policies of resistance were well known; J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., was elected Governor last fall on this single issue. On this record, it is clear that the vast majority of the people of Virginia stand opposed to race mixing in the schools.

In less than 4 months, the strength of that conviction may be severely tested. In the absence of new legal delays, some public schools, and perhaps all public schools, may be closed in 3 cities and 2 counties. The question will be: What do we do in September?

A better question would be, What do we do now, in May? Now is the time for planning. Now is the time to draft local ordinances, organize private schools, line up teachers, and prepare for the siege. Governor Almond can help by undertaking a survey of possible tuition grant requirements, so that aid can be made promptly available to white and negro students alike. The attorney general's office can help by advising with localities on problems of local taxation and disposal of surplus property. The department of education can make available to both white and negro groups some useful advice on school operations.

But the thing that must be most clearly recognized is this: Private schools must be the responsibility of private citizens. On the precedent of Federal tuition grants under the GI Bill of Rights, we believe a good case can be made for the validity of State tuition grants, provided the State's action is limited to the disbursement of funds on a wholly nondiscriminatory basis. We believe also that a good case can be made for the leasing of unused public school buildings to private educational corporations. But the actual organization, administration, and day-by-day management of private schools must be undertaken by private groups, acting privately and without State supervision.

This is not an impossible task. At first glance, the total number of pupils to be educated privately may seem appallingly large. Broken down in terms of individual schools, and further reduced in terms of individual grades or classes, it is not appalling at all. It is one thing to think of private schools for 3,000; it is not so great a problem to establish private schools for 300. But the initiative must be taken now. Next September will be too late.

We approach the most critical point in the whole struggle. If parents in affected communities can meet the crisis calmly, accept the temporary disruption of their children's education, and switch over to private school operation without great confusion, a great advantage will be gained. That advantage should not be lost in the fall for want of prudent groundwork in the spring.

Indiana Newspaper Supports World War I Veterans' Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to present an editorial from the Plainfield Messenger, a newspaper in Plainfield, Ind., on the subject of pensions for veterans of World War I.

The editorial follows:

HAVE YOU CONSIDERED?

There is a movement on foot by veterans of World War I to ask Congress to grant them pensions after they reach the age of 60, which is meeting some opposition.

The movement is nationwide and already over 1,250 barracks have been established throughout the 48 States and Territories. This organization is known nationally as Veterans of World War I—U. S. A., Inc. It is intended that this organization will add strength to the cause of all veterans, but is specially constituted to press for immediate attention of the men and women who served in the Armed Forces in 1917–18.

Those who are opposed to this movement perhaps have not considered all the facts. We have seen our men and women leave for war on three occasions during our lifetime; and it was no different in 1917, when they marched off to serve their country, than it was in later years—insofar as offering their lives was concerned. The care of these veterans who became wounded or sick did not compare in the slightest degree with that provided for subsequent wars; the pay was much less; the facilities were meager; training was inadequate, and clothing and supplies were barely sufficient to keep them from suffering—their parents suffered the same losses as parents of the two latter conflicts. They were denied college educations since they were fighting during this period in their lives. They left jobs with no assurance that they would be reinstated upon their return. They were, in addition to being soldiers, flu victims of the 1918 epidemic. They were the victims of the 1929–38 depression. They were the fathers and mothers of World War II and Korean veterans. They have been the heaviest taxpayers in these years of such fabulous spending. They have helped pay the bill and have neither sought nor received anything for their service to their country.

Their ages now range from 60 to past 70 and their days are numbered. Many of them are forced into retirement and living on small fixed incomes, if any, which are far from sufficient to meet their daily needs.

The cost for the better care and attention given to the veterans of the later conflicts have been paid by the taxpayers, including World War I veterans. They have not complained. They have wanted their sons and the sons of their buddies to have every consideration.

Now, doesn't it seem just a little selfish to begrudge pensions to those remaining veterans of World War I, all of whom are on the shady side of life? At most, the program would not last many years. Thousands have already died, 1 now is dying every 5 minutes. With the number involved and their present age, the cost of pensions for them would not be a drop in the bucket compared to that spent and being spent on the others.

Why not withhold some of the foreign aid and give these older veterans a pension of $100 per month—no strings attached—for their declining years? If you will give the matter an honest appraisal we believe you'll agree that veterans of World War I have had pretty shabby treatment in comparison to those of other wars and to that given our foreign neighbors.

A Forward Look at TVA's Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BAKER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an editorial from the Knoxville News-Sentinel, Knoxville, Tenn., Sunday, May 18, 1958, entitled "A Forward Look at TVA's Program."

The editorial follows:

A FORWARD LOOK AT TVA'S PROGRAM

On this 25th anniversary of the Tennessee Valley Authority much is being said and written about that agency's past record.

But here, we want to take a forward look at TVA. And what we have to say is directed to Congress.

There are two things that need to be done by Congress to give TVA the assurance and self-confidence which its overall past record has earned.

First, the Senate should delay no longer the confirmation of E. R. Jones and Frank J. Welch as members of the Board of Directors.

President Eisenhower made interim appointments of both these men last fall; Congress has been in session now 4½ months without doing anything about their confirmation. In the interest of stabilizing morale, the two appointees should be approved quickly.

Second, Congress should give TVA the right to sell its own self-liquidating bonds on the open market for financing necessary electric power additions to the system. This would put TVA on a better business basis, and in addition would silence the critics—at least it should silence them—who say that TVA is subsidized.

Considerably more than half of TVA's electric power output goes into national defense operations—and at a big saving to United States taxpayers. This fact alone justifies a self-financing authority, and Congress should give the matter top priority on its current calendar.

Report of Special Committee of New York Savings Bank Association on Dual Banking System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 13, 1958, I introduced a bill to provide for the establishment of national mutual savings banks, H. R. 11412. Although we have a dual system of commercial banks and of savings and loan associations, there is no dual system of mutual savings banks.

In this connection, I commend to the attention of our colleagues a report issued by the special committee on the dual-banking system of the New York Savings Bank Association. The report was made to the Savings Banks Association of the State of New York, and published in that association's 65th annual report on April 22, 1958.

The report follows:

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE DUAL BANKING SYSTEM

(By Earl Harkness, chairman)

The Special Committee on the Dual Banking System was appointed by the association at the request of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks. Each State association was asked to establish such a committee to study and determine (1) whether a dual savings-bank system was desirable, and (2) if so, what form a Federal charter should take. The committees were to report to the national association and be available for consultation, advice, and suggestion.

The committee proceeded at once to carry out its assignment and found that the question of whether there should be a Federal charter for savings banks was a matter which has confronted the industry for 25 years without any positive action having been taken. As a result, savings banks are the only financial institutions which do not enjoy the benefits of the dual banking system. Savings and loan associations, operating under dual chartering, have experienced such expansion that they have grown to the point where they are one-third again as large as savings banks.

The committee thereupon adopted a resolution that geographical extension of mutual savings banking was in the public interest and that the dual savings bank system was a desirable and necessary step—a principle overwhelmingly ratified by the savings banks of this State acting through their respective groups. The specific recommendations of the committee on the framework of Federal supervision and control and on the powers and privileges which a national savings bank should have were thereafter contained in a formal report which was filed with the national association. The committee further authorized distribution of this report to the members of the Savings Banks Association of the State of New York immediately prior to their annual convention in Miami in November 1957 so that they could be apprised of their committee's implementation of the principles already adopted.

The report is unique in that it represents the only completely blueprinted statement of position on the subject ever advanced by any segment of the savings-bank industry. It has been the subject of considerable discussion in newspapers, among savings bankers, savings and loan associations, housing experts, and in Washington.

Events since the filing of the report confirm the conclusion of the committee that if there is to be a geographical extension of mutual savings banking it must be through the medium of a Federal charter, that delay can be destructive, that any initiative which may now be ours can soon be lost, and that if we are to be successful we must have the cooperation of the savings and loan industry. There is so much more similarity than difference between our two types of institutions that it should not prove too difficult to find a community of interest possible of translation into legislation which would receive favorable consideration by Congress. It is the belief of the committee that its recommendations should aid immeasurably in providing the basis for discussion to that end.

Perrin L. Babcock, Robert M. Catharine, James R. Davie, Gerald R. Dorman, Bryant Glenny, Walter J. Hess, George C. Johnson, Joseph A. Kaiser, Earl B. Schwulst, Gabriel Wendel, Earl Harkness, Chairman.

Loans—Not Grants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call to the attention of the House an editorial appearing in the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, which points up the need of a review of our foreign policy in South America.

The editorial follows:

LOANS—NOT GRANTS

In terms of lasting good will, and sound policy procedure in our hemispheric relations, the 80 minutes Vice President NIXON spent in conference with Dr. Galo Plaza Lasso at Quito might prove to be the most profitable interview of his whole Latin American tour.

Dr. Galo Plaza's suggestion was that the United States (1) review its policies, (2) forgo a new aid grant, and (3) render assistance to these neighbors by loans—not gifts.

That is not, note it, an isolationist talking. It is not an amateur in diplomacy and statecraft, or a skeptic needling Uncle Sam; or a hostile critic bent on dissension. It is a friend of the United States, profoundly concerned for peace and progress by a program of mutual responsibility. He is a Latin American statesman, who knows both the economic and the political facts of life; and who views this operation from the standpoint of the hemisphere's long-range interest.

Competent voices have pointed out the desirability—yea, the necessity—of cultivating pan-American solidarity. They have emphasized the equal necessity of building that on the basis of self-help, an encouraged initiative, not charity. The former builds; the latter undermines. That is the Galo Plaza view.

When he advises the Vice President that a new grant or handout would be a mistake, he unquestionably means that it would be a mistake for donor and recipient alike; that is, it would fail of its purpose. And to avoid that, he suggests a better way.

Who better to evaluate the merits of a plan than a leader of this stature—who speaks as a Latin, and at the same time as a leading figure in promotion of stronger hemispheric ties?

Dr. Galo Plaza has been prominent for years in the Organization of American States, and its forerunner, the Pan American Union.

He is a former President of Ecuador, and prior to that its Ambassador to the United States.

In 1955, he won the American Award of the American Foundation for notable service in behalf of peace and progress on the hemisphere.

No one knows better the potentialities of these Latin lands—their capacity for self-help, their spirit and national pride best served by loans where and when needed . . . not gratuities.

He speaks with prestige on a subject concerning these lands, and what he says will bear weight with them. It will bear weight, assuredly with the United States, which has faced the necessity of reappraising policy in this particular throughout the foreign-aid picture.

None has spoken more forthrightly on the subject, or with a more enlightened view.

Dr. Galo Plaza is not an opportunist, grinding an ax of enmity. He is one of this Nation's stanchest friends—seeking to develop a course of constructive international enterprise, mutually and permanently beneficial.

He wants solid ties, evoking responsibility on the part of all concerned. That makes sense. It is in accord with the highest concept of good-neighbor relations. He has earned the gratitude of America by saying something that needed to be said.

We Need Reforms, Not Frauds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as we consider many of the suggested devices for meeting emergencies brought on by the current recession, I feel that we are fortunate in having men in positions of leadership who are capable of facing the issues squarely and sensibly; who maintain sanity when others about them are given to panic. I am proud that the leadership of such a great and influential organization as the American Bankers Association is being led by a fellow townsman of mine, J. C. Welman, president of the Bank of Kennett, who is also president of the American Bankers Association. In this capacity he has been going about the country, appearing before State bank groups in many of the States of this Nation. His philosophy is reflected in the following editorial, written by another good friend of mine, Jack Stapleton, Jr., publisher of the Daily Dunklin Democrat, Kennett, Mo., and which appeared in its issue of May 14, 1958:

WE NEED REFORMS, NOT FRAUDS

Earlier this week Joe C. Welman, of Kennett, president of the American Bankers Association, spoke out against indiscriminate tax cuts in an attempt to end the current business recession. Welman, in an address before the Texas Bankers Association, said a tax cut will do little in relieving the present

situation, but will add billions to the Federal deficit.

All this talk of a tax cut, it seems to us, is bound to put thinking persons in a kind of dilemma. We doubt if it can be disputed that the present tax load is too heavy on the American taxpayer. Fully one-third of the whole economic effort of the people is consumed by the Federal, State, and local Governments. A vast proportion of this is plainly sheer waste; that is, it goes to support governmental activities which have nothing to do with national defense or with the real welfare of the people.

This newspaper yesterday published the fact that all earnings up through yesterday went to Uncle Sam in the form of taxes. The rest of the year we work for ourselves, but from January 1 through yesterday we were working to pay our taxes.

As welcome as a tax cut might seem, we hope Congress will not rush into a recession-period panic with indiscriminate cuts just to gain a few votes next November. There is so much talk of a recession, and one need only reflect on what the people could buy and enjoy for themselves if they had even a small part of these taxes to put to their own use. Beyond this immediate effect, although perhaps not so obvious to everyone, the weight of this tax load is a drag upon the future. Every dollar Government takes now for nonproductive purposes is a dollar subtracted from the future economic strength of this country.

The present tax structure is a jerry-built mishmash that distributes the burden inequitably and unwisely. The excise taxes are a crazy quilt; the design is not only senseless but is an actual penalty on many lines of business and many consumers.

The present method of levying direct taxes upon individuals is, if anything, worse. The steeply graduated income tax is fundamentally unjust because the more the taxpayer works and earns, the more he pays. It is economically unsound simply because it takes a bite out of the future—the savings which must provide the capital tomorrow for a growing Nation.

So plainly tax reform which would both reduce and redesign the tax structure is more than overdue. The words of "tax cut" which they're hollering through the corridors of the Capitol in Washington are bound to appeal to everyone.

But few of the politicians who are saying "cut taxes" are actually talking about reforms. They're talking about gimmicks. Some excise taxes, so we are told, must be cut on certain products just to help boost sales on these particular products. This is not reform. The plan is not to revamp plant amortization rates to make economic sense for all, but rather to give temporary fast writeoffs in certain areas somebody thinks need a little stimulation.

There are other gimmicks—"forgive" a month's taxes, or have a 1 year's increase in the tax exemption, or otherwise just juggle the books to put a few more dollars in people's pockets in the hope they will spend them fast.

As far as we're concerned, it would make just as much sense for Congress to hand out $40 to everybody in the country from the Treasury. The guy who signed the check would undoubtedly be elected President.

But the simple fact is that the Government is now running a deficit of more than $3 billion. There is no plan underway to reduce Government spending. We even hear talk of increasing this spending.

If this is what is meant by a "tax cut" then let's not kid ourselves—it simply means the political effect of 40 pieces of silver for which we will pay many times over in future taxes and in the theft of all values by way of inflation.

Before we can be realistic and cut taxes, we must cut Government spending. Otherwise we'll just be kidding ourselves.

We can't have our cake and eat it too. We should welcome tax reforms and tax reductions. But we should not permit Congress to vote tax frauds.

The Water Pollution Control Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is disappointing but not surprising that the Eisenhower administration is now proposing that the water pollution control program, which was one of the great achievements of this Congress in 1956, should now be terminated.

The President's recommendation on this point, sent to the Congress on May 13, states that this program must be eliminated to end the dangers of overcentralizing power and authority in the National Government.

It is very difficult to find, in the water pollution control program any dangers that are equal to the very grave menace that is posed to our Nation and the national health by the ever-increasing problem of pollution of national water supplies.

The estimate has been made by reliable authorities that pollution today is costing our Nation more than $1 billion in valuable water supply, each and every year. The program now underway, in which the Government is authorized to invest up to $50 million a year, falls far short of meeting our national needs in this field.

When we consider the fact that municipalities have been matching Federal funds under this program at a rate of approximately $5 for every Federal dollar, we get some idea of the scope of the program and of the undeniable fact that major responsibility in this field is still being carried by local government.

In the State of Oklahoma, as of March 31, 1958, there were 24 projects under the Water Pollution Control Act, with a total estimated cost of $7,717,289.

The Federal grant offers for these projects totaled $1,703,785, leaving a total in local funds to be spend on this worthwhile purpose of $6,013,504.

As of March 31, 21 Oklahoma communities were vitally interested in this program, including the cities of Ardmore, Cache, Carnegie, Chickasha, Chouteau, Cushing, Dell City, Drumright, Grove, Harrah, Kingston, Lindsay, Locust Grove, Luther, Mangum, Marietta, Muskogee, Norman, Oklahoma City, Pawnee, and Tulsa. All of these communities had approved projects as of that date.

Four of these projects, at Cache, Carnegie, Drumright, and Marietta have already been completed, with very real benefit to the people of these communities.

In the Second Congressional District, projects at Chouteau, Grove, Locust Grove, and Muskogee are going forward under this worthwhile program.

I earnestly hope that this Congress will reject the Presidential recommendation, which fails completeley to make any case for danger—and which asks us to turn our backs upon the very real and provable danger to the most precious commodity which we own—our water supply.

I hope the Congress will consider approval of H. R. 11714, the bill sponsored by our colleague from Minnesota, the Honorable JOHN BLATNIK, which would enlarge and improve this program and meet fully our national responsibility in this critical field.

I have today introduced an identical bill to H. R. 11714, and was pleased to testify today in support of the Blatnik measure, and to place before the committee the recommendation of President B. E. Townsend, of the Oklahoma Outdoor Council, Inc., in support of H. R. 11714.

A Resolution Relating to the 45th Infantry Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JARMAN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include in the Appendix of the RECORD Resolution No. 4 of the Oklahoma State Legislative Council setting out the council's unanimous opposition to the elimination and abolishment of the 45th Division of the Oklahoma National Guard.

The resolution follows:

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL RESOLUTION 4

Whereas during the past few weeks various United States Army officials have indicated by press releases that the strength of the National Guard in the United States should be reduced by eliminating six divisions therefrom; and

Whereas these same officials have strongly implied that Oklahoma's famed fighting 45th Division would be deactivated and abolished; and

Whereas Gov. Raymond Gary and other State-elected officials have filed letters and telegrams with the Secretary of the Army bitterly protesting this contemplated abolishment of the 45th Division; and

Whereas since the activation of the 45th Division in Oklahoma the legislatures of this State have consistently supported the guard program by passing numerous appropriation bills to match Federal funds to build armories and meet other monetary needs of said program; and

Whereas the function of the Oklahoma Guard in peacetime provides splendid training for the youth of this State as well as a highly trained organization available to our State in times of flood, disasters and other State emergencies; and

Whereas in wartime the fighting 45th has proved by its excellent and valiant battle record on the beaches of North Africa, Anzio, and Korea that this famed division has no

equal and, thereby, deserves and warrants the united support of all the citizens of this great State; and

Whereas the executive committee of the legislative council is aware and cognizant of the fact that an all-out and united effort should be made by the members of the council, as well as every citizen of Oklahoma, to protest the abolishment of the 45th Division, and at the same time an all-out effort be made to urge our elected Congressmen and Senators in Washington to urgently request the proper Army authorities to retain the famed fighting 45th as a part of the National Guard Reserve components; and

Whereas it is the unanimous feeling and the consensus of this committee that the chairman of this council advise the proper authorities that the Oklahoma Legislative Council, for reasons above stated, is vehemently opposed to the abolishment and deactivation of the 45th Division: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Executive Committee of the Legislative Council of Oklahoma, That it is unanimously opposed to the elimination and abolishment of the 45th Division of the Oklahoma National Guard, and that the chairman of the council be directed to register this protest with the proper United States Army officials in Washington, D. C., and urgently request the Oklahoma Congressmen and the United States Senators from the State to exert all their influence to insure the retention of the fighting 45th in the great State of Oklahoma; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Raymond Gary, Governor of Oklahoma; all Members of Congress from Oklahoma; Maj. Gen. Roy W. Kenny; Maj. Gen. Hal L. Muldrow; all commanding officers of guard units in the State; and to the appropriate Army officials in Washington, D. C.

Report of New York County Lawyers' Association on S. 3423

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the committee on the Federal courts of the New York County Lawyers' Association adopted, on April 29, 1958, a report recommending enactment of S. 3423 which would grant the consent of Congress to an interpleader compact between or among any two or more of the States, Territories, and possessions of the United States and the District of Columbia.

The report of the committee is as follows:

NEW YORK COUNTY
LAWYERS' ASSOCIATION,
COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION,
New York.

Report of committee on the Federal courts on S. 3423, which seeks to grant congressional consent to an interpleader compact.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL

The congressional consent to an interpleader compact is approved because:

1. It relieves from uncertainty a person who may be subject to multiple liability because of adverse claimants;

2. It assists in overcoming present restrictions of interpleader practice, i. e. Federal diversity jurisdiction requirements and State territorial limitations; and

3. It is supported by many nonpartisan committees and writers.

Respectfully submitted,
COMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL COURTS.

Eugene F. McDonald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, it is seldom in the growth of a city that you find one man like Comdr. Eugene F. McDonald, whose versatile activity touched upon all phases of business life. He was the personification of a great executive, a financial genius, military expert in intelligence service, explorer, and radio pioneer. Chicago and the Nation has lost a great man. He was fearless in any enterprise and positive in his business acumen. His popularity was treemndous. He contributed so much to the commercial and financial importance of Chicago and its business success within certain fields affecting radio manufacturing and promotion. He was a true sport in the fine sense of the word. And as a man enjoyed the sterling friendships and confidences of important men. He did big things for the city that he loved.

The Members of Congress from the State of Illinois send this message to his family: His daughter, Mrs. Marianne Weisenberg; his son, Eugene F. McDonald III; and his sister, Mrs. Wilson Towns, and we are also proud of his admirable accomplishments and hope in some way to allay their great sorrow in his loss—and further spread this eulogy on the RECORD to commemorate his sacred memory with our prayers.

The Chicago Daily Tribune article does great justice to this distinguished Chicagoan, as follows:

MCDONALD, RADIO PIONEER, ZENITH CHAIRMAN, WON FAME AS EXPLORER

Mass for Comdr. Eugene F. McDonald, 72, board chairman of the Zenith Radio Corp. and a pioneer in the radio field, will be said at 10 a. m. Monday in Assumption Church, 313 West Illinois Street. He died Thursday night in Billings Hospital, where he had been a patient since December 26.

A fabulous executive, Commander McDonald welded together an executive team at Zenith so able that he could spend much time exploring and adventuring. He often directed Zenith's policies by radio from far places.

AUTO FINANCE PIONEER

Born March 11, 1886, in Syracuse, N. Y., he read electric meters to earn his first money, and while in high school operated with a friend a successful business installing and repairing electric bells in homes.

Commander McDonald spent his early years in various phases of the auto business, making a fortune in financing time payments for cars, a business he started in 1912. He sold the business in 1917 to enlist in the Navy Intelligence Service, and eventually became a lieutenant commander, the basis of the title he kept the rest of his life.

In 1920 he went to a small radio shop on Ravenswood Avenue to buy a radio set and wound up by joining the company owned by two young men, Karl Hassel and R. H. G. Mathews. In 1923 the partnership was incorporated as the Zenith Radio Corp.

HEADED BROADCASTERS

Commander McDonald catapulted Zenith into a top position among radio manufacturers and at the same time launched his career as an explorer and adventurer that greatly publicized the company's products and sent sales soaring.

In 1923 he organized the National Broadcasting Association of Broadcasters, became its first president, and conducted the first successful radio advertising campaign. In 1943 he developed a hearing aid, and had been a pioneer in phonevision, a form of pay-as-you-see television.

When Comdr. Donald McMillan, the Arctic explorer, planned his 1923 expedition, McDonald went along to handle radio communications.

OWNED 185-FOOT YACHT

McDonald bought the yacht *Peary* and was its skipper and second in command when it took McMillan to the Arctic in 1925. He also made other expeditions to other parts of the world on his 185-foot yacht, the *Mizpah*.

In 1931 he married Elba Inez Riddle, a descendant of President Zachary Taylor. The marriage ended in divorce in 1947.

Norway's Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of fellowship that I share with the citizens of Norway their national day—Nowegian Constitution Day. To Norwegian nationals, this day honors the living constitution which has endured from May 17, 1814—for almost a century and a half—down to the present. It is my prayer that Norway, under its forward-looking constitution, shall continue to lead the way in fair relationships between the people and the Government, to stand as a sturdy ally to the United States, for untold centuries to come.

The recent visit of Princess Astrid and Prime Minister Gerharden to the Minnesota centennial observances strikingly emphasizes the close friendship, the esteem, the regard, in which our two countries hold each other.

Sixty years ago this summer—in Douglas County, Minn.—the so-called Kensington Stone was found. This stone held inscriptions which, when translated, indicated that it was the record of a Viking expedition, composed largely of Norwegians. For six decades controversial claims have been advanced about this otherwise unheralded tour of discovery. Whether or not men of Norwegian ancestry stood on Minnesota soil six centuries ago is of small significance. What does matter is that men and women of Norwegian ancestry have contributed far beyond the strength of their numbers to the spiritual and material progress of the State of Minnesota and to these United States.

Men and women of Norwegian origin could point to their compatriots who have won distinction in art, in music, in science, in education, in medicine, in law, in theology. They could point with pride to blood-relatives whose names are forever blazoned in the roster of this Nation's wars. No phase of American progress in culture, business, or the humanities but has its honored roll of giants of achievement with a common Norwegian heritage.

Yes; it is true. Americans of Norwegian ancestry have attained to leadership in all fields.

Yet, it is equally true that others of the same noble breed have served their adopted country just as well as the leaders. It has been their destiny to live their lives unnamed, unhonored, and unsung.

What was the impact of these, the great unknowns?

They thrust into the wilderness. They built their cabins and sod houses. They faced the dangers of the frontiers, the blizzards, the forest fires. They started the schools. They built churches before they had hearths of their own. They borrowed from the Norwegian Constitution to help make the laws of the States. They gave their ideas, rich in human warmth, to American social progress, to American governmental growth. They sang as they worked and the songs of Norway became the songs of the United States. Such was the completeness of their giving in their new land that the relationship between Norway and the United States—instead of hands across the sea—became hearts across the sea.

This is what Norwegian Constitution Day, May 17, means to me.

This is why I raise my voice to cry, "Skoal" to all Norwegians, on this day they honor, whether theirs are only ancestral ties or whether they are numbered among the three and a half million citizens of Norway itself.

Hail to our friend and ally.

Hail to the people who have made Norway's name honored throughout the world.

Hail to our mutual fellowship throughout the years to come.

Danny Dever Died

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the Congress of Illinois learned that a fine citizen and patriot died the other day and those who knew this friendly man have good reason to mourn his passing. He was the quiet and forgiving kind. He liked poor people and secretly helped them—no fanfare—just did it because he knew that in charity one serves God best. His father was a great man—perhaps the shadow of the father cast an obscure shadow over his son, Danny. Sometimes that happens. Yet we can say that the son was something in his own right. Good people liked him both as lawyer and friend. He served his Nation in World War I—Army—and was active in veterans work. Mayor William E. Dever, 1923–27, of Chicago, judge and alderman, now deceased, had a good son in Danny. He was his pal. It is with heavy heart that we send condolences to his family, brother George, sisters Miss Margaret McCafferty, Mrs. Jane Gahagan, Mrs. A. S. Newman, and Mrs. Herbert Phillips. We can truly say that the poor people of Chicago lost a real champion when Danny Dever died.

A Five-Point Plan To Curb the Recession and Bring About a Wholesome, Sound, Prosperous, and Stable Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said and much study is being applied to the quick stimulation of the economy of the country.

I feel that private enterprise is much better able to cope with this situation than is Government. However, I believe that inducements should be given to private enterprise and to every citizen of our country to start them thinking and acting in a way that will develop a better economy.

On May 1, I introduced H. R. 12316, which is a companion bill to one introduced by Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana, which would have the effect of stimulating construction by providing for a shorter writeoff period of invested capital.

I am in receipt of a plan which could complement my proposal, and I desire to insert it at this point in the RECORD:

A FIVE-POINT PLAN TO CURB THE RECESSION AND BRING ABOUT A WHOLESOME, SOUND, PROSPEROUS, AND STABLE ECONOMY

1. Home owners repair program: Permit home owners to deduct from taxable income the cost of repairing homes (for example, up to $500 or 5 percent of the original cost of the house whichever is greater), said repairs to include exterior and interior painting, plumbing, heating, air conditioning, roofing, storm windows, and other physical improvements and additions.

Beneficial results: This would encourage a Nation-wide home-improvement program by creating an attractive incentive to home owners, most of whom are still gainfully employed or in business. It would not require any change in our present banking system, while providing business for the metals, hardware, paint, lumber and kindred industries and supplementary services. It would provide employment for skilled and unskilled workers. It would create a movement of goods benefiting transportation firms and manufacturers of transportation equipment.

Cost to the Government in lost taxes would be offset to a major extent by additional taxes derived from individuals and companies benefiting from this program.

2. Personal automotive repair program: Permit owners to repair their personal cars and to deduct this cost from taxable income, to the extent of a small percentage of the original cost of the car. Repairs to include painting, replacement of tires, overhauls, seatcovers, etc.

Beneficial results: This would provide immediate increased business for the smaller gasoline station, automobile repair shop, the producers of tools and repair parts, skilled and unskilled labor, transportation, and so forth. Here again the amount of tax loss involved would be offset to a major extent by the benefits that the Government would obtain from increased taxes generated by new business.

3. Capital goods incentive program: Permit users of machinery of all kinds, to apply accelerated depreciation to all new machinery bought, received and installed within 12 months beginning April 1, 1958. This depreciation rate could be on either of two plans: (a) 4 percent a month for 12 months and 2 percent a month for 24 months or (b) 3 percent a month for 24 months and 2 percent a month for 12 months. It will be noted that this would provide 96 percent depreciation in three years. The Internal Revenue Code or Regulations should be amended to provide that if any equipment subjected to this rapid writeoff should be sold, the profits, if any, resulting from such sales would become ordinary income and not capital gain.

Beneficial results: This would provide an incentive for all users of machinery—whether in mines, railroads, bakeries, chemicals, metal products, or any other type of operation—to place orders immediately for modern equipment. Such orders would provide immediate employment in foundries, in pattern shops, in iron and steel mills, in transportation, for both skilled and unskilled labor. Again the loss of tax income would be spread over a time and would be offset in major part (if not entirely) by added income to the Government from reemployed workers and profitably operating companies.

4. Commercial and apartment building repair program: Permit operators of commercial and apartment buildings to make physical repairs and improvements, and to charge such costs to taxable income instead of capitalizing the expenditures. The expenditures could be limited to a percentage of the net depreciated cost of the building, say 5 percent or 7½ percent. Thus, on a million dollar building the owner could spend $75,000, whether it be for air conditioning, elevators, new windows, sandblasting, painting, or other improvements.

Beneficial results: Here again a wide area of skilled and unskilled labor would receive employment, and would boost transportation, producers of machinery, paints and chemicals, and so forth, quickly, and with a minimum, if any, tax revenue loss.

5. Excise tax reduction program: Inaugurate a program of reduced excise taxes on automobiles, automobile accessories, appliances, and other consumer durable goods. This would include such items as television and radio sets, pleasure boats, typewriters, and so forth.

Beneficial results: This point is a longer range one and will produce results at a slower rate than points 1 through 4, but will definitely provide a stimulus to the sale of new cars and appliances—and again, provide greater opportunities for employment of skilled and unskilled labor, for the production of components, for their transportation, for the employment of sales and other service people.

It should be noted that none of the above will require financial aid from the Govern-

ment, easing of bank credits, or relaxing of inflationary controls.

HERBERT I. SEGAL,
President, Van Norman Industries, Inc.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that points 1, 2, 3, and 4 could be applied to the great advantage of our economy and should stimulate untold millions of dollars of improvements throughout every nook and corner of our country. I think such a plan as this is far better than delving into tax reductions and other methods of trying to bolster the economy.

I trust the Ways and Means Committee will take recognition of these proposals and the Congress may have an opportunity to pass on them in the near future.

Voting Restrictions: A Report From the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, late last month, on April 27, a group of men and women who were deeply concerned about the legal rights of the individual in the South gathered under the auspices of the southern conference educational fund to hear reports on voting restrictions in 8 Southern States. These reports were subsequently submitted to the Civil Rights Commission.

Seldom have I had an opportunity to see such a complete picture of the actual abridgment of rights—largely, I believe, because the substance of the reports which were presented are made up of actions against individuals which are seldom given publicity. In many cases, denial of the right to vote is more in the nature of a sin of ommission than an overt act and is therefore less likely to be publicized.

The truth about restrictions on voting might not make headlines, but it represents the bedrock of our constitutional guaranties. If the American people are not completely aware of the real situation, and I believe that many of us are not, they should be informed. The southern conference has performed a needed and courageous job in getting these factual reports to the public.

More recently, in delivering the keynote address to a group of Negro leaders here in Washington, William O. Walker, president of the National Newspaper Publishers Association said:

The Negro is no taller than he can reach in Mississippi. Our freedom must not be measured in Ohio, but in South Carolina.

Our aim must be that the stature of every citizen be the same before the law. Unless we know how far we have to go, this goal will be too long in being realized.

I, therefore, include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the introductory address of Mr. Aubrey Williams, president of the southern conference educational fund which follows immediately. I shall in the future include reports from Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina, as well as a special report on a recent registration drive in Baltimore, Md.:

REPORT FROM THE SOUTH

(Address by Aubrey Williams, of Montgomery Ala., at the southern conference educational fund's conference on voting restrictions in Southern States, Washington, D. C., April 27, 1958)

We are here to discuss one of the basic rights of American citizens—the right to vote. In many respects it may be said that the right to vote is the most fundamental right in a society in which the government rests upon the consent of the governed, for upon it rests what we may term sovereignty. It is the keystone of freedom. By its exercise the positive functions of citizenship are performed. Men decide the kind of government they want. They set up mandates for those elected to power. By the same token the vote is the soverign remedy of free men against all of their civic grievances.

We are here to make a report on a region of our Nation where trouble exists for many citizens in obtaining the right to vote. These citizens want to fulfill their obligations as well as enjoy their rights as citizens. They are having great difficulty in doing either. I speak of some 6 or 7 States of the Deep South. We are not here to condemn, in a blanket fashion, this region or to indulge in odious comparisons. Sad to relate, no section of our blessed Nation is perfect and possessed of all the virtues. Each has its shortcomings and could stand some additional equality, justice, and fair dealing.

We are here to report what the facts are in respect to the Negro and his efforts to exercise his right to vote. We feel Congress can profit by a greater knowledge of what is going on in these States. We feel that no individual or group is wise enough to know all the answers to these problems. On the other hand, we certainly do not come here with the feeling that we have all the answers. We wish only to give the facts and to help in any way we can to work out the right answers.

It is stating the obvious to say that relations between the races in the South have changed for the worse since May 1954, when the Supreme Court declared segregated public schools unconstitutional. This worsening has reached the stage now where there are few channels of communication open between the white- and the dark-skinned people in the six or so Deep Southern States.

There are those who find in this condition a reason for complete despair. I am not among these. I agree that it would be far more desirable to have an atmosphere devoid of antagonisms, where persons in conflict talked to each other and fought out their differences in a relaxed climate. But realism should force one to recognize that to ask such is to disclose a sad ignorance of human nature. I must confess I find something healthy about the present condition in the South. Not, I want to say, about the white man's side of it or the way he is acting, but about the Negroes' conduct during this period; yes.

I get a great deal of hope from what Negroes have done and how they have conducted themselves during the months and years since the 1954 ruling. What we have seen in the South is a generation of people who have come of age with a heritage of keeping the peace with the white man at any price. There was a harmonious relation between the races in the South—of a sort. There was a surface peace. There was the appearance, but not the reality. When white men said, "We get along with our Negroes," what they meant was, Negroes know their place and stay in it. This was a degrading peace. White people knew what they were really saying, and Negro people knew what the white man meant. The Negro purchased peace at the price of his self-respect. The white man purchased a working relationship with the Negro community by indulging in a refusal to face the consequences of his democratic professions. It was a debauching and degrading condition for all concerned. The present condition of tensions is at least honest. The Negro has said he will no longer settle for a peace which costs him the first prerequisite of a free man—his self-respect. He now stands openly and honestly for his rights. The Negro leadership has forced the struggle out into the open.

There had been a leavening working, of course before then. There were leaders like Dr. Mordecai Johnson, Walter White, Mrs. Mary McLeod Bethune, A. Philip Randolph, John Wesley Dobbs, E. D. Nixon, Charles G. Gomillion, Mrs. Modjeska Simkins, Paul Robeson, Roscoe Dunjee, Lula White, Thurgood Marshall, Dr. T. R. M. Howard, and many others. These people were stoking the fires of manhood and womanhood among the disfranchised, denied, insulted, segregated Negroes of the country. The first fruits were the Sweatts, the Hendersons, and others like them, who came forward as expendables to make legal challenges of the bonds that bound them. Then came the new crop of younger fighters, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Mrs. Rosa Parks, Miss Autherine Lucy, the Reverend C. K. Steele, Mrs. Daisy Bates, the Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth—and then the "tender warriors," the children of Clinton, Tenn., of Clay and Sturgis, Ky., of Little Rock, Ark., and elsewhere. All of which adds up to the fact that the Negro has finally made up his mind that he is freed and that he intends to possess that freedom.

That he will have to do most of the fighting is not unusual or saddening. It is probably one of history's most consistent axioms that those who would be free must fight for their own freedom.

What is sad and altogether disillusioning to me as a citizen of this country, predicated as it is on the principles of democracy and Christianity, is the Negroes' naked aloneness as they engage the enemy. For they must take on not only the race haters of the South and the institutions of the South, its white educational institutions, a considerable portion of its churches, its elected governments, its law-enforcement agencies, but they must often find the Federal Government in league with the local and State governments in keeping them from the enjoyment of the rights vouchsafed under this selfsame Federal Government. One of the discouraging incidents of the past year has been the result of the one fulfillment of the Federal Government's obvious responsibility for enforcing its decrees. The one simple manifest demonstration that the ruling of the Supreme Court was more than pious words has resulted in a Federal apologia. I refer to Little Rock. The apparent result of this one acceptance of its responsibility is that the Attorney General has now decided that there will be no more Little Rocks. The field has been abandoned to the racists. The children at Little Rock are left to the mercies of the local institutions. Everyone seems more concerned that there be no more Little Rocks than that justice be done. The net result is to make the work of the deprived even more difficult.

It is important in this regard to call attention to the fact that what may appear as just a fight for the right of Negroes to a desegregated existence is much more than that. Our laws and constitutional safeguards are not selective. They must protect everybody or they will soon protect nobody. Once we let down the barriers to get at people we don't like or to get at ideas we don't like, the rights of all are endangered. Mr. Justice Frankfurter, in a dissenting opinion in a case

involving the due process rights of a rather disreputable character made the following pertinent observation:

"It is a fair summary of history to say that most of the safeguards of our liberties were forged in controversies involving 'not so nice people.'"

The traditional technique of those who would limit or even destroy individual liberties is to involve fear of, or hostility against, "not so nice people." Nor do the "not so nice people" conveniently remain the same people. In one period they have been the Protestant followers of Roger Williams; in another period they have been the adherents of the Catholic Church; in 1932 they were the bankers of America.

It would have been possible during a certain period around 1932 to have gotten almost any sort of punitive law enacted against corporation heads or bankers. It is not at all difficult to transform nice people into not so nice people. A pattern gets established and times change. For example, the pattern that is now fast being returned to usage in the South, of wholesale challenging of Negro voters—such a pattern gets established, then a new group comes under public disfavor and you have a new set of victims. We have seen the Federal Government allowing its stable of informers to be used by Senators in the United States Senate to destroy white persons in the South who stand up for the rights of individuals regardless of color or nationality. This is not only a shameless thing, but it is a dangerous thing. Unless we Americans turn our faces against liars and informers, no man's character or livelihood will be safe.

There are disturbing parallels between conditions in the South in the year of 1958 and in the year 1858. I sincerely believe that the devastation and the horrors of the Civil War could have been avoided and we could have moved from slavery into a sounder economic order if we had been willing to deal openly with slavery and people had been allowed to express themselves and to discuss the problems of slavery openly. But we were not. There was almost a complete black-out of discussion by legislatures as well as by social and economic pressures put upon people. School teachers were silenced or sent back to New England, where came from. Preachers were faced with the choice between Christian principles and the demands of their major contributors that they remember their obligations to the church which gave them bread and board. Books were censored and literature suggesting that things as they were were not necessarily as they should be was barred from the mails. The advocacy of abolition was made a felony in some States; punishable by death in others. Having put an end to thinking, talking, reading, and writing, there was no way left open but the way of violence.

"Freedom to speak and write about matters of public interest is to our form of government as the heart is to the human body," wrote Justice Hugo Black. "If the heart be weakened, the whole body is debilitated; if it be stilled, the result is death."

Things in 1958 have not yet reached the state of repression that existed in 1858. There are, however, signs that such a state of affairs is what the more extreme element in the South today desires and is working to bring about. Given a few more years of accomplishments similar to those of the past 4, and it is no exaggeration to hold that the South will be in much the same condition as it was 3 years before the explosion of the Civil War.

It would be well for those Members of Congress who aid and abet those un-American attacks to ask themselves, "What are the possibilities of such a course of conduct?" They should ask themselves, "What are the consequences to white citizens?" "Is it possible to maintain the safety and well-being and peace of the Nation?" Nothing is more dangerously explosive than pent-up pressures for change. So long as people can exchange ideas, express ideas, discuss their feelings about desired changes, there is little danger of explosions. It is when people are stopped from speaking their thoughts, when they are even warned not to have such thoughts, that danger mounts. Today a blanket of silence lies over the whole South. Men no longer discuss the race question in the white community except to view with alarm and deplore; they fear even to talk about a different point of view. And most newspapers are unhappily caught in the prevailing community hysteria and reflect the one-track line of southern thinking. The national radio and TV programs are the only media that sometimes differ from the dominant opinion. There is one political party, with one issue, in Alabama in the present governor's race. Each candidate is trying to outdo the other 13 in the vehemence of his opposition to integration. It is political suicide to be even mildly for segregation.

However, with our preoccupation with the treatment of the Negro close at home and its effect upon the white South, we may tend to overlook the greater significance of the struggle. The Negro's fight for political emancipation and racial democracy may very well have a far greater significance than just the securing of the right to register and vote, for behind the race crisis stands the specter of an inclusive political struggle involving the political party organization of both the South and the North. This is not just a matter of a major minority group trying to gain admittance into the political house of their fellows. What you have here may be the coming to a head of the long-delayed political realinement of the two political parties on all the great issues of the day. The issue of the political emancipation of the Negro could be the activating agent that threatens to explode the present ill-mated political setup. What we have here is a Government consisting of two political parties; the Republican is made up in part of what are termed "moderates" and another part of "conservatives"; the Democratic Party is little different. They have what is known as the "liberal" wing and what few call by its rightful name but which in fact is the southern oligarchy. The right wing of the Republican Party and the southern oligarchy have everything in common except the names by which they are called. Both are concerned primarily with maintenance of the present power structure in control in our country. The results for the American people from this situation are that the reactionaries in the two parties always effectively get together on anything really important to their interest and the liberals in both parties either split over political lines or are unable to put together a sufficiently large number of votes to pass legislation in line with their respective professions and promises.

It is this always inconclusive situation that the race crisis threatens, for the interests of the Negro are looming larger and larger in congressional districts in the North and West and in a considerable number of States. Members of Congress feel with greater urgency than ever before that their own personal interest is bound up with the fight of this particular minority group. Once enough Congressmen see how great is their personal interest in this issue and take the only course open to them, which is simply full-fledged support of the Supreme Court's position, they will seal the doom of the southern oligarchy or drive them into the Republican party where they really belong. By the same token, the liberals in the Republican party will be forced in the interest of self-preservation to support the Court and will face the necessity of finding working relationships with the liberals in the Democratic party.

It is possible, therefore, that the political emancipation of the Negro may have gotten underway a political realinement of major magnitude. Much will depend on how deep is the determination of the Negro. There is considerable evidence that this determination runs very deep in a considerable part of the Negro community, but how widespread it is is something that time alone can tell. The Montgomery bus protest had all the elements of a people who would not be denied their elemental rights. The Tuskegee resistance to having their votes taken away from them again has all the strength that characterized the ancient Anglo-Saxons as they fought similar battles for their elemental rights. However, there is disquieting evidence that Negroes do not always take advantage of the opportunities which are offered them. But the overwhelming weight of evidence is that the Negro has at last made up his mind to secure his rights as a citizen. If this is true, then we may well have the stuff out of which can come a true and sincere realinement of political parties in the country.

There stands to hand, then, for all Americans, with the exception of those whose privileged positions would be undermined, the opportunity to do all within their power to see that this comes about, to lend every possible support to the Negro community in their efforts to secure the vote. We must do all within our power to see to it that the Federal Government gives unequivocal support to the mandates of the Federal courts and unceasingly pressure the Federal law-enforcement departments to do their duty. We must work to secure southern white support and assistance. We must aim at political reform in the South and force the liberal southerners in the Senate and the House to cease their playing footsie with the Byrds and the Talmadges and the Eastlands. We must recognize the Negro's struggle for what it is—the spearhead which is challenging the hyprocisy of American political party alinement and which, if it succeeds, can clear the ground of the creeping fascism and totalitarianism which is inherent in the thinking of the power elite and their supporters, the conservatives and reactionaries of both parties.

College President Discusses the Lift That Modern Education Needs in Our Country

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply impressed with the thoughts expressed in a little booklet entitled "Antioch Notes," which recently came to my desk. In considering the problems of education, I believe there is a great deal in the statements of the author, Samuel B. Gould, president of Antioch College, of Yellow Springs, Ohio.

I should like to quote the entire booklet for the benefit of my colleagues, but confine the quotation to the final paragraph which is certainly food for thought as we appraise the shortcomings of the system of education in America:

The goal that we have set for ourselves in education will not be reached without sacrifice by the American people, the kind of

sacrifice that impels them to put educational necessity for their children before personal luxury. That the President's program is a relatively short-term one, that it emphasizes the sciences and mathematics so heavily, and that it offers scholarships to qualified students with no mention of the students' own investment in their future—these facts are disappointing to some of us but not too disturbing. For the real lift that education needs must come out of the minds and hearts and pocketbooks of the American people themselves. A realization on their part that education is the key to America's future and an inclination to make sacrifices to support that realization are the truly essential factors that can give us hope. The Federal and State Governments can and do provide assistance of many kinds, and should continue to provide it increasingly. But it is not the American way to turn the responsibility completely over to Government. It is not only desirable to maintain the present diversity in education, it is also feasible, if our people have the will to make it so.

Cases of Speiser and Harris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Cro Duplantier, executive sports editor of the New Orleans States, pounds a typewriter with a steady and a firm hand. What comes out is a reflection of the strong and logical processes of his brain.

Just to keep the fires burning and the record straight, Cro Duplantier recently turned out another piece in the saga of the International Boxing Club and its weird and strange ways—if you are so naive—of doing things in the professional boxing business where it controls both the muscle and the fat—the muscle of the competitors and the fat of their purses.

This story is no The Tale of Two Cities but vividly and graphically the tale of two fighters.

It is revealing but certainly not surprising in view of the other exposés which have been made and still we Members of Congress do nothing about it. We investigate this and we investigate that but the smelly circumstances surrounding professional boxing—investigate? Never.

Here is Cro Duplantier's column from the pages of the New Orleans States:

CASES OF SPEISER AND HARRIS

(By Cro Duplantier)

One thing Truman Gibson, new president of the International Boxing Club, has never been accused of doing is meeting a question head on.

In a manner common to a certain group in the legal profession which expects yes or no answers to its questions, but believes it can never give a direct answer to one, Gibson recently explained away the inability of light heavyweight contender Chuck Speiser to get a fight.

Speiser terminated his managerial contract with Hec Knowles, an IBC favorite, a year ago. Since then, with his brother as manager, he has gotten but one fight.

So Murray Olderman, NEA correspondent, asked Gibson:

"Why can't a ranked fighter like Chuck Speiser get a fight?"

You couldn't ask for anything more direct. But here's how Gibson handled that one:

"We thought that Hec Knowles, when he had his contract, did a great job with Speiser. We prefer to deal with managers instead of fighters because they have more stability. I could show you a couple of checks that bounced."

This is an answer that is no answer at all. Though we're sure that Gibson did not mean it this way, the only interpretation we can get from the statement is that if Speiser wants to be a good boy and go back to the fold of the suave Mr. Knowles, he may suddenly find his prospects brightening.

This is a heckuva way to run a business, shelving a good piece of property like Speiser, a college man who is fifth ranked in his division, can box, can hit, and doesn't run from trouble.

But that's the way it is and Joe Speiser, acting for his brother, says he has been totally unable to get any fighter of any consequence to agree to a date with Chuck.

He went on to explain that he had arranged a date with Yvon Durelle, but that Durelle later backed out.

"He's got to live with the IBC," says Joe.

Joe Speiser says that the power of the IBC was further demonstrated by the fact that he had arranged for a title fight with Archie Moore, with only a sponsor for the TV part of the show needed to clinch the agreement.

He said that Gov. G. Mennen Williams of Michigan, the home State of the Speisers, had written a letter to the firm which frequently sponsors TV fights, a firm owned by the Governor's family, but had not been able to coax the company to brave the possible wrath of the IBC.

So Chuck stays idle, while the bank account drops.

But on the other side of the street is Roy Harris, the Cut and Shoot, Tex., heavyweight who surprised everyone with a win over agile Willie Pastrano of New Orleans.

Roy ain't got any more education than Speiser, who also holds a college degree, but apparently has more horse sense. He knows if he wants more than hay he's got to be in the right barn.

Roy, you may know is now under the managerial reins of Lou Viscusi, who also holds the contract on lightweight champion Joe Brown and who also was the promoter for the recent Brown-Ralph Dupas catastrophe in Houston.

But this is a recent development.

Harris, up until the time he decisioned Pastrano, was managed by Benny King, a Houston fight tutor who has a stable of boys he helps develop.

King told us on our visit to Houston that he saw the handwriting on the wall about a year before the blow fell. Harris was starting to make a splash in the second year of their 3-year contract as he continued to win them all.

"About a year before the contract was to expire," King said, "the IBC boys started to work on him and his father trying to get over the message that though I had helped develop Roy he needed someone bigger to get him the big money shots."

When Roy decisioned, in order, Charlie Norkus, Joey Rowan, and Bob Baker, King's days were numbered. Suddenly Harris got the biggest bout of his career—the shot at Willie Pastrano—and, when that was over, King was out.

Now Harris, with only these four wins to serve as any real recommendation, is being boomed as the logical contender for the heavyweight crown.

And if the IBC can ever manage a truce with Cu. D'Amato, manager of heavyweight champion Floyd Patterson, Harris is the guy who will probably get the title shot.

And Benny King, who developed him? He's busy trying to find a new meal ticket from among his other proteges.

The Errors of our Latin American Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 21, 1958

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in attempting to evaluate the violent incidents in South America last week some administration officials, including the President himself, have attempted to put all the blame on the Communist element in these countries. However, more detached observers indicate this explanation is over-simplified.

I suggest, at this time, we would best serve our cause by candor. We should for example, admit that our relations with Latin American countries have deteriorated; and concede that our blunders have been a prime factor.

Mr. Speaker, as sobering evidence of the deeper causes of the anti-American ground-swell, I present two articles. The first is an interview with Dr. Russell C. Ewing, head of the University of Arizona department of historic and political science which appeared in the Tucson Daily Citizen last week. A specialist on South America, Dr. Ewing was a visiting teacher at the University of the Andes in Bogota, Columbia, from August 1956 until last July. The second is an article written for INS by Miguel Angel Capriles, the publisher of Venezuela's most influential group of newspapers. Senor Capriles was jailed by Dictator Jimenez last January for refusing to publish a government editorial. These articles follow:

[From The Tucson Daily Citizen]

NIXON INCIDENTS BLAMED ON DETERIORATING RELATIONS

(By John Riddick)

To blame the Nixon incidents this past week in Peru and other countries entirely on Communists would be a mistake, a University of Arizona expert on South America said today.

The incidents reflect the fact that relations between the United States and its neighbors to the south have deteriorated badly since World War II, said Dr. Russell C. Ewing, University of Arizona history and political science department head.

No doubt there were Communists involved in the riots, but it would be too simple an answer to give them the credit. The roots of antagonism towards this country run much deeper. We are felt to be hypocrites and a friend to dictators, Ewing said.

A specialist on South America, Ewing was a visiting teacher at the University of the Andes in Bogota, Colombia, from August of 1956 until last July.

The report this week of the lavish spending of Dominican Republic dictator Trujillo's son in this country is a key to some of the unfriendliness.

"They can't understand how we can be so friendly to dictators in South America and so unfriendly to Russia," Ewing said. "The South Americans think of us as being a bit hypocritical."

It mystified South Americans that President Eisenhower appeared to be so concerned about the dictator of Nicaragua when he was shot by an assassin several years ago that the President sent a physician.

While Ewing was in Colombia, the dictator of that country—Rojas Penilla—was overthrown.

Ewing said the Colombians were angered that the United States sold arms to Rojas who, in turn, used them against the people. "How would you feel?" he added.

The United States has appeared to the South American countries to give aid and comfort to such dictators as Batista in Cuba and the late reigns of Jimenez in Venezuela and Odria in Peru.

There was great disappointment in South America about the United States after World War II, Ewing said.

"We immediately began canceling contracts at the end of the war and they couldn't understand the suddenness," he said. "They felt they were let down too soon. They thought they had been used during the war and then dropped."

Later when the Marshall plan began in Europe, the South Americans were disappointed that they got little benefit of such aid.

The Nixon incidents have occurred mainly around universities, and Ewing stressed that the schools have a strong political importance in South America.

"Almost everywhere, the faculty seldom holds a position if it does not have the approval of the reigning power," Ewing said. "The faculty quite often goes down with a regime. The students react against this."

South American students tend to be much more politically conscious than students in this country, Ewing said.

"If you count heads, a majority of South American people are somewhat sympathetic to the United States," he added. "But a good share of the intellectual leadership is unfriendly."

At the same time, many of these people are violently anti-Communist and it will create a great deal of antagonism to accuse them of being Communists.

After a 300-year history of colonialism, South America began a difficult climb toward self-government in the early 1800's. The area is now gradually moving toward more stability.

"We have neglected South America," Ewing said. "Things can be straightened out with attention. But we should have a new look at our policies. We should make it clear to the world we don't support dictators anywhere."

VENEZUELAN PUBLISHER GIVES BACKGROUND OF RIOT—UNITED STATES POLICY NEEDS TO BE REVAMPED

(By Miguel Angel Capriles)

CARACAS.—The group of newspapers published by me was the leader in a campaign, in the days preceding the arrival of the Vice President, for a frank discussion of the problems facing the United States and Venezuela.

The main problem was that of the presence in the United States of (former Security Chief) Pedro Estrada and (exiled dictator) Marcos Perez Jimenez.

We called for the open discussion of these problems in a civil and orderly form, without resort to violence of any kind.

Unfortunately, as NIXON himself told us yesterday at the embassy, young people are impulsive and quick tempered and do not always follow the advice of their more mature elders.

However, and I told this to NIXON at the meeting, I have just conferred with the leaders of the three main Venezuelan political parties—Accion Democratica, Democratic Republican Union, and Christian Socialists—and the great majority of the Venezuelan public opinion emphatically condemns yesterday's violence as undemocratic.

I am sure the Venezuelan Government Junta has expressed these same sentiments to NIXON.

We cannot, however, blame all that has happened solely on communism even though it is true that some of the demonstrators were members of Communist youth groups.

As I have said in my newspapers, many things led to yesterday's violence. These things might be grouped under the general term of errors in United States policy toward Latin America.

Just one calculated step taken by the United States a week ago might have turned NIXON's reception in Caracas into a cheering ovation. This step was to have expelled our hated security chief, Pedro Estrada, from the United States.

People were incensed at the ease with which a permanent resident's visa was granted to Estrada. Other applicants go through a trying and lengthy process to get one. But Estrada got his in a hurry.

Another easy step for the United States to have taken, would have been to have NIXON omit his visit to Paraguay. This would have shown Latin Americans that North American leaders do not visit dictators.

Unfortunately, however, NIXON not only went to Paraguay but, I understand, he praised Dictator Alfredo Stroessner as an anti-Communist fighter.

The Venezuelan youths who yesterday demonstrated against NIXON still have fresh in their memories a decoration of the order of merit conferred on Perez Jimenez by the United States while hundreds of them were confined in the dictator's political jails.

And they still remember Secretary of State John Foster Dulles' praise of Venezuela's sane economic policies, under Perez Jimenez, whose plunder of the Venezuelan treasury and public mismanagement was the worst in Venezuela's history.

Lynwood High School, Lynwood, Los Angeles County, Calif., 23d Congressional District, Again Achieves National Recognition in Winning Sixth Consecutive Principal Freedoms Foundation Award

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I proudly present for the information and inspiration of all who read it, the text of newspaper comments announcing that Lynwood High School, in the great 23d District, Los Angeles County, Calif., has for its sixth consecutive year, and being the only school in the Nation to be consistently recognized by the Freedoms Foundation, received an award for an outstanding citizenship training program.

The Lynwood Press of Thursday, February 27, 1958, said:

LYNWOODD IN TOP AWARDS OF FREEDOM'S FOUNDATION ANNOUNCED AT VALLEY FORGE

Lynwood was again in the foreground as an outstanding community in the Nation with announcement from Valley Forge that four major awards were presented within this city from the Freedom's Foundation.

Award winners were Lynwood High School to receive a principal school award, George Washington Elementary School to receive a library award, Lynwood Coordinating Council to receive a George Washington Honor Medal and Joe McMillan as editor of the award winning Robertshaw Fulton house publication Relief Valve to wind a distinguished service award.

Lynwood High School maintained it's Nation leading position this year despite handicap of day sessions and for the sixth consecutive year and coveted principal school award. It is actually the seventh win for the school since while still a junior high school under W. W. Jones as principal won the first principal award. Since then the performances have been repeated with Don Reber and later Ralph Cosman as principal.

The high school entry was based on the citizenship program and training for leadership. Lynwood high has won the principal award more than any other high school in the country. It also holds two distinguished service scrolls.

Lynwood Coordinating Council entry was based on the part it plays in the community and the community sponsorship of the United Charities, case conference, senior citizens, youth coordinating council and junior coordinating council. Ruth Carver is president of the coordinating council.

George Washington School, appropriately on Washington's birthday, received the library award, the highest honor that can go to an elementary school. This makes the second consecutive year winning this award by Harold Peterson's school.

Joe McMillan, editor of the Robertshaw Fulton Controls Co. house publication received a distinguished service award for his part in producing an award winning bulletin.

Lynwood groups have consistently been at the top in receiving recognition from Freedom's Foundation and it is noted that each year there are different judges.

The Lynwood Press also said:

DELEGATES TO LEAVE FOR VALLEY FORGE

Receiving Lynwood High School's sixth consecutive Principal Freedom's Foundation Award next week at Valley Forge, Pa., will be Mickey Bach, an 11th grade student, and Edwin Clark, United States history teacher.

They will be representing the only high school in the Nation to be so consistently recognized by Freedom's Foundation for an outstanding citizenship training program.

The two high school representatives will fly to Valley Forge next Wednesday, at the expense of the Foundation, to participate in the annual Freedom's Foundation ceremonies and to begin a tour of other historical shrines in the East. Their itinerary includes a visit to Washington, D. C., where they have been invited to breakfast at the Capitol with Congressman CLYDE DOYLE.

In a letter to Lynwood High Principal Ralph Cosman, Congressman DOYLE has said that such a high accomplishment (Lynwood High's Freedom's Foundation record) its worthy of special mention in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The 23d Congressional District Representative also said that his personal car would be available to Mr. Clark and Mickey Bach while they are in Washington.

Mickey Bach is president of the junior class and secretary of the Key Club at Lynwood High. He is a varsity football player and an honor student in the college preparatory program. He is planning a career in

law. Mickey is the son of Mr. and Mrs. N. Bach, 3554 Carlin Avenue, Lynwood.

As chairman of the social studies department at Lynwood High, Edwin Clark directed the preparation of this year's Freedom's Foundation entry. He has taught at the high school 7 years and is currently an adviser to the student council. Clark is a UCLA graduate with a bachelor's degree in political science.

He is the father of one daughter who was born last month.

In the ninth annual honors at Valley Forge next week, Lynwood will be 1 of only 2 high schools in the southern California area to receive a principal award for its contribution to a better understanding of America. The Freedom's Foundation record of the entire Lynwood Unified School District is unequaled by any school district of comparable size in the Nation.

The Lynwood Herald-American said:

FREEDOM AWARD TREK: LYNWOOD HIGH YOUTH, TEACHER TO GO EAST

Receiving Lynwood High School's sixth consecutive Principal Freedoms Foundation award next week at Valley Forge, Pa., will be Mickey Bach, an 11th grade student, and Edwin Clark, United States history teacher. They will be representing the only school in the Nation to be so consistently recognized by Freedoms Foundation for an outstanding citizenship training program.

The two high school representatives will fly to Valley Forge next Wednesday, at the expense of the foundation, to participate in the annual Freedoms Foundation ceremonies and to begin a tour of other historical shrines in the East. Their itinerary includes a visit to Washington, D. C., where they have been invited to breakfast at the Capitol with Congressman CLYDE DOYLE.

Mr. Speaker, having already represented the Lynwood community adulthood and school youth as well for 12 years now in this great legislative body, I know you and all my distinguished colleagues will share with me the pride Mrs. Doyle and I had when we had the privilege and honor of having instructors Edwin Clark and Mickey Bach, of Lynwood High School, who traveled to Valley Forge for Lynwood High, at breakfast here at our Nation's Capitol. With them at the same happy breakfast occasion we had the pleasure and honor of having with us Miss Charlotte Becker and Jim Heinrich, representing Franklin D. Roosevelt Junior High School, in the important city of Compton, Calif., also in the great 23d district. Said Franklin D. Roosevelt Junior High was also awarded a highly coveted principal award of the Freedoms Foundation as 1 of the top 50 nominations in the nationwide contest in the junior high school division.

Also at the breakfast table we had the privilege of having instructor Leicester B. Yates and Walter Stewart, 664 East 120th Street, Los Angeles, Calif., a student of the John C. Fremont Adult School; said school also being a winner, being named the principal winner by Freedoms Foundation in the adult school class. Said adult school is located in the congressional district represented by the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT.

I know you and all my other distinguished colleagues will share with me the pleasure and pride I have these successive years on account of these young people repeatedly achieving nationwide recognition for their scholarly competitive attainments. I am sure you also share with me complimentary and congratulatory best wishes to the faculty of these fine educational establishments, as well as to all the students thereof.

An Example of Controls Over Corn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 19, 1958

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I should like to include a letter written by Mr. Rex R. Keck, of Lake View, Iowa, which appeared in the May 1, 1958, issue of the Des Moines Register.

Mr. Keck has pointed out the significan fact that the reason farmers are not entering the farm program is because they have had their support price taken from them in a manner quite contrary to the purpose of the program itself. Mr. Keck's letter is interesting and gives a graphic picture of what happens under the present program as administered:

AN EXAMPLE OF CONTROLS OVER CORN

To the EDITOR:

During some 20 years of Government-controlled price supports we have built up a surplus of corn. During those years the average 160-acre farm had a corn base of about 50 acres.

Recently it became apparent something had to be done to reduce this accumulating surplus. The following figures taken from the 1957 records of a 160-acre Sac County farm clearly illustrate Secretary Benson's idea of how this should be done. This farm is rented on a 50–50 crop share basis and the 1958 figures are the same except a $5 per acre increase in the Soil Bank payment.

CORN BASE DOWN TO 34 ACRES

Benson's first move was to cut back the corn base to 34 acres, a reduction of approximately 30 percent in production. If we did this we could seal our corn. If we would cut this 34 acres another 15 percent or 5 acres we would get a soil-bank payment of $245. Now we are down to 29 acres.

Then he advised that as we were only farmers we should not expect to get full price for our products so he set the sealing price at 70 percent of parity; another 30 percent deduction. This 29 acres of corn was to be divided 50–50 between landlord and renter.

You cannot raise enough corn on 14½ acres to keep a 160-acre farm at the proper degree of fertility. The renter would have to buy corn from his neighbors to feed, even though he fed only the stock he raised on the farm. Imagine a successful auto company advising its employees they would have to buy their new cars of its competitors as they had failed to make enough for their own requirements during the year.

SUGGESTS APPLICATION TO SALARIES

In other words, Benson cut off 30 percent of the farmer's hog at each end and left him about 40 percent in the middle and we all know what that adds up to. May I suggest that you people working on salaries apply the Eisenhower-Benson program to yourselves.

For instance—if you are a teacher, cut your working time one-third and your monthly salary for the reduced time 50 percent. Then you might add about 5 percent of your original salary to the result to offset the soil-bank payment. We can guarantee this system will reduce your income taxes. It did ours.

If in 1957 and 1958 we had been offered a program reducing acreage 30 percent and a sealing price at or near parity practically every farmer would have signed up and our surplus would have disappeared.

REX R. KECK.

The Communist Attack on Judaism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following excerpt from Masters of Deceit, written by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Masters of Deceit is a firsthand account of American communism, from its beginnings to the present. Mr. Hoover gives particular attention to Communist attempts to influence minority groups and exposes the lies behind the Communists' efforts to infiltrate the Jewish community.

The excerpt follows:

THE COMMUNIST ATTACK ON JUDAISM

(By J. Edgar Hoover)

The Communist propaganda machine with its tactics of infiltration and division has long fostered the false claim of widespread influence in the Jewish communities of America. One of the most malicious myths that has developed in the United States is that persons of the Jewish faith and Communists have something in common. The people who gave the world the concept of our monotheistic God and the Ten Commandments cannot remain Jews and follow the atheism of Karl Marx and the deceit of the Communist movement.

It is a matter of record that numerous Communist Party leaders call themselves Jews and claim a Jewish origin. This does not, however, make them Jews, any more than William Z. Foster's Catholic background and Earl Browder's Protestant background give them any standing in present-day Catholic and Protestant communities in the United States.

The reasons for the extensive activities of the Communist Party in seeking to infiltrate and make extravagant claims for its work in some Jewish organizations and those of other minority groups are readily apparent. In the Soviet Union, the proving ground for Marxism-Leninism, Communists are confronted with a minority problem of staggering proportions. Only 58 percent of the population in the Soviet Union is Russian whereas 42 percent is non-Russian and consists of 168 national minorities.

A more important reason for Communist interest in minorities in the United States is, of course, the opportunities they provide for exploitation and propaganda. The large number of Communist fronts using the word "Jewish," as well as publications that the Communists dominate, is for the obvious purpose of conveying a false impression of strength among those who embrace the Jewish faith. This also accounts in part for the literary interest Communists devote to the problems of Jews. Prior to issuing the Communist manifesto, Karl Marx, the atheist, wrote a treatise called, On the Jew-

ish Question, which sets forth his views regarding Judaism and Jewish culture.

From that time to this in dealing with those of the Jewish faith, the Communists invariably do so in terms of discussing the Jewish question. In fact, by this propaganda technique the Communists deliberately try to make the Jews a problem, which is denied by the record of good citizenship and civic responsibility of adherents of Judaism in the United States.

A true follower of the Jewish faith, like those of other religions, cannot embrace communism. Marxism-Leninism is irrevocably opposed to all religious beliefs and all forms of worship, whether they be Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, or Moslem. One of Lenin's basic teachings is, "We must combat religion—this is the A. B. C. of all materialism and consequently of Marxism. The Marxist must be a materialist, i. e., an enemy of religion." In theory and practice the Communists make no distinction among any of the world's greater religions.

The Communist propaganda line directed to Jewish people follows three general themes:

1. The Soviet Union offers the Jewish people complete freedom. As one apologist put it: "There is one spot on the earth where the Jewish people are not under increasing pressure, one spot where the Jews have full equality * * * That is the Socialist Soviet Union."

2. The Soviets have created a national homeland for Russian Jews in the Jewish autonomous region of Birobidzhan (or Birobidjan), where they claim Jewish culture is flourishing.

3. In World War II the U. S. S. R. saved thousands of Jews from certain death from the Nazis.

Standing by themselves, these claims admittedly make an impressive appeal. The record, however, demolishes this propaganda line as a collection of half-truths, exaggerations, and outright deceptions.

At best, Soviet tolerance toward Jewish culture was never anything more than a temporary political tactic. And even then the Soviet claims were contemporaneous with the 1917 revolution, when the Communists were seeking support from all quarters. Stalin's Marxism and the National Question, the acknowledged Communist classic on the subject, though consisting of 222 pages, contains only 20 pages written after 1927, with the most important single part having been written in 1913. By the late 1930's alleged concessions to the cultures of the various minority groups gave way to a policy of forcible denationalization rivaling the brutal russification tactics of the Czars.

To illustrate: In 1917 there were a total of 49 Yiddish or Hebrew newspapers in the Soviet Union. By 1921 these had increased to 62; but no less than 50 were Communist-controlled, while the 49 not under Communist control in 1917 had dwindled to 12 in 1921.

Jewish literature suffered a similar fate. From 1928 to 1933 books published in Yiddish rose from 238 to 668, but there was a marked decline in books dealing with Jewish history and tradition. In 1932 there were 36 books in Yiddish classified as history—of these, 16 were memoirs chiefly of old Bolsheviks; 6 were studies on the Communist International; 6 dealt with the revolution and history of the Communist Party; 5 consisted of speeches of Stalin and other Communist leaders; and only 3 actually dealt with matters pertaining to Jewish culture. These related to the labor movement and were an attempt to rewrite history to conform with Marxist-Leninist doctrine.

One of the most crippling Communist attacks on Jewish culture has been prohibition of the use of Hebrew, the traditional language of Judaism. As a tactic the Soviets launched a program of compulsory Yiddishizing to destroy the influence of Hebrew among Russian Jews. A similar program of suppression of Jewish institutions shifted to the satellites after World War II, where Jewish schools were abolished, Jewish organizations banned, and even athletic clubs bearing Jewish names were forced to change their names on 24-hour notice.

The second propaganda claim of the Soviets in establishing the Jewish homeland of Birobidzhan should be closely analyzed. The so-called Jewish homeland was set up at a time when the threat of Japanese and Chinese invasion of the U. S. S. R.'s far eastern frontier was not idle. Thus, the Jewish homeland was conceived as a means of populating the vast spaces in the Far East of Russia, and also provided a convenient place to settle Jews not wanted in other parts of Russia.

By 1933 the Soviets envisioned a population of 60,000 Jews in Birobidzhan. During its first 6 years 19,635 Jews arrived, while 11,450 left, leaving a net gain of only 8,185. By 1939, after 11 years, the Soviet Jewish homeland could claim no more than 30,000 Jews, and by 1951 around 40,000 which was a small community surrounded by Asiatic peoples completely separated from the mainstream of Jewish life. Furthermore, it is in the maritime provinces of Siberia, where the climate is unsuitable for those accustomed to European life.

The third Communist propaganda claim, that of rescuing Jews from Nazi extinction, is also a deception. In the first place, for 2 years prior to the Nazi invasion of Russia, when Moscow was allied with Berlin, there is no record of any Soviet protest against the Nazi slaughter of Jews, so far as is known. The good-neighbor policy between the Communists and the Nazis, initiated by the Stalin-Hitler pact, is clearly established by the following report sent by the German Ambassador to Moscow to the German Foreign Office, where it came to light after the war: "The Soviet Government is doing everything to change the attitude of the population here toward Germany. The press is as though it had been transformed."

Then, too, the silence of the Soviet leaders on the outbreaks of Nazi anti-Semitism completely misled Eastern European Jews as to the real character of the Nazi threat and hence, some 2 million Russian and Eastern European Jews made no attempt to escape the Nazis during the early months of the German invasion of Russia. And even after the Nazi onslaught, there was a shocking failure on the part of the Soviets to reveal Nazi atrocities against the Jews.

For example, the Soviet government in 1942 condemned the bloodthirsty, criminal plans of the fascists aimed at exterminating Russians, Ukrainians, Byelorussians, and other peoples of the Soviet Union, with no direct reference to the Jews. As late as 1945 the Soviets, in a report on the German concentration camp at Auschwitz (Oswiecim), where more than 4,000,000 persons were exterminated, did not even use the word "Jew," although they constituted the majority of those whose lives were so brutally taken.

Not only did the Communists in the Soviet Union fail to make any special effort to save Jewish people during the war, they showed no concern over their fate.

When Khrushchev denounced Stalin at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in Moscow in February 1956, news of the long pent-up acts of oppression against Jews in the Soviet Union began to leak out. It is, of course, significant that Khrushchev made no mention of the mistreatment of the Jews in his exposure of Stalin, whom he had so loyally served over the years.

Within a few weeks, the disclosures of anti-Semitism came in the Warsaw Yiddish-language Communist Folks-Shtimme on April 4, 1956, regarding the Soviet purges of Jewish leaders and culture under Stalin. Later, on April 13, 1956, the Daily Worker expressed regrets and then admitted "* * * we were too prone to accept the explanation of why Jewish culture had disappeared in the Soviet Union in the late 1940's." With the agility of whirling dervishes the Communists then sought to develop a justification for the Soviet Communist leaders' action.

World public opinion over the Soviet Communist leaders' injustices mounted and as Khrushchev turned on the "smiles" and started visiting other countries, he was confronted with the accusation of anti-Semitism in Russia.

In England, Khrushchev characterized "anti-Semitism" as "nonsense" to which he would not listen. To a French delegation he protested that he was not anti-Semitic but that the Yiddish language is fading away in Russia as the Jews in the Soviet Union are learning to speak Russian. A new low in deception was reached when Khrushchev claimed that, in the early years of the revolution, "Jews occupied a disproportionately large number of high Soviet positions because the country had few trained people." He then asserted that the Kremlin had received protests from "the various Soviet Republics that too many Jews held desirable positions." The New York Times story on June 10, 1956, then reported that Khrushchev "* * * reportedly pressed Lazar M. Kaganovich, only high-ranking Soviet leader of Jewish origin, to confirm his statements, which Mr. Kaganovich finally did, saying one word, 'correct' * * *." And now there are no top Communist leaders in the Kremlin of Jewish origin since Khrushchev ousted and denounced Kaganovich last summer.

The President of B'nai B'rith, Philip M. Klutznick, answered the Communist propaganda claims when he made the factual observation that only in Soviet Russia and its satellites is "Jewish life languishing and approaching extinction."

The Communist Party of the United States at its February 1957 convention sought to hoodwink the American public by a series of statements to the press of how it had declared its independence from Moscow. This deceit was established in no unmistakable terms by the handling of a resolution dealing with anti-Semitism in Russia. The resolution stated: "This matter concerns us as Communists in a country which includes 5 million Jews." It then points out:

"Since the Jewish question is international in scope, we Communists must be alert to the problem and its worldwide aspects. The Jewish question is a specific question that requires specific attention. * * * The liquidation of the outstanding Yiddish writers and Jewish communal and political leaders, and the snuffing out of organized Jewish cultural life have been known for some time."

The resolution called for the creation of a Jewish commission, a return to Leninist policy, and a request to make this subject one for fraternal discussion with the Communist Party in the Soviet Union, which, of course, negates the view of independence of the Communists in the United States.

The resolution was soft-pedaled and disposed of, as was a similar resolution dealing with Soviet terrorism in Hungary, by being referred to the national committee of the party. Pravda, on February 16, 1957, had this to say: "The 16th Convention of the Communist Party, United States of America, confirmed the loyalty of the American Communists to the principles of Marxism Leninism."

Party leaders, however, in the face of the overwhelming evidence of Communist hate for the followers of Moses, still are attempting to deceive unsuspecting persons of Jewish origin and, as this is being written, Communist tacticians are at work on a program of

infiltrating Jewish groups by seeking the answers to such questions as:

How to avoid the extremes of negating Israel and of accepting its actions uncritically.

How to work in religious groups while keeping ourselves and our children free of the religious doctrine of these groups.

How to avoid the extremes of taking on all issues and avoiding all issues.

How to balance Jewish work with our interests as Marxists in general trade union, minorities and people's movements.

The vigilant and patriotic members of Jewish organizations have demonstrated their alertness to counteract such infiltration tactics.

Mineral Resources Security Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an analysis of the Mineral Resources Security Act of 1958. The time has come when a healthy balance must be reached between oil importation and domestic oil production, if the United States is to preserve a healthy oil industry in peace or in times of national emergency. Our defense posture is dependent to no small degree to our ability to provide the necessary sinews of war. Oil is most important, and this means the preservation of oil production. Excessive oil imports have threatened the very economic life of many of our small producers, none of whom are successful small-business men are expendable, if their demise is being accomplished by the unbalance of imports. Poor or unsuccessful business operation is one thing, but being throttled by excessive importation is another. I recognize the danger to the oil industry from Government regulation, and of the failure to control voluntarily the oil imports on the other. While I am not an authority, but a student of this problem, I would like to recommend an analysis of the bill currently pending that is intended to correct the present unhappy situation as outlined by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD]. It is my hope that my colleagues will give this matter their attention so that we can find the right solution, to both permit importation and yet just as fairly permit the oil producer to operate his well or wells instead of shutting them down most of the time. The latter course, will lead to danger to this Nation. From the combined effort of the Members I feel confident that a right solution can be found. It is my hope that these few remarks may shed some light on this troubling problem. The Mineral Resources Security Act of 1958 is presently pending before the Rules Committee as an amendment to the Trade Agreements Act. I urge my colleagues to lend their support to this amendment, which seems fair and equitable, or if any not deem it so, that such an equitable solution be found without delay.

The analysis follows:

ANALYSIS OF THE MINERAL RESOURCES SECURITY ACT OF 1958

(By Congressman FRANK IKARD)

BASIC PURPOSE

The basic purpose of this bill is to provide for the national security insofar as mineral resources are concerned. The bill is, therefore, entitled "Mineral Resources Security Act of 1958." The bill would serve the national security by the Congress taking action with respect to individual defense minerals as will assure the availability of such essential materials in time of need.

The bill would amend the existing defense amendment (19 U. S. C., sec. 1352a). The defense amendment was first enacted in 1954 and further amended in 1955. Its sole purpose is to make sure that excessive imports will not impair or threaten the national security. The present law delegates to the President broad authority to take whatever action he deems necessary whenever he finds that the national security is endangered.

The bill would implement the present law by establishing legislative findings as to the level of imports that constitutes a threat to the national security in regard to two commodities, namely: (1) fluorspar; and (2) petroleum.

It is anticipated that as Congress determines the essentiality of other mineral resources and the level at which imports must be held in order to protect the national security, such resources would be included in this provision of the law.

TREATMENT OF PETROLEUM

With respect to petroleum, the bill would provide that imports for consumption of both crude oil and all petroleum products, in excess of the ratio in 1954 between such imports and domestic production, are determined by Congress to endanger the national security. The President is directed to limit such imports to or below such ratios.

LEGISLATIVE GUIDELINES FOR ADMINISTRATION OF PETROLEUM LIMITATION

The bill would establish specific and definite guidelines to be followed in the administration of the quota limitation on petroleum imports.

First, it would provide that the President may, if he deemed it advisable or necessary in the interest of national security, allocate the quota among the countries or areas which are the source of imports.

Second, it would provide that the quota be put up for bid. Each person desiring to import would bid for a license to import. These licenses would be awarded, subject to approval by the President, on the basis of the highest bids. Licenses could be awarded annually, semiannually, or more often, at the determination and discretion of the President.

The licensing procedure would function as follows:

Prior to the beginning of each calendar year, the President would request the Bureau of Mines to forecast the daily average domestic petroleum production during the next calendar year. This would have to be done sufficiently early to permit bids to be awarded and to provide licensees with sufficient time in which to make arrangements for importing petroleum during the next calendar year. By applying the 1954 ratio between imports and domestic production to the forecasted production for the ensuing calendar year, an initial quota for the year is determined. This quota may be adjusted for each quarter of the year so as to take into account seasonal variations in domestic consumption. This is necessary to recognize the rather wide seasonal variations in imports of products such as residual fuel oil. To avoid disruption of normal industry practices geared to this seasonal fluctuation, it is necessary to consider these seasonal factors.

Upon determination of the quota as outlined above for the ensuing calendar year, the President would be required to give public notice of the quota so established and to request bids for licenses to import during the calendar year. Licenses to import would be awarded on the basis of the highest bid, subject to the approval of the President. The highest bid is to have priority unless for some overriding reason the President finds that a license should not be awarded to the highest bidder.

If during any calendar quarter domestic production is above or below the forecasted production, imports for the following quarter shall be adjusted commensurately. In other words, if actual production during a quarter is 10 percent above or below forecasted production, the quota for the next quarter would be increased or decreased by 10 percent provided that in no event could imports exceed the 1954 ratio.

Such quarterly adjustments are necessary in order to minimize the adverse effects of imports upon the conservation programs of the oil producing States. Whenever the conservation programs require cutbacks in domestic production, similar cutbacks should be made, as soon as possible, in imports of foreign oil. Equity requires that such periodic adjustments be made. In addition, the administrative problems faced by the State conservation agencies will be aided under such a program. The necessity for such periodic adjustments is emphatically demonstrated by the fact that in the State of Texas the allowable producing days has been continuously cut back to a current low of 8 days per month. Under any program to limit imports, similar cutbacks in imports should be made periodically whenever domestic production is reduced.

The bill also provides that the President may, if he deems it advisable, allocate the quota determined for each calendar year among the countries or areas which are the source of imports. This discretionary authority is given the President in the interest of national security. If the President determines that allocation of the quota on a country or area basis is necessary in the interest of national security, this provision of the bill delegates to him unrestricted authority to do so.

This licensing procedure provides a method of administration which eliminates the danger of Federal governmental control of domestic industry activities. This licensing system would automatically allocate the quota to individual companies according to their bids which in turn would be based upon the economics involved. This automatic method of administration is far superior to any method of administration which involves undefined administrative discretion to allocate the quota to individual companies based upon a myriad of unnamed and unknown considerations which may be changed from time to time and may not be known in advance by all parties concerned.

The awarding of the licenses on a bid basis would tend to eliminate the economic advantage enjoyed by foreign oil. It should function in the direction of placing each barrel of imported oil on a competitive equality with domestic produced oil.

The awarding of the quota on a bid basis would also provide a substantial source of revenue to the Federal Government.

EFFECT OF THE BILL ON PETROLEUM IMPORTS

If this bill had been in effect during 1957, the effect on petroleum imports, both crude oil and products, would have been as follows:

	Barrels daily
(a) Domestic crude-oil production in 1957	7,175,000
(b) Total imports permitted under 1954 ratio (16.6 percent)	1,191,000
(c) Actual total imports during 1957	1,545,000
(d) Reduction that would have been brought about under this bill	354,000

The effect of the bill upon imports of crude oil alone would have been as follows:

	Barrels daily
(a) Domestic crude-oil production in 1957	7,175,000
(b) Total imports of crude oil permitted under 1954 ratio (10.3 percent)	739,000
(c) Actual crude-oil imports in 1957	997,000
(d) Reduction that would have been brought about under this bill	258,000

The effect of the bill upon imports of petroleum products, including residual-fuel oil and all other products, would have been as follows:

	Barrels daily
(a) Domestic crude-oil production in 1957	7,175,000
(b) Total imports of products permitted under the 1954 ratio (6.3 percent)	452,000
(c) Actual imports of all petroleum products in 1957	537,000
(d) Reduction of imports of all petroleum products	96,000

ESCAPE CLAUSE

The bill contains an escape clause which authorizes the President, during any period in which he finds that supplies of petroleum, or directly competitive articles, are inadequate to meet current domestic demand to suspend the quota limitations provided by the bill.

The bill, therefore, contains a flexibility that assures the consumers of the United States that they will not be faced with a domestic shortage and at the same time a limitation upon imports into the United States.

Huntington Park, Calif., Daily Newspaper Says: "Nixon's Woes Are America's"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I present herewith the text of an editorial on Tuesday, May 13, 1958, in the Huntington Park Daily Signal "serving the greater southeast community" published in the great 23d District which I represent in this my 12th year in this great legislative body:

NIXON'S WOES ARE AMERICA'S

The troubles of Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON in South America undoubtedly are, as reported, Communist inspired and Communist perpetrated.

But the basic cause, we believe, goes far beyond that. It stems from a general loss of respect the United States has suffered, not only in Latin America, but throughout the world.

Today's news report is a perfect reflection of the point we make. Not only is the life of the Vice President of the United States endangered in the "friendly" country of Venezuela but half way across the world mobs have sacked a United States cultural center in Algiers. Another mob, equally bent on destruction, had to be turned away by force from the American Embassy in Beirut, Lebanon.

Part of this feeling of resentment, to be sure, is the price we pay for being a wealthy and powerful nation. This has been the case throughout history and against all nations which have risen to similar positions of world power.

It is an integral part of human nature to resent those who have more—not only in the case of nations but of individuals as well. The rich man always has been a target of one form or another.

LACK OF FIRMNESS

But even more important than this natural resentment, we believe, has been our failure, particularly in recent years, to assume the world leadership our position entails.

We have had no firmness in dealing with other nations. Our foreign policy has been one of vacillation, bluster and bluff. One by one we have seen friendly nations picked off and placed under the Communist sphere of influence while we have threatened, cajoled and finally wrung our hands.

As a parent who fails to exercise firmness in leading his family soon loses its respect so we as a nation have lost the respect of the world.

And while it is easy to blame the Government for the faults we see, the American Government, more than any other, is a reflection of the American people. To a great extent, we believe, it is the unwillingness of the American people to stand up and be counted, to "go for broke" as it were, that has led us to our present plight.

Top Award in Reporting to Mollenhoff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, Iowa is justly proud of news correspondent Clark R. Mollenhoff, who recently was awarded a Pulitzer prize in journalism for excellence in national reporting. The following account of Mr. Mollenhoff's work in exposing evidence of racketeering appeared in the Tuesday, May 6, issue of the Des Moines Register, Des Moines, Iowa:

TOP AWARD IN REPORTING TO MOLLENHOFF—PULITZER PRIZE FOR RACKETS STORIES

NEW YORK, N. Y.—Clark R. Mollenhoff, of the Washington bureau of the Des Moines Register, was recently awarded a Pulitzer prize in journalism for excellence in national reporting.

Mollenhoff won the $1,000 award for his 5-year reporting job in digging out and exposing evidence of racketeering in labor unions. His disclosures led to the McClellan committee's hearings in the Senate as well as to other remedial actions.

A similar award for distinguished reporting of national affairs went to Relman Morin of the Associated Press. He was cited for coverage of the Little Rock, Ark., Central High School mob violence of last September 23.

EARLIER HONORS

Mollenhoff, 37, has been a member of the Register's Washington Bureau since 1950. Before that he had been a reporter for the Register in Des Moines since 1941.

The Pulitzer award, announced here by the trustees of Columbia University, was the second award based on Mollenhoff's news coverage of labor racketeering.

Last month the Register was awarded the 1957 public-service prize of Sigma Delta Chi, professional journalism fraternity, for his work in the same field.

Mollenhoff previously won two other Sigma Delta Chi prizes, the Raymond Clapper memorial award for distinguished Washington reporting and the Heywood Broun memorial award of the American Newspaper Guild.

FIVE-YEAR ACTIVITY

The work which won for Mollenhoff the Pulitzer prize, most coveted award in American journalism, began 5 years ago.

The series of investigations which he undertook in many States and the stories he wrote from then through 1957 resulted in a series of congressional investigations of racketeering, misuse of funds, and mishandling of welfare and pension funds in labor unions.

Chairman JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in Labor and Management—a group which has conducted explosive hearings since its establishment a little over a year ago—has credited Mollenhoff with providing the impetus for the broad probe.

MCCLELLAN, in a letter to Mollenhoff, once said: "Your ideas, advice, and guidance have been invaluable."

BECK AND HOFFA

Mollenhoff's extensive and exclusive reporting on the activities of former Teamster President Dave Beck and current Teamster President James Hoffa formed the starting point for the McClellan committee's work.

Beck's retirement as teamster president and a tangle of legal problems in which Hoffa is now enmeshed were results of the McClellan hearings.

The Senate recently passed a bill to reform the handling of union pension and health and welfare funds. Mollenhoff's detailed stories on abuses in various unions had focused attention on this area.

Mollenhoff, a native of Fort Dodge, Iowa, was graduated from Drake University law school in Des Moines in 1944. He served 2 years as a naval officer in World War II. In 1949 he won a Niemann fellowship and spent a year studying at Harvard University.

IN IOWA FOR WEBSTER CITY TALKS

Mollenhoff heard the news of his Pulitzer award while in Des Moines Monday en route to Webster City, his former home town.

Mollenhoff will speak tonight to the Webster City High School Quill and Scroll Journalism Society at Elm Park School, and Wednesday night to the Webster City Teachers Association at Washington Central School Gymnasium.

Mollenhoff plans to visit Drake University, his alma mater, Thursday.

His wife, Georgia, formerly of Webster City, heard the award news at their home in Washington, D. C. The Mollenhoffs have 3 children, Gjori, 17, Sue, 14, and Raymond, 8.

Mollenhoff's mother, Mrs. R. E. Mollenhoff, lives at Waverly, Iowa.

UNDERWORLD TIES

Mollenhoff predicted here Monday night that labor news involving the underworld and the hold it has on the Teamsters union and some others will be of great national interest this summer.

"This underworld picture will be further dramatized in the summer months to give

impetus to labor legislation in the United States Senate," Mollenhoff said.

"The Senate will try to enact legislation on the labor front, and may even jar the House into action."

Mollenhoff said responsible labor leaders such as George Meaney, president of the AFL-CIO, have tried to clean up unhealthy situations.

"Meany and others like him are faced with the problem of practical politics within their operation, and would be powerless to act if the Senate Labor Rackets Committee were not continually putting fire on the subject," Mollenhoff said.

Summer Folklore Institute at Indiana University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to an article in the March 1958 issue of Indiana History Bulletin, with reference to a folklore institute which will be held at Indiana University this June:

The fifth folklore institute of Indiana University will be held on the Bloomington campus during the regular summer session from June 11 to August 8, 1958. These institutes were established by Stith Thompson in 1942 and have been held every fourth summer since. Their chief purpose is to bring together folklore specialists from all over the United States, and where possible from other countries, who lecture in a variety of courses on folklore, in conjunction with the resident folklore faculty of Indiana University. Besides the formal lecturing in the classroom, the institute makes possible free exchange of ideas and shoptalk in between times, and gives students an opportunity to meet a number of active and eminent folklorists.

For the 1958 institute two distinguished visiting scholars will teach for the full duration of the institute. Prof. Archer Taylor of the University of California, past president of the Modern Language Association of America, and author of The Proverb and English Riddles in Oral Tradition, will offer courses on The Proverb and the Riddle, and Research Problems in Folklore. Prof. Katharine Luomala, chairman of the department of anthropology at the University of Hawaii, a past editor of the Journal of American Folklore, and author of Maui of a Thousand Tricks and Voices on the Wind, will lecture on Folklore of the Pacific and Introduction to Folklore.

Three other courses will be given by Indiana University faculty. W. Edson Richmond will teach English and Scottish Popular Ballad, Warren E. Roberts will give The Folklore and Allied Forms, and Richard N. Dorson will serve as chairman of a course entitled "International Relations in Folklore." The purpose of this course will be to inform students of comparative folklore of current activities in folklore in various countries of the world. A panel of outstanding specialists will lecture in the course on the particular countries they have visited:

Africa: Melville J. Herskovits, Northwestern University.

China: R. D. Jameson, New Mexico Highlands University.

Finland: Aili Kolehmainen Johnson, Piedmont, Calif.

French Canada and France: Luc Lecourciere, Laval University, Quebec.

Great Britain: Richard N. Dorson, Indiana University.

India: Edwin C. Kirkland, University of Florida.

Italy: William E. Simeone, Southern Illinois University.

Japan: Richard N. Dorson, Indiana University.

Russia: Felix J. Oinas, Indiana University.

Scandinavia: Stith Thompson, Indiana University.

South America: Stith Thompson, Indiana Universtiy.

Turkey: William H. Jansen, University of Kentucky.

Other prominent folklorists will give special lectures in the Institute in the American folktale, folk museums and folk art, problems of archiving, the relations of folklore to literature, collecting in the Ozarks, style in folklore, and Anglo-American ballad scholarship. These lectures will be offered by John Ball, Miami University; Ernest W. Baughman, University of New Mexico; Daniel G. Hoffman, Swarthmore College; Thelma James, Wayne University; Louis C. Jones, director, New York State Historical Association, Cooperstown, N. Y.; Vance Randolph, Eureka Springs, Ark.; D. K. Wilgus, Western Kentucky State College.

It is hoped that State folklore societies will send delegates to the Institute. Courses may be taken for regular academic credit, or audited without credit. For further informatoin address Richard N. Dorson, chairman, folklore program, Indiana University.

Exclusive Private Schools and Class Systems Swell British Emigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the period since the end of World War II is having a swelling impact on the British educational and class system. One result is a record British emigration. According to competent observers, this is the kind of comment one hears in England from families about to emigrate:

"We must not confine our children to the limited opportunities we've had. In this country there's not only a lack of incentive and discouragement of initiative but, unless you've been to the right school, you can get only to a certain point—accent too often counts more than ability. There's too much class distinction."

The current wave of emigration is the result of deep-seated social and economic troubles, and is indicative of a growing conviction that only by starting life anew in a country with an expanding economy can one achieve a rapid improvement in one's economic condition and have a higher standard of living such as we achieved in America.

This situation is discussed by George W. Oakes, well-known journalist, in the magazine Freedom and Union, May issue. Mr. Oakes has been visiting Britain for more than 30 years, and with his brother, John B. Oakes, of the New York Times, established the first graduate scholarship in American history at Oxford.

I include here the article from Freedom and Union:

EDUCATION AND CLASS SYSTEMS SWELL BRITISH EMIGRATION

(By George W. Oakes)

The impact of the postwar era on the British educational and class systems—which are closely interrelated—is having some far-reaching results. These range from contributing substantially to a record British emigration to causing the London County Council to reorganize its high schools along American lines. This is the sort of comment one hears in London from families about to emigrate:

"We must not confine our children to the limited opportunities we've had. In this country there's not only a lack of incentive and discouragement of initiative but, unless you've been to the right school, you can get only to a certain point. Not many without a public-school[1] education become senior executives or company directors. Accent too often counts more than ability. There's too much class distinction."

The urge to move to a land with greater scope has been mounting to such an extent that 220,000 Britons emigrated in 1957, mostly to the Commonwealth and to the United States—the largest emigration by far since the war. Canada alone took 110,000 from the United Kingdom, more than twice as many as during 1956.

The current exodus is the result of deep-seated social as well as economic troubles. Primarily it expresses a strong conviction that only by starting life anew in a growing country can one achieve a rapid improvement in one's economic condition and approach more quickly a higher standard of living, such as Americans enjoy. Frequent remarks about the classless society out there—in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the United States of America—also reflect an underlying resentment by at least a substantial minority in Britain against the confining restrictions of a social system that is changing in many ways but is still firmly based on class distinction.

In assessing the motives behind the emigration wave, both economic and social factors impel an average white-collar family in the London suburban area to leave. Ontario, where most Britons settle in Canada, finds that office and commercial workers form as high a proportion of applicants as any other group.

Why shouldn't a company secretary, for example, who has been with the same firm for 20 years be dissatisfied with $3,300 a year? In the 20 years his cost of living has risen about 3 times, yet his buying power is less than three-fourths of what it was in 1938. During this period a process of economic levelling has taken place between the white-collar man and the skilled industrial worker who now has about 40 percent more purchasing power than he had 20 years ago.

In recent years the economic foundations of British life have been profoundly altered by mass industrialization accompained by heavy taxation and the development of the welfare state. For the first time the disparity in living conditions between the classes no longer exists.

As this economic merging of previously sharply separated income groups occurred during the postwar years, many who felt denied greater scope and opportunity because of the class structure expected rapid social consequences. They had thought that such a drawing together in the way of living among those of differing financial strata would have produced corresponding shifts in

[1] The term "public school" in Britain refers to what Americans would call exclusive private schools.

the class system. Yet many observers believe that few basic changes have taken place thus far in the traditional class organization of British society.

How does the durability of the class relationship affect the white-collar worker's life? First of all, by making it harder for him to make ends meet. He no longer has the obvious advantages in his standard of living over the manual worker that he enjoyed before the war. Then he had a house maid. He went to a better seaside resort for his holidays than those socially down the line. His wife could afford finer clothing. He even ate better food than the skilled industrial worker. Today their incomes and ways of living are not too dissimilar. Aside from the fact that the white-collar worker is more likely to own his own home while the factory worker lives in state subsidized housing, the chief way, perhaps, in which the former still asserts his social superiority is through his children's education.

ACCENT IMPORTANT SOCIALLY

Certainly, he clings more tenaciously now to such things as education and accent which still set him apart from the lower social group. At great financial sacrifice the office worker sends his children to a private school both a get a better education and to prevent them from developing the cockney accent so typical of the working class. It is not unusual for his wife to take a part-time job so that their children can thus maintain their rung on the social ladder.

This search for wider economic and social opportunity is for the benefit of the children even more than the adults. Today's emigrants aren't unemployed or looking for work. Ninety-five percent are giving up jobs and often selling homes as well as businesses. Their decision to leave isn't due to temporary hardship. It is based on broader and longer range reasons, especially consideration for the future welfare of their children.

Many who are frustrated by their personal financial troubles and skeptical over the country's economic prospects—and hence turn to emigration—say that though minor improvements may be occurring in the class relationship, these changes are too slow to assure their children as broad an opportunity as they could have overseas.

In contemporary Britain, it is now the "done" thing to discuss class. Just as in Victorian days one didn't talk about sex, so until recently one didn't discuss class. Ever since the feudal period the class stratification of society has been accepted as the normal pattern. Unlike America, social position depends on it in Britain. A few unusually successful men, of course, occasionally have broken through the rigid system and been accepted socially even despite this working-class background.

LABOR URGES CLASSLESS SOCIETY

The apparent failure of the economic leveling process to break down the class system is seriously disturbing many Labor Party intellectuals and political leaders. The doctrine of equality and the classless society has been proclaimed, as the party seeks a new creed. Labor politicians have proposed a more equalitarian society as one of the party's major objectives. Admitting that ours is a a class society, a Labor Party pamphlet on equality adds that our society will be happier and healthier without social classes.

The first target is the public school, which is the reverse of public in the American sense. Attendance at a public school is the Plimsoll line of class. Even Hugh Gaitskell and other Labor leaders who came from the public schools, recognize that these schools form the root of the problem. Labor proposes to achieve its egalitarian ends by trying to make Eton, Winchester, and the other public schools the training ground for the best talent from all social groups. For this to occur, there will be a battle worth watching.

Undoubtedly this political attack on the class system appeals to some voters. Yet it is a measure of British adherence to the social order that labor's call for equality seems at present to be attracting little interest even among the workers.

Educators in the state schools—which Americans would call public schools—find both the white-collar and working-class groups indifferent to the increasing opportunities which are offered their children to attend private schools. For example, in one of London's most populous suburban counties, the education officer for the past 10 years has been offering six free places a year in them—two each at Eton, Winchester, and Rugby. Out of a thousand eligible boys, only 20 on the average apply each year, and of these about half come from working-class families.

Labor politicians in explaining this situation point out that the workingman dislikes the snobbery of the public school and doesn't want his boy to be uncomfortable in a different social atmosphere. What he does want is that his boy should receive as good an education through the state system as in a private school and have an equal opportunity of being admitted to a university.

Why is it that most British whitecollar or industrial workers seem satisfied with the class system and that only a minority want to break away from it by emigration? Why don't they have the same social ambition that their opposite numbers have in the United States, or even in mainly British countries such as Canada and Australia?

In Britain, first of all, the average man for generations has accepted the traditional organization of society and his place in it—from royalty and the hereditary aristocracy down through all the gradations of professional and business classes to the white-collar and manual workers. On the whole he is satisfied with the social system—and with his club—the city or country pub. (Most British pubs provide a public bar for the working class, a saloon bar for the white-collar class, sometimes even a private bar for the upper class.)

He and his leaders accept and endorse the values that the upper classes have established—the class system as defined by birth, education, accent, and a man's position in the world. He isn't jealous of those higher in the social scale. What he demands is that this standard of living should show a constant improvement—that he should continue to enjoy the benefits of modern industrialization, especially in his home. Since the war, the proportion of income spent on food and rent is about the same as in prewar days, but that spent on the embellishment of the home has doubled. Recent studies of life in the new communities of suburban London show that, in contrast to the thirties when the industrial worker couldn't and didn't spend money on his home, his ambition now is to give it the same comfortable atmosphere that formerly only the white-collar class and above could afford.

Another important factor in Britain which tends to solidify the traditional social system is the small proportion of the young, compared to America, who go to a university. Higher education is for the few, not the many. Only about 82,000 attend British universities in a population of 50 million, compared to 3 million American college students in 170 million—approximately 12 times more in the United States. A mere 6 percent of boys leaving British state schools go on to institutions of higher education. This fact is frequently brought out by those planning to emigrate: "Out there, our children will have a better chance for a university education—here you have to have scholarship standing to get in."

In the United States, because of the large numbers who go to college, the ordinary citizen is likely to have been affected by the social as well as academic influences of university life. In the hundreds of American private and State universities, as well as technical and junior colleges, students from very different family backgrounds learn to mix and live together. This creates a social mobility and intermarriage on a scale unknown in Britain.

LITTLE INTERMARRIAGE BETWEEN CLASSES

Prominent sociologists say that thus far there has been little indication of intermarriage developing in Britain between different classes of society. British students in America are amazed when they find a graduate of a college for women marrying a carpenter or other manual worker.

The strength of the British class system is further illustrated by the fact that it is accepted enthusiastically by those workingmen's sons who do get into a university and thus raise their social status. They thus help perpetuate it.

Even trade union leaders, after taking a university degree, hardly ever return to work in the union headquarters; they prefer jobs with a higher social status. United States unions can recruit trained economists as staff members; in Britain very few unions, except the small Trade Union Council, employ university graduates.

There are other educational counter forces at work slowing down the process of social assimilation. For example, under the Education Act of 1944 11-year-olds take competitive examinations for admission to State grammar schools. Those who fail attend secondary modern schools where stress is laid on a practical rather than academic education. Many families, unwilling to deny their children the best possible education because they cannot meet the competition for entrance to the grammar schools, undergo great financial strain to send them to private schools. Thus they help perpetuate that important mark of class—private school attendance.

This division of children at the age of 11 into three distinct types of schools, even though done on the basis of ability, also has the effect of separating the children socially. One reason the London County Council has adopted a policy of "comprehensive" (American-type high schools) is to counteract this tendency. In fact, the argument raging over whether comprehensive schools should be adopted generally is in some degree over the issue of reducing social differences between children in State schools.

LONDON COPIES UNITED STATES HIGH SCHOOLS

By comprehensive school is meant one that includes pupils of all abilities in a school that offers both general academic and commercial-technical courses—much as a United States high school does. Labor Party control of the London County Council led to its adopting this policy instead of continuing to separate the children in three types of schools—grammar, secondary modern and technical. The first comprehensive school—Kidbrooke—was opened in September 1954 in Blackheath with 1,770 students and 90 teachers, and a 5-year course.

The comprehensive school has caused a lively controversy. Its opponents argue that in such a huge school, the identity of the individual child is lost and the headmaster—who has wide discretionary power over the curriculum under the British system—cannot exercise proper supervision and loses the personal touch. Its advocates point out that it offers the most modern facilities—even a model apartment where girls can learn housekeeping—and that classes at Kidbrooke average only 30, thus permitting individual attention.

In these and other ways the educational system is probably the chief reason for the

continuing strength of class society in Britain. Therefore it is the target of those campaigning to reduce social distinctions. But they must contend with the fact that the British, a historically minded people, do not alter their social pattern rapidly. Change there is evolutionary, not revolutionary.

Quite possibly the social discontent with class distinctions—currently evident among the thousands of emigrants—may give impetus to reform. If so, the public school will be the first bastion to be leveled in the educational system. This crusade will not come until Labor returns to power—which may occur before long. Because of the time required for such a basic change, many thousands of emigrants will have left for a new life before British class distinctions becomes as reduced as economic ones.

Resolution Favoring Excise Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, of all the tax-reduction proposals to stimulate our sagging economy which have been offered and discussed in the past weeks, the proposal to make cuts in some excise-tax levies has been steadily gaining favor in Congress. There is little question that this growing solidarity in Congress for excise-tax reduction is but a reflection of the sentiment of those who must pay these old wartime taxes. The following resolution of the Central Western Shippers advisory board represents the views of the members of this organization in seven States, including Iowa. Excise tax cuts would be a lasting contribution toward the economic recovery of segments of industry which are hardest hit by the downtrend in business:

CENTRAL WESTERN
SHIPPERS ADVISORY BOARD,
Denver, Colo., May 12, 1958.

Hon. MERWIN COAD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

At its 77th regular and 36th annual meeting held at Denver, Colo., on May 6, 1958, the Central Western Shippers advisory board gave serious consideration to matters affecting railroad transportation. The views of the membership with regard to pending or proposed legislation and regulations dealing with transportation were embodied in resolution form and set forth as follows:

"RESOLUTION 1

"Whereas the Federal transportation tax was instigated as a means of discouraging unnecessary traveling and shipping; and

"Whereas the state of emergency for which this tax was created no longer exists; and

"Whereas it places an undue burden on shippers as well as carriers; and

"Whereas it places an undue burden on shippers as well as carriers; and

"Whereas the long haul and the LCL shippers pay the greater portion of this tax: Therefore, be it,

"*Resolved*, That the Central Western Shippers advisory board continue to support legislation against this unjust and burdensome tax; and further,

"*Resolved*, That the general secretary make our position known to the proper congressional delegation in this territory."

Your favorable consideration and active support of these views, representing the considered opinion of the 3,640 members of this board in the States of Iowa, Nebraska, Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Idaho, and Oregon, is respectfully urged and will be sincerely appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

HOWARD HOSEK,
General Secretary-Elect.

Franklin D. Roosevelt Junior High School, Compton, Calif., 23d Congressional District, Again Achieves Winning Freedoms Foundation Award, Valley Forge, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of appropriate comments in Lionews, publication of the students and faculty of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Junior High School, Compton, Calif.; said school being in the great 23d District, which I represent this my 12th year in this great legislative body. I know you and all my other distinguished colleagues will share with me the pleasure and pride I have these successive years on account of these young people repeatedly achieving nationwide recognition for their scholarly competitive attainments. I am sure also you share with me complimentary and congratulatory best wishes to the faculty of this fine educational establishment, as well as to all the students thereof:

ROOSEVELT ENTERS FREEDOMS FOUNDATION COMPETITION

Roosevelt is again entering the Freedoms Foundation competition which closes October 15. The Lions are set to repeat their previous victory of the principal award in 1953. Last year Roosevelt won the Valley Force Library award.

As you may or may not know, the Freedoms Foundation is a group which conducts contests among schools, groups, and individuals. The object of these contests is to help educate us, through competition, in the basic principles of our liberty and also to preserve our heritage for future generation.

Schools entering the contest tell of what they have done in the past year to educate the citizenry and their students of our heritage, also what they are doing to preserve it. For example, Roosevelt's mock election, the distribution of Bill of Rights circulars, back to school night, the nominations assemblies, Bill of Rights essays, the dances, and our school's athletic program are some of the things we did last year to educate people in our heritage and to preserve it.

The best 50 schools are awarded the principal award. This includes an interesting trip for one pupil and one teacher to Valley Forge, Pa., to visit the shrines of our national heritage. Other lesser awards are given various other schools for their strivings in the field.

Roosevelt owes its most sincere gratitude to Mr. Moore, Miss Becker, Mrs. Ensign, Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Wolfe, and all the students and teachers who aided the above mentioned in their hard work in preparing our entry.

P. O.

ROOSEVELT WINS TOP AWARD IN FREEDOMS FOUNDATION CONTEST—MISS BECKER, JIM HENRICH FLY TO VALLEY FORGE TO ACCEPT PRINCIPAL AWARD

Roosevelt has been awarded the highly coveted principal award of the Freedoms Foundation. The announcement came in a special coast-to-coast television program on Washington's birthday, February 22. Only the top 50 nominations in the nationwide contest win the principal award.

The award consists of an all-expense paid trip to Valley Forge, Pa., where 1 teacher and 1 pupil from each of the principal award winning schools will visit the shrines of our American heritage. Miss Becker, who prepared our entry, and a student, Jim Henrich, will make the trip for Roosevelt.

Mr. Moore stated, "Our faculty and students can be justly proud of receiving top honors in the Freedoms Foundation's 1957 nominations. This is truly an achievement which is representative of the way we at Roosevelt live and believe. Congratulations to all of you for contributing your share of the nomination."

As you may or may not know, the Freedoms Foundation is an organization which recognizes contributions to the American way of life by schools, groups, and individuals. The object of this recognition is to help educate us, through awards, in the basic principles of our liberty and also to preserve our heritage for future generations.

Schools entering their nominations for awards tell what they have done to educate the citizenry and their students of our heritage, and what they are doing to preserve it. For example, our winning award told of our mock elections, the distribution of Bill of Rights pamphlets, back-to-school night, the nomination assemblies, Bill of Rights essays, the dances, and our school's athletic program.

Roosevelt is not a newcomer to these awards as we won the principal award in 1953 and the Valley Forge Library award, a lesser conferment, last year.

Roosevelt owes its gratitude to Miss Becker, Mr. Moore, Mrs. Ensign, Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Wolfe, and all the students and teachers who aided the above mentioned in making this victory possible.

HENRICH, BECKER FLY EAST TO ACCEPT PRINCIPAL AWARD

Jim Henrich, student body president, and Miss Becker, of the faculty, toured some of the historical shrines of our American heritage on the east coast from April 30 to May 3. The trip east was part of our school's prize for winning the principal award in Freedom's Foundation competition.

On the trip they visited New York City where they saw the Statue of Liberty and other points of historical significance. They joined with representatives of 30 other top awarded schools from 17 States for a 3-day, all-expense tour of the historic shrines in the Valley Forge-Philadelphia-Washington, D. C., area.

In Washington, D. C., they were shown around by Congressman CLYDE DOYLE of our own 23d Congressional District.

In addition to the pilgrimage trip, each principal awarded school received a George Washington Honor Medal and a "Freedom Library" of books, films, and other teaching materials. Teachers officially attending the pilgrimage received the Valley Forge Pilgrimage Recognition Medal. Highlight of the pilgrimage was the presentation of the George Washington Honor Medal to school

representatives by Foundation president, Dr. Kenneth D. Wells, in special ceremonies at Valley Forge on May 3.

They arrived back in Los Angeles on Wednesday, May 3, and thus concluded what both termed as a very enjoyable and educational trip.

P. O.

And, Mr. Speaker, in that same school magazine, in which the above articles are written by the students themselves, is an editorial which is clearly so pertinent and so very close to one of the subjects which we as American Congressmen are at all times aware of, and which we are in duty bound to guard: to wit, freedom, I take the liberty of also including it in this extension:

AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE: PRESERVE IT AND PASS IT ON TO FUTURE GENERATIONS

Do you know how much your freedom as an American means? Are you doing your best to preserve it?

The privilege to say what you feel, print the truth, and being able to learn about anything man has ever known are freedoms you probably take for granted. If we continue to take these for granted we will soon lose our freedom. Try to imagine for a while what the United States would be like without freedom.

FREEDOMS FOUNDATION ON THE JOB

The Freedom's Foundation is doing something to preserve freedom and the American way of life for coming generations. They support contests which you may enter only by doing something that promotes for yourself and others a better understanding and appreciation of liberty.

GET IN THE ACT

An an individual you should support this foundation by taking an active part in school and community projects.

School is very important in preserving freedom. In school we learn more about the history of our country and of the Government. We also learn about voting through student body elections and mock elections such as we had last year. In student council we learn of the right to voice our own opinions and the way to run the school democratically. All these help to prepare us for our later lives as good citizens.

To have a strong government we need knowledge. Our leaders, to be good, must be intelligent.

Tomorrow, let's all start working with the Freedom's Foundation to keep our liberty and our way of life.

P. B.

Mr. Speaker, having already represented the Compton community adulthood and school youth as well for 12 years now in this great legislative body, I know you and all my distinguished colleagues will share with me the pride Mrs. Doyle and I had when we had the privilege and honor of having instructor Miss Charlotte Becker and Jim Heinrich, of Franklin D. Roosevelt Junior High, who traveled to Valley Forge for this outstanding junior high school, at breakfast here at our Nation's Capitol. With them at the same happy breakfast occasion we had the pleasure and honor of having with us Edwin Clark and Mickey Bach, representing the Lynwood High School—also in the great 23d District—and Leicester B. Yates and Walter Stewart, representing the John C. Fremont Adult School, of Los Angeles.

Businessmen in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. COFFIN
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, most of us, I am sure, have firm and fixed ideas about the businssman in Government. These preconceptions range from the one extreme that he is a villain to the other extreme that he is a saviour.

The facts about the businessman in the Federal Government—why he served, how long, his satisfaction with this experience, how he was regarded by others, and so forth—have been gathered, organized, and set forth by the Harvard Business School Club of Washington, D. C.

As a former student and graduate of that institution I have had the privilege of distributing to my colleagues an attractive 44-page pamphlet, the product of 4 years of hard work by this group—an extended busman's holiday.

Their findings reflect a competent, careful effort to substitute facts for preconceptions and bring about a better mutual understanding between the businessman and the Federal Government. For these reasons I am inserting an abridged version of this pamphlet in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend this group of citizens for a most significant public service. They recognized the need for information. They did not seek an appropriation. They simply dug in and did the job.

The abridged version of the pamphlet follows:

BUSINESSMEN IN GOVERNMENT—A REPORT BY THE HARVARD BUSINESS SCHOOL CLUB OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

FOREWORD

The size and complexity of modern government suggests the need for a considerable number of well-qualified executives. This executive talent, whether it be represented by businessmen, lawyers, educators, or career civil servants, is needed to manage the affairs of government in a competent, efficient manner. The number of positions these executives fill has been estimated at 5,000.

Many businessmen fill these positions. Many more have turned down the opportunity. Very few have stayed more than a year or two. Why? Is there a difference between business and government know-how? What attracts businessmen? What keeps them away? Do they do a good job?

Alumni of the Harvard Business School in the Washington, D. C., area decided to find out.

For the purpose of this study, a businessman was defined as a business executive whose primary duties were those of administration—planning, organizing, directing, and controlling. Government positions calling for these talents start at the top with heads of agencies, their deputies and aides, and go down to Grade GS–15. While these jobs might be filled ably by lawyers, educators, and others, this study concerns businessmen.

Written questionnaires were sent to 8,500 business executives and top career civil servants throughout the country and personal depth interviews were held with both groups.

For over 3 years, more than 100 alumni and others worked devotedly on a voluntary basis to plan and carry out a comprehensive analysis of the problem under the general direction of Dr. Wilford L. White, chairman of the steering committee, and the immediate supervision of Louis Alexander Trazel, executive director.

Financial contribution came from the Committee for Economic Development, and the Fund for Adult Education.

JAMES A. BARKER,
President, Harvard Business School Club of Washington, D. C.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The business administrator

1. Should recognize and welcome the opportunity of Government service and its personal benefits while he is climbing the ladder of corporate or professional responsibility, while he is on top of the ladder, and as he is preparing for retirement.

2. Should take an active part in national politics and acquaint himself thoroughly with the national and international issues of the day.

The business community

1. Should recognize and assume responsibility for supplying qualified administrators for varying levels of Federal Government service for a minimum term of 2 years.

2. Should carefully formulate and communicate corporation policy relating to Government service so that administrative employees will know how it applies to them when they take a Federal position, how it will protect their corporate advancement while they are on leave, and what will happen to them when they return.

The business association and press

1. Should, with other groups, keep the business community informed of the specific need for qualified administrators in the Federal Government and develop a climate conducive to easier transitions to public service.

2. Should point up this need and indicate and illustrate advantages and disadvantages of real life circumstances surrounding such service.

The business educator

1. Should develop more practical courses on public administration in schools of business administration.

2. Should allocate more funds and facilities for research into practical public administrative problems.

Members of Congress

1. Should recognize the human dignity and professional attainments of men who occupy top Government positions and spare them needless harassment while still exercising their right of legislative inquiry.

Political parties

1. Should assume the responsibility of supplying the Federal Government with qualified administrators by formal and continuous recruitment.

Executive department of the Federal Government

1. Should indicate to the party in power the types of individuals needed to fill specific administrative positions and help party officials match position requirements with abilities of candidates, thus actively accepting the fact that it is the intent and practice of the party in power to fill exempted administrative posts.

2. Should maintain a central recruiting office in the White House which would catalog top executive requirements of all Fed-

eral agencies and at the same time act as a clearing house for businessmen and others offering to serve. This office would recruit actively when no qualified candidates are available.

3. Should place candidates primarily because of ability and suitability and not only because of political or personal recommendation.

4. Should accept in practice as well as in principle the fact that agency heads will not knowingly hire a business executive or other person from outside Government for less than a 2-year period except in emergency.

5. Should engage for shorter periods, as consultants, rather than as regular employees, businessmen and others needed to bring in a fresh point of view or some special knowledge or skill.

6. Should establish short, off-the-job training programs for new administrative executives to point out, among other things, the main operational differences between Government and business. This program could be carried out by a professional institution and supported by foundation money.

7. Should encourage top administrators to seek advice and counsel of experienced members of their staffs before making policy decisions.

Career civil servants

1. Should utilize all of their administrative skills to achieve promptly policy changes and personnel procurement requested by new administrators.

All interested groups

1. Should formulate rules of reason in their interpretation and application of conflict of interest laws and regulations in order to utilize the services of exceedingly competent administrators from outside the Government and still safeguard the public trust.

INTRODUCTION

"Business executives in government."

These highly charged words set a lot of images going in the average American reader's mind, many of them unfavorable. Cartoons of corpulent, self-important men entering government buildings with loot bags in their hands flash through the mind's eye. You see a fellow already rich as Midas taking a top Federal job to further his own and his company's financial interest.

On the other hand, there came along a play not so long ago called The Solid Gold Cadillac which seemed designed to reverse this popular image. For here was a business executive in government so dedicated to giving the taxpayer his dollar's worth that the officers of his own company were scandalized by his indifference to self-interest.

Why the service of the businessman in government should be questioned is difficult to understand. Surely, the successful business executive of the kind sought for Federal service owes much to our political system. What, it must surely be asked, should he give in return? Many will say that he owes something more than merely paying taxes and obeying the laws.

One cannot contemplate this subject, however, particularly in an age of crucial international contest between two rival political systems, without considering the basis upon which our kind of democratic government fundamentally rests. It is not debatable that such government must have both an enlightened citizenry and a capable public service. It is with the latter requirement that we are concerned here.

The shocking fact is that though the Eisenhower administration has been called a businessman's government, it has had an exceedingly difficult time getting the kind of businessmen it wants.

The popular notion of the businessman who has served or is serving in Government (BMG) as a questionable character no doubt originated in the traditional suspicion of so-called special interest groups. Whatever its origin, the impression has been tremendously fortified by innumerable congressional committee hearings over the qualifications of this or that industrialist for a top Government position. Although the outcome of these performances has usually been favorable to the businessman concerned, they gave the appearance of proceeding on the un-American assumption that the businessmen were guilty until they proved themselves innocent. The public consequently became more suspicious than ever of the BMG, and businessmen became all the more reluctant to accept positions which would expose them to this kind of treatment.

From where we sat

Watching these things from close quarters over the years, we members of the Harvard Business School Club of Washington, D. C., decided a little more than 3 years ago that it was about time somebody substituted some facts for the mythology which had been flourishing in this controversial area. We had no more proof that the BMG was the potential villain so many surmised him to be, than that he was either selfless or even effective in the public service. We decided to find out.

It quickly became apparent, however, that to describe the BMG with any degree of accuracy was a lot more complicated than taking the measure of a man for a suit of clothes. The rounded picture we wanted involved attitudes, motivations, the individual philosophies of people concerned, and performance records based on something more than self-appraisal. We already knew, for example, that the BMG had not produced consistently good results as a public servant. We had to find out why. Also, why had there been such a rapid turnover of this particular kind of Government official?

A host of other basic questions clamored for answers. Did the Federal Government really need these businessmen? Assuming they were needed, why were they so hard to get? Where in the Government service do business executives serve most effectively and what professional qualifications and personal attributes do these jobs require? What about the attitude of the businessman himself—why should he want to serve in the Federal Government? If, indeed, this wedding of the businessman and the Federal service is a desirable thing, what can the Government and the business community do to promote it? What is the present situation?

It was our conviction that if we could turn up significant information in answer to questions like these, it might be helpful both to the Federal Government in recruiting business talent and to business executives themselves in deciding whether they or their colleagues should serve.

Even General Motors and Standard of Jersey executives should be in awe of a public concern which has as stockholders 173 million citizens, which owns some of the best real estate in every important capital on the globe, and which runs the largest medical research and the largest retirement and disability insurance operations in the world. It would require a list of superlatives to attempt to measure the dimensions of the wealthiest and most influential government in contemporary times. Suffice it to say that the presentation of the gigantic Federal budget requires a document the size of the New York City (Manhattan) telephone directory for its minute listings of proposed expenditures.

How does the businessman fit into this colossus? What kind of businessman goes into Government service, for how long, and for what purpose? Does he get along well with the career civil service people upon whom he must depend for effective action? To answer these and many other basic questions about the BMG, we dispatched detailed questionnaires which were answered by 456 businessmen who had previously served, by 153 of those presently serving, by 437 businessmen who had never served, and by 530 uppergrade Federal career civil servants ($12,000-and-up salary range).

For the purpose of this study, we defined our businessman as a business executive whose primary duties are those of administration. He would thus be a man concerned with planning, organizing, developing, directing, and controlling. It should be understood that in the Federal establishment there are approximately 5,000 positions requiring this kind of skill and that the salary range is from $12,000 for lower administrators to $25,000 for a member of the Cabinet. The average salary for executive positions in the Government is around $13,500. Obviously, considerable financial sacrifice is required for some top business executives to take one of these positions. Such sacrifice becomes a critical factor which bears, as we shall see, upon a man's willingness to accept such jobs, his length of tenure, and his feeling of satisfaction in doing the required work.

PROFILE OF THE BMG

Since many of the BMG's most in the news spotlight, like former Secretaries George Humphrey, of Treasury, and Charles E. Wilson, of Defense, had reached or were near retirement age, a general impression had been created that all businessmen serving Government were in the same situation. From the answers received, we found that the typical BMG is about 45 years old when he begins Government service. This compares with a reported age of 48 for top-level civil servants who answered the inquiry and 46½ for a cross section of responding business executives who have never served the Government.

What he earned

The typical BMG had 3 or 4 dependents and a salary of $14,600 just before he entered Government. Twenty-six percent in this group did not say what their investment income was, 44 percent reported investment income of from zero to $5,000, while 30 percent had more than $5,000.

Businessmen who had served and left the Government averaged $14,400 in salary just before they entered (1940–56 period). Twenty-four percent did not report their investment income, 46 percent received from 0 to $5,000, and 30 percent more than $5,000.

Of businessmen now serving, the median salary was $15,800 just before entering Government with the middle 50 percent running from $11,000 to $31,200. Twenty-nine percent were making less than $10,000. Some 34 percent did not say what their investment income was, 35 percent had an investment income of from 0 to $5,000, while 31 percent received more than $5,000.

Figures from these groups are pretty close to those given by responding businessmen who never served in Government. The typical salary for these was $15,800, with 26 percent having an investment income of $5,000 or more.

Here it is well to distinguish between Government jobs which are political appointments, and those which require entrance into the civil service. The political jobs would include Cabinet members, their Under Secretaries, Assistant Secretaries, and numerous specialized positions not included in the career civil service. Since most of the political positions pay higher salaries than the civil-service jobs, it was to be expected that businessmen entering the latter category would have come from lower salaried positions in industry.

Where he came from

Of the businessmen surveyed, 41 percent entered Government from manufacturing industries and 11 percent from service industries, the next highest category. Since

the pre-World War II period, the number of businessmen coming to Government from manufacturing industries has progressively increased.

Incidentally, most (65 percent) of the civil servants we polled felt that businessmen with varied experience were most valuable in Federal jobs.

What he did

The BMG was not only from manufacturing, but probably had ben serving as an administrator (37 percent). The second largest (22 percent) came from sales departments, 8 percent from production, 5 percent finance, 3 percent each from accounting, personnel, and promotional activities. In all agencies (where sufficient data are available) businessmen from big business were favored by civil servants over men from small business by a margin of 5 to 1. In the Defense Department the ratio was 9 to 1.

His work in business primarily involved helping to make major policy decisions or determining which major policies were to be executed. That he was pretty good at these things in government was demonstrated by the fact that 45 percent of the responding civil servants reported that BMG's were above average in ability to make decisions (14 percent thought him below average; the rest considered him average). Also, 38 percent of them thought the BMG above average in ability to delegate responsibilities (16 percent thought him below average). Fifty-six percent of them thought him above average in demonstrating loyalty to superiors (5 percent below), and 18 percent regarded him as better than average in getting people to work together (14 percent below).

Life with father

But life in Washington was not all triumph and comfort for the BMG. For one thing, 70 percent of the BMG's said they could spend less time with their families than in their usual jobs. That word of this had got around was indicated by the fact that 18 percent of all businessmen who have served or are serving, said that family considerations were a factor against accepting Government employment. Other factors that bothered them were: unwillingness to make the financial sacrifice (17 percent), restrictions on making independent decisions (14 percent), hestitation to sever business connections (12 percent), political interference with performance (11 percent), and inability to freely select subordinates (10 percent).

Why he served

How was the BMG who served motivated to get into the Battle of the Potomac? Most of them (89 percent) said that opportunity for public service was a primary reason. Many had personal considerations—24 percent felt Government service would enhance their chances for greater personal prestige when they returned to business, 22 percent though that learning Government procedures would help them when they got back into private business, and 13 percent listed personal prestige as a consideration. (Many gave more than one reason for serving.)

There was a strong suggestion of conflict between the career civil servants and the BMG's in the responses received from the former as to what they thought were the motives of businessmen in taking Government jobs. Many career civil servants unblushingly accused the BMG's of getting into Government to enhance their personal prestige (60 percent named this as a factor), but most named more than one factor. In descending order, the civil servants cited other BMG motives, as preparing for future business position (48 percent named this), opportunity to extend business acquaintances (30 percent named this), profiting from knowledge of Government techniques for future use in business (29 percent named this), and opportunity to extend political acquaintances (24 percent named this. Some 35 percent named 1 of a number of other less important factors.

The career civil servants were, on the whole, quite complimentary in their recognition of many of the abilities of the businessman. They were most impressed by the fact that he brought something different into the halls of government. They also were impressed by his ability to make decisions. Some 52 percent of the civil servants who responded though that the one businessman with whom they had had the greatest contact—without reference to other occupations—was definitely above average in developing major policies (13 percent thought him below average and the rest average). The same group felt BMG was above average in executing policies already established (49 percent) while 6 percent thought him below; 47 percent thought him above average in determining policy to be placed in execution and 14 percent below. On analysis and review of operations (27 percent above, 23 percent below) and advising others on technical matters (29 percent above, 25 percent below), he did not do so well.

How long he served

Our survey confirmed the impression that businessmen usually serve short periods with the Government, but many stayed longer than most of us believed. For those BMG's presently in Government, 41 percent have served 3 years or less, 23 percent from 3 to 6 years, and 36 percent more than 6 years. One out of five (21 percent) has served 12 years or more. The average term of service for the current crop is 4½ years.

However, of those BMG's who have served and left Government over the past 16 years, as many as 48 percent served 1 year or less, 19 percent served 2 years, 19 percent served 3 years, and 14 percent served 4 years or more. The median for this "have served" group is 1¼ years.

Satisfaction of Government service

What about the satisfactions—or lack of them—that the BMG got out of Government service? The largest number (30 percent) described their greatest satisfaction as a sense of having made a contribution to the public service. Many others (23 percent) admitted that the experience broadened their point of view.

Significantly, 14 percent of the BMG's said that Government service helped them to get a new job. But most of them (74 percent) returned to the same company they had left. Strikingly, one-third of all of them returned to better jobs. Even more impressive was the statement of 49 percent of the BMG's that their business careers were enhanced by their background of public service, while only 4 percent said their careers had been injured.

And what about this? Seventy percent of the BMG's expressed the view that Government experience had made them better business executives. The rest, 30 percent, felt no benefits.

How he entered Government

How did businessmen get into Government? Were they invited, or did they solicit jobs? Almost 90 percent of the serving businessmen were offered their Government jobs, while only 10 percent made an initial application. Of those who were invited, 37 percent received the offer from a Government executive whom they already knew. In 19 percent of the cases, the offer came from a Government agency, in 20 percent from the businessman's industry, and in 22 percent from his own company.

Employers' reaction to Government service

Only 9 percent of the responding BMG's said their companies disapproved of their entering Government service.

The generally favorable attitude of employers toward Government service was borne out by the fact that in many cases leaves of absence were arranged. This was true for 50 percent of those responding. In about half of these cases it was for a specific period of time and in the other half for an indefinite period. Complete severance of the employment relationship was involved in 22 percent of the cases and informal severance was found in 11 percent of the cases. Other arrangements were made in 17 percent of the cases. It did not matter when a man came into Government service—under Presidents Eisenhower or Truman, in war or peace—his firm was, for the most part, in favor of his Government service.

ASPECTS OF THE FEDERAL JOB

The BMG normally did not work in a career civil service classification. Fifty-eight percent indicated that their Government jobs were not covered by civil service. Thirty-eight percent worked within the civil service system; 4 percent held commissions in the armed services.

In recent years there has been a growing tendency for businessmen to take noncareer rather than career civil service jobs. Of those entering Government service prior to 1941, 52 percent took noncareer jobs; in the 1942–45 period, 40 percent; in the 1946–49 period, 75 percent; in the 1950–52 period, 67 percent; and in the most recent period, 1953 and later, 82 percent of the entering businessmen took noncareer positions.

Policymaking

The Government service of the BMG ordinarily involved either assisting in the development of major policies or in the execution of already determined policies. Assisting in the development of major policies was the primary duty of 32 percent of the businessmen serving in Government. Thirty percent were involved in the execution of already-established policy, 17 percent in advising others on technical or administrative matters, 10 percent in determining those major policies that were to be placed in execution, 7 percent in the analysis and review of operations, and 4 percent in other miscellaneous activities.

Challenge of work

The adjective "challenging" was checked by 58 percent of the responding BMG's as descriptive of their Government work. Fifteen percent found it to be "rewarding," and 12 percent checked the adjective "pleasant." A negative reaction toward Government work was expressed by 16 percent of the businessmen, with the adjective "frustrating" being checked by 11 percent. Of those men who found Government work frustrating (11 percent of a total of 445), nearly all of them found their private work after leaving Government rewarding, whereas all of those who found their private work frustrating reported their Government experience rewarding.

There was a noticeable difference in attitude toward Government work, depending upon the particular years of service. It suggested a correlation to war or preparation for it. In the pre-1941 (defense) period, 87 percent of the businessmen serving regarded their Government work as either challenging or rewarding. In the 1942–45 (war) period, the figure was 80 percent, and in the 1945–49 (postwar) period, 71 percent. The percentage of businessmen regarding their work as challenging or rewarding dropped to 58 percent in 1950–52; and, in the most recent period of 1953 and after, the percentage rose slightly to 64 percent.

Political interference

Most businessmen in Government were not bothered in the discharge of their duties by political party interference. The large majority of businessmen (81 percent) stated

that there was no political party interference. Of the remaining 19 percent, half of them indicated that there was some pressure for preferential treatment of private interests. The rest felt that there was pressure either relating to hiring and firing or in the direction of dictating policy.

Indoctrination

On-the-job indoctrination was completely lacking or frequently not satisfactory. While 39 percent of the respondents described their indoctrination as being good, some 61 percent received none or were not impressed by it. Thirty-seven percent indicated they received none, 6 percent indicated that the indoctrination was unsatisfactory, and 18 percent checked the adjective "indifferent" as describing their one-the-job indoctrination.

Social activities

His social activities while in Government service were regarded as normal. In an effort to find out whether social commitments for top-level Government executives were a problem, the serving businessmen were asked to check their social activities as "too demanding," "normal," or "inadequate." "Normal" was checked by 86 percent of the respondents," "too demanding" by 7 percent, and "inadequate" by 7 percent.

Cooperation of associates

Almost 2 out of 3 businessmen in Government service found their Government colleagues to be, on the whole, cooperative. Some 50 percent of the respondents checked the adjective "cooperative"; 14 percent indicated a friendly attitude. "Suspicious" was the adjective used to describe the attitude of Government colleagues by 32 percent of the responding businessmen. Only 2 percent felt that the adjective "resentful" applied to those with whom they worked in Government.

On the other hand, many businessmen serving in government (55 percent) thought that there was no civil service employee in the office capable of performing the BMG's government job. Twenty-four percent said that there was somebody available who could do the work, but not so well, 18 percent felt that there was at least one person available who could do about as good a job, and only 3 percent indicated that there was a civil service executive who could perform the businessman's government job better than he could do it himself.

Attitude toward Government

The BMG's Government service made him more sympathetic toward Government, its problems, and its people.

That businessmen change their opinion toward civil servants from critical to complimentary was asserted by 86 percent of the Government career people we questioned. Eleven percent felt there was no change, and 2 percent believed they changed from complimentary to critical.

Termination

The serving businesaman terminated his Government service primarily because of the expiration of the time originally agreed upon to serve. Fifty-nine percent gave this as the reason for termination.

Civil service executives agreed that the reason businessmen leave Government service is that their agreed tenure has expired. This was what the largest group (31 percent) stated in questioning on the point, although 18 percent felt the BMG left to take a better position, and 10 percent felt it was because of the financial loss involved.

Red tape

Least surprising of all was that the BMG should list red tape as his chief complaint against Government service. Indeed, these familiar characteristics of Dickens' circumlocution office—going in many circles unnecessary to get somewhere—were so outstandingly impressed upon the businessman's mind that aside from 48 percent who mentioned red tape specifically, no other dislikes were mentioned in any significant number.

Batting average

Finally, rounding out our look at the BMG, we had to have something more than generalities on how he performed. If he proved to be a misfit or ineffective in Government service, the whole matter of need for business executives in public service would be open to question.

The BMG came through our test with flying colors, but it was significant that the BMG's (past and present) thought more of their own performance and that of other BMG's they worked with than experienced top career civil servants thought of the performance of BMG's as a group.

Businessmen who have served stated that approximately 90 percent of other business executives they observed in Government were either average or above average. Some 65 to 70 percent were above average. Businessmen presently serving were slightly more conservative, indicating that approximately 90 percent were either average or above average and 55 to 60 percent were above average.

On the other hand, career civil servant executives indicated that approximately 35 percent of BMG's were better than men of other occupations and that only 20 percent were not so good as others. If they were staffing key positions, 9 percent of career civil servants would prefer BMG's above all others, 21 percent would prefer them as a group to most other occupational types, 63 percent would be willing to have them along with other groups, only 5 percent would accept them with reluctance, and only 1 percent would refuse to have them.

RECRUITMENT

Our search showed that there were five main elements in the resistance of businessmen to Government service, and these we set out to explore. The five problem areas were conflict of interest, compensation, duration of stay, the belief that Government executive processes are different from business in basic ways, and disinterest in Government service.

Conflict of interest

Conflict of interest is a term which has been applied to those situations in Federal Government where the possibility exists that decisions made by Government executives might be influenced by the personal interests of the executive. Those interests which have been referred to primarily by Congress, the press, and others generally have been defined only as pecuniary interests. But it is significant that there can be all sorts of other personal interests such as religious, social, fraternal, familial, or ideological interests which can influence Government decisions. However, the one receiving the most attention in recent years, which will be discussed here, is the conflict arising from ownership interest.

Present Federal Government policy in regard to conflict of pecuniary interest is not easy to define. The policy is derived in part from a statement of legal principles contained in an opinion rendered by the Attorney General (40 Op. A. G. 187); in part from a variety of Federal statutes, many of them adopted many years ago to meet specific situations; in part from regulations adopted by the heads of various administrative agencies; and in part from congressional reflection of what it regards as general public concern.

There is apparently no statute of general application requiring a businessman or anyone else who enters Government service to sell investments which may effect decision made during the course of Government service. It is worth noting that the celebrated cases of recent years involved Presidential appointees requiring Senate confirmation. They undoubtedly received tremendous publicity all out of proportion to their significance in terms of numbers of jobs affected since only 5 percent of the responding present or former BMG's stated they were required to relinquish their investments. This problem appears to be limited to a very small number of businessmen who serve, probably those in the most important positions. On the other hand, it could mean that a considerable number of businessmen declined Government jobs because they refused to dispose of their investments.

During the term of their Government employment many BMG's continued to receive some income from their previous employer. Fifty-six percent of the businessmen received some income from the company for which they worked prior to accepting Government employment. A significant difference appeared in this regard between the have-served and the presently-serving group. Among the have-served respondents, 62 percent received supplemental income, whereas only 31 percent of the presently serving businessmen receive additional income from their pre-Government employer. Income received by the businessmen included salary, bonuses, pension payments, severance payments, stock dividends, and all other forms of payment. Included in this total are many BMG's who served the Federal Government without compensation.

Businessmen who have served and are presently serving were asked for their attitude on the requirement of relinquishing personal investments upon entering Government service.

The BMG's opinion on the conflict-of-interest problem was that in most circumstances a rule of divestment is unnecessary. Fifty percent felt that a requirement of divestment was unnecessary and unfair and would let BMG's keep investments. Only 9 percent indicated a general attitude in favor of relinquishing.

Approximately 35 pereent would require relinquishing only if a conflict of interest actually existed, but the remainder felt investments should be kept. The comment, "you can't legislate honesty" was repeated many times in the questionnaires and interviews. Significantly enough, civil servants agreed with the businessmen's attitudes. Eighty percent stated that the BMG should be permitted to keep his investments unless there is a clear-cut conflict of interest.

The solution to the problem of potential or actual conflict of investment interest is not simple. Businessmen who have served in government generally feel that the present policy is unnecessary and unfair, although not all of them take the position that in no case can there be a conflict of investment interest.

Five suggestions were made to remedy the situation:

(a) Bring about increased public awareness that most businessmen enter government service with a sense of integrity.

(b) Bring about a recognition of the fact that pecuniary interest is just one of the several types of interest which give rise to the possibility of conflict.

(c) Provide for disclosure by the businessmen of all relevant investment interests at the time of entry into government service, and provide for disqualification with respect to any matter concerning which there is, or might be, or there is reasonable likelihood that the public would believe there might be, a conflict of interest.

(d) Establish substantial criminal penalties for those found to have violated the public trust.

(e) Establish a requirement of divestment of ownership interest only where the job, the ownership interest, the relationship between the company and the government job are such as to indicate a clear and present danger of personal conflict.

Compensation

The civil servants felt that the Government could best attract administrators by increasing salaries. Thirty-five percent of the responding civil servants felt that the Government should increase the salaries of the men from business. Other means of attraction were mentioned, none of them by more than 10 percent of the civil service people. They included protection from attack, increased prestige, and more job latitude.

Three general categories were identified by this survey. First is the last job group, including those who are within a year of retirement, those being retired, or those already in retirement from their industry job. Second is the top management group, including those who have reached the presidency, vice presidency, or chairmanship of the board of their company, and are finally in the exceptionally high-pay bracket. Third is the middle range group, including men who have great potential for top management positions but are presently striving for recognition and not yet financially secure.

For the last job group, compensation is of minimum concern, if any. Adequate salaries, of course, are desired to permit them to meet their status obligations and to live comfortably while serving in Government. This group even reflects a willingness to go in the hole to some extent to do a job for the Government and fulfill their responsibility.

For the top management group, tremendous losses in compensation can be involved in accepting Government service. The difference is so great (for example, Mr. Neil H. McElroy was reported to have gone from a salary of $280,000 as Procter & Gamble Co. president to $25,000 as Secretary of Defense) that it becomes evident that governmental compensation, of itself, is not a compelling factor in the determination of whether businessmen will serve or not. Presumably the top management man has reached financial security for himself and his family. His motivations for or against Government service are ones of public service, prestige, and challenge.

But in considering salary levels, it is well to bear in mind the strength of other motivations toward accepting Government positions. While the respondents to our questionnaires did rate the financial problem highest in general, it by no means stood alone as a major consideration; 24 percent (the largest group) of men now serving named this as the most acute need. Twelve percent of the BMG's now serving think that protection from slanderous attacks is the most important need, while an equal number feel it is having more latitude in the job. Nine percent think that increasing the prestige of Government service is most needed, and 8 percent think that removing the political atmosphere is required. No more than 4 percent selected any other single factor. Those mentioned were: Better job placement, education of businessmen, and publicizing the civic duty of the job.

Duration of stay

At the time of entry into Government service, the BMG usually planned to serve less than 1 year. Of the responding businessmen in the have served category, 44 percent planned at the time of entry to serve less than 1 year (48 percent actually served less than 1 year), a 1-to-2-year stay was planned by 16 percent (19 percent stayed 2 years), a 2-to-4-year stay was planned by 4 percent, and an indefinite stay by 36 percent (33 percent stayed up to 4 years).

Younger men are more likely to serve a longer period of time than older men. For example, a higher percentage of men under 40 who have served accepted a job to stay a longer period of years than did men between 40 and 50; the same holds true for men between 40 and 50 compared to men over 50. For example, of men under 45 who have served government, 46 percent accepted their jobs for 2 years or more, whereas of the men between 45 and 70, only 21 percent accepted for as long as 2 years or more.

Of the responding civil servants, 36 percent felt the businessman should serve a minimum of 2 to 3 years, 32 percent 3 to 4 years, 17 percent 1 to 2 years, and 13 percent over 4 years. They came to this conclusion because 39 percent thought it took up to 6 months for the businessman to adjust to his new job, and another 19 percent, 6 to 9 months. Eleven percent felt the businessman never became adjusted.

It was stated earlier that 48 percent of the BMG's who have served stayed on the Federal Government job less than 1 year. The breakdown by periods shows that the psychology of civilian service during a war is far different from that which prevails at other times, for only 16 percent served less than 1 year during World War II while 70 percent of those answering our questionnaire and who have served since 1953 stayed less than 1 year.

Of BMG's who have served, percentage who served 1 year or less

Period during which service began:	Percent
1941–45 (World War II)	16
1946–49	37
1950–52 (Korean conflict)	67
1953–56	70

The businessman, as well as any of the top appointive executives, is consistently reported as bringing a new point of view to Government administration. It follows, then, that an overextended tour will result in the outsider's losing his original purpose and acquiring, whether he likes it or not, a career outlook on Government operations.

The survey gave further evidence of the need for longer tours by the responses to questions concerning the time it took to adjust to the job. Civil servants stated that 61 percent of the BMG managers of their acquaintance took over 6 months to become adjusted; 42 percent of them took over 9 months; and 26 percent over 12 months. For the Government to obtain a return on its investment, longer terms appear appropriate and necessary. Further, since these positions are key in nature and exert great influence on the overall operation of Government, it would appear reasonable and in the Government's interests that they should be longer. One top personnel executive in Government stated he had seen many cases where a new man came in and announced he was leaving in 1 year. With that tactical error, his career associates and subordinates marked him down at once as a 1-year man and did not really take his ideas seriously.

From some individual businessmen's point of a view, a quite different attitude on the length of tour prevailed. As a major factor repeatedly advanced in the interviews, these executives felt that long tours of duty would cause them to "lose contact," "the boss would think of promoting those active in the company," or "any time away is time lost on my career." Only a small percentage looked upon a tour in Government as an opportunity to broaden themselves and thereby enhance their long-range business careers. Of those who served, only 4 percent committed themselves to a 2- to 4-year stay. Likewise, the business community, industries, and the individual companies appear to be one the side of the short term.

Clearly, the survey has provided no quick and easy solution to this problem. The conclusion appears justified, however, that some lengthening of the tours would be in the interest of better Government. Education of industries and companies to the need and as to their responsibilities in this connection would be helpful. Also, education of potential executive candidates to the advantages of a 3- to 4-year tour in Government might convince some.

Differences between business and Government

The fact remains, however, that a considerable group of experienced men felt the processes of Government and business were dissimilar to the prejudice of Government service. This being the case, we took a further look at the factors which actually made, or appeared to make these processes dissimilar. To this end, businessmen were asked for their observations on aspects of Government administration which made it different from private enterprise. They were specifically questioned about the absence of a profit motive, goldfish-bowl environment, and size of Government operations.

Most businessmen working in Government (55 percent) felt that the goldfish-bowl nature of top-level Government jobs either was not substantially different from top jobs in private industry or, although different, did not affect the ability of a man to perform effectively in Government. Thirty-one percent felt the existing differences did affect performance. So it was with other supposed dissimilarities—they found the basic processes of administration in Government and industry similar, but laid considerable emphasis on the different environment. Most of the BMG's found the essential functions—developing policies, making decisions, reviewing performance, and policymaking—similar or somewhat similar in both business and Government. Nearly all of the men who found the functions similar were able to use effectively in Government the techniques used in business.

Size and complexity: The BMG's agreed that there was a significant difference between Government and private business in terms of size and complexity. They were about equally divided as to whether this difference affected job performance, and the differences they mentioned were more concerned with complexity than with mere size. What they usually mentioned were such things as complex organization charts, the vertical layers for reviews and approvals, the large numbers of people giving attention to staff details, and the alphabetical jargon which is everyday talk to the more permanent employees. They found that many agencies of the Government may be involved in executing a single national policy or law. They often wondered about the extent of their own authority, especially if they had acted on their own only to be reversed or stopped by other agencies.

BMG respondents advised caution in executing decisions within this large and complex organization and patience in becoming acclimated to it.

Yardsticks of Progress: The absence of acceptable or familiar yardsticks for progress measurements related mainly to the absence of the profit motive so familiar to industry. This, the BMG's thought, represented a difference of considerable magnitude. In some of the Government operations, however, greater similarity to industry (Government Printing Office, industrial fund operations, etc.) permitted consideration of the profit motive, or substitutions for it, which were reported as very helpful. The substitutions or alternate satisfactions for the profit motive cited by the BMG's were one of the surprises of our study.

Rigidity in Government operations: This problem was manifest in the following connections:

(1) Personnel administration (civil service appointment complications, the job classifications, salary systems, promotions, dismissals of unsatisfactory or mediocre employees), (2) financial administration (elongated and detailed budgetary processes, apportionment controls once money is appropriated, accounting restrictions and re-

views), (3) recordkeeping (legal or regulation requirements, susceptibility to review after long periods of time), (4) organizational status (major job to change formal organization) and purchasing (limited latitude of negotiations), and (5) expense accounts.

Outside pressures: Outside pressures are exerted by the Congress, other executive branches, the public, and the press. They constitute a further difference between Government executive action and that of private enterprise. Suitability and security investigations were also cited as part of the difference between Government and business. BMG's generally accepted the need and importance of these outside pressures, although they felt they tended to slow down operations. They objected strenuously to unrestrained criticism, particularly when it had political overtones. Opinion was strong in many cases on this point. One respondent observed: Businessmen are not likely to take responsible Government positions if they are subject to a procedure, which, if not conducted by our august legislative bodies, might be described as a kangaroo court.

Coordination difficulties: The process of coordination, similar to both business and government, is present in greater detail and in greater quantity within government. BMG's were concerned by the large number of people or agencies who can compel others to consider their ideas, thus impeding speed of action. The businessman seemed aware of the need for this coordination, but quite impatient in accepting it. The checks and balances in government made getting the job done relatively difficult for the BMG. One of them said: "Democratic action is by its very nature less efficient than is one-man direction. However, in the public interest, cause without it we would no longer be a this lack of efficiency is absolutely vital, bedemocracy." Another questioned the extent of coordination prevalent in government by pointing out that while it is so necessary in the policy formulation process, it becomes an undesirable habit as it reaches higher levels of authority which have complete authority for determining policy. Another pointed out that when authority was not too clear cut, it resulted in unnecessary consultations on even minor matters.

Disinterest in Government service

Both the Government and the business community have responsibilities for the recruitment of the executive talent from business and industry which our survey clearly showed was needed. What of these responsibilities? And what are government and business doing about them?

Businessmen who had never served in the Government said they had tried to offer their services, had been unable to find the right contact and, inevitably, finally tired of trying. Candidates should not have to wear themselves out to see officials who are too busy doing the things they would not have to do if they took the time to interview and hire candidates who could ultimately do the work. One vigorous retired businessman even came to the office of this survey project as a last resort, to see if his services could be advertised. He was directed to an agency official who plans to use the applicant as a top United States representative in a foreign country.

Government does not at present take continuing action to recruit and retain businessmen, or any other type of executive manpower. Its activity, except for as yet untested results with the embryonic Executive Reserve program, is centered at the political level. Activity of this kind appears to be limited to the party in power. The present administration began with a management firm survey of the executive positions needed to be filled with political appointees. It required that all proposed appointees for the executive departments be cleared informally for political adequacy prior to appointment.

However, no discussion of the apathy and disorganization which besets recruitment can ignore the closely related problem of placement. A vigorous recruitment program should find the right person for the particular job; individuals must not be placed solely by reason of their availability accompanied by pressure on the hiring agency. Almost without exception this practice results in a disgruntled, briefly serving executive who neither does justice to the job while he is in it nor acts as a disciple in convincing his friends and business acquaintances that a tour of duty in Government is a part of their civic responsibility. But both interviews and questionnaires contained evidence that the availability and pressure basis for placement too often occurs.

One Federal department head stated that whenever he had a vacancy for an assistant secretary he first approached capable people he knew to consider the job, then asked friends to help him locate a candidate, then friends' friends, and after months of searching, finally came up with a placement. Lower echelons in his department duplicate his procedure. We found this method of recruitment equally common in other departments.

Another recruitment approach was reported by an official in the Executive Offiec of the President. He said that after every trip he makes around the country, he brings back the names of business executives who are anxious to serve in the Federal Government. He distributes these to people in the executive branch and, according to him, nothing ever happens.

James F. Brownlee, partner, J. H. Whitney & Co., who did a considerable amount of executive recruitment for the Federal Government during the war years, points out: "There is no question whatsoever in my mind that there are many businessmen who would be willing to serve if there was a proper recruiting program which would point out to them the particular needs that the Government might have. There is certainly small chance that businessmen are going down knocking at the door in Washington, where their connections are often limited and where there is no central agency that can direct them to parts of the Government which would have needs of their kind of talent."

CONCLUSIONS

Having looked over the Washington employment scene, we are forcibly reminded that democracies (or republics) that have perished, have perished for lack of capable, properly oriented public servants, supported by a citizenry which should have demanded superlative public service.

The survival of democracies has been perilous throughout all recorded history, and, in the opinion of many, is even more perilous now.

To be sure, it is more of an achievement to raise the standard of living of our 173 million people than to produce the first sputnik, but this should not blind us to the fact that recent Soviet scientific accomplishments symbolize an enemy which, by whatever means, can with the will of its system surpass our own at times. How are we facing this test? What does the evidence show about our adeptness at getting the right skills into the places in government where they are most needed?

It is not a comforting picture. The evidence of our survey indicated that, whatever the need, there exists a frightening lack of interest in the business community for participation in the government service. For example, of businessmen who had not served in the government, 50 percent stated that they did not know the attiude of their companies toward government service. This clearly indicated little discussion of the problem had occurred in the typical firm. The conclusion was underscored by the responses to many letters sent to major trade associations requesting information on the attitudes and policies of their member firms toward government service by their executives. In approximately 85 percent of the replies, the attitude expressed was that this had just not come up as a live issue in their industry.

Government service today is looked upon by business in general (and the individual in particular) as a career detour. Notwithstanding this, there is a self-interest viewpoint that such service gives the executive a broadened experience which is useful both to himself and to his firm, as well as to the political system of which he is a beneficiary. This suggests that business could give recognition to the advantages of government service by considering a tour in government as one worthwhile prerequisite to a top management job. The short range benefit to industry is the creation of leaders with greater vision and with sharpened awareness of the part government plays in their personal and corporate life. The corollary benefit to government is an increased flow of middle-management executives into service. Finally, for the long range there will be greater understanding, by the returning top business executives, of government problems and of the interplay of forces that takes place at the policymaking levels of government. There is, therefore, a clearly discernible reward.

The trade associations and similar groups can help by encouraging discussion of these neglected problems. To this end, men from industry who are currently serving in Government should be asked to discuss their Government experiences and problems both at industry meetings and in the various trade publications. In addition, central groups such as the Chamber of Commerce of the United States or the Society for the Advancement of Management should be urged to prepare reference material which can be made available to each interested association. The primary goal must be first to obtain a recognition of the problem on the part of businessmen themselves.

Is this program too altruistic for aggressive business? More and more, it has found that such programs are not altruistic but rather a very necessary part of commercial success. Business has given extensive support to higher education through grants and scholarships and has benefited through a greater number of trained persons. It has supported community welfare programs and has obtained returns in the form of a more prosperous and stable community. The returns to business for its investment in Government can be better government and better business.

The problem of effective government in these times surely transcends government and industry. In the final analysis, the roots of this problem are grounded in the American society in its entirety. Therefore, it is to each segment of this society that we must look in seeking a permanent solution.

There is overwhelming evidence that the rapid growth of the American Government has not been accompanied by a corresponding understanding in our society of the complexities and problems of modern day government nor of its tremendously increased impact upon the individual. Yet, such an understanding is basic to the development of an environment in which the nature and the demands of government service are understood—an environment that provides a fertile soil for both the enlistment and longer retention of qualified executives.

To assist in creating such an atmosphere, participation by each segment of our social and economic structure is required in what

may be termed a combination "orientation-education" program designed to overcome a problem in communications. The need for such a program has existed in the past and exists to an even greater degree today. But our survey indicates that to varying degrees, we are not accepting this responsibility. We are convinced that educational institutions, political parties, organized labor, civic, fraternal and social organizations, the press, radio, and television have the opportunity to increase awareness of Government's vital role and the need for experienced executives to guide its operation.

That the political party in power desires to place candidates of its own persuasion in positions of authority and policy is a foregone conclusion. Vacancies in top posts are obvious but vacancies in lower echelon, noncareer posts usually are known only to the immediate supervisors and the personnel departments and seldom to agency heads. Federal agencies have an obligation to call these vacancies to the attention of the party in power and to provide job specifications indicating qualities, abilities, and talents needed.

The political party, on the other hand, has an equal obligation to furnish candidates possessing abilities specified and not to pressure agencies to take prospects who have little else to offer besides availability and party loyalty. To do this properly, the party in power must develop a strong, formalized recruitment program stressing selection and placement. The party out of power, if it wants to get down to business immediately after winning an election, must take these steps before an election.

While political pressure are ever-present on the employment departments, personal pressure by careerists as well as noncareerists also is persistent. Everyone wants to hire his friend and it is only through insistence on impersonal selective techniques that poor placement can be avoided.

Usually the new BMG and his top personal staff do not have the know-how of government operations. Many pitfalls, embarrassments, and even international incidents can be avoided by obtaining the advice and counsel of experienced career civil servants. The great majority of them are eager to carry out the mandates of their new bosses and are just waiting for a chance to display their abilities. Unfortunately, there are those who delight in telling their bosses that "it can't be done under government regulations" whether it be the carrying out of new policy or personnel procurement of special talent. There always is a way around most obstacles and the skilled career civil servant knows the way.

It is seldom that industry plunges a man into a new administrative responsibility without proper indoctrination and yet it happens regularly to the BMG's. The task would be so much lighter and progress so much faster if agencies adopted off-the-job orientation for its noncareer people. So that the neophytes would not be suspicious of career brainwashing, these courses could be conducted by a nongovernment organization with foundation money.

The BMG has been accused (as our survey proves) of not staying long enough in government to learn the ropes, of leaving just as he is beginning to become useful. Responses to our inquiries indicate overwhelmingly that tours should seldom be for less than 2 years. For those jobs that require a shorter tenure, the use of consultants is recommended.

While Congress, the press, radio, and television have played up "conflict of interest" cases, our responses showed that generally statutes and regulations concerned were not too great a bar to acceptance of Federal employment. Persons who have spent a lifetime accumulating savings, however, should not be required to divest themselves of stocks and bonds if ownership of these investments does not conflict with the use of honest judgment in their jobs. The methods employed by some Congressmen bothered our respondents. Congress should recognize the human dignity and professional attainments of the people in the executive establishment and not subject them to needless harassment.

Any long-range program of action must include greater emphasis on education. All levels of education should be reviewed as to the adequacy of instruction in the processes of modern government. In this respect, secondary educational institutions have the primary responsibility, but there should be a carrythrough in college. All students—regardless of their major academic field—should be required to take courses in the functioning and significance of contemporary government. These courses should be concerned not only with political and economic theory but should also be strongly oriented toward actual problems of public administration, day-to-day operations, and the responsibilities of American citizens to serve in their Government.

Such a program, in which each segment of our society participates, is the only way to cultivate an atmosphere necessary for the development and retention of sufficient qualified Government executives. That points especially to better teamwork among Government, the political parties, business, and education in the recruitment of the needed businessmen. This teamwork should comprise the following nine basic activities:

1. The executive branch of the Federal Government should take immediate steps to improve the situation by establishing a central recruiting office in the White House, which could catalog the requirements of the departments and at the same time act as a clearinghouse for businessmen willing to serve. Such an office could actively recruit when no candidates are available and maintain an executive reserve file of businessmen who are capable and may be willing to serve.

2. The business community should develop a greater appreciation of the need for service by businessmen in Government, without regard to political lines.

3. The business community must respond to requests from Government by providing the type of individuals requested (and not ineffective executives) and by recognizing the greater worth and ability of men who have served Government.

4. Trade associations and industrial organizations should be of major nonpartisan influence on the potential executive and on their companies, through an active program of education, information, and orientation.

5. Rosters of candidates should be developed by trade associations.

6. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, National Association of Manufacturers, American Management Association, and other organizations representative of the business community should further studies and programs of this kind and educate members as to the needs of Government for executive assistance.

7. Companies should define, adopt, and publish their policies on the subject of their executives leaving for Government service.

8. Educational institutions, particularly business schools, should place a greater emphasis on education of the individual concerning his responsibility to Government.

9. A general philosophy to make "public service" a desirable factor in our society must be developed and recognized as a basic principle of our society. In the present context of world affairs it may have more to do with our survival than does the profit motive.

It all adds up to the fact that we have to take a hard new look at recruitment of Government personnel. It could well be argued now, we believe, that getting the best men into Government service is at least equally important to recruitment of men for military service. For, more and more, the wise men of our era are expressing the conviction that the "new competition" with Soviet Russia is more likely to be won in the sprawling bureaucracy of Washington, D. C., than on some remote battlefield. If the military services can command a certain allegiance in their recruitment, how much more should the civil departments of the Federal Government do the same.

Unless some kind of effective centralized recruitment service is set up in Washington with good communication with, and cooperation from the American business community, the new urgency is going to find us as a nation very much wanting. Only by standing up as men with a heritage to proclaim and defend can we meet the challenge of survival.

Plywood Imports Injure Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, considerable discussion has taken place on the floors of the House and Senate and in the press over whether plywood imports are injuring employment in and the prosperity of the Pacific Northwest fir plywood industry.

The Douglas Fir Plywood Association which is comprised of nearly all the plywood manufacturers of Washington, Oregon, California, and Montana says these imports do injure the softwood plywood industry as well as the hardwood plywood industry.

The position of the Douglas Fir Plywood Association mills, which produce 86 percent of all fir manufactured in the United States, is made quite clear in a resolution passed at a meeting of its management board in Eugene, Oreg., on Wednesday May 14, 1958.

The resolution of the Douglas Fir Plywood Association follows:

Whereas the importing of foreign plywood has had a serious effect upon the plywood industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the consensus of opinion of the Douglas Fir Plywood Association is that the great volume of imported plywood has had a highly detrimental effect on domestic production and employment. This consensus rests on the following facts:

Import figures of record show that the United States imported 53 percent of all hardwood plywood consumed in the United States during 1957, a total of 847 million square feet during the year.

Seventy-nine and three-tenths percent of all imported plywood came from Japan, where the average rate of wage per hour is 15 cents as compared with an average rate per hour of $2.52 in the plywood industry in the States of Oregon, Washington, and California. Practically all of this imported plywood is hardwood. It is not only replacing hardwood plywood manufactured in the United States, it is replacing our Douglas-fir plywood. It is possible for Japan to sell this better grade of plywood cheaper than we can produce Douglas-fir plywood with hardwood faces.

The 847 million square feet of plywood imported this year will represent a loss of $40 per thousand square feet in employment in

the United States or a loss in payrolls amounting to $34 million.

We feel that should foreign countries continue to exploit their economic advantages, such as cheaper timber, cheaper labor, and cheaper transportation and should they be permitted to continue to sell their production in the United States unchecked, the economic effect on our plywood industry, and especially on the States of Washington, Oregon, and California, will be serious.

Douglas-fir plywood was an extremely important critical construction and building material during World War II, and as such was subject to a very high priority, and it is of vital importance that this industry be left in a sound and healthy condition in case another such grave emergency faces this country.

We recognize the need for, and encourage foreign trade. All we ask is that sufficient restraint on the importation of foreign plywood be applied to permit our plywood industry to survive and maintain our wage structure and standard of living and to enjoy prosperity so necessary to the economic welfare of our area.

Social Security as a Path to Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, according to reports, some of our economists believe that an upturn in business activity will not come before the end of the year and possibly not until the early part of next year. By now, it is clear to all that the recession has gone much further and may last considerably longer than expected. The people of this country demand that the necessary precautions be taken to deal with the situation before it gets completely out of hand.

The question of primary importance is: What steps are we to take? Many steps have been suggested, but which of these will serve the best purpose from the standpoint of the Nation's economy? Most of them appear to be sound, though some are of a temporary nature and will not bring the desired results, while others would benefit only a certain segment of the population.

I shall, of course, be glad to support any proposal which holds promise of improving our sagging economy, but I should like to see action taken that will strike deep roots and help to bolster the Nation's economy on a wide scale and on a durable basis.

Such a step appears to me to be available through our social-security system. This is the system established more than 2 decades ago, when we were experiencing the greatest depression in our history, and it proved to be an important factor then in helping to pull the country out of the economic mire. It can do so now, too, if we bring it up to date and liberalize its benefits to reach more people. It will repay the extra cost by providing greater purchasing power and more jobs.

In the Full Employment Act of 1946, the Federal Government assumed the responsibility to stimulate useful employment opportunities and also to promote the retirement of older citizens from the labor force and to provide them with a decent standard of living. I suggest that the time has come to do just that, that is, retire as many of our older citizens as possible and provide them with an adequate standard of living in their retirement. This will help them maintain their purchasing power, while their retirement will provide jobs for younger citizens.

I propose that we increase the benefit payments under the Social Security Act to allow for the increase in the cost of living since the end of World War II. This increase will help raise the standard of living of the elderly and the retired people who have no personal savings and must rely entirely for their subsistence on their monthly social security payments.

In a bill which I am introducing in the House, I am proposing the following two steps:

First. Reduce the retirement age for all to 62, with full social security benefits available to both men and women.

Second. Increase the monthly social security payments in the following manner:

(a) Minimum payments to be increased to $50 a month, instead of $30 at present;

(b) Maximum payments to be increased to $150, instead of $108.50 now; and

(c) Those falling in between to receive an across-the-board increase of 40 percent.

It is estimated that, by reducing the retirement age to 62 for men and women, an additional 4 million people in the 62 to 65 age category would become eligible for social security benefits. In November 1957 the number of those receiving old-age and survivors insurance benefits was 11 million people. By lowering the retirement age to 62, the number of people receiving such benefits would increase to about 15 million. That means that perhaps as many as 4 million people would be encouraged to leave the labor force to make room for younger job seekers.

In addition, it should be noted that there are at the present time approximately 1.8 million persons over the age of 65 who are still working, but who would be eligible for social security payments if they chose to retire. If we were to increase the present benefits by 40 percent, as suggested above, many or perhaps the overwhelming majority of those over 65 who are still employed might choose to retire. This would open additional hundreds of thousands of jobs for younger people.

As for the cost involved in realizing these proposals, namely, adding 4 million additional retirees and a 40-percent increase in monthly benefits, it is generally estimated that the social-security trust fund would have to pay out about $5 billion more per year. Current annual payments out of this fund are approximately $7 billion.

How would this additional cost be financed? The level premium cost of this proposal is estimated to be about 7 percent of payroll. To full finance this cost would require an increase in the payroll tax for both employer and employee alike of 3½ percent. Thus, while employers and workers are now paying 2¼ percent of wages each toward social security, by the adoption of my proposal for a lower retirement age and increased benefits they would be required to pay a little over 5½ percent of wages in order to cover the cost.

I admit it is a bit high and appears to be a drastic step. When social security was first introduced, it was also considered a drastic step, yet today the whole Nation realizes its importance and would not discard it. What is needed today is an overhaul of the system to bring it into step with the times and to make its benefits available to our elderly citizens so that they may enjoy the fruits of their labor in their declining years.

Let us look at this thing from another point of view. By instituting these newly proposed social-security benefits, considerable sums could be saved in unemployment-compensation and relief expenditures, since many of those drawing or eligible to draw unemployment-insurance or relief checks would be able to retire on social security. Exact figures on such savings are, of course, impossible to ascertain. Government statisticians familiar with such expenditures have come up with the following estimates:

If insured unemployment—meaning those entitled to receive social-security payments—reaches 2.6 million persons, payments on unemployment compensation under the present arrangements would be about $3 billion per year. If legislation to increase unemployment compensation to 39 weeks is enacted, then compensation payments to 2.6 million insured unemployed persons would reach $4.5 billion a year. If the number of insured unemployed goes up to 3 million or 4 million persons, the extra cost would be proportionate.

This is not to be interpreted that I am opposed to the extension of unemployment benefits in the current emergency period. On the contrary, I favored the more liberal proposals to extend unemployment compensation as advocated by the Democratic leadership when the House considered this measure recently, and I opposed the administration proposals because it discriminated against some 2 million unemployed who worked in uninsured industries and are therefore not entitled to unemployment benefits.

I merely wish to point out the fact that this type of assistance is of a temporary nature. When the unemployed will have used up the additional weeks of compensation allotted them, they will still remain unemployed because basically the economic problem from which they are suffering will not have been solved. Hence, it may be asked: Would it not be advisable, from the standpoint of the national economy, to direct some of these additional billions into the so-

cial security fund and to liberalize the payments and the retirement age along the lines suggested above? In so doing, we would achieve the following:

First. Make possible for an additional 4 million people between 62 and 65 to retire on social security.

Second. Encourage 1.8 million persons over 65 to retire on increased benefits.

Third. Provide employment for several million younger persons and decrease the unemployment lists by taking the older citizens out of the labor force.

Fourth. Increase social security payments by approximately 40 percent, giving the retirees more purchasing power and a more decent standard of living.

Fifth. Save billions of dollars now expended on unemployment compensation and on relief assistance.

Sixth. Provide a boon to the economy which would be of a more permanent and lasting nature.

It should also be noted that whatever economic reforms are instituted at this time on a national scale should have a double purpose: we must aim to end the recession as soon as possible, but we must not overlook the dangers of inflation. I am firmly convinced that the improvements and adjustments in the Social Secuity Act, as advocated above, will achieve both of these purposes—help to end the recession and curb the threat of inflation.

In short, I believe that my proposals are of the kind that would strike deeper roots and provide a more durable and a better solution to the present economic problems. Let us roll back the recession. The path to prosperity lies through social security.

Disarmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in having inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter which I have received from Mr. C. C. Hiles, of Panacea, Fla., on the subject of disarmament. Mr. Hiles is a very careful thinker and has a genuine interest in the welfare of this Nation. I suggest careful reading of his letter, which follows:

PANACEA, FLA., *May 14, 1958.*

The Honorable BOB SIKES,
United States Representative for Third District of Florida, Washington.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The ever-increasing manifestations of a hostility toward the United States and the growing anti-American policies throughout the world are most distressing and alarming, and clearly indicate that there are other factors involved besides communistic opposition and propaganda. Even those nations that have been so much benefitted by our generosity have become lukewarm in their obligations to us or even disaffected. We have failed completely to put over the ideals we so often profess to follow, but do not. I shall not go into details as to the reasons for this failure. They should be known to all. I shall confine my comment to the fact that it is a sickening and disheartening spectacle when one has to witness the loss of respect and prestige once enjoyed by this great country which, while not always right, was once nearly so. All of this aside from the perils to which we find ourselves exposed.

Time was when outrages to the flag or the person of a Vice President of these United States would have been the signal for mobilization of the Armed Forces and the almost unrestrained indignation of the American people, but today no one turned a hair and its business as usual, with the baseball scores coming in on time and everyone apparently satisfied. I do not propose any action to set these matters straight because I feel that the blame lies here at home and squarely in our own lap.

Favored geographically and endowed with the abundance of domain and natural resources, and further enriched by the finest of traditions handed down by those to whom life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness were God's own gifts to a chosen Nation, America stood out as the leader of all men who strove to make the world a better place in which men could live, prosper, and worship God. Nations respected America for her espousal of the rights of the underdog. During the last great war our finest slogan was the four freedoms, of which freedom from fear was the one that meant the most to an embattled world—most of all to us.

Now we have failed and are failing, not only our own people but the rest of the civilized world that looked to us for moral and spiritual guidance at a time when mankind has most need of such support. We, ourselves, are going along hand in hand with, and are a party to, the inspiration and creation of fear itself, to plague humanity for as long as it is privileged to be here. How long that will be is anyone's guess.

Somewhere we have lost our way; we have forgotten our duty to the cause of mankind in our selfish, mad race for power that, by all the chances of probability, may well be entirely unnecessary and uncalled for. So blind have we become to the consequences of our blind headlong rush to destruction that we have even forgotten the primeval urge of all men since creation, that "self preservation is the first law of Nature," which applies to our potential enemy as well as to us. The recognition, once more, of this first principle should point out to us today that the position of the Russians is just as precarious as ours and that they are just as badly frightened at the course of current events as we are, and this knowledge should strengthen us in finding a sane solution of the world's troubles.

There is 1 course, and 1 only, that will, at 1 stroke change all this, and I respectfully urge that either the Congress or the executive department, or both, working in harmony and unison, at once initiate such action. That there be advanced, at once, and publicly, for everyone to see and hear, a policy of complete disarmament for all nations of the world. That such policy encompass all necessary safeguards for security. That such policy, as expounded, be positive and unequivocal, and without any reservations whatever, and totally devoid of any vague or misleading diplomatic windowdressing—so worded as to be fully comprehensible to any and all people.

Such action could only—

Bring to fruition that which we are so earnestly seeking—peace and disarmament, or

Establish, once and for all, the stand of the United States in the matter of world peace, and restore its lost prestige, and respect of all the nations of the world.

By our advocacy of such a move, without equivocal reservations or unpalatable conditions, the Soviet Government would be completely denied any opportunity for further evasion of the issue of peace, and would be compelled to accede or else find itself in the unenviable position of being the only barrier to peace.

Be, propagandawise, more effective than the launching of a thousand satellites.

Restore the United States to its former position of being the true advocate of the common man and champion of the oppressed underdog.

Now, Congressman, you have, in the past, given me to understand that you favor disarmament, and I believe you will agree that it must be complete to be effective. This is not a plug for my own plan which is well known to you. Any plan that makes sense and meets with the proper conditions of security wold be acceptable to the people of the world. There are many good ideas being expressed now by reputable, thinking men in this country that could well be heeded.

What I desire to know right now is your own honest opinion as to the possibility of acceptance of a plan that could well bring us what we seek. If the plan for total disarmament is feasible and workable why has no effort been made to advance it by those in a position to act in the best interests of the country? There appears to be a cool attitude toward such action. Why? Is it because there is some jeopardy involved in it? Or, is it because of a lack of political courage to advance it? I invite you, most respectfully, to give me your views on the matter. By this, I do not mean in terms of generalities. If there is jeopardy, just where, specifically, does it lie? If such exists why do we continue to pretend to advocate disarmament?

It is time the people knew these things, Congressman. Even if the Russians were to reject the proposal suggested there would be some relief from the present untenable and equivocable position of this country, and even that much would serve, partly, to relieve our minds. At least, we would know just where we are—something none of us now know. We would have an end of the constant bickering which we consider demeaning and unworthy of our Government. There was a time when all the world knew what the United States stood for but today no one knows, least of all, its own people.

I urge you, once more, Congressman, to be sufficiently indulgent to give my proposal your fullest consideration. I urge that you bring this letter to the attention of, not only the Florida delegation in the Congress, but all the membership that have the best interests of the country at heart, and those of the executive department that are in a position to affect the necessary reforms so badly needed to restore the lost prestige of the United States. You may use this letter as you deem expedient. There is nothing in it that I do not openly advocate daily, and the questions I have asked are no different than those which are asked every day by those inarticulate Americans who also wonder where we are headed.

With one closing remark I shall end this letter. Nearly 44 years ago I entered the service of the United States and took an oath to support and defend the country and its Constitution from all enemies and, as I take it, that means from within as well as from without. Although I am retired and my twpewriter must now supplant my sword, I propose to do just that, and I am certain that you will join me.

It is not necessary that I reiterate my respect for you. I think that goes without saying since I have been so frank with you in the expression of my views. I know that these are trying times for the Members of Congress; but the least they can do is to be honest with themselves and the country, and

this, I am confident, will be no problem for you. Need I say more?

With my heartiest best wishes for whatever you undertake on behalf of your State and this country, I am,

Most cordially yours,

C. C. HILES.

Dangers of Groupism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress an editorial which appeared in the Mesa Tribune on May 14.

The Mesa Tribune is my hometown paper. Its editorial writers have unusual ability to put into print reflections on current trends upon which all of us might well meditate.

The editorial follows:

DANGERS OF GROUPISM

In recent months some observers of American life have commented with some force on the dominance of the group in so many of our activities.

Government is a kind of group to which we are all beholden in ways not common a few decades ago. We are taxed and regulated and managed in considerable areas of our lives by Federal, State, and local authorities.

Those millions of us who work for some company, large or small, know allegiance to still another group that, in effect, governs a substantial portion of our lives.

Whether we live in city, suburbs, town, or open country, other parts of our lives are affected by group doings. Particularly is this so in the larger cities and suburbs, where most Americans now live.

Naturally, things vary from place to place, but organized social, community and general civic effort blankets much of the field.

In both school and playtime, children are taught to blend with the group, to join in group doings. The tendency to organize is seen in juvenile gangs, which in turn reflect the criminal combinations of the adult world.

Of course much good flows from group organization. It can spell order, regularity, some measure at least of discipline, security. It can satisfy man's need to belong, to be accepted and be protected.

The difficulty is that so much organization, such widespread allegiance to the group, can smother his individuality. It can make him timid, afraid to rebel against set ways of living, complacent behind the group's stout shield.

If what the group does, what the group authorizes and approves, represents normality, then the man who fails to join or reparts from group thinking is odd, nonconformist, sometimes a nuisance, now and then even dangerous.

In an America so engulfed by group standards and doings, the true individualist is becoming a rarer and rarer species. Most men find rebellion risky and costly. They yield to pressures to play along.

Yet this country was pioneered by rebels, individualists with the nerve and the energy to burst bonds and strike out alone. The same kind of men built the Nation.

We're still a great country. But we'll stand a better chance of being a greater one when we somehow manage, in spite of the great weight of the group, to recapture the fire of individualism that lifted us so high.

James P. Warburg's Proposed Agenda for a Summit Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, James P. Warburg has for some years been advocating a more imaginative foreign policy. In his recent lecture at Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine, he addressed himself to the journey toward a summit meeting that this country is apparently embarked upon without an adequately prepared Western position. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include significant excerpts from Mr. Warburg's challenging talk:

Since it now appears not unlikely that we shall reluctantly attend some sort of high-level conference with the Soviet Union before the end of the year, it seems appropriate to discuss what we might seek to accomplish at such a meeting.

Although predictions are hazardous—especially optimistic predictions—it seems likely that the forthcoming conference will achieve at least one positive result; namely, an agreement to ban nuclear tests, enforced by some sort of inspection. The world has been clamoring for a ban against further pollution of the atmosphere; the Russians have offered it; and, thanks very largely to Governor Stassen, to the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament and especially to its chairman, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, our Government seems about ready, at long last, to separate this one item from its other disarmament proposals.

If this agreement is achieved, it will be of considerable importance, not only as a step toward halting the arms race but as a breakthrough in reaching any agreement whatever in the existing atmosphere of mutual suspicion and distrust. If the agreement is reached and adhered to, it will create a climate of opinion in which other agreements may more readily be negotiated. Additionally, once any degree of inspection is permitted, an important key log in the log-jam will have been lifted.

Though highly desirable, a ban on nuclear tests should not, in my opinion, constitute the sole American objective at the summit conference. It looks, however, as though the United States intends to resist any broadening of the agenda. Our delegation will in all probability restate its often-rejected demand for free all-German elections and for the liberation of the East European satellites, but this would merely be an indirect method of refusing to discuss any of the recent proposals for disengagement in Europe which have emanated not only from the Soviet Union but from the German Social Democrats, the British Labour Party, and a number of Americans, most recently Mr. George F. Kennan.

If we rule out sheer obstinacy in clinging to a bankrupt European policy, it is difficult to understand this attitude on the part of our Government.

The policy of seeking to bring about the reunification of Germany by creating a position of strength through building up West Germany as a sovereign state and later rearming it, was originated chiefly by former Secretary of State Dean Acheson with the enthusiastic concurrence of West German Chancellor Adenauer. The rearming of Germany was never popular in France or in Germany itself. It was agreed to with great reluctance by the British Labour Party.

Here, in this country, only a handful of students of European affairs publicly expressed their misgivings. As one of that small group of American dissidents, I testified before the State Department Policy Planning Staff, of which Mr. Kennan was then chairman, as well as before General Eisenhower's Advance Study Group in the Pentagon (General Eisenhower was then Chief of Staff), and before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This was in 1948 and 1949, when the North Atlantic Treaty was under negotiation.

The chief points of my testimony were these:

1. That making West Germany into a sovereign state would inevitably result in the creation by Russia of an East German puppet state; and that it would also in all probability result in a Soviet effort to push the Western Powers out of Berlin.

2. That stretching the Atlantic Treaty commitment into a promise to defend Western Europe at the Iron Curtain would constitute the making of an unfulfillable promise; and that the attempt to fulfill any such undertaking would result in rearming West Germany, in spite of Mr. Acheson's unqualified assurance that no form of German rearmament would be considered.

3. That rearming West Germany would not, if undertaken, create a position of strength from which the West would be able to negotiate an all-German settlement permitting all of Germany to join the NATO alliance; but that, on the contrary, it would freeze the partition of Germany and of Europe, undermine West European morale, and increase the tensions between Russia and the West without making Western Europe defensible against Soviet invasion.

The first two of these prognostications were, as you know, promptly fulfilled. The third contention still remains a matter of debate, although it is difficult to see how anyone can claim the contrary.

Some of you may have seen the plea against altering our present policy by Mr. Acheson in the April issue of Foreign Affairs. Mr. Acheson and Mr. Dulles make strange bedfellows. Both are convinced that the policy we have pursued since 1949 has been and still is a great success. The facts, however, speak for themselves.

We are no nearer to German reunification and a European peace settlement than we were 9 years ago.

NATO is getting weaker, not stronger. Its members have failed to develop anything like a common political policy, as witness Cyprus, Algeria, and the invasion of Egypt. They have not even reached agreement on a common military policy, as evidenced by their repeated failure to live up their own force goals and by the current disagreement over the distribution of atomic weapons and the establishment of launching sites for ballistic missiles.

The long delay in German rearmament, the reduction of the British Army of the Rhine and the withdrawal to North Africa of 400,000 French troops have made a mockery of the defensive shield contemplated by the NATO planners. The dispute over Cyprus has broken up the Balkan alliance and alienated both Greece and Turkey from Great Britain.

Not only is the obsolete defensive structure of NATO deteriorating but NATO's value as a bargaining counter is rapidly diminishing.

The sole and very real value of the NATO alliance has been that it served notice on the part of Canada and the United States that they would consider an attack upon any of the European signatories as an attack upon themselves.

Disengagement of the opposing forces in Central Europe will have no effect whatever upon this commitment.

As long ago as 1949, the alternative to the Acheson-Adenauer policy—now the Acheson-Adenauer-Dulles policy—was to recognize three facts: that there could be no European peace settlement so long as Germany remained partitioned; that neither Russia nor the West could hope, without war, to gain control of a reunited Germany; and that the only sensible solution would be an agreement providing for mutual withdrawal and the military neutralization of a reunified Germany.

* * * * *

I venture to express the opinion that, if it were not for American intransigence and European fear of opposing the United States, majority opinion in Europe would for some time have been overwhelmingly in favor of such a solution. I would go further and say that, were it not for the iron grip in which Chancellor Adenauer holds his country's foreign policy, the Germans themselves would today gladly accept military neutralization as the price to be paid for reunification.

In order not to discuss disengagement in the somewhat imprecise philosophical generalities of Mr. Kennan, let us consider what might be gained by a specific proposal.

You may recall that, in November 1956, the Soviet Government proposed to the United States a mutual withdrawal from all of Europe west of the Soviet frontier and the working out of a general European security agreement. This was shortly after the Polish and Hungarian uprisings. Let us suppose that, instead of brushing off this overture as insincere propaganda, our Government had made a counter-proposal. Let us suppose that this counter-proposal would have contained these suggestions:

That the United States welcomed the Soviet proposal as a long-range objective but that a mutual withdrawal must be undertaken gradually, in a carefully phased step-by-step procedure.

That the first such step might be for Soviet forces to retire behind the Oder-Neisse line in exchange for an Anglo-French-American withdrawal to the western bank of the Rhine.

And that this mutual withdrawal should be accompanied by agreements providing for the release of West Germany from NATO and of East Germany from the Warsaw Pact, and for the neutralization under United Nations supervision of the evacuated area, with the four-power status of Berlin to remain unchanged pending reunification of the two German republics.

The Russians would, of course, have boggled over the demand that Western troops should remain in occupation of that small part of Germany which lies on the left bank of the Rhine. We might have countered by saying that the proposal provided for the Western evacuation of considerably greater, more populous and more important territory than that to be evacuated by the Russians. We might even have suggested to begin with, as British Labour leaders have suggested, that Russia evacuate Poland and Czechoslovakia as well as East Germany. We cannot antipicate what sort of bargaining might then have resulted.

But let us assume that some sort of bargain, not too far from our hypothetical counter-proposal, might have resulted. What would have been gained?

A major cause of East-West tension would have been removed through the neutralization of Germany. Germany would have been prevented from coming into possession of nuclear armament. A laboratory would have been created in which the United Nations could test out the techniques of inspection and enforcement. A state of affairs would have been established in which the two German states could gradually find their own way toward reunification. And, most important of all, the first step would have been taken toward the liberation of Eastern Europe from Soviet coercive power.

Now, as a matter of fact, the hypothetical counter-proposal just stated was actually submitted to President Eisenhower in December 1956 by the participants in the Arden House Disarmament Conference, of which I was one. The proposal was taken to the President by 2 Senators, 1 a Republican and the other a Democrat. It was rejected chiefly on the grounds that Chancellor Adenauer would not like it.

This was not the only occasion in the past on which I have wondered whether American policy was being shaped in Washington or in the West German capital of Bonn.

Since then, a number of rather similar proposals calling for varying degrees of mutual withdrawal have been put forward. The Poles have produced the Rapacki plan, which does not provide for any mutual withdrawal but for the creation of a nuclear-free zone including West and East Germany, Poland, and Czechoslovakia.

The Rapacki plan has aroused considerable interest in Western Europe, particularly in Norway and Denmark. Our Government has flatly rejected it. My own view is that, by itself, the Rapacki proposal would tip the balance of power on the continent in favor of the Soviet bloc; but that it might be an important adjunct to an agreement providing for mutual withdrawal of conventional forces.

* * * * *

Let me now pass on to other possible items for the agenda of a summit meeting.

The Russians have not only suggested that they might consider disengagement in Europe but have also put forward some interesting proposals for disengagement in the Middle East. Their note of February 17, 1957 proposed what amounted to a hands-off agreement, including an arms embargo and a mutual undertaking not to interfere in the internal affairs of the Middle Eastern countries. It likewise indicated a willingness to consider an agreement to strip economic assistance of political overtones.

The proposition as a whole was unacceptable because it added up to a one-sided withdrawal on the part of the West. Britain and the United States have certain military commitments and several bases in the Middle East. They have very large commercial interests and investments. Britain still has a colony in Aden and certain valuable preferential positions through its protectorates over the gulf sheikdoms. The Russians, on the other hand, have little to give up except their recently acquired political influence over the United Arab Republic—Egypt, Syria, and Yemen—and, of course, their hopes of expanding their newly gained political bridgehead.

Nevertheless, the Soviet proposals for an arms embargo, for noninterference in the internal affairs of the region and for stripping economic aid of political conditions were, I think, well worth exploring. Our Government, however, failed to express the slightest interest, rejecting the whole proposal out of hand with the usual denunciation of insincere propaganda.

I would like to suggest that, at the forthcoming summit meeting, it might be well to consider disengagement in the Middle East along with disengagement in Europe. Our present policy in the Middle East is no less bankrupt than our policy in Europe. * * *

It is almost certain that any proposal for disengagement in Europe acceptable to the West will call for a disproportionately large Soviet withdrawal, so long as Britain, Canada, and the United States feel that they cannot withdraw their troops from the Continent altogether. It is hard to find in Europe any compensation acceptable to the Russians for a disproportionate withdrawal. But it is not too difficult to see how the discrepancy might be offset in the Middle East.

In my view, the fundamental basis for a bargain at the summit meeting lies in the fact that, while Russia occupies an ultimately untenable position in eastern Europe, the Western Powers occupy an ultimately untenable position in the Middle East.

Neither side will retreat if it thinks that the other will move in on the heels of its retirement. Neither side will retreat if, by withdrawing, it sees itself as the victim of an unequal bargain.

The Russians want us to withdraw from bases in the Middle East which threaten Soviet security much as Soviet bases in Mexico would threaten our security. We want Russia to retreat from positions in eastern Europe which threaten the security of our allies.

The quid pro quo for an unequal withdrawal in Europe might well be the evacuation of our Dahran base in Saudi Arabia and our agreement to stop any further arming of the middle eastern countries which border on the Soviet Union. Turkey would have to be an exception because of its membership in NATO, but the United States could agree not to maintain or establish American bases on Turkish territory. The Russians, for their part, would have to agree to stop arms shipments to Egypt, Syria, Yemen or any other middle eastern country.

As a final Middle East item on the agenda, I would suggest a mutual agreement to guarantee the existence of Israel within its present armistice boundaries, except to the extent that these boundaries may be eventually rectified by mutual agreement between Israel and its Arab neighbors.

This would be my docket for the forthcoming summit meeting. I should scarcely hope to see all of these objectives achieved, but I should definitely hope to see some real progress toward their achievement. I only wish that our Government were approaching this meeting with anything like such a program.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Warburg is to appear before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on May 23. It is well that his views are to be accorded a hearing. I hope that the Secretary of State will see fit to tell the committee, and the Nation, what he thinks is wrong with them.

Oil Import Limitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a release entitled "The Oil Imports Problem, an Effective and Desirable Answer." The economic health of the oil industry is vital to the southwestern part of our country, indeed to the entire Nation. For some time it has been apparent that voluntary limitation of oil imports has not been effective, so that other steps must be taken to preserve this industry. Yet Govern-

ment regulation is repugnant to those enterprising businessmen comprising the oil industry. The risk, speculation, profit, and loss that constitute private enterprise are all present in oil exploration and drilling. For some time the normal demand and supply factors of this domestic industry have been upset by excessive importation of oil. In Texas production of oil has been cut back to such a few days "allowable" of pumping that many small oil producers are threatened with extinction. Widespread loss of such oil production would seriously endanger this Nation's economy, and defense posture, since domestic oil most certainly would be needed in time of national emergency.

Therefore, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a bill presently pending as an amendment to the Trade Agreements Act, which is before the Rules Committee for a rule. This bill, known as the Mineral Resources Security Act of 1958, deserves the thoughtful consideration of every Member. To aid in its understanding, I would like to present a description of "the oil imports problem, an effective and desirable answer," by the information service of the Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners Association.

The release follows:

THE OIL IMPORTS PROBLEM—AN EFFECTIVE AND DESIRABLE ANSWER

The oil imports bill now favored by independent producer groups throughout the Nation and most other congressional and industry proponents of a curb on excessive oil imports is known as the Mineral Resources Security Act of 1958—H. R. 11781, by Representative FRANK IKARD, Democrat, of Texas.

This bill, which would amend the Trade Agreements Act now before the House Ways and Means Committee, would make sure that oil imports increase only when domestic production is also growing, and would provide a self-executing means of administering the limitation without running the risk of extending Federal control.

Imports of both crude oil and products would not exceed a 16.6 percent relationship to domestic production, the ratio found to be the maximum consistent with national security and which Congress clearly intended as the limit when it last extended the Trade Agreements Act of 1955. Licenses or rights to import would no longer be allocated by arbitrary decision of a governmental agency, with all the discriminations and controls-promotion that entails, but through a competitive bidding arrangement similar to that practiced by Brazil and by our own Government on certain State and Federal lands.

This plan is superior to the numerous other courses considered for several reasons:

1. All the straight quota plans so far devised, including the current voluntary program now in effect, contain fatal deficiencies which this bill would avoid.

On any straight quota plan, no means has yet been devised for allocating import rights to companies that doesn't involve discriminations and encourage ever-expanding Federal controls. Most people who have studied this matter closely agree that the nearest thing to a fair quota allocation program would be one allocating quotas only to refiners based on refining through-put capacity—a plan some administration officials are known to favor over the current chaotic one.

Yet even that proposal is far less desirable for several reasons. In the first place, it contains no provision for limiting products of oil, which would unavoidably have the effect of encouraging refining capacity abroad at the expense of United States refiners and employment. Second, allocating import rights to refiners, many of whom would sell such certificates to other refiners because they are in no position to process foreign oil, would be tantamount to a Government subsidy. This is true because there is an admitted economic advantage in imported oil which accrues to any person with an import quota or certificate. Third, this refinery allocation plan would do nothing to equalize costs of foreign and domestic oil, thereby posing a constant threat to United States crude price structure and particularly the marginal or stripper wells which would be abandoned with a price collapse here. Fourth, such a quota program would contribute little toward reducing the clamor of ever more newcomers for import rights. The obtaining of a quota would be a virtual guaranty of a profitable enterprise.

2. The Mineral Resources Security Act would avoid objections of some to a straight tariff program.

Equalization tariffs or duties are beyond doubt the most equitable means of removing unfair advantage of foreign imports when restraint is essential to security and economy, and they are in keeping with the best tradition of the American free-enterprise system. Nevertheless, occasions arise, just such as this, when the imposition of a straight tariff or excise tax would not achieve the intended objective of encouraging reasonable imports from accessible sources while preventing undue dependence on unreliable scurces.

Since Middle East oil is vastly cheaper than oil produced particularly in Canada and to a lesser extent in Venezuela, a straight tariff high enough to slow Middle East imports would be altogether prohibitive of imports from sources in this hemisphere. This is contrary to defense objectives.

Additionally, there are deep-seated prejudices in some quarters against tariffs as such.

This bill would avoid such objections. Duties would be set on the basis of normal economics based on competitive bidding by the importing companies. Obviously bidding for licenses to import Middle East oil would be much higher than licenses to import Canadian oil, thereby achieving the intended defense objective without encountering the most-favored-nation obstacle. And the stigma attached to tariffs would be averted.

3. This proposed imports plan would work to the distinct advantage of free world allied nations which supply the United States with oil.

Under the present unsuccessful voluntary plan, or any other quota plan, nations such as Canada and Mexico—those we can depend most directly upon in emergency—will inevitably find their oil squeezed out of this market by vastly cheaper oil from such unreliable areas as the Middle East. This has already been proved in the case of Canada which has lost most of her markets here in recent months primarily because cheaper oil outside this continent displaced it.

Under this plan imports from Canada would be at no price disadvantage. Competitive license bidding would equalize prices and, additionally, the President would be authorized to assign country or area quotas as needed to assure reasonable access to this market by reliable sources in this hemisphere.

4. This plan has distinct advantages also for legitimate importing companies, as opposed to those entering the international field strictly to profiteer from the price differential between foreign oil and domestic oil.

Under the present voluntary arrangement or any other quota plan there will be demands from more and more newcomers for import rights—there being a virtual penalty for not importing. Any company or broker who can gain adequate financing will insist upon being granted a quota, and the Government agency apportioning them out will be unable to resist such demands for fear of promoting monopoly in imports.

Under any such quota arrangement, where import quotas amount to outright subsidies without regard for normal economics, the established importers will be compelled to yield more and more markets.

Under this bill, on the other hand, the artificial incentive for newcomers to demand import rights would disappear as bidding became competitive, and their only reason for entering the field would be the desire to go legitimately into foreign operations. Yet the field would be open to assure that bidding for import licenses remained truly competitive. For the most part, these speculators in the import field have neither the facilities nor financing to develop foreign markets, and are interested solely in capitalizing on the virtual subsidy that now goes with the assignment of import rights. Those with a legitimate interest in oil operations abroad would not be hurt, and the windfall resulting from the cost differential in imports would be effectively removed. This would be a small price indeed to pay for industry stability and an orderly imports program.

5. The Government and consuming public would benefit from this program.

Most direct benefit accruing to the Government would be in the form of substantial revenue derived through competitive bidding for import licenses or certificates. This would return to the Government a significant percentage of its cost in promoting these foreign investments, and would recoup a portion of the revenue lost to State and local governments when imported oil displaces domestic production.

An additional benefit would be the maintenance of a program with a minimum of governmental expansion to provide regulation. Under any quota plan, including the current voluntary one, endless complications develop and controls powers are necessitated, not the least of which expenditures are the regular emergency meetings of the Cabinet Committee to deal with new problems.

The consuming public would be the beneficiary through the assurance of, first, a continuing adequacy of oil resources to meet free-world requirements in peace or war, and second, a guaranty against the price gouging that would assuredly result if our Nation ever became dependent upon foreign sources for this critical mineral.

Mrs. Ray Godbey, National President of Ladies' Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, United States of America, Carries Forward Nationwide Classroom Helpers Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present more information and timely and very significant facts about the remarkable service already having been rendered by members of the Ladies' Auxiliary to the

Veterans of Foreign Wars, United States of America, in initiating and carrying forward their very remarkable and appreciated classroom helpers' service in the schoolrooms of our Nation.

But first I should like to pay tribute to the work of the 375,000 members of the Ladies' Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, who this year have sponsored an outstanding new project called Classroom Helpers, to bring direct aid to our Nation's schools.

Serving as classroom helpers, thousands of auxiliary members in all 48 States have worked in the classrooms and offices of their local schools during the 1957–58 term, on a regular schedule, week after week, as unpaid volunteers.

The classroom-helpers project was planned and organized by one of my constituents, Mrs. Ray Godbey, of Lynwood, Calif., who is the national president of the VFW Auxiliary.

Alarmed by the fact that the Nation's schools this year would be operating with a shortage of 135,000 teachers, a shortage of 159,000 classrooms, a shortage of time for 840,000 youngsters who would have to go to school half time in swing shifts, early last fall Mrs. Godbey called on leading educators to find ways that the VFW Auxiliary could help.

She discovered that in the average classroom as much as one-third of the teacher's time was consumed by routine, nonteaching tasks such as keeping attendance and other records; duplicating and distributing work materials; collecting money for school lunches; milk funds, and drives; helping to supervise on the playground and in the lunchroom. If these jobs could be handled by volunteer workers, this time would be available to the teacher for all-important instructional work. The VFW Auxiliary offered to take on these jobs wherever they were needed in their 7,000 home towns.

The classroom-helper project was launched last October in Kansas City, Mo., and already the impact of the volunteers' work in easing critical school problems has been felt in numbers of cities and towns across the Nation. The classroom-helpers plan has won the praise of teachers, principals, and local superintendents. It has been warmly endorsed by leading educators, not only for the immediate aid it offers, but for contributing to the continuing interest and participation of citizens in their schools.

Dr. Lawrence G. Derthick, United States Commissioner of Education, said of classroom helpers:

> It has been my observation during more than 30 years of educational work that when our citizens become conscious of the problems of our schools, they take effective action. The activities of the Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars which lead to greater public understanding of our schools will contribute much to the enrichment of American education.

I became so interested in this significant service of these distinguished American women that I asked my great friend, Mrs. Ruby Godbey, national president, to give me her own statement about it so that we all might share some of her experiences and to the further end that the uniqueness and timeliness of this worthy program might be better understood and possibly patterned after in a great many of our communities. Following is a memorandum which I have received from Mrs. Ruby Godbey:

MEMO TO CONGRESSMAN CLYDE DOYLE FROM MRS. RAY GODBEY, NATIONAL PRESIDENT, LADIES AUXILIARY TO THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Since last October, I have made official visits to all 48 States and the District of Columbia. Each place I stopped—in large cities and small, industrial States and agricultural—I have talked about classroom helpers. I can tell you now that never in my memory has there been an auxiliary program that provoked such immediate interest, not only on the part of our own members, but of the public as a whole.

It is as though we as a nation are at last becoming aware of a fact the noted writer H. G. Wells predicted nearly half a century ago: "Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe." The events of the past few months have emphasized that fact—and I believe the public concern about education and the shocking shortages under which our schools have been forced to operate has at last been aroused.

It will take time and intensive interest and support from the public to correct these shortages and provide for the ever-growing number of youngsters to be educated in the future. So I am not suggesting that a volunteer effort such as our classroom helpers' program can provide the whole answer for the problem—but our experiences this year have proved to us classroom helpers can provide an immediate and vital part of the answer, by relieving teachers from time-consuming nonteaching jobs, so their time can be devoted to instruction work.

That our helpers have provided an invaluable service this year in hundreds of schools across the Nation is substantiated by the letters I've received from teachers, principals, school superintendents. Letters from parents, newspaper articles, radio, and television broadcasts have shown me how enthusiastic is the public's approval of our work.

And this, of course, is only the first year for classroom helpers—a year which, understandably, had to be devoted largely to working out details of the plan with individual schools to determine their specific needs and to find the right helper for the right job.

Despite this, we found the program was so needed in some areas that our volunteers were pressed into immediate service and have already chalked up several months of work.

In a north Georgia town when our volunteers went to offer their services, one principal said, "There is never a day when we don't have work for you to do." Another asked simply, "Can three of you start in my school day after tomorrow?"

In South Dakota one school system was able to open its libraries again, when our VFW Auxiliary members came in to help sort and mend the books and stay on duty during the day.

In a New Mexico town, helpers have added to their list of duties and relieve teachers supervising at crossings before and after schools. In Rhode Island they make it possible for teachers to go on with their classwork instead of having to take time out to assist with eye tests and other health checks. In a number of areas some helpers have been specially screened and assigned to serve in schools for retarded and physically handicapped youngsters.

And these are just a few of the stories.

I could not conclude this brief report to you without mentioning the helpers' reaction to their work. Without exception they have told me it is the most thrilling, the work they've ever done as volunteers.

Faith of Our Forefathers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Leonard J. Demchak, national chairman, Catholic Action, Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, resides in Richmond Hill, Long Island, N. Y., in my Congressional District. He is doing an outstanding job in bringing forcefully to the attention of our citizens the fact that we must not forget one of the principles on which this Nation was founded—belief and trust in God.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter written by Mr. Demchak and the parchment, Faith of our Forefathers, to which he refers. This pinpoints the necessity for an expression of faith such as is outlined in my bill, H. R. 6762, introduced on April 9, 1957.

The letter follows:

To: All commanders, first vice commanders, and Catholic Action chairmen.
Subject: "Faith of Our Forefathers."

Since the successful launching in October 1957 of the Russian satellite moon Sputnik, and even following our own launchings of the American Explorers and Vanguards, there have been repeated comments that our country's educational system has fallen far behind the Russian system, and has need for radical revision. The need for curriculum changes is there, but of far greater import is the need to return moral training to the classroom.

The Communists in Russia teach their children in school that the state is supreme and that the children must dedicate themselves for the greater glory of the state. They will not acknowledge that it is God's laws and His creation of the universe that keeps even their satellite circling the earth.

Here in the United States, God has too often been expelled from our public schools, cut from our films, red penciled from our literature. Our Nation was born of the marriage of God and law, therefore, law without God will never make a fitting home for the American Nation.

As our Nation embarks upon a new scientific program, and our school systems are revised to bring more science and math into them, let us not forget that our forefathers placed their trust and belief in God, and asked of us to teach our children and our children's children, that God must be supreme. As long as we have faith in God, we will love our country, and as long as we love God, we will serve our country.

We urge all members and units to call upon their friends and neighbors to join us in spreading the message of the Faith of our Forefathers in God and His commandments. We, therefore, ask that you display the parchment of the Faith of our Forefathers in schools, public institutions, and your homes.

Yours in the C. W. V.,

LEONARD J. DEMCHAK,
National Chairman Catholic Action, Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America.

FAITH OF OUR FOREFATHERS: GEORGE WASHINGTON (FEBRUARY 22), THOMAS JEFFERSON (APRIL 13), BENJAMIN FRANKLIN (JANUARY 17)

Faith in God—Service to country—love of home. These phrases distinguish the great moral strength and vital spiritual fiber of our forefathers.

We honor them, for their undying courage in the face of extreme dangers; for their belief that the earth would yield food if tilled honestly; for their confidence in themselves to shape their own destiny; for their loyalty to their country and their faith in Almighty God. Their ideals, their strength and their work made America great.

May we who shoulder the responsibilities of citizenship remain true to the heritage they forged. May we enrich our freedom and faith and acknowledge our debt to our forefathers.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Commerce Department appropriation bill passed by House.

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Wednesday, May 21, at 12 o'clock noon.

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

APPROPRIATIONS—COMMERCE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee continued its hearings on fiscal 1959 appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies, with testimony from Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks and James R. Durfee, Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, both of whom were accompanied by their associates.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Construction continued its hearings, today in executive session, on S. 3756, military construction authorizations for fiscal 1959, with testimony from the following Air Force representatives: John M. Ferry, Special Assistant for Installations; Brig. Gen. William Rentz, Deputy Director of Installations; Maj. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, Deputy Commander for Ballistic Missiles; Brig. Gen. Christian Dreyer, Deputy Director for Real Property; and Col. William Leonhard, Ballistic Missiles Division.

Hearings continue tomorrow in executive session.

FHA AUTHORIZATIONS

Committee on Banking and Currency: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported without amendment S. J. Res. 171, to increase FHA authorizations by $4 billion.

HOUSING

Committee on Banking and Currency: The Housing Subcommittee continued its hearings on pending housing legislation with testimony from Senators Bible and Javits; Silas F. Albert, Grand Rapids, Mich., and Walter J. Gill, Newark, N. J., both representing the National Association of Real Estate Boards; Roland Boyd, Wherry Housing Association; and Frank Flynn, Jr., Home Manufacturers Association.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

SMALL-BUSINESS FINANCING

Committee on Banking and Currency: The Small Business Subcommittee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported to the full committee S. 3651, Small Business Investment Administration Act of 1958. The bill was amended by striking all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof language embodied in a committee print.

The full committee will meet in executive session to consider this matter on May 27.

TARIFF AND ANTIDUMPING

Committee on Finance: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported with amendments H. R. 9291, to define parts of certain types of footwear for tariff purposes; H. R. 6006, to amend the Antidumping Act to provide for greater certainty, speed, and efficiency in the enforcement thereof; and H. R. 10015, to continue for 1 year the suspension of import duties on metal scrap.

FOREIGN POLICY

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee, in executive session, agreed to the following two motions: (1) that the committee authorize its Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs to proceed forthwith with a study of United States-Latin American relationships and problems and that the said subcommittee report its findings to the full committee for such action as the latter deems appropriate, and (2) that a subcommittee of four, to consist of Senators Green, Fulbright, Wiley, and Hickenlooper, explore the possibilities of an examination of United States foreign policy throughout the world somewhat along the lines of the study conducted last year by the Committee on Foreign Aid.

MARINE TERMINAL FACILITIES

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Special subcommittee held and concluded hearings on

Appendix

South Texas County Judges and Commissioners Deplore Veto of Omnibus Public Works Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, among the many messages I have received from Texas citizens deploring the President's veto of the omnibus public-works bill passed by Congress is a resolution passed by the South Texas County Judges' and Commissioners' Association.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this resolution, as set to me by Elmer Zahn, secretary-treasurer of the organization, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved, That we go on record as deploring the Presidential veto of the Omnibus Public Works Act Senate bill for a second time.

We assure all our Members of Congress, Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, and Speaker SAM RAYBURN that the county judges and commissioners of south Texas have confidence in their leadership and they have our unanimous support in any course which they in their judgment determine to be in the interest of Texas and national welfare in order to secure the final passage of these necessary authorizations either by a vote to override such veto or by new legislation.

Address by Hon. William F. Knowland Before American Feed Growers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at the American Feed Growers Association conference luncheon in Chicago, Ill., on May 20, 1958.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF UNITED STATES SENATOR WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND DELIVERED AT THE AMERICAN FEED GROWERS ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE LUNCHEON, CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 20, 1958

This is not the year for men of little faith to dominate our thinking or our actions.

It was only a few short months ago that men of little faith were prepared to accept the false notion that the godless men in the Kremlin had an economic, a political and a military ascendancy over the United States because they had sputnik and mutnik in the air and we had none.

In November of last year I stated in my home State of California:

"This is no time for either defeatism or complacency. It is no time to sell America short."

In the intervening months our Nation has successfully put into orbit Explorer I, Vanguard II, and Explorer III.

It is, of course, always dangerous to underestimate the opposition. It can also be fatal to overestimate it.

We must not take our constitutional form of government or our free enterprise system for granted.

Neither fall into the category of something that can be locked in a safe deposit box and kept forever secure. Each generation must be prepared to make the necessary sacrifices to maintain them that our Founding Fathers were prepared to make in the first instance.

Other nations have been or now are larger in land area, in population and in natural resources. Yet they have not been able to give to their people the freedom and the standard of living Americans have enjoyed.

As important as is the productive capacity of our Nation and its military strength, these are not the factors which alone could preserve our freedom or enable us to maintain a free world of free men. The inner strength of America has not been its great cities, its huge industrial plants, its extended transportation systems or its variety of natural resources as important as these are.

The factors which made America an inspiration to the rest of the world grew out of our Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States and the spiritual values which the founders of our republic recognized and by which they were guided.

We have recognized that there is a higher moral law to which governments are also accountable. We have humbly acknowledged the divine inspiration which has made and preserved us as a nation.

America is still the authentic revolution. The flame of freedom which was struck at Concord and Lexington still is an inspiration to the enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

But it is also an ageless lesson that no outsiders can win independence for a people. They must be willing to pay the price in blood and resources to gain their our freedom.

We do recognize, however, that when freedom is destroyed anywhere a bit of freedom is destroyed everywhere.

We have read of and been inspired by the action of George Washington in kneeling in prayer during the dark days of Valley Forge and of Lincoln seeking divine guidance during the dark days of the Civil War.

The priceless ingredient for our people has been our constitutional form of government which guarantees our religious, personal, and economic freedom.

In my judgment we do a disservice to the Nation and to ourselves when we lose sight of the fact that business profits, wage increases, and other benefits depend upon increases in productivity.

Our objective always should be to increase and put more of our productivity within the reach of more of our people. It should also be to leave sufficient incentive and resources, after taxes, for the people to exercise their freedom of choice in the market place.

Big government with confiscatory taxes can deprive them of that incentive.

Big industry and big labor with monopolistic power can also deprive them of that freedom of choice.

No group in industry or in labor has the right to strangle the economic life of 170 million Americans.

This is too much power for responsible men in business or labor to want, and is far too much for irresponsible ones to be allowed to have.

Our political freedom and bill of rights is closely related to our economic freedom. If one is destroyed the other will not long endure.

In no other political or economic system do the people have a greater freedom of choice.

The monopolistic power of business was checked by our antitrust statutes. That of the labor unions in recent years has been unrestrained. The power of the labor boss over the rank-and-file member has in many cases become tyrannical and unchecked.

The tragic and sordid revelations of the Senate's select committee, under the chairmanship of Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, with its uncontested evidence of widespread corruption, arrogance, and abuses in the operations of the unions investigated to date, have, in my judgment, not only shocked the working men and women who make up the membership of organized unions but also the American people throughout the Nation.

The American worker believes in our constitutional guaranties for our citizens. Why then does he tolerate the dictatorship and corruption in some of his unions.

The only reason, in my judgment, is because he does not have the tools to clean house.

How bad has corruption become? Let me quote from two well-known Americans. On Sunday, December 8, 1957, in New York, Francis Cardinal Spellman said:

"Daily we learn the sordid details of corruption and violence featured by newspaper, radio, and television. The close association of some union leaders with known criminals, the creation of dummy locals, the rigging of elections, extortion, acid throwing, graft, and the misuse of union funds—these blatant violations of the trust of their fellow

workers make all of us who are friends of labor feel shame and indignation.

"But we must do more than be shocked or feel morally aggrevied. We must act, and, while there is still time, remove from power unscrupulous leaders and their underworld hirelings."

Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN stated the situation as he found it in the following words:

"We have had ample evidence in our hearings of intimidation and victimizing of rank-and-file members by hoodlum control of some of the unions. The hearings have also revealed raids and plundering of union treasuries, violence against workers themselves, as well as instances of violence against management. The continuation of our work will, we are confident, result in legislation of benefit to the country and to the 17,385,000 working people in the United States who are members of unions."

The Interim Report of the select committee on Improper Activities in the Labor-Management Field stated:

"As an overall finding from the testimony produced at our hearings, the committee has uncovered the shocking fact that union funds in excess of $10 million were either stolen, embezzled, or misused by union officials over a period of 15 years, for their own financial gain or the gain of their friends and associates."

I believe in and unqualifiedly support:

1. The right every American worker to join a union.

2. The right of collective bargaining.

These rights are now and will continue to be protected by law.

The right of every union member to have a free voice in the administration and activities of his or her union is a vital civil right of the first magnitude. If the union does not act in the best interests of the membership, the individual should be able to express his dissent without fear of coercion of retaliation.

I have introduced legislation in the Senate, and support similar legislation in California, which will guarantee democratic control by union members over the officers and activities of their respective unions. This legislation does the following:

1. Guarantees the election of union officials by secret ballot and assures that the ballots cast are those that are counted.

2. Provides for the recall of union officials who misuse their positions of trust and responsibility.

3. Prevents conspiracies between management and union officials that work against the welfare of union members.

4. Protects union members' welfare and pension programs.

5. Requires that where unions are permitted, under law, to represent all employees in an industry or plant, all employees must be admitted into the union if they should desire union membership.

6. Provides that union members shall have a voice in the conditions, terms, and duration of strikes.

7. Prevents arbitrary control over local unions by trustees appointed by national or international unions.

8. Provides for regulation by union members of the actions of their unions on questions of excessive union fees, or assessments.

It is necessary, I believe, to raise the issue of a worker's bill of rights at this time in our Nation's history. It is important to the worker and to the public.

This is not a partisan issue. I have great faith in the ability of the citizens of this Nation to independently see the difference between truth and falsehood.

The stake which 170 million Americans have in democratically conducted unions is a large one.

One hundred and seventy million Americans also have a vital interest in American agriculture throughout the Nation. These farm facts are pertinent:

Income per person on farms last year was highest on record—up 2 percent over 1951, the previous high year.

Farm assets are an alltime high—$188 billion as of January 1, 1958.

Farmers have less than $11 in debts for each $100 of assets. In 1940, the ratio was $19 for each $100.

Owner equities rose 7 percent during 1957 to a peak of $168.4 billion.

Farm ownership is also at a record high. Only 1 in 3 farms has a mortgage.

Not long ago there was a lot of carping criticism of our Secretary of Agriculture.

As for me I have respect and high regard for the ability, courage, and integrity of Ezra Benson.

As a Californian, I have an added interest in agriculture and its future. We are now the leading agricultural State in the Union.

Our farmers produce nearly all of the Nation's almonds, dried figs, olives, and artichokes. California contributes to the country's market basket more than 90 percent of all apricots, dates, grapes, lemons, plums, dried prunes, walnuts, and brussel sprouts.

California's cash farm income—$2,800 000,000 last year—leads the Nation. In 1 year it exceeds the value of all the gold ever mined in the Golden State.

We rank first in the production of 36 products ranging from alfalfa to turkeys. We slaughter more than 2½ million head of cattle annually—more than any other State in the Union. Each year, more than 1 million miles of food labels are printed for the cans that hold the products of the California farmer.

Yes, we have a great interest in agriculture today and the developments that are in the offing. New horizons are always looming up ahead.

For a long time we have referred to farming as a basic industry. It is basic in the sense that over half of all the raw materials consumed in the United States, including industrial consumption, come from the farm.

But the significant fact about agriculture today is that it is almost impossible to separate farming in the pure sense from the great complex of industries which has sprung up about it.

This relationship works two ways.

First, there are the vast food processing and marketing establishments, the great meatpacking houses and other businesses which are essential links between the farm and the dinner table.

Second, there is a huge bloc of industries which came into being purely to meet the needs of the man on the land. These include the fertilizer industry, the farm machinery manufacturers and even the auto makers, for farmers are heavy purchasers of trucks. Also in this group is the vital feed industry.

This country has never been faced with famine. Perhaps that is the reason why the true state of affairs in agriculture has not been fully appreciated by the public.

United States farmers always have produced in sufficient quantities to keep our growing population well fed.

We have acknowledged only casually that unless scientific progress is stepped up our food producers might 1 day be unable to grow enough for all.

When you attempt to predict the future you deal in tricky stuff. Before World War II, for example, some experts estimated that the United States population would level off at around 165 million after 1975. This figure was exceeded in 1955 and the estimate for 1975 has now been increased to 225 million.

There are risks in making any kind of forecast. But it seems reasonable to estimate that in order to feed that many additional mouths we will have to increase the present rate of production by a least one-third.

If I were to choose one phrase to describe modern agricultural progress, I would pick the agri-dynamics age. If you will look at the record, you will see why it fits so well.

In 1956, production of all crops in this country was about 50 percent above that of 25 years earlier. The dirt farmer of today produces enough for 21 persons. In 1940, he grew enough for somewhat less than 11 persons.

This production miracle stems from advancement on many fronts.

The results reflect tremendous increases in the mechanization of farms, in rural electrification and in marketing methods.

They also reflect advances in the breeding of livestock and poultry, improved control of insert and plant pests and development of better seeds and improved varieties of crops.

The feed industry has been quick to grasp the significance of this scientific revolution in agriculture over the past 50 years. Indeed, it has served as a bridge between scientific advance and the men in the feedlot and the poultry house.

In this sort of progress the consumer has as much at stake as the farmer. It is developments of this kind that help to keep production costs in line.

Few, if any, of us expect the forward surge in agriculture to slow down. Thirty years ago we knew little or nothing about improved fertilizers, antibiotics, better feeds, seeds, and breeds. As Secretary of Agriculture Benson puts it:

"Today the laboratory is as much a part of American agriculture as the barnyard."

Every time the sun rises we have an additional 7,000 mouths to feed. Very soon it is expected that each farmer will produce enough for 25 persons instead of 21. It is highly unlikely that scientific progress will stop there.

You all know that for many years fewer and fewer people have been needed on our farms to meet our constantly growing demands for food.

Today the farm population is only 20 million—less than 12 percent of the total population of the United States. In 1940 we needed 30 million farmworkers, more than 23 percent of the population at that time, to keep us well fed.

Some view this as an indication that the so-called family farm is on the way out.

Actually, our family farms have been developing into larger, more economical units. About 96 percent of all farms and ranches are still family affairs. This is about the same ratio as existed 30 years ago.

It is perfectly sound to speculate that scientific progress to date has merely laid a firm base upon which the family farmer may build toward greater security in the future.

But the farmer himself is not in a position to do the research which will assure his future progress. Historically, this has been done by the land grant colleges and the Federal Government, and now much is being done by private industries associated with agriculture.

The three-way partnership should be continued and strengthened. The outlook is that industry most likely will—and indeed it should—assume an increasingly important role in research.

New acreages that can be drained or irrigated are relatively small when compared with present productive areas. Our cities, towns and industries are expanding outward and eliminating many farms, orchards and ranches. For our future needs our researchers must find new ways to improve production per acre and per animal unit.

This is an area in which the feed industry is particularly well versed. Just one illustration: As late as 1947 it took an average of more than 4 pounds of feed to put a

pound of gain on a broiler chicken. Last year the average was down to a little more than 3 pounds of feed per pound of gain. I am told that prospects are good for reducing the average to a pound of gain on 2 pounds of feed in the near future. In fact, many of the better producers already are doing just that.

Similarly great strides have been made in the production of hogs, sheep and other livestock and in boosting output of milk and eggs. Work with beef cattle and sheep now promises advances commensurate with those in other lines. In every instance, animals are being made to put on more weight on less feed. All species now reach market weights in much shorter periods of time than they once did.

Still, one of the greatest needs for more agricultural research lies right in this area. There must be a continuing drive to keep production costs under control.

Industry as a whole is fully alert to the fruits of research. The fact is, it has no choice except to climb on the research bandwagon. Our economic history clearly shows that companies or industries which do not foster a vigorous research program sooner or later expires or declines to a place of minor importance.

There remain vast fields ripe for exploration.

Intriguing opportunities challenge those who would find new uses for food and fiber crops, new ways to improve distribution and marketing of agricultural commodities.

Research must tailor foods to consumer tastes. It is as sure as night follows day that consumers will dictate more and more the kinds of food which reach the market and the form in which they are marketed.

Why cannot all of agriculture cooperate in giving the man in the street a complete concept of the industry and its problems?

Organized labor and consumers as a whole must be shown that they, as well as the farmer, have a vital interest in maintaining a sound base under agriculture. They spend 25 percent of their incomes for food, much more than for any other family necessity.

Consumers must be made aware that farmers have been doing a good job. In 10 years prices of foods have gone up a little more than 16 percent. What about rents? The tenant pays 47 percent more today than he did in 1947. What about transportation? The cost is up 42 percent compared with 10 years ago. What about fuel? The cost has risen 47 percent since 1947.

Food is still one of the better buys. Why is it a better buy? In large measure because scientific progress has helped the farmer to keep his production costs in line.

But agriculture's role in keeping the country well fed at reasonable prices is far from being the whole story of the industry's contribution to the total economy. More and more, farm commodities are supplying the raw materials for finished items on the consumer want list. These include plastics, chemicals, new fabrics, and so on.

Ultimately, the natural oils, minerals, and other resources from which many of these products have been made in the past will be depleted. But so long as the land is properly cared for, it will go on producing crops year after year. Agriculture, therefore, will assume much greater importance in the future as a supplier of raw materials to other industries.

This brings up another point. Few of us have taken time to consider the sweeping changes in production patterns which are altering the whole complexion of agriculture in this country.

The Corn Belt is expanding from the Midwest to the South. Livestock production is now so dispersed that both the South and the Far West are important factors in the beef industry.

How about cotton? California last year produced 75,000 bales more on 716,000 acres than did Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina and Tennessee combined on 1,908,000 acres.

Irrigation helped to make the difference, but efficient and progressive production plans were an important influence, too.

Simultaneously, sweeping social changes have been taking place. Rural life today has been accurately described as city life widespread.

Farm people have come a long way toward attaining many of the facilities, comforts and conveniences that city dwellers long have taken for granted. They spend many billions each year for consumer goods. Agriculture is a great stimulus to other industries.

It brings you up short to realize that 10 million full-time jobs are provided just in the the marketing phases of agricultural products. Another 6 million persons are employed in plants which make materials and supplies for farmers' use.

In terms of dollars, agricultural producers spend $12 to $13 billion each year for production goods and services, and that does not count consumer items.

These facts make the point that agriculture, in its broadest sense, is big business. It is larger by far than any other comparable industry. As of last January 1, farm assets alone were at an alltime high of $188 billion.

With America's traditional respect for bigness per se, it is unthinkable that we can any longer deny an industry of this size the recognition it deserves.

Agriculture must, and will, attain coequal status in our economic structure. Industries associated with the agricultural complex must assume a full measure of responsibility in bringing this about.

This means that concrete action must be taken in at least four directions:

1. To find the best possible solution to the problem of surpluses—through improved nutritional standards, to develop new industrial uses for products, and to fully exploit modern marketing methods.

2. To tell agriculture's story so that consumers recognize the broad area of common interest.

3. To recruit an adequate supply of young brainpower capable of staffing the infinite and expanding variety of jobs throughout agriculture.

4. To foster to the greatest extent possible research, both basic and applied, which will give agriculture the tools it needs to keep the country well fed at reasonable cost.

Future careers in agricultural research will be particularly rewarding. One reason why this is so is that agriculture is the one major field, other than medicine, where it is possible to work almost exclusively with living things—to improve upon nature.

Atomic radiation already is being applied in fundamental research with plants and anmals. It can provide us with new and better information on such subjects as how and when to apply fertilizer, or how to further improve livestock and poultry nutrition.

The business end of agriculture must come alive to the intriguing opportunities for improving the preservation and marketing of foods.

For example, milk is still packaged and delivered to the door in much the same way that it was 50 years ago.

As a result of improved refrigeration and transportation, every part of the country now enjoys highly perishable fruits and vegetables the year around.

But billions of dollars' worth of these foods are still lost through spoilage between the truck farm and the dinner table.

The cosmetics industry long ago realized that attractive packaging was a great stimulus to sales. Agricultural processors have made a start toward applying these sales aids to the food field, but the opportunities are still almost limitless.

By using modern merchandising concepts, it is possible to tap hitherto unreachable markets and to stimulate impulse buying. In many parts of the country, machines installed in schools and industrial plants have made large dents in local milk surpluses.

These examples give only a sketchy hint of the broad areas in which leaders throughout agriculture must be up and doing. Legislative fiat alone will never solve all of agriculture's problems.

Agriculture has become big and diverse. The component parts naturally have interests of their own, but they also have some things in common. Advance of the well-being of the industry as a whole is the concern of all.

Again I say, this is no time to sell America short.

We have great problems but also great opportunities.

If we of this generation only use the same courage and commonsense as motivated the men who sat at Philadelphia and with what I believe was divine inspiration, gave us our Declaration of Independence and Constitution of the United States, there are none of our domestic problems we cannot solve and there is no foreign foe we need ever fear.

Departure of Ambassador Mehta of India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have already had occasion to mention on the Senate floor the departure from Washington of Mr. G. L. Mehta of India. There have been many comments in the public press concerning Mr. Mehta's achievements here.

An editorial in the New York Times of April 27, 1958, was entitled "Farewell to An Envoy." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The well-known correspondent of the Manchester Guardian, Mr. Max Freedman, wrote a tribute in his newspaper on April 24, 1958, entitled "The Achievement of Mr. Mehta." I ask unanimous consent that the article, too, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 27, 1958]

FAREWELL TO AN ENVOY

Ambassadors, even in these days of instantaneous communication and jet plane travel, still play important roles for good or bad in international affairs. India has been fortunate in her Ambassadors to Washington as the United States has in its envoys to New Delhi.

A notable Ambassador from India, Gaganvihari L. Mehta, is now ending a mission that started on September 25, 1952, when he presented his credentials to President Truman. This has not been an easy period for an Indian envoy. Prime Minister Nehru's efforts to strike an attitude of independence between West and East and to treat both sides in the cold war with equality has sometimes looked from this end like Russia being treated with more equality than the United States. However, Mr. Nehru is recognized for what he always was—a bulwark for democ-

racy and freedom in south Asia. For this the Ambassadors both in Washington and New Delhi deserve thanks.

Where Ambassador Mehta probably was of greatest service to his country was in the fields of economics and finance. He is an expert in these subjects, having come from the business and financial worlds, not from a career service. The first 5-year plan was under way when Mr. Mehta came here, and now the preparations are completed for a new and ambitious program. This has been well explained to Americans, and the help being extended is generous and could be even more so.

G. L. Mehta leaves his successor a task made easier by the fund of good will and understanding he built up here during the last 5½ years. Americans see him go with regret and wish him new triumphs in his native land.

[From the Manchester Guardian of April 24, 1958]

THE ACHIEVEMENT OF MR. MEHTA

(By Max Freedman)

WASHINGTON, April 22.—The departure of an Ambassador from Washington rarely calls for public comment beyond a graceful little tribute to his personal qualities: But there are special circumstances which give Ambassador Mehta of India what it is perhaps not excessive to describe as a unique position in the Washington scene during the first few years of India's independence. A number of Ambassadors came and went like embarrassed phantoms. For the last 5 years all this has changed, as Mr. Mehta has represented the Government and people of India with unwearied tact and heroic devotion.

No country was ever welcomed to nationhood with more acclaim by the American people than was India as she began her inheritance of freedom after the end of British rule, never so noble as in the manner of its surrender. But this country soon learned that India had no intention of basing her policy on debts of gratitude. India's course might be baffling or inconsistent, but it was resolute and independent. The initial spasm of irritation had passed long before Mr. Mehta arrived in Washington. Everyone knew that India's support on critical issues had to be won by the merits of American policy. It could not be taken for granted, nor exacted as an inevitable tribute to the wisdom of Washington. Still more important, there has slowly developed a recognition that India and America can differ in dignity without blemishing their covenant of friendship. Many influences were at work to produce this result, but the constant wisdom of Mr. Mehta will never be omitted from the final account.

In all essentials Mr. Mehta displayed a gift for justice and perspective. It is no secret that he was disappointed by America's criticism of India's policy in Kashmir, disturbed by the shipments of arms to Pakistan, and disgusted by the indiscretions over Goa. Yet none of these grievances ever was suffered to interfere with his balanced and detached judgment.

A test case of central importance was presented by the quarrel over segregation in Little Rock. At all times he has been extremely sensitive to questions of discrimination, to the rights of minorities, and to every aspect of the color problem. There were many voices which were telling India and the rest of Asia that Little Rock was a tragedy of racial hatred that shamed the promise of American equality. This surge of prejudice received no sanction from the Indian Ambassador. Alike in Washington and in his reports to New Delhi, he insisted that the importance of Little Rock should be measured not by the truculent defiance of Governor Faubus but by the determination of the Federal Government to protect the rights of Negro children. The State Department has reason to be grateful for the constructive influence of Mr. Mehta's dispatches during a period when prejudice was enthroned in ugly supremacy. Not only India benefited from this wise counsel; through his leadership among other Asian representatives, many other countries in the Far East were better able to know the true challenge and inner meaning of Little Rock. This was a diplomatic service of enduring value.

In recent years the destiny of Asia has been seen to turn in large measure on the race between India and China to raise their living standards. India has chosen the method of freedom, China the way of compulsion. This rivalry has helped India to obtain a more cordial hearing in Washington. The Eisenhower administration has understood after some delay the importance of India's 5-year plans, and has helped to meet her exchange problems. Can there be more impressive proof of India's essential integrity than the way she has treated this rivalry with China? One can think of many Governments which would have used this situation to extort more generous favors from Washington. It would have been easy to apply this pressure, since the hostility of America to China was already profound and implacable. Instead the representatives of India tried at all seasons to make the State Department less suspicious of Chinese policy.

Mr. Mehta has too much respect for human values to defend everything done in Peking's name, but he gradually taught some officials to look upon the Communist revolution in the context of Chinese history instead of as a wild adventure sanctioned by the blundering folly of misguided American officials. He also warned the Americans to move slowly in applying the philosophy of military pacts appropriate in Europe to the very different conditions in Asia. There is no sign as yet of any change in American policy, but in private conversation some officials have shaken off their servitude to ancient dogmas. In this necessary work of tuition and challenge, no one has played a more tactful or more constructive role than has Mr. Mehta.

Within these spacious horizons, he conceived his task with vision and fulfilled it with distinction. Mr. Mehta's departure weakens the diplomatic traditions of Washington. He leaves an exacting and exalted standard for his successor to sustain.

The Mellon Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President for many years the Mellon Institute has been recognized for its development of new products and processes. It has been in the forefront in scientific discovery. The institute under the leadership of Gen. Matthew B. Ridgeway is now entering new fields. This is being discussed in an article in the Pittsburgh Press and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG GUNS TRAINED ON STEEL BY MELLON INSTITUTE—RIDGEWAY MAPS NEW 3-POINT PROGRAM HERE

(By Edwin Beachler)

Mellon Institute is training its big research guns on replenishing the storehouse of knowledge in iron and steel.

An accelerated discovery program in metals, both fundamental and applied research, was announced yesterday in the 45th annual report by Gen. Matthew B. Ridgeway, chairman of the board.

The famed Oakland science center, long a pacesetter in developing new processes and products, now is aiming at basic research in corrosion mechanisms, high-temperature alloys, liquid metal studies, magnetic materials and phase transformations.

Fundamental research also will be expanded in physical chemistry, chemical physics, inorganic and organic chemistry, solid-state investigations, polymer chemistry and physics, radiation, biophysics and biochemistry.

This course, advocated by the 1958 Parliament of Science to step up scientific development in the Nation, has been in the planning stage for 5 years and reaffirms the institute's original purpose of research for the benefit of mankind.

Thus, Mellon Institute propels itself to the forefront in the race for scientific discovery and reinforces Pittsburgh's position as a leading research center.

During the year ending February 28, covered in the report to the trustees, the Oakland institution reorganized its structure to point its principal investigations toward long-range fundamental research. The primary objective is to free the creative research scientists from administrative demands while providing the most in service facilities.

"Although it is the aim eventually to direct the main efforts along the lines of fundamental scientific research," General Ridgway stressed, "there is no intention to depart from the field of applied research."

A healthy collaboration between the two will be fostered.

Under the new setup, there are three divisions—all of which report to Chairman Ridgeway.

Research, under Dr. P. J. Flory; administration, directed by G. A. Webb; and finance, handled by Comptroller H. C. Davies.

The board of trustees, acting at times through an executive committee, sets the policies. Two advisory groups make recommendations to the board. One is an inside board of scientists and the other is the Robert Kennedy Duncan Advisory Council. The latter is a group of scientists with interests and activities outside the institute. The members are selected annually from the RKD Club composed of Mellon employees.

Highlights of the past year in fundamental research, which Dr. W. A. Hamor, senior director of research, describes as the "armor of applied science," included:

Two studies in the physics of metals and the reactions that take place between metals and substances dissolved or in contact with them.

A new molecular-spectroscopy lab to study molecular interactions in solids and learn more about the structure of excited electronic states of small molecules.

A joint project with Pitt Medical School to develop procedures to detect corrosion of metal inserts in repairing bone fractures.

New research program in radiation chemistry and radio chemistry installed along with Cobalt bomb and Van de Graaff accelerator.

This program will be expanded and shifted to the Bushy Run Radiation Research Laboratories, now being built on a 230-acre campus 23 miles east on Route 22 in Westmoreland County near Murrysville.

The 18,000-square-foot radiation-research building is to be finished by August. Along with the cobalt bomb, Van de Graaff accelerator, it will house a mass spectrometer, radiochemical, and isotope work.

On the opposite side of a 300-foot mall, structural steel has been erected for the 30,000-square-foot chemical-hygiene building to expand the research of the Union Carbide & Chemical Co. fellowship. It will be ready in 1959.

During the year, the Oakland research center produced 3 books, 7 bulletins, 55 research papers, 23 articles, and 23 patents. The cost of research was $4,128,504, with 590 members working on fundamental research, in the departments and on 61 fellowships.

The Monahans Sandhills of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the concluding portion of an address delivered by J. Conrad Dunagan, of Monahans, Tex., president of the Monahans Sandhills Park Association, before the Fort Stockton, Tex., Historical Society. I also ask that there be included with Mr. Dunagan's remarks a brief statement by Robert G. Larson, manager of the Monahans Sandhills State Park and director of the Sandhills Museum.

There being no objection, the portion of the address and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. DUNAGAN. I think you might be interested in a few historical notes on the impressions the sandhills made on early-day explorers. The first traveler who kept a fairly complete journal seems to have been Capt. R. B. Marcy. In 1848, Captain Marcy had commanded a military escort from Fort Smith, Ark., to Santa Fe, N. Mex., protecting a party of gold seekers, and he then sought a new return route to the southward.

Dropping down the Rio Grande to Dona Ana, he engaged a local man to supplement Manuel, a Comanche Indian guide he already had, and struck out along the 32d parallel, about where the present Texas-New Mexico boundary line is, until the party came to the Pecos. They followed this river to the southward until they reached a point about 20 miles below the site of the present town of Pecos. There they crossed the river and headed eastward.

The following is an excerpt from Marcy's own report as given in Senate Executive Document No. 64 (31st Cong., 1st sess.), being reports of the Secretary of War, transmitting among others, the reports of Marcy and Michler:

"September 22: This morning we made a march of 9 miles down near the left bank of the river in a direction north 82° east, where we struck a narrow laguna or lake, which we followed for about 2 miles and encamped near the southern extremity. There the soil has been a rich loam, and I have no doubt would prove very productive. There has been a chain of sandhills in sight today, running from north to south across our course, about 20 miles to the east of us (upon the Llano Estacado) in which our guide informs me that there is water, but that we are obliged to pass over a sandy road for some 15 miles to get through them. I have, therefore, determined to remain at this place until I can send ahead and ascertain whether I cannot pass to the south of them.

"September 23: I sent out Lieutenant Sackett, with an escort of dragoons, this morning, to explore the country in the vicinity of the sandhills, and shall remain here until tomorrow evening, by which time I expect to learn the result of his exploration.

"September 24: After filling our water barrels, and giving our animals all they would drink, I made a start this evening at 2 o'clock and traveled 10 miles in a direction nearly perpendicular to the valley of the river. Shortly after we left the laguna, an express from Lieutenant Sackett, informing me that after making a thorough examination of the range of sand for 40 miles south of our course, he was of the opinion that there was no place within that distance where they could be crossed with wagons. The whole surface of the country in that direction seemed to be one continuous succession of white sand hills, from 20 to 100 feet high, in which his horses sunk to their knees at almost every step, from which I infer that the route indicated by our guide is the only one in the vicinity where this formidable obstacle can be passed. I shall, therefore, take a direct course for the pass in the morning, and expect to reach the hills during the day.

"September 25: We reached the sandhills this afternoon about 2 o'clock, over a good level road, except about 4 miles near here which is sandy, making the distance from the Pecos 23.4 miles. There is a great abundance of good water at several places in the sandhills, but it is necessary to drive the animals to it as it is half mile from the road and wagons cannot pass nearer. There is a trail leading to the water from where the road strikes the hills. These hills, or mounds present a most singular and anomalous feature in the geology of the prairies. They extend (so far as we have explored) at least nearly 50 miles in a north and south direction, and from 5 to 10 miles east and west; they are white drift sand thrown up with much uniformity into a multitude of conical hills, destitute of trees, soil, or herbage.

"In the following up the trail from our road into the midst of this ocean of sand, we suddenly came upon several large, deep pools of clear water—the very last place on earth where one would ever think of looking for it. We are told by our guide that water can always be found here in the dryest season, and judging from the rushes and other water plants growing in the ponds, I have no doubt that such is the case.

"September 26: As we have a long march before us still, and as the road through the hills is sandy, I have concluded to double teams today, and send one-half of the wagons to the last watering place, 5 miles from here; and take up the remainder tomorrow.

"September 27: We moved up today with the wagons we left behind yesterday, and found water at this place equally as good as the other. Although there are but two particular points at which trails lead from the road to water in the hills, yet it can be found almost anywhere between the two points by going about half a mile to the east of the road, among the highest hills.

"September 28: 8 miles of sandy road which we passed over today brought us to the hard prairie today. Thus the entire distance from where we first encountered the sand to this place is about 17 miles; but only about one-half that distance is bad, and this not worse than some parts of the road on the Rio Grande. There is good grass near the hills, and sufficient wood for fuel."

(NOTE.—Three months after Marcy traversed the sandhills, Lieutenant Michler, Jr., traveled Marcy's route in a reverse direction.)

Upon reaching the sandhills, he said, "We found for the first 12 miles, low ridges of sand, running parallel to each other, plains of the same kind interspersed between them with small hillocks. The sand here was of a black color. Then came the white sandhills which are really an object of curiosity. They are perfect minature Alps of sand—the latter perfectly white and clean; in the midst of them you see summit after summit spreading out in every direction, not a sign of vegetation upon them, nothing but sand piled upon sand. They form a belt 2 or 3 miles in width, and extend many miles in a northwest direction. But a matter of the greatest surprise is to find large waterholes among them; they are found in the base of the hills, are large, deep, and contain most excellent water, cool, clear, and pleasant. The water is permanent."

The next early-day explorer of whom we know who wrote of the hills was Capt. John Pope, who passed this way in 1854, and whose account is contained in a paper called "Report of Explorations and Surveys To Ascertain the Most Practicable and Economical Route for a Railroad From the Mississippi River to the Pacific Ocean, being House Executive Document No. 91, 33d Congress, 2d session, volume II, page 70:

"Camp No. 24, Friday, March 24, 1854: Left last camp at 20 minutes past 6 o'clock a. m., and moved in the direction of the trail discovered yesterday (probably Marcy's). We struck our road at the emigrant crossing about 9 o'clock a. m., distance from camp upward of 4 miles. This is an extremely bad crossing; our oxen swam for upward of 30 feet to the opposite bank. It would be utterly impossible for wagons to cross without rafting. It cannot for a moment compare with the crossing of the Pecos (mouth of Delaware Creek), the former presenting many difficulties—soft bottom, deep stream, and on the east side miry banks. The latter affords many facilities, and is strongly recommended to emigrants. We halted here to water, which had to be done with buckets. As we will not reach water until we strike the sandhills our kegs were filled. We are now upon the long-desired trail.

"Camp No. 25, Saturday, March 25, 1854: Left last camp at 20 minutes after 6 o'clock a. m., an moved in the direction of the sandhills. Our road today, for 9 miles, was over a level prairie; the road for this distance was excellent. Before reaching the hills we had nearly 7 miles of bad, sandy road. We could perceive them at a distance of 12 miles, stretching away as far as the eye could reach. For 2 miles, before camping, we passed around their western base. We arrived in camp at 20 minutes after 2 o'clock p. m. These hills present a curious and interesting formation. They extend about 50 miles from north to south, and 15 miles east to west. They consist of white drift sand, thrown up into innumerable conical mounds, totally destitute of all vegetation. One would suppose that this region of sand is the last place where water could be expected; yet, however incredible as it may seem, there is an abundance of water in these hills, contained in basins of the finest sand. When amongst the hills, one would suppose that there had been a heavy fall of snow. Our camp was about a quarter of a mile from water. The animals were driven up to water, sinking to their knees in the sand. The team mules were fed with corn; six animals picketed in camp for the purpose previously mentioned.

"The soil for 10 miles from the Pecos was good, with plenty of prairie grass and mesquite root. As we near the hills these become scarce. At camp we had some brush. The grass was very poor and scanty. The weather

changed suddenly to cold with a high wind. A slight rain fell during the night.

"Our camp is 31.2 miles from the emigrant crossing the the Rio Pecos. No observations taken during the day. Heavens cloudy at night. General direction north 7°30' east; miles 16.4.

"Camp No. 26, Sunday, March 26, 1854: Left camp 20 minutes to 7 o'clock a. m., and proceeded in the direction of the next watering place in the sandhills, 5 miles distant from camp. There is a well-marked trail here leading to the water, which can be obtained, however, at any point in the hills by driving the animals about half a mile from the road. The mules and stock were watered and turned loose to graze some time. We passed from last camp from northeast to southwest in arriving at this point, over a deep, sandy road, which was very trying to the animals. From the great quantity of fragments of abandoned wagons, this place has evidently been a general camping ground.

"Having halted an hour and a half, the command started. The remainder of our route for this day was over a very fine and deep sand; we encountered many steep hills of the same nature. There could not, indeed, be a worse road, as was sufficiently evident from the exhausted condition of our animals. We fortunately overcame all the difficulties of this miserable road without doubling teams or meeting with any accident. As we did not expect to reach water until the following day, all the casks were filled at the above halting place. The grass is poor and scarce; there is no wood, although we found vegetation on this arid and sandy plain.

"From the point where we first struck the sandhills, we proceeded along their western base and crossed the main ridge of sand at the lowest apparent point. At 5 miles across we came to the last known watering place to the eastward. In this direction we passed over many ridges of deep sand separated by valley of the same character. They are in reality impassable for heavy wagons. From the above point to the hard prairie east of the sandhills, a distance of 13 miles, we continued to cross deep sandy ridges, with intervening bottoms of a similar description, totally destitute of vegetation. From the Pecos River to the level prairie east of the sandhills, the road passed through about 30 miles of the heaviest sand. It is the worst road to be found in New Mexico, on the Rio Grande, or indeed anywhere else. It cannot be too strongly urged on emigrant parties never to attempt traveling by this route, except in the rainy season from August to the middle of October, as the distance without water from the sandhills to the first permanent water to the eastward is 67 miles, 13 of which (immediately to the eastward of the hills) are through sand so deep and heavy as to be absolutely impassable to heavy-laden teams. With animals perfectly fresh, and lightly loaded wagons, it required all our exertions to overcome the difficulties of this dreadful road. It is also to be observed that our animals were in fine order, with 8 and 10 mules to each wagon."

This apparent contradiction between Pope's appraisal of the difficulties of crossing the sand and Marcy's appraisal, may have been caused by a slightly different routing, difference in equipment, or merely a difference in the subjective attitude of the two men.

I'd like to read you one more impression by an early traveler as recorded by Mody C. Boatright, in a West Texas Historical and Scientific Society Bulletin:

"One oldtimer relates that in the early days he was traveling on horseback from El Paso del Norte to the settlements further east taking the route afterward followed by the Texas and Pacific Railroad.

"One night he found himself overtaken by dark near where the town of Monahans is now. He unsaddled his trusty mount, as was his custom, and tied him to a small cottonwood tree, the only shrub available. Using his saddle blanket for a bed and his saddle as a pillow the traveler was soon lulled into a sound sleep by the melodious music of the coyotes and the haunting harmonies of the panthers and the lobos.

"He slept peacefully until morning, when he awoke to find himself near an immense cottonwood tree. His horse was nowhere in sight. The beast, however, was an animal of unusual intelligence, whom he always called by name, and addressed as an equal.

"He called, 'Frijole, where are you?'

"A pathetic neigh came from among the leaves of the cottonwood, and looking up into the branches, he saw poor Frijole suspended and almost choked to death.

"The explanation dawned upon him instantly. He had tied the animal on top of a sand dune. During the night the wind had arisen, the sand had shifted, and what had appeared in the evening to be a small shrub had turned out to be a tree so large that the lariat was not long enough to let the horse over halfway to the ground.

"With great presence of mind the traveler whipped out his six-shooter, severed the rope, and released poor Frijole just in time to save his life.

"After the horse had 'blowed' for awhile, he was none the worse for his experience, and the traveler continued on his way. As the day advanced, the sandstorm increased in intensity, and it was only by tying huge rocks to the saddlehorn that the equestrian could keep his horse on the ground. As he rode through the drifting sand, however, his own misfortunes were mitigated somewhat by the deep sympathy which he felt for the prairie dogs, many of whom he observed as high as 10 feet in the air, digging with all their might in a vain effort to regain their holes."

And now I would like to introduce to you the man whom we found after a search of the whole country. He was selected from a field of thirty-odd applicants to be manager of our park and director of our museum. We had applications from literally every section of the Nation—from New England to Florida—from Washington to southern California and every region in between. He is a talented painter—having studied at the Layton School of Art, and served as staff artist for the Milwaukee Public Museum, under Keith Gebhardt, art director, during the time when that institution was emerging as one of the most progressive museums in the country. He has successfully created and operated his own small business for 7 years in Minnesota's northern vacation country. He returned to creative work as staff artist for the Missouri Resources Museum at Jefferson City, and from there he came to us.

He is also a talented photographer, and he has taken a number of exquisite colored slides of the sand and ski in their many moods. He has something to say to you and something to show you. I am glad to present to you Mr. Robert G. Larson, manager of the Monahans Sandhills State Park and director of the Sandhills Museum:

Mr. LARSON: Mr. Chairman, members of the FSHS, guests, since first being informed of the Sandhills Park plan, it represented an exciting adventure in cultural development with unlimited possibilities. I believed then, as I do now, that our project at Sandhills Park will become a great asset to this area of west Texas.

All across our Nation there is a need for cultural institutions geared to general public appeal. These institutions should fulfill the recreational and cultural appetites of the greatest number of responsive people. When people are allowed these cultural and recreational satisfactions it has a great civilizing effect.

Some people have never been afforded an opportunity to know this better side of life. What is never known and appreciated cannot be passed on to the youngsters. This failure leaves a great number of children wholly without concern or appreciation for the arts and sciences.

These notions of the cultural world should be fostered as early as possible in the young minds, and quite certainly the youngsters will develop an acceptance and admiration for the finer pursuits during their life span.

The modern museum has every opportunity to aid in awakening the youngsters and the whole public to a wonderful world around them, both past and present.

If an institution such as the Sandhills Museum is to be a means of introducing the cultural life of the area and exhibiting the products of that life, its facilities, and exhibits must be designed to carry the message clearly, precisely, and, above all, in a manner that will be interesting, colorful, and understandable.

In developing Sandhills State Park proper we are convinced of this. If it is to function as a first-rate recreation center it must be built on a foundation of sound ideals carried to realization through a program of creative action.

Whatever and whenever it is possible I hope we may be able to build installations in Sandhills State Park that wil be a source of pride to every visitor.

To achieve these lofty goals we will face many difficult hours of negotiations and painstaking work, both in the park and in the museum.

In the past months we have built exhibit equipment that has enabled us to make a start in the direction of a dynamic program of changing exhibits which will include, as time permits, paintings, drawings, sculpture, architecture, and many of the crafts.

We are working at this time on the more complex problem of setting up our historical exhibit which will be permanently housed in the east end of the museum. This hall will eventually show and explain the gargantuan effort man has made in settling and developing this west Texas area.

Though we will begin with a number of temporary exhibits based on objects we have borrowed from other institutions, we hope eventually to cover thoroughly a period dating back to the Stone Age Indian of the lower Pecos River up through the Spanish era, the buffalo hunters, Indian fighters, trail drivers, ranchers, railroaders, irrigators, and, finally, the modern oil industry.

The accomplishment of this outlined show will represent must time and effort, but I feel confident that Sandhills Park and Museum will grow in beauty, prominence, and importance as time passes.

Milwaukee and Transcontinental and Intercontinental Air Travel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a number of welcome decisions by the Civil Aeronautics Board now confirm the fact that the great air center of Milwaukee will undoubtedly prove to be the most important air terminal in central United States, second only to Chicago.

Wisconsin's largest city is now among the top 25 cities in the United States so far as number of air passengers is concerned; a position in keeping with the

tremendous industrial growth of the city, with its metropolitan population of 1.1 million.

By way of illustrating the type of decision which is helping Milwaukee achieve its place in the sun, I cite the fact that the CAB is now in the process of reviewing a 131-page initial decision filed by an examiner which will rightfully help assure direct flights from Milwaukee to the Southeast, without stops at the Chicago bottleneck.

Not only is Milwaukee a great national and international air center, but it continues to grow as a port on the St. Lawrence seaway, and to be a great railroad, bus, and truck center, as well. It is a convention capital, a tourist center, and a gateway to the wonderful vacationing of the northern lake country.

An article in the business section of the May 11 Milwaukee Journal confirmed these facts. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of May 11, 1958]

TRANSPORT ROUTES LINK US TO GLOBE'S FARTHEST POINTS—RAILROADS, AIR AND SHIPPING LINES, BUS AND TRUCK SYSTEMS MOVE PASSENGERS AND FREIGHT; NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION WEEK BEING OBSERVED HERE

(By Emil Schneider)

Almost every country in the world, including several behind the Iron Curtain, can be reached from Milwaukee via transportation facilities represented here.

Although Milwaukee may not be a transportation hub such as Chicago or New York, it still has a considerable representation of railroads, trucking firms, airlines, bus firms, and steamship lines to carry both passengers and freight about the globe.

The city's transportation facilities line up like this:

Six railroads directly serving Milwaukee and 35 other lines with offices here.

Some 75 common-carrier trucking firms plus private trucking operations and numerous truck lines not serving the city directly but maintaining representation here.

Six airlines flying in and out of the city daily, and six others, including four foreign-operated lines, with operations here.

Thirty-five Great Lakes steamship lines, 25 regular overseas services, 2 car ferries, and 1 barge line.

Four bus lines headed by the nationwide Greyhound system.

EXHIBIT THE MODES

All of these agencies are combining to celebrate National Transportation Week this week. Exhibits of various modes of travel by land, sea, and air have been set up around Milwaukee to point up the available facilities here.

Railroad coverage is extensive. The 6 lines directly serving the city spread out to 22 of the 48 States, and the off-line roads represented here cover all but 2 of the remaining States. Connections with other railroads, of course, will cover the 2 left-out States—Connecticut and Rhode Island.

Of the city's two major railroads, the Milwaukee road links Milwaukee with Chicago, and westward through Omaha to Los Angeles and San Francisco or across the Pacific Northwest to Seattle, while the North Western road, also connecting with Chicago and Omaha, runs as far west as Lander, Wyo., where, reportedly, there is "some mighty fine trout fishin'" out behind the depot.

MOST IS FREIGHT

The North Shore line is generally a commuter run between here and Chicago, and the Soo Line, which comes into Milwaukee via Milwaukee road tracks, links the city with points in the northwestern section of the State.

The other 2 railroads that directly serve Milwaukee—the Chesapeake & Ohio and the Grand Trunk & Western—actually come into the city by water. They operate the two car ferry systems from Milwaukee across Lake Michigan to Ludington (C. & O.) and Muskegon (Grand Trunk).

Although all but 2 of the 41 railroads directly and indirectly serving the city offer passenger service, the bulk of their business here is freight, hauling the raw materials and finished products of Milwaukee's heavy capital goods industries and commercial enterprises.

Actively competing for these freight dollars are the multitude of trucking firms that operate here, rolling over the Nation's highways—and back roads—to deliver their cargoes of "you name it, we'll haul it."

ONE THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED FLY DAILY

Although the trucking industry generally relinquishes the hauling of the heavier, bulkier items to the railroads, occasionally a piece of machinery is so large and cumbersome—too big to pass under a railroad trestle, for example—that the railroads turn it back to the trucks—special trucks designed for heavy hauling to travel where the bridges are not.

By bus, Milwaukeeans can travel to east or west coasts, to the Canadian border or the Rio Grande.

But the romance of far-away places in overseas lands lies with the airlines and ships.

The 6 airlines flying into Milwaukee carry 1,800 passengers a day, as well as freight and air express, in and out of General Mitchell Field to 41 States and 8 foreign countries.

Northwest Airlines, for example, stretches from coast to coast and west to Honolulu and north to Edmonton and Winnipeg in Canada and on to Alaska and across the polar route to the far east—Japan, China, Korea, and the Philippines. United Air Lines also extends to Hawaii, and American flies south of the border to Mexico.

SEVENTY-FIVE PORTS ACCESSIBLE

Flying Tiger Lines, an air-freight-only operation, currently serves Milwaukee by truck from Chicago, although it has said it plans to resume direct flights here in the future.

The "off line" airlines represented here extend around the world. Air France, whose closest American stop is Chicago, reaches more than 215 cities in 76 countries on 5 continents, and KLM Royal Dutch, picked up at New York, Miami, or Houston, stretches to 118 cities in 74 countries.

London, Paris, Berlin, Madrid, Milan, Cairo, Johannesburg, Istanbul, Bangkok, Calcutta, Saigon, Singapore, Hong Kong, Tokyo, Mexico City, Buenos Aires, and Sydney Australia, are on the flight schedules. Also included are cities in several of Russia's eastern European satellite countries—Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia.

Foreign shipping serving Milwaukee also reaches to the far corners of the globe—the Caribbean and South America, Western Europe, and the Scandinavian countries and all of the countries bordering the Mediterranean—from southern Italy and France to ports in North Africa and the Near East. In all, Milwaukee reaches by water to 75 major overseas ports on 4 continents.

The barge line? It links Milwaukee via the Mississippi River with ports along the Gulf of Mexico.

Security Rather Than Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, that Americans have lost much of their initiative is now being discussed by many people. There is now much talk about security rather than opportunity. Too many are interested in getting something for nothing. They forget that America was made by thrift and hard work. The Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph had a fine editorial appearing in their Sunday issue on the subject Something for Nothing. I ask unanimous consent that this be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of May 18, 1958]

SOMETHING FOR NOTHING?

A searching inquiry by Newsweek magazine into the causes of the recession finds widespread the opinion that the American people have lost much of their initiative.

Most of those interviewed in the survey are convinced that people need not and do not work as hard as they once did—and they believe this is a good thing.

Many say salaries are much larger today than 20 years ago but that they can save less.

Others declare high taxes deaden incentive for seeking higher rewards.

Many seem to feel the Government should insure employment, although others express cautious doubts about this.

Nearly all voice desire for security, as though this outweighed almost every other factor.

Some believed that the recession might help to shake the country loose from lethargic acceptance of patterns of mediocrity.

Unfortunately, all these disquieting subjects are present to greater or less degree in the world of 1958.

But the suggestion that they have come to stay or are controlling is something about which there can be a great deal of argument.

The Nation is too young and still possesses too many opportunities to close the door against the power of individual initiative.

Everyone knows that a great many persons are interested in getting something for nothing.

There always have been.

They have been the easy marks for the sharpers since the beginning of time.

The truth is that there is no such thing as something for nothing. Those who learn this truth soonest are those who get ahead in the world, make their own security, and live proudly, with some dignity, until the end of their days.

Moreover poverty is not entirely confined to emptiness of the pocketbook.

Emptiness of the head or the bankruptcy of ideals can represent poverty in its most devastating sense.

There is nothing original in this idea.

Shakespeare expressed it quite clearly when he wrote:

"He who steals my purse steals trash * * * but he who robs me of my good name takes that which naught enricheth him but leaves me poor indeed."

The ideal of America has been equality of opportunity for an individual to succeed, to establish home and reputation, to be recognized for accomplishments.

Such opportunities are present today in more diversified forms than ever in the new world of science.

The frontiers today are those of atomic power, medicine, chemistry, electronics, and their many related branches.

Nor are the doors closed to young men starting in business. The statistics on new business installations attest to that.

The only limit on the individual American in these new business undertakings in whatever field he may select is that his efforts shall be constructive, and shall not take unfair advantage of others who strive with him in competition.

True, taxes are high but where are they lower? Where is there more individual freedom? Isn't it time for the lazy and the downhearted to take a look around them and see whether they have been missing something.

The opportunity for individual initiative is always there, but who is to blame if the individual does not use it?

Poland Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me paying tribute to the people of Poland on the anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It gives me great pleasure to express my sympathy with the captive Polish nation, on the anniversary of the establishment of its famous constitution of 1791, embodying, like our Constitution, the hopes of men of good will that the world was moving slowly but certainly in the direction of freedom for all nations.

Little did the people of that day or the following century dream that the 20th century would give birth to the most cruel and shameful tyranny the world has ever seen.

The memory of Attila the Hun and Ghenghis Khan has come down through the ages, but they were barbarians seeking to lead their hungry people from lands of famine to lands of plenty. What shall we say of our time which has perverted all the intellectual, scientific, economic, and political achievements of the centuries to making tyranny both horrible and successful?

Every bit of knowledge which men have gained in their slow upward climb from barbarism has been used by the Soviet rulers to make a monstrous engine for enslaving all the people within reach of their armies, and chilling with fear and dread all the people within reach of their sleepless propaganda.

No age has ever been confronted with a challenge as great as the Communist marriage of savagery with technology which is dominant for the moment in the world of today.

We shall escape from the fate they plan for us, but we shall not escape until we have grown strong enough and wise enough to use all the economic and political and technical wisdom of our day to bring about a new birth of freedom to regenerate the world.

The Polish nation has the harsh fate of living under the heel of Soviet tyranny, but all the decent nations of the world are as one in being the object of Soviet conquest and the fighters for a new and greater freedom. Poland is the outer frontier of the Soviet Empire. But it is also the front line of the fighters for freedom who must press upon and ultimately destroy the Soviet monster state.

How To Win the Cold War With Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by our former Ambassador to Canada, Mr. James H. R. Cromwell.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO WIN THE COLD WAR WITH RUSSIA

(Address of Hon. James H. R. Cromwell, dinner of the International Services of Information Foundation, Inc., Belvedere Hotel, Baltimore, Md.)

I am sure the facts of life—of military life, I mean—that you have just heard from one of General MacArthur's most trusted officers, have left you with the same feeling of alarm and dismay with which they left me. For my part, I have not felt such a degree of alarm, concerning the welfare and security of our country, and of our GI's, since I delivered the Cassandra-like address in Toronto in 1940, just mentioned by Mr. Cleveland. So, not having sounded an alarm for 17 years, I can contend—with some assurance—that I am not an habitual alarmist.

Today, I am convinced that Secretary Dulles' "agonizing reappraisal" of American foreign policy has overtaken us with a vengeance and that, as was the case in 1940, our Nation has once again come to the crossroads. By crossroads I mean that we must soon decide whether or not to withdraw our GI's from Europe. For the frightening comparison of NATO and Soviet divisions on the European front, just quoted by General Willoughby, conveys only one message to me. That message, to put it bluntly, is that our GI's are caught in a booby trap. And now, let me give you the reasons why I have come to that conclusion.

Seventeen years ago, we volatile Americans were as frantically isolationist as we now appear to be frantically internationalist. And, it seems to me, the circumstances and problems confronting us have changed as completely, within those disastrous two decades, as has our national psychology.

I say disastrous advisedly. For the Communists, within a few years after World War II, added over 750 million souls to their empire of slavery, and they have been—and still are—winning the cold war, hands down. That, you will agree is bad enough, but now we must add to the debit side of our ledger, three vital, fundamental, and alarming facts.

The first fact is that our atomic weapons, which the No. 1 political brain of our century, Winston Churchill, described as "the shield and buckler" of the free world against Communist aggression; our atomic weapons, I say, are now shared by the Soviets. So, we have apparently reached an atomic stalemate, and our shield and buckler has gone with the wind. A wind, let me add, of which the evil genii were spies of the Soviet Comintern in the guise of British, Canadian, and American citizens.

Inasmuch as General Willoughby was trained by the No. 1 military brain of our century, Douglass MacArthur, to deal in facts and not in fancy, I submit that his estimated ratio of 75 Soviet divisions to twenty-odd NATO divisions, adds up to fact No. 2. And fact No. 2, alas, carries with it some extremely disagreeable and far-reaching connotations. As a famed military intelligence expert, General Willoughby cannot deal in connotations. But, since I am not an expert of any kind I can exercise my privilege as a plain citizen of our great democracy and speak freely—about connotations, or anything else. For which we can all thank God and the great wisdom of our Founding Fathers.

The connotation directly deriving from fact No. 2—or shall I state boldly that it is fact No. 2—is that our NATO Allies—those, I mean with the greatest military potential—have lost the will to defend themselves. Apparently they have come to love social welfare more than liberty, for what other interpretation can one apply to national budgets wherein guns give way to butter? To disabuse your minds of any uncertainty on that score, allow me to quote these statistics from the British budget. For armaments: four billion, three hundred-odd million dollars, and declining. For social welfare: four billion, five hundred thirty-odd million dollars, and rising.

Now, unfortunately, facts 1 and 2 add up to fact No. 3, which is the most disagreeable fact of all. For it is the fact I have already mentioned, to wit: That our GI's in Europe are caught in a booby trap. In the good old days of the atomic shield and buckler—and the genesis of NATO—our American Divisions in Europe represented a symbol, and that symbol was the bulwark of freedom behind which the free nations of war-torn Europe could recover and rearm. If the preponderant Red Army dared touch a hair of that old grey head, there would be visited upon them, without hope of retribution, the utter devastation of atomic warfare.

No one could complain about that picture, it made sense, but need I state that today, while the symbol remains, the shield and buckler have vanished, and the free nations of Europe have failed to rearm. We can, furthermore, be certain that the Communists will prefer the risk of external war to internal revolution, and if and when such a Hobson's choice should come to pass in Moscow, and the preponderant Red Army suddenly sweeps across Europe, what then would our choice be?

Would the American people be prepared, either to start a thermonuclear war—and thereby court their own destruction? Or, would they dispatch another vast expeditionary force, composed of the flower of our youth, once again to liberate a Europe that lacked the will to defend itself? Now, I ask you—if that Hobson's choice is not of itself a booby trap, then what is it?

Let me digress for a moment at this point, to state that I am one of those weird and amphibious creatures known as an Eisenhower Democrat, and having campaigned hard for the General, I can scarcely be accused of being prejudiced against his administration or any member of it. Yet, I must voice grave concern and disappointment from my careful reading of the major foreign policy speech of Secretary Dulles of April 22. For, I found therein no slightest indication that the long bankrupt and defeatist spending and appeasement policies of the State Department had changed an iota. Scarcely an iota, I say, to meet the utterly metamorphosed conditions which

General Willoughby and I have described, and with which we are confronted in Europe today.

Grants are henceforth to be called loans, and our free-wheeling and spending bureaucrats are to be given carte blanche for years to come—without recourse to Congress. That is about all, except this, and I quote, "we revere and honor those who as martyrs gave their blood for freedom. But we do not ourselves incite violent revolt. Rather we encourage an evolution to freedom."

In the meantime, as is common knowledge, the Communists are working night and day, with every power at their command, here in America and all over the world, to incite violent revolt against democracy, and to encourage revolution to slavery. Now, may I call your attention to one more fact—the fact that the incredible victories of the Communists since war's end, have been won without a shot having been fired by the mighty Red army. They have been won by subversion, by meticulously planned and perfectly implemented incitement to violent revolt.

Inasmuch as my associates and I are convinced that the reason for Soviet success, as compared to American failure, since the inception of the cold war in 1945, is our unwillingness to fight the Communists with their own subversive weapons, I wish to emphasize the vital difference between the rival policies. And here it is, that very policy which we have failed to pursue—incitement to violent revolt is the means by which the Communists have expanded their empire of slavery by 750 million souls and won their incredible victories. And, let me add, they have won those victories to the tune of the utter frustration of our $40 billion annual bill for armaments, and the $60 billion we have spent on foreign aid since 1945.

Allow me to quote from the announcement of February 11, this year, one of the purposes for the formation of the Citizens' Foreign Relations Committee. I quote:

"We should fight fire with fire. We should abandon the defensive policies of the past. Since war's end, we have been like a boxer in a ring with his hands tied—getting punched and unmercifully beaten by our Red antagonist, but never striking back. To make ourselves perfectly plain, we are talking about volunteer fighters for freedom, and about democratic subversive cells and groups behind the Iron Curtain."

Since that announcement was made, a subcommittee has been formed, under the auspices of the parent committee, to persuade the Congress to organize a liberty legion as a vehicle for the actual enlistment of volunteer soldiers and to coordinate and equip the patriot groups behind the Iron Curtain. Generals Willoughby and Wedemeyer, along with Colonel Amoss and I, presently constitute the nucleus of the new legion subcommittee.

Before launching into a brief exposition of the legion idea, I should like to explain that we of the legion subcommittee, do not believe for a moment that any incitement to violent revolt behind the Iron Curtain is in the least necessary. On the contrary, we believe that the pressures deriving from the failure of communism to function are becoming so intolerable that revolts such as those in East Germany, Poland, and Hungary, are certain to occur with increasing frequency.

In short, our concept of the liberty legion's task would be to aid, equip and organize the enslaved patriots to the end that the kind of leaderless disorganization that engendered the needless slaughter of thousands of the irreplaceable and heroic youth of Hungary, should henceforth be prevented.

It is right at this point that we criticize the policies of our State Department. For we believe that the so-called Kennan thesis of accepting the status quo, which has been completely refuted by the aforesaid violent revolts and unrest behind the Iron Curtain, still remains our underlying policy. And we further believe that the continuance of that hands off policy is largely responsible for the slaughter of the innocents in Hungary.

This occasion in Baltimore has been chosen as the kickoff in our effort to activate and implement the liberty legion idea. So, since I am here to seek your interest, advice and cooperation, please bear with me while I read a letter I wrote to President Truman on March 1, 1951. It still expresses, concisely and with clarity, what our executive subcommittee has in mind. I quote:

"Dear Mr. President: The purpose of this confidential letter is to obtain your support of a project to organize a counterinfiltration and subversive corps to operate chiefly behind the Iron Curtain. Inasmuch as the expansion of Communist power over the past 5 years has taken place without the firing of a shot by the great Red army, the success of the politburo must be due to the meticulously organized and directed work of its elite subversive corps.

"Your courage in halting Communist aggression in Korea last June finally awakened our country to the Red sword of Damocles, hanging over the head of western civilization, and we are now planning to spend tens of billions of dollars, for years to come, in the effort to deter further aggression. Yet, apparently, the best we can hope for is decades of this appalling waste of our natural and human resources, accompanied by the constant psychosis of the Red sword.

"Since preventive war is impossible for democracy, must we stand condemned to bear these terrible burdens ad infinitum? The answer is no. The weapon which will permit us to seize the initiative from the politburo, and can ultimately encompass the destruction of Russian militarism, lies ready to our hands.

"It is the Politburo's own major weapon and the key to its success; the planned and disciplined subversion, conducted within the frontiers of a friendly nation, which rang down the Iron Curtain upon democratized and western oriented Czechoslovakia, without the presence of a single Red soldier. But Russian militarism, masquerading under the cloak of communism, is infinitely more vulnerable to this weapon than democracy—for the more it expands, the longer time is given to illuminate the false promises and to highlight the stark fraud of the Red terror—the more susceptible it becomes to fatal penetration by its own sharp spearhead—subversion.

"Mr. President, there is only one method I know of, by which we can promptly and properly implement an American counterinfiltration corps without, as a democracy, committing an overt act. That method is by organizing a foreign legion, upon the facade of which appropriations can be hung, for an intelligence corps which would constitute and, in fact be, the proposed counterinfiltration corps. * * * The breath of life can be blown into this vital project only through executive and legislative action."

In view of the status quo policy of the State Department, which I have just termed long bankrupt, and which was inherited from the "Pal Joey" days of the Roosevelt regime, I was not surprised never to have received an acknowledgement of that letter from President Truman. And the same applies to President Eisenhower, when I hopefully sent him a copy of the Truman letter, following the campaign of 1952.

Our committee adheres to the notion that changing times require changing policies and we believe that the Legion idea is the best vehicle presently available to extricate our Nation and our GI's from the booby trap described by General Willoughby and christened as such by me. The Legion concept is sufficiently flexible to meet foreseeable American requirements, not only for volunteer alien military manpower, but also for the counterinfiltration and subversive activities set forth in the Truman letter.

From what source, you might ask, could we obtain the alien manpower that our military staff and executive officials might determine we would require and could afford? It is estimated that there are today, approximately 10 million refugees and expellees in Western Europe, most of whom would be glad to risk their lives to insure the defeat of communism. For, they have suffered its evils, they have been deprived by it of their homes and property, and they who have had the courage and good fortune to escape its clutches, know for certain that their lives would be forfeit if communism ever caught up with them again.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are convinced that there is no alternative to the Legion idea. Either we must supply and equip enough alien infantry divisions to offset the Red preponderance on the European front, and thereby give our boys a fighting chance to survive, or we may be compelled to withdraw our divisions to Spain or to the United States.

We are now in the process of organizing a campaign which will seek to show President Eisenhower, Secretary Dulles and our State Department, that there are thousands, perhaps millions, of red-blooded American citizens who, like my fellow committee members, believe that the road of appeasement leads but to the grave of democracy and of freedom, and of our American way of life. The kind of American citizens I mean, who further believe, as we believe, that we must, to save our boys from death, and our country from bankruptcy, henceforth fight fire with fire and do unto the Reds what they do unto us.

Please let me assure you that we are not so ingenuous as to expect Mr. Dulles and our State Department to announce publicly that the United States of America now proposes to incite violent revolt within the U. S. S. R. Of course not, we only hope that while, to do as the Russians do, our good Secretary of State will have to oppose the Legion idea publicly, he might approve it privately.

Soon, my friends—and I hope you will permit me to call you friends and well-wishers—we will be ready to come to you with our hopes, ideas and ideals all formulated, set forth and ready to go. We will come to ask you to join us and help us in seeking to destroy that Red sword of Damocles which hangs, like an endless nightmare, over the head of Western civilization. We will ask you to work with us, under the banner of our new and cogent slogan: "Keep our boys—and our dollars—home."

Problems of Automobile Merchandising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Mr. J. O. Wright, Ford Motor Co. vice president and Ford division general manager, before the Lorain, Ohio, Chamber of Commerce, Tuesday, May 13, 1958, Lorain, Ohio.

Mr. Wright has admirably explained some of the outstanding problems of automobile merchandising which I believe will be of considerable interest to many Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows;

REMARKS BY J. O. WRIGHT, FORD MOTOR CO. VICE PRESIDENT AND FORD DIVISION GENERAL MANAGER, BEFORE THE LORAIN, OHIO, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, TUESDAY, MAY 13, 1958

I am glad to have this chance to visit with you again here in Lorain. * * *

I can say to you without reservation that the Lorain assembly plant is the best and most modern assembly plant in Ford Motor Co. and very probably in the world. It stands as a concrete indication of our feelings about this area and its people—and about the bright future of our country. I am sure you will be interested to know that this plant was not built specifically to meet our present needs for productive capacity. We had enough capacity to cope with any contemplated market prior to the early 1960's. This plant was and is in fact an essential part of our production planning for future markets that will surpass anything our Nation has ever known.

* * * * *

The automobile business is one that is full of drama and emotion. People feel strongly about it. * * * Second guessing this business is a favorite national pastime. Everybody has his own ideas about how he would run the show, if he had a chance. And, as you would expect, we sometimes find ourselves in the position of the baseball player whom the fans regard one day as a genius and the next day as a bum.

We are preesntly going through one of those periods when the auto industry is the center of white-hot attention. Much as we normally like attention, we kind of wish it would ease off just a little at the present time, because we feel that it is hurting sales—and that's not good for anybody.

You are familiar with the general line of reasoning. It is argued that there has been a sudden switch of consumer preference away from the large, powerful, high-styled automobiles typical of North American manufacture toward smaller, relatively inexpensive, low-powered, economy cars typical of European manufacture. Some writers say indeed that most people really never did want the big, flashy jobs, but that they had no choice except to take the cars that manufacturers were offering for sale.

* * * * *

Some observers go so far as to plant the blame for the recession on the automobile business, right in the face of the fact that the sharp dropoff in car sales did not begin until several months after the recession was well underway.

Most of these things that are being said lead to the inevitable conclusion either that industry management has gotten out of touch with the consumer, or that it is arrogantly trying to push unwanted products into the hands of consumers.

It is certainly not my intention to offer a bold and fearless defense of the products of our industry or of the brilliance of our management decision. I do think that the industry should give serious attention to the charge that it is willfully and wrongfully pursuing a course contrary to the wants of the consuming public.

The one overriding point I want to make today is this: We are an industry whose existence depends on seeing facts and dealing as intelligently as we can with facts. As individuals, we in this business may have widely divergent opinions. But in making decisions as manufacturers and managers, we all must act upon the basis of the same body of fact. The hard demands of the market place, and not any sense of divine inspiration or intuitive genius, are what dictate our actions.

Some of the questions being raised today are not easy to answer with flat assertions. I would like to comment, however, on what seem to me to be the 2 or 3 critical questions at this time.

First, I would like to examine the proposition that we are either failing to read the customer right or that we are trying to force-feed him with the diet we think is best for him.

Second, I would like to give you our view of what is really going on in the automobile market today, including the slump in domestic car sales and the rise in sales of small imported cars.

And, third, I would like to discuss with you a little of how we go about planning our own future products and show you some of the evidence and reasoning on which we base our plans.

On the first score, let me point out that the automobile industry involves management problems and decisions of a difficulty certainly not surpassed and very probably not equaled in any other larger industry.

The ones that lie all about us in Detroit serve as a constant reminder of the penalties of careless or casual decisions. The companies that have survived almost half a hundred years of fierce automotive competition have not done so by being careless or casual about meeting the wants of the consumer.

That is not to suggest even remotely that automotive management is infallible. This is a business offering numerous and superb opportunities for dramatic boners. And, being human, we sometimes make the best of those opportunities. But I do mean to suggest that mistakes made in this business reflect the complexity of our choice, rather than poor homework.

Above all, as one who lives with these problems from day to day, it is incomprehensible to me that anyone should accuse our industry of "force feeding." Our normal position is one of abject prostration at the feet of our customers. Far from leading the consumer by the nose, we are forever trying to fathom his wants and keep up with him. Every year we spend millions in the effort to find out what he wants, hundreds of millions to make what we thinks he wants, and finally tens of millions to tell him that the car we are offering him is the product he has indicated he wants.

In the present depressed car market, it would certainly be just to label this industry both arrogant and foolish if we did not examine critically both the market itself and our future automobiles to make sure to the best of our ability that the cars we are now planning and designing for 1960 and 1961 and later years will be the cars our customers really want.

I would like to tell you something of how we examine the market and plan our products, what relevant facts we are accumulating from that examination.

One question that is raised in current discussion of the industry is the extent to which general styling of automobiles is contributing—if at all—to the present sales slump.

To begin with, we have a very simple and, I believe, accurate explanation for our present difficulties. It is very hard to believe there has been a rapid drop of almost 30 percent in car sales for the sole or even primary reason of a sudden, cataclysmic change in a nation's car-buying habits. It is particularly hard to believe that when a much more obvious reason lies right under our noses.

The fact is that we are in a general business recession. We have never gone through such a recession without suffering comparable reverses in the car market. This is a risk business, and historically we have always tended to fare better than most industries on the upswing and worse than many on the downswing.

In the 1938 business recession, we had a drop of 10 percent in consumer income that brought about a drop of 50 percent in auto sales. In the present recession, a 3- to 4-percent drop in consumer income has contributed to a 30-percent drop in car sales.

And let me point out that, due to inflation, real per capita income has been on the decline since 1956. The present business recession, moreover, began last summer. And the serious slump in car sales became apparent only in January of this year.

Here is concrete evidence both that the primary factors underlying the car market are broadly economic in nature and that the automobile is the victim and not the cause of the present recession.

Styling has played a role in the present market, but not at all the role that some people might think—a point I will get to in just a moment.

It's pretty easy to understand why the automobile should be hard hit during any recession. Ninety-five percent of new cars are bought by people who already own cars. We have presently in this country a very substantial number of good cars of fairly recent vintage. For most people, the car is a deferrable purchase. If a man has been disturbed by recession talk, if he knows of a fellow down the street who has just been laid off, he can readily decide to hold on to the old car for a while longer. Aside from a house, a car is the biggest item in the budget of most families, so it is a logical victim of a general anxiety about the economy.

The main reason for the theory that sales are off because most or all Americans really want a puddle-jumper car lies, of course, in the expanded importation of small cars that has taken place in recent years. The trouble is that some people are seeing an avalanche in what is really a rather respectable trickle.

I can assure you that no one phenomenon has been given more careful attention by the automobile business than this increase in imported small-car sales that began discernibly back in 1956. Ford Motor Co. has been in the business of importing small English Ford cars since 1949, and we have participated in that way in the general rise. We have carried on numerous and continuous studies to try to see just what this thing means and where it seems to be going. I don't have time here to go into our findings in detail. I can give you just a few general observations.

First of all, the small car spree reflects both novelty and economy buying, and often a mixture of the two. If you eliminate all considerations other than operating economy, it would not make sense to buy a small car. A good used American car can be had for one-half to one-third the price of a new foreign car. You could drive the small car till it falls apart and be hard put to make up the difference in gas economy. Moreover, many imports and some American models which are not really small cars are priced at or near American makes.

We do not, incidentally, classify the American Motors Rambler as a small car. It is substantially bigger than, for example, the Volkswagon, and competes in general operating economy with such cars as the Ford Custom 300 six-cylinder car. In fact, most Ramblers sell for more than the lowest-priced Ford.

Our studies indicate a very strong element of "fad-buying" and a sort of reverse prestige buying in the small-car market. The small car is the smart thing to have in certain circles—usually, I might add, where you already own a standard American make. We have particularly noticed lately a tendency

among substantial public officials and other gentlemen whose position regrettably requires them to ride in large black limousines to extol the virtues of the small cars—for others, that is.

We find that there are important self-limiting factors in the small-car surge. One is the probability that their resale value will decline as they become available in greater numbers in the used-car market. This has already begun to happen in the case of several foreign makes. The other is the inadequacies of a small car which has been designed for the short distances and narrow streets and terrific gasoline prices of the old world when it is measured against the requirements of our topography, our highways and the expanding vistas of the American family.

It now appears that imported small-car sales will level off at a rate of 300,000 to 350,000 cars a year.

The problem we as manufacturers face in examining the small car is not whether it is the coming, dominant factor in the car market, but whether we should place our own entries in this field. That is not an easy question to answer. Nor is it one on which I can enlighten you at this time.

I should like, however, to tell you something about what the customer is actually buying in the present market and what signals he is giving us about his probable future wants.

This is a matter directly related to some of the current comment about the supposed public reaction to big cars with plush interiors, high-powered engines, chrome decorations, options and accessories.

During all our advance product planning, we are kept very busy trying to fathom the customer and his probable wishes 2 or 3 years hence. In that process we have three main aids.

First, we have the all-important facts about what the consumer is actually buying in the present market and what he bought last year, the year before and back as far as you want to go. What people are actually spending their dollars for is our best single piece of evidence. Here we can directly measure trends and developments and changes in consumer taste.

The fact that today we are dealing with a shrunken market does not alter the importance of what is going on inside that market. We find, for example, and expect to find that in such a market economy buying is a relatively larger factor than it would be in a boom market. We are selling more six-cylinder engines today than last year. But if we find that costly options and accessories are still holding up relatively well, and if the more expensive models of cars are selling strongly in terms of that market, we will have a strong evidence to dispute the claim that the long-term upgrading of the automobile by the consumer has come to an end.

What do we find in today's market? We find first of all that the three strongest performers, relatively, are the Chevrolet Impala, the Oldsmobile, and the Ford four-passenger Thunderbird. These in their respective ranges are not economy cars. With the exception of the Thunderbird, they wear at least as much chrome as any other car on the road.

In the case of our own company, 61 percent of Ford's current automobile sales are accounted for by the combined Fairlane series and the station wagon series. The Fairlane's share of our current production is down somewhat from last year, but is still more than double its share as recently as 1954. On all Fairlane models, sales of extra-cost equipment such as automatic transmissions and power steering run high. Even on our economy model, the Custom 300, the demand for extra-cost accessories is substantial compared to 4 or 5 years ago. So far as ornamentation is concerned, on the Custom Ford, there is a decorative gold-anodized aluminum strip for which there is an extra charge. Seventy-six percent of our customers currently are buying cars with that strip.

The May 5 issue of Ward's Automotive Reports announced that the installation rate of power steering for the whole industry through March was up 8.7 percentage points over the sales rate for all of 1957. Installations by all Ford products were at a 40.5-percent rate in the first quarter of this year as compared with 31 percent for all of last year. Similarly, installations of power brakes for the industry increased 4.6 percentage points over last year's rate.

When you look at what people are actually buying, it makes you hesitant indeed to throw all your plans out the window and start building a complete new line of stripped-down jobs for 1961. It just could be that when 1961 rolls around, we will be in the middle of another economic upsurge, leaving us with a lot of unattractive cars that nobody wants.

The past experience of our industry has left us with a healthy fear of downgrading—at least on the basis of the kind of evidence we now have.

During the past decade, a number of what might be called downgraded cars fell by the wayside. Where are the Crosley, or the Henry-J, the Aero-Willys, or the Willys Americar?

Or consider if you will, our own experience in our long, see-saw struggle for leadership in the low priced field. Here, very briefly, is what has been happening.

In 1949 we introduced a new Ford automobile that was 5 inches lower than the previous model and repersented completely new styling. At the time this car was introduced, Ford was obtaining 16.7 percent of the market, Chevrolet 21.3 percent. We continued to emphasize new styling and within 6 years we had recaptured our position in the market and were selling at approximately the same rate as our principal competitor.

In 1954 Ford and Chevrolet each obtained slightly more than 25 percent of the market. Meanwhile, Plymouth in 1953—running counter to Ford—shortened its wheelbase by 4 inches, maintained chair height seats, and emphasized interior package. This reflected a decision that what the consumer really wanted was a good old-fashioned car—the kind that carried Dear Old Dad—"smaller on the outside, bigger on the inside," as the commercial put it. Plymouth sales promptly dropped from 600,000 in 1953 to 381,000 in 1954.

In 1954 a new Ford V–8 engine was introduced which, together with the accumulative effect of the new longer, lower styling initiated in 1949, helped Ford to increase its share of the market by six percentage points over 1953. For the first time in 20 years, we sold more cars to retail customers than our principal competition.

In 1955 Chevrolet introduced new styling and, for the first time, a new V–8 engine and sold more cars than any make had ever sold in postwar history, outselling Ford by 67,000 units. Meanwhile, in 1955, Plymouth reversed its field and introduced a completely restyled vehicle that was the longest (204 inches) of the low priced three. It added 266,000 units to its sales and increased its share of the market by 2.1 percentage points.

In 1956 we did not change our styling as much as Chevrolet did. We emphasized safety; Chevrolet emphasized its new performance. That year Chevrolet sold 190,000 units more than Ford did. Plymouth followed Ford's pattern and dropped 120,000 units.

In 1957 Ford redesigned completely—4 inches lower, 9 inches longer—and we won a 37,000-unit victory over Chevrolet. Plymouth also went to new styling—longer, lower and wider—and increased its sales by 112,000 units.

And here's another pertinent item.

From 1950 to 1955, American Motors had a small-sized Rambler which it dropped in 1955 because of a poor sales showing. In 1956 American Motors introduced a Rambler which was longer and heavier and had the same interior size as the low-priced three. They subsequently increased their penetration from 1 percent in 1955 to 1.5 percent in 1957. In other words, the American manufacturer who is leading exponent of the small car altered its course to parallel more closely the course of the low-priced three.

With this kind of experience behind us, you can imagine we are reluctant to jump to any hasty conclusions that there has been a big switch in the auto consumer.

But I can assure you we do not stop here. We have been and are at this moment polling the consumer, up, down, and sideways, and checking what he says against what his neighbor says, and against what he is actually doing and what he has done in the past.

All evidence points to the fact that we have not given the customer more than he wants. If anything, we have failed to move rapidly enough to keep up with his desires for product innovations. We are convinced that the race in the future will go to him who is first with greater innovations, particularly in components that enhance the functional and riding characteristics of the car.

After all, we are building automobiles for a people and for an economy that has been in a state of continuous and explosive expansion for a long, long time. We are convinced that our growth will accelerate, that the tremendous impulses of our expanding population, our new technologies, our drive for better and better living standards for ourselves and our children all point to continued dynamic growth. Our industry is an integral part of that growth. For us, there can be no turning our backs on the future. We intend to continue to look ahead.

Rumania Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me paying tribute to the people of Rumania on the anniversary of their independence day.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It gives me great pleasure to pay tribute to the people of Rumania on the anniversary of their independence day. We are glad to do our part in celebrating this occasion, for a people who must honor their own patriots in the grim silence imposed by a brutal alien dictatorship.

It has been a long time since the blackness of Communist rule settled down over the people who live in the troubled borderlands that have long protected Western Europe from barbarian invasions. The hope of liberation which swept over the countries on the borders of the Soviet Union when the Nazi tyranny was liquidated was quickly replaced by the more horribly ingenious tyranny of Communist rule. The Soviet rulers

made many solemn commitments to the Government of the United States that the people of the states on the Soviet border should have truly free elections. Every one of these commitments has been broken.

President Roosevelt told Stalin that the United States could never consent to abandonment of these agreements, or subjection of free nations to Soviet rule. President Truman and President Eisenhower have made the same pledge.

The American people are firmly committed to the principle of independence for all nations in the orbit of great military powers. That was our belief in 1776. It was our belief when we supported the nations of Latin America against the Spanish power. It was our belief when we supported weak and divided China against the great powers at the beginning of this century.

Because we love our independence we respect the desire of all other nations for their independence. That has always been the policy of the United States and I promise you it always will be our policy as a nation.

The Consumer Price Index in the Current Price Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a speech entitled "The Consumer Price Index in the Current Price Situation," which was delivered by Ewan Clague, Commissioner of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor, before the Milwaukee Control of the Controllers Institute of America, at Milwaukee, Wis., on April 8, 1958.

In offering these excerpts for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that Mr. Clague, who delivered the address, has given an expert analysis of why the consumers' price index has been rising during the recession; and in the address he points out that some of the influences—and of course it is important that we also evaluate the entire situation—are temporary in character, and that one of the main ones has been an absolute and urgently needed rise in the price of food grown on the farm.

Whatever may be our views of the validity of Mr. Clague's conclusions, certainly it is important that we give them our earnest consideration; and it is with that thought in mind that I offer the excerpts from his address for printing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONSUMER PRICE INDEX IN THE CURRENT PRICE SITUATION

(By Ewan Clague, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor, Before the Milwaukee Control of the Controllers Institute of America, Milwaukee, Wis., April 8, 1958)

Each month when the Consumer Price Index is issued to the public, we in the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics are continually asked to answer this question, Why in the midst of a business downturn with mounting unemployment does the price index continue to go up? Economists have commented on the "paradox" of declining business and rising prices. And occasionally some critics have tried to explain away the situation by questioning the accuracy of the statistics. A number of times during the past 2 years, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has had to defend the essential accuracy of its price statistics. So I welcome the opportunity to discuss the Consumer Price Index and its behavior under present conditions.

First, at the very outset, let me assure you, if you have any doubts, that the Consumer Price Index is accurate, substantially, and reasonably accurate. We price for the index about 300 different commodities and services; we get reports from 46 cities, ranging from a dozen of the largest with over a million population each to some small towns with a population as low as 2,500; we collect prices in a wide variety of stores and we have careful methods of checking the accuracy of the prices reported to us. The index does not misrepresent retail price levels.

CRITICISMS OF THE INDEX

Second, I would like to call your attention to some of the mistaken or misleading criticisms which have been made at various times recently. One of these is that the Bureau simply accepts list prices for durable consumer goods and, therefore, does not obtain the real prices at which automobiles or household appliances are purchased by the consumer. This charge is not true. We do make every effort to obtain the final realized price. We make allowances for trade-ins; we price in specialty stores which are likely to give heavy discounts; and we obtain a reasonable number of quotations for each item.

Another is that we do not take into account special sales at which articles can be bought more cheaply than usual. The answer here is that if a sale lasts for a long enough period (for a week or two) so that consumers have a reasonable chance to take advantage of it, then we use sale prices. In January we reported a drop in the price of house furnishings, partly because of the white sales in that month. We do not, of course, include the sale prices of items which are being closed out, such as a discontinued line of clothing; nor do we include special sales that last such a short time that the average consumer would not be able to take advantage of them.

Still another criticism is that we do not obtain weekend prices for foods and, therefore, use higher-than-average food prices. To this we have two answers. One is that our primary purpose is to measure changes in prices, not to determine the level of prices. If we measure the change from first-of-the-week prices in one month to first-of-the-week prices in the next month, our index of food price changes is just as accurate as if we had measured it from weekend prices in one month to weekend prices in the other. But we have a second answer which is equally significant. Over a period of nearly a year we checked early-week prices against weekend prices for several food items. We found that the difference between the two was small on the average. It is true that a given store may have spectacular weekend reductions in some prices, but other stores select different items for weekend specials and keep up their other prices. We found wider ranges of prices toward the weekend, but not significantly lower on the average.

Finally, before leaving this subject, I would like to mention one other charge that is made quite often. It is that the careful consumer switches his buying from higher priced items to lower priced items and, therefore, can actually live more cheaply than the index would show. Surely this is true. We know that any careful housewife can beat the index by shrewd and discriminating shopping. But we can't follow this careful housewife around and find out just how well she succeeds in keeping her particular cost of living down. We have to deal with the general average, and, believe me, there are many consumers who are on the other side of the line from this good housewife. Prices are high because somebody is buying. We get the prices as they exist.

LIMITATIONS OF THE INDEX

I would like now to go on to a third subject, namely, limitations in the index which we recognize fully as much as other people. One is that the index does not measure the complete cost of living. It used to be called a cost-of-living index, but we changed its name because it was misunderstood. A family's cost of living may increase in many ways. More children may be born into the family, thus requiring more food, more housing, and more clothing. A family may move from one town to another and find that it will cost them considerably more in the new place. A family can decide to raise its standard of living by purchasing a home instead of renting, or by shifting from a lower price model car to a higher one. The Consumer Price Index is not designed to measure a rise in the standard of living. Our objective is to measure as carefully and precisely as possible one factor in the cost of living, namely, changes in prices. We try to measure by the index the effect of price changes upon the cost of living, and price changes only.

In pursuing this objective we encounter many technical problems of index making, most of which we solve reasonably well, but some of which cause considerable difficulty. Since we concentrate on measuring price changes only, we collect prices of a fixed market basket of goods and services, that is, a market basket in which the quality of the products is maintained constant. If there is a decline in quality, as often occurs in wartime, we try to take this into account. If there is an improvement in quality, we try to factor this out of any price increase which may be associated with the change in quality.

However, it is not always easy to achieve this goal. Many consumer items are standardized, and we have little trouble in matching quotations from month to month, or even over the years. On the other hand, some goods, especially durables, are changed in style from year to year, and we have the problem of taking that into account. For example, when a new model car comes out with an automatic transmission and at a higher price, we exclude from the index the effect of that change. So, too, with a hillholder, a car radio, or any other extra that we can detect and measure. On the other hand, we know that there are many less obvious changes, often without any price increases at all, which we do not find it possible to exclude from the index. Certainly, the automobiles of today are easier riding, faster, and more durable than they were 20 years ago. And these improvements undoubtedly cost more. Some of that cost is reflected in the index.

However, to those of you who are users of the index, I must point out that the effect of these unmeasured improvements is extremely small in the short run. From month to month, and for a few years, these would have very little effect. Over a 10-year period, or longer, they could be quite significant; although I must also point out that there are some downward biases in the index which would partially offset this upward bias. However, our main answer on this point is that the major uses of the index are based on the short-run changes—the wage escalator contracts, for example.

In summary, the index is more accurate over a period of 3, 5, or 7 years than it is

over a period of 10 to 20 years. In fact, about every 10 or 15 years the index should be basically revised anyhow in order to enhance its general accuracy.

FLUCTUATIONS OF THE INDEX

May I now turn to a discussion of the actual behavior of the index—why does it fluctuate in the way it does? Why is it now going up when, according to current business conditions, it should be going down?

1. In the first place, all users of the index should recognize that it moves quite sluggishly, and that it generally lags behind other gages of the economy. Retail prices are the end of the line. They represent the buildup and the accumulation of the processes of production and distribution. They represent costs which have been incurred all along the way. They reflect the stability and the (usually) steady growth of consumer incomes. Therefore, consumer prices as a whole do not fluctuate quickly and widely, as do the prices of raw materials.

2. Second, the Consumer Price Index covers the entire range of family buying. As a rough count, we estimate that there are as many as 2,000 different products or services consumed by the average American family. From among these we have selected a sample of 300 of the more important ones. This sample includes over 80 foods, apparel of all kinds, rents, home ownership costs, public transportation, automobiles and their operating costs, reading and recreation, personal care, etc. Some of these items are commodities; others are services. Some are perishables; some are durable and last for years. The very comprehensiveness of the index practically insures that many of the price movements within it will counterbalance and offset each other.

3. However, the different parts of the index respond very differently to current business conditions. For the purpose of this discussion, I shall divide the index into three major groups: (a) foods, (b) commodities other than foods, and (c) services of all kinds. You may be interested to see how these three have behaved in recent years.

(a) Take services first. These include items of personal care, such as hair cuts, and permanents; streetcar fares; recreation items, such as movies; doctor's fees and hospital costs; gas and electricity rates, etc., etc. The prices of these are heavily influenced by law and by custom. Streetcar fares can be changed only when approval has been obtained from a public service commission. The price of a haircut or of a visit to a doctor's office is governed to some extent by custom. They change slowly, but when once raised they usually remain there. For the past 20 years the prices of the services represented in the index have climbed slowly but steadily. They will continue to do so for some time to come. They usually lag behind commodity prices, but they can move on upward after commodity prices have fallen. These service charges are not influenced directly or immediately by business fluctuations. In a long and deep depression they could and would fall, but in minor business recessions they continue to rise, slowly but persistently. Since these make up nearly one-third of the index, they constitute one important factor in the rise of the index in recent years.

(b) Let us move to foods next. These constitute roughly 30 percent of the index, somewhat less than one-third. However, they are as a group the fastest movers in the index. This is due in part to the seasonality of many food products. All the perishables, such as fresh fruits and vegetables, have a short harvest season. In the old days, before refrigeration, many of these foods appeared on the market for only a few months of the year. Today, because of deep freezing and household refrigeration, nearly all of them are available throughout the year. And, of course, most of them have always been available as canned goods.

Most of the meats have seasonal factors in their prices. Cattle, hogs, sheep, chickens, etc. have heavy marketings in the spring and fall, at which times the price of meat is influenced by the increased supplies.

So, foods are responsible for many of the minor fluctuations of the index within the year.

In the recent rise of the index from the spring of 1956 to the spring of 1958, foods played an important part. This was due to two factors, both associated with the hazards or the economics of farming. In 1956, in 1957, and again now in 1958 bad weather has seriously affected the supply of fresh fruits and vegetables. In the summer of 1956, potatoes rose to a peak of 12 cents a pound, the highest price ever recorded in this country. In January and February 1958, fresh fruit and vegetable prices reached the highest level the Bureau has ever recorded for those months. This is because the American people have become accustomed to fresh fruits and vegetables in their diets. If the supply is short, the prices rise. But people continue to buy at those prices.

The bad weather recently is only a temporary factor in the rise of the Consumer Price Index. If we have good growing weather this spring in the middle States and in the north, we should have large crops of fruits and vegetables in the late spring or early summer. When these local crops come to market, all these prices fall sharply, oftentimes as much as 25 to 50 percent. Fruits and vegetables are always cheaper in the second half of the year, and they will be this year, too.

Meats (including poultry and fish) are half again as important in the index as fruits and vegetables. In fact, meats make up about one-fourth of the entire food index. The American people are heavy meat-eaters. At the present time meat prices are rising. They reached bottom at the end of 1955 when there was a heavy supply of cattle and hogs brought to market. In fact, the price fell so low that farmers cut down on their herds during the next year or so. This was simply the response of the farmer to low prices and high costs. Some farmers could not make a profit feeding high-priced corn into low-priced hogs.

At the present time, the Department of Agriculture reports that cattle and hogs are being raised in somewhat larger quantities, but they have not yet come to market. When farmers are building up their herds they save the female animals for breeding. At the present time this seems to be the dominant factor. However, later this year some increase in marketing of hogs and cattle (especially prime feeders) should occur, while chickens and turkeys have been generally increasing in recent years. So we may see lower meat prices later on in 1958.

(c) The remainder of the index consists of commodities other than foods—soft goods and durables. Soft goods are such items as clothing, shoes, house furnishings; household supplies, gasoline, etc. These have a weight of somewhat more than 20 percent of the total index, and the group as a whole ordinarily shows the influence of the spring and fall seasons in apparel prices. The latter are usually high in March when the new spring lines are introduced and they are high again in September when fall clothing is introduced. Apparel prices are usually low each year in January and February, following the Christmas shopping, and in July and August, when summer sales take place.

The durable-goods group consists of automobiles (new and used), furniture, household appliances, TV, and radios, etc. All of these combined make up about one-seventh of the whole index, or 14 percent. This group also has a strong seasonal element, usually toward the end of the calendar year when the next year's new models are introduced. These often sell at or near suggested or list prices. However, discounting by retailers begins in a month or two and accelerates during the model year. So prices on the current year's models are at their lowest in the autumn months just prior to the introduction of the next year's models.

Durable goods were an important factor in helping to maintain the stability which the Consumer Price Index exhibited from the summer of 1952 to the spring of 1956. During that period, this group declined about 10 percent at retail. Then the prices of durables turned upward, due partly to higher manufacturers' prices and partly to smaller discounts by retailers. The retail prices of durables have leveled off during the past year, except for seasonal fluctuations. The peak was reached in November 1957, the month in which the 1958 models of all automobile manufacturers reached the market at the same time. The manufacturers' list prices were only about 3 or 4 percent higher than the prices for the 1957 models, but dealers' discounts were sharply curtailed, as they usually are at that time. But by January 1958 larger discounts again appeared, and car prices began to decline.

From November to February the prices of commodities other than foods (including both soft goods and durables) declined 0.5 percent. But the index as a whole rose 0.7 percent, because of the 2.3 percent advance in food prices and 0.9 percent in services.

Return of Liberal Arts—Differentiating the Profession of Teaching

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the comments of Dr. Max R. Goodson, dean of Boston University's School of Education, on two very important questions affecting American education be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Dean Goodson's comments on, first, the return of liberal arts; and, second, differentiating the profession of teaching were presented as a part of a comprehensive symposium in conjunction with the 40th anniversary of the school on the topic What Needs To Be Conserved and Changed in American Education in the Next Decade. Certainly, Dr. Goodson's statements deserve the attention of every American.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS OF MAX R. GOODSON, OF WELLESLEY HILLS, MASS., PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION AND DEAN OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, BOSTON UNIVERSITY

On the return of liberal arts:

In the educational times just ahead there will likely be a return to the liberal arts and sciences. This movement should influence elementary and high schools, colleges and

university programs of professional preparation. An appropriate question is: Return to what?

In the quest for educational reform there are arts and sciences which could profit the student in his pursuit of a free and informed mind and which of necessity belong in his education. A predominant part of any education is the arts and sciences; they do not have to be justified in principle.

In practice, however, a particular instruction in art and science may not be worth the effort of return and would substitute very little substance for a college course in fly casting. They may be taught without student contact or in an atmosphere of dilettantism and supercilious isolation. The current event, ethical and political issues of modern life and the principle of using scholarship for solving problems may be ignored. Instruction in the liberal arts and sciences needs methodology so as to assure that the teaching joins the concerns of the learner, releases and disciplines his mind, and forms his personality. Without interpersonal competence that is nurtured by the liberal arts only when instruction is favorable, the arts and sciences may not generate a trustworthy human situation. The liberal arts can turn sour unless they are prized and communicated through a humane climate.

A balanced program in the humanities, natural science, and social studies is relevant at every age from the first grade through a doctor of philosophy degree. An affection for the intellectual life is a requirement for revitalizing American life. A liberal education responsive to social welfare and friendly to the theory of democracy is needed. A scholarship oriented to cultural reform and national purpose must become more central to education.

Asking for a return to liberal and science education makes an earcatching slogan. But the substance of an education that honors our destiny as an American people as well as the arts and sciences still needs attention. A conserving perspective that is constructive in intent—such is the appropriate attitude toward education in the next 10 years. The task is more than making a return.

On differentiating the profession of teaching:

Perhaps one reason the profession of teaching is suffering from low social status is that it has not stratified its personnel who perform the teaching act. "A teacher is a teacher," and all teachers have tenure and move automatically on the salary schedule in accordance with experience and education.

The principle of paying a teacher in accordance with merit has a great deal to recommend it. One reason the principle is now resisted in its application is the difficulty of making a valid difference between teachers. In theory it's admitted that some are more competent than others, but how to make these differences apparent in the system by which the teachers are given status and are rewarded is a problem in need of solution.

It is conceivable that now is the time, in the face of a teacher shortage and a further impending shortage, for the public schools to differentiate the profession of teaching. More people and better-qualified candidates might be attracted to the teaching profession if it were stratified.

There are four categories of teachers that might be established in a school system. The first is that of career teacher. Nominees to this category would be highly qualified by their educational background, through their professional awareness and competence, and because of their motivation to make a life career of teaching. People in this category—and they are to be found in any school system of every size—break the ceiling that is set by any certification requirements or any pattern of preparation for teaching.

A second category is that of teacher in its conventional connotation. Persons in this category differ from persons in the first primarily because of a lower grade of leadership capacity. They meet certification requirements and have been produced by accepted patterns of education for the teacher in colleges and universities. Persons in this category should be periodically appraised as a candidate for a career teacher position. Devotion to the responsibilities of the profession and demonstrated excellence would be the principal criteria to be applied.

A third category is associate teacher. In this group one might expect to find the younger members of the profession, the teachers in preparation and those who have not met minimum certification standards.

A fourth category is that of amateur teacher. People in this category would not compete with professional people for pay, but would participate in the educational program of an elementary or high school on a part-time basis and for reasons other than financial gain. These people would be established in the community, and in a profession or occupation, but would not have trained themselves directly for a teaching position.

They may be the mothers of the community who are willing to give a half day, 3 days a week to assisting professional teachers in the school's work. They may be the research scientists who devote 5 hours a week to teaching advanced physics or mathematics to a select group of high-school seniors. Or they may be the retired businessmen who out of a rich life experience and successful community work have a great deal to offer young people on the subject of the community.

There are ways in which very fine human talents might be recruitment to the educational program of the community if the role of amateur teacher should be established and honored. One of the expected valuable outcomes of this role is that the amateur and the professional would interact with one another with a resultant enrichment and vitalization of the educative processes.

The Supreme Court and the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column by Holmes Alexander entitled "On the National Front," a nationally syndicated column, which appeared in the press April 10, 1958.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE NATIONAL FRONT
(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—There goes the eighth amendment. Everybody knows how the Constitution's fifth amendment ("No person * * * shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself.") was destroyed by ill use.

Well, just before Easter, Chief Justice Warren set a precedent which could rob us of another gem in our American heritage. In giving his opinion that Congress could not take away the citizenship of a military deserter, the Chief Justice cited as his authority the eighth amendment, which reads:

"Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted."

The Chief Justice contended that Congress was practicing "cruel and unusual punishments" in the Nationality Act of 1940. This law declares that an Armed Forces' deserter, having been convicted with all the protections in our system of justice, no longer is an American citizen.

This use of the "cruel and unusual" phrase is something that periodically turns up in a smart-aleck column or in the plea of a desperate attorney whose client has one foot inside the gas chamber. You don't expect it from the Supreme Court. The drafters of the eighth amendment were trying to write in a safety catch that would prevent the American Government from visiting inhuman atrocities upon prisoners, as was an official practice in the Old World. The first Congress which concurred in making the amendment part of the Constitution, could hardly imagine that a future Chief Justice would wrench the phrase out of its meaning.

Think it over. The Constitution forbids the Federal Government to gouge out a man's eyeballs, or to feed his liver to the vultures, or to do any of the heartless and indecent things that Spanish kings and Chinese war lords did to political captives. So, more than a century afterward, a Chief Justice reasons that the same amendment prevents Congress from denationalizing a convicted deserter. That would be "cruel and unusual," like slicing off a traitor's ears or branding him as a convict.

But what would seem incredible in 1791, when the Bill of Rights went into effect, is today tolerated, though not with approval, as a commonplace abuse. Last October-November the enterprising Indianapolis Star ran a series of editorials called The Runaway Court, tracing the mad dash of the headless horsemen under Earl Warren. The response was astounding. Hundreds of lawyers, jurists, legislators and newspaper publishers wrote in to express agreement with the editorial series and disapproval of the Supreme Court.

In February 1958, National Review magazine analyzed the voting on 10 recent Supreme Court cases which bore upon internal security of the United States. The record is staggering to look upon. Three Supreme Court members voted against protecting their country's internal security in all 10 cases. Only one Supreme Court member did more than break even. The three who used every opportunity to strike down precautions against enemy subversion were Messrs. Warren, Black, and Douglas. Justice Clark stands out as a dissenter against this trend. Clark cast 7 votes for internal security measures and 2 against them.

This summary, of course, did not include the opinions given last month on citizenship. But the same lineup held. Justices Black and Douglas joined the Chief Justice, as did Justices Whittaker and Brennan, relative newcomers. It seems certain that the United States is to be deprived of the basic right of self-preservation as long as Mr. Warren remains the intellectual leader of the Supreme Court. Mr. Warren's forceful personality, and evidently his concept of judicial duty, are shaping history in a way that is not good for our side.

What can we do about it? The Constitution very wisely makes it extremely difficult to remove Justices. This remedy is not practical and probably not desirable. The Senate is very determined not to confirm any more legislating judges, for high or lower courts. This in time will rectify the judiciary, provided that Senators do not backslide in their resolve.

But meanwhile, a sickness keeps eating into America. The Supreme Court is only one of many daily symptoms which show how listlessly we cling to our life as a nation. The

fierce will to live has left many parts of our body politic. The man-in-the-street who can't see why President Eisenhower should shun a meeting at the summit; the greedy merchant who thinks we should trade with Red China; the pacifist who prefers to give up H-Bomb supremacy rather than live dangerously as a sovereign nation; the sentimentalist, the seduced internationalist tramp and the Supreme Court Justice who believes that non-Americans are just as important as Americans—all these, I would consider it self-evident, have no quivering passion to see the United States endure.

Well, any doctor can tell you what happens to a very sick man who doesn't want with all his might to live. It can happen, and often has happened, to an ailing nation, too.

The Area Redevelopment Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, when the Area Redevelopment Act was being considered by this body, I opposed it vigorously. I pointed out that it is a socialistic bill with so many defects in it that even the alleged advantages of socialism would not be obtained.

The weaknesses of this bill have since been clearly pointed out by the Honorable Robert M. Hitt, Jr., the able editor of the Charleston Evening Post, of Charleston, S. C., in an editorial published in that newspaper on May 17.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "THURMOND Correctly Labels It" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THURMOND CORRECTLY LABELS IT

The United States Senate ought to be thoroughly ashamed of itself for passing a bill which was correctly labeled by Senator STROM THURMOND as a socialistic measure.

What it proposes is both bad government and bad business.

The law would make available $375 million of Federal funds to cities and rural areas declared to be in a state of "chronic" distress.

Sponsors claim passage of the measure would offer hope of comeback to about 70 industrial areas over the Nation and to as many as 300 rural counties.

They can hardly have asked themselves why any particular community or county should be experiencing prolonged economic trouble. Why are other cities, other counties, holding their own or progressing? If they can do it without Federal handouts, why can't the others? In short, what are the economics of the matter, and not the politics of it?

There are throughout the United States ghost towns which died when economic reason for their creation ceased to exist. There are any number of cities and prosperous rural areas which once were wilderness—before their locations and natural resources became of economic value, attracting settlers and investors.

It is a pity the United States Senate did not heed the statesmanlike protest by Senator THURMOND. The South Carolina solon cited just about every one of the several potent objections to this socialistic proposal—a proposal doomed to failure if ever it becomes enacted into law.

"The Federal Government," Senator THURMOND said, "should not be permitted to spend and lend the money of all the people for the purpose of favoring any one area over another with industrial development. * * * It is a socialistic bill with so many defects in it that even the dubious advantages of socialism would not be attained."

The measure selects for rural redevelopment the 300 counties which, by the arbitrary criteria written into the bill, are classed as most in need of Federal financing.

Commenting on this feature, Senator THURMOND had this to say:

"In view of the setbacks which agriculture has suffered in recent years, it is important that more industries be located in our rural areas. The task of locating industries in our rural areas, however, should be the job of local communities, their development boards, their chambers of commerce, and private industry."

No such boondoggling shot in the arm can cure any chronic ailment brought about by changing economic conditions. It would mean not only an added cost of Government, but another expansion of an already bloated bureaucracy. It would be another perversion of the Government's spending, lending, and taxing powers. Who doubts that much of the Government's aid would be diverted to sheer political use? It would open up another field of opportunity and temptation for waste and corruption. It would be more of socialism's sickening futility.

The Power of Negative Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Frank J. Smith, the vice president of marketing, Columbus Boat & Forging Co., which article was published in the Sample Case. The Columbus Boat & Forging Co. is an important manufacturing concern of my home city, and Mr. Smith is an accomplished economist and leader in the field of marketing.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POWER OF NEGATIVE THINKING

(By Frank J. Smith, vice president, marketing, Columbus Bolt & Forging Co.)

I have always been a positive thinker. I've had to be—and I still am. However, I'm afraid that I am a member of a rapidly diminishing group, the optimists. There seems to be a growing delight on the part of a good many people to be gloomy, pessimistic, and discouraged. As a matter of fact, whenever I try to point out some of the silver linings I see in our economy, I find myself many times outnumbered. There are those who look down their noses, wrinkle their brows, shake their heads, and look at me as though to say, "What a dreamer." or "You just don't know the score, Bud." I get the feeling that those of us who do have confidence in the future of our companies, our country, and ourselves, are being looked upon by some of our fellow men in much the same way folks must have viewed Columbus when he expressed his idea that the world was round, and set out to prove it.

As happens all too frequently today, I recently overheard a conversation between two men that went something like this: "Business sure is bad, isn't it?" said the one. To which the other replied, "Yep, it sure is," shaking his head and letting out a sigh that sounded like it came right from the tip of his toes. The longer they talked, the gloomier they became.

This sort of thing is happening today wherever you go. People are talking about economic and world affairs. And whenever and wherever such conversation takes place, it is often audible to others—just as I couldn't help overhearing these two men talking. Similar conversations go on daily in such places as buses, factories, offices, and locker rooms. Because world conditions are changing (and when haven't they been doing this?) and business is readjusting in certain areas, many men are discouraged, frightened, and ready to throw in the sponge. Little do they realize, however, that what they set in motion with this kind of talk is dangerously powerful.

If there was ever a time when our thinking could exert a powerful influence for good or bad, it is now. Consider the power of negative thinking. Negative thinkers are quickly imitated by others. And thus begins a contagious spiraling effect that starts to draw all of us down. Sure, we must be honest and face up to realities. Things are tough; sales are off in many lines; profits are down, and a good many people are unemployed. But does that mean that we should just sit around feeling sorry for ourselves and give up? I think not. Negative thinking and talking affects people in much the same way as throwing a lead weight to a drowning person when he's crying for a lifesaver. Now is the time to fight. Now is the time to think, act, and preach optimism, faith, and good will. Now is the time for renewed confidence supported by forceful actions. But what do we too often find? We find men talking the blues, like the ones mentioned previously.

I wonder if we realize that what each of us says and does may change the lives of others with whom we come in contact. One man touching the life of another man cannot help but exert some influence upon it. The effect may be minor or tremendous. It may be for good or for bad. Negative thinking is a powerful influence. In fact, it can be just as powerful in a harmful way as positive thinking can be powerful in a beneficial way. This negative thinking, and the power of it, we find all about us. We find men seeming to want to outsell others about how bad times really are; pointing out bits of evidence gathered from here and there to strengthen their case. We find men seeming to take pride in having a mouthful of arguments to put across and prove their point that things are really rough—and going to get much, much worse. We find such men sewing up their arguments with the parting shot, "Just you wait and see." Others within earshot pick up this weeping and wailing. Some of it rubs off. That which does is often distorted, twisted and magnified to sound even worse when passed on again by the eavesdropper.

A remark such as "I understand that company X is laying off 55 workers," is often passed on by a second party as, "Have you heard that company X laid off 150 workers?" and by a third party as "They tell me company X gave the ax to 500 workers." And so, like a grass fire that gets out of hand, little sparks of pessimistic chatter flying out

in various places ignite into a major conflagration. The situation gets out of hand. A seemingly harmless exchange of comments between two men about conditions grows into a monster. For what is said between them passes from mouth to mouth like a chain letter, multiplying over and over again, touching and influencing the lives and actions of all it passes through.

Now is the time for each one of us to check ourselves. Most of us, if questioned, would say that we are positive thinkers. Yet, perhaps without realizing the implications, we all too often are guilty of doing exactly what the men to whom I referred were doing. How about you? Do you choose your words wisely? Are you careful about the mood you are reflecting to others with whom you come in contact? Are you an optimist or a pessimist? Are you a booster or a knocker? Do you think and act in a positive or a negative way? Suppose you do feel badly about some reverses, will it help to make others feel badly, too?

William James, in a line from one of his writings, says "Be not afraid of life. Believe that life is worth living, and your belief will help create the fact." If each of us thinks as William James suggests, and then acts and talks accordingly, we can destroy the source of the power of negative thinking and build up a dynamic force, powered by constructive attitudes and actions.

If, on the other hand, we contribute to this power of negative thinking, you and I may be helping to write pages of history that will read that these days were most noted for being the first time that any peoples talked, thought, and acted themselves into a depression. Who wants to be famous that way?

Let each of us do our share where we are right now to cut off the power of negative thinking by not contributing to it. Let's face up to our problems and buckle down to solve them, but let's do it in a confident, optimistic, and positive way.

Manufacture and Sale of Antipolio Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two editorials from the Washington papers in regard to the antitrust action against the five drug companies in connection with the sale of Salk vaccine may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of May 16, 1958]

PATRIOTS OR PLOTTERS

Presumably the Government has evidence which it thinks justfies prosecution of five drug companies for conspiracy in connection with their manufacture and sale of antipolio vaccine. It is ironic, however, that so soon after these companies had been acclaimed by Federal authorities and the public generally for meeting the demand for the lifesaving Salk vaccine they should find themselves branded as greedy connivers.

When Dr. Jonas Salk, early in 1953, first disclosed the development of a vaccine that was highly effective against the long-dreaded crippler-killer disease, poliomyelitis, there was in existence only a tiny supply in his laboratory. No facilities were available for large-scale production of the vaccine and no techniques had been worked out for commercial manufacture. But the drug companies, in response to an urgent appeal by the United States Public Health Service for a partiotic effort to solve the supply problem quickly, launched a crash program. It cost them a great deal of money. One of them, Cutter Laboratories, ran into difficulties and had to quit, with a reported loss of several million dollars. The five others continued to step up production—and to cut prices—until there was an abundance of the vaccine for everybody.

Against the background of so-called patriotic effort that has produced the vaccine needed to assure victory over the polio scourge, the Department of Justice's action in indicting the five companies for restraint of trade is startling, to say the least. Although details of the broad charge have not been revealed, the general accusation is that the firms conspired to prevent a free market in the vaccine. It does not charge that prices were kept high (actually they have dropped steadily until they are about half of the initial prices) but that prices have been kept uniform.

All of this will be very puzzling to many persons, especially to those who have had the benefits of Salk shots. One of the companies, Eli Lilly, which has produced more than half of the vaccine to date, has called the Goverment's charges complete nonsense. Certainly in fairness to the accused firms, the public ought to withhold judgment until the evidence is of record and the companies have had their day in court.

[From the Washington, D. C., Post of May 18, 1958]

UNSOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Antitrust suits are inescapably abstruse. Perhaps, therefore, the presumption of innocence to which defendants are always entitled under American law is even more than usually obligatory in the case of the five major pharmaceutical firms indicted a few days ago by a Federal grand jury on charges of conspiring to fix prices and eliminate competition in the sale of Salk antipolio vaccine to Federal, State and local government agencies. It must have taken some temerity for the Department of Justice to bring this suit. Inevitably, it recalls the monstrous bungling with which the administration—and especially the Department of Health, Education and Welfare under Secretary Hobby—conducted the entire Salk vaccine distribution program 3 years ago in the spring of 1955.

Do you remember the system of voluntary controls which the President and the Secretary of HEW kept advocating as the way to determine priorities for allocation of the scarce vaccine supplies? The Government itself seemed to be suffering from paralysis at that time. There was a frenzied demand for Salk vaccine. Exhorted by the Government to produce it as speedily and plentifully as possible, the five firms now under indictment were authorized to go ahead with production; and, in point of fact, they went ahead so efficiently and so successfully that by mid-1956 the supply was abundant and priorities were no longer necessary.

Whether these five firms conspired in any way to fix the price of the vaccine, we have no means of knowing; since a grand jury found evidence suggesting that they may have done so, it seems altogether proper that the Government should move against them in vigorous prosecution. Price fixing is bad enough under any circumstances; it seems especially odious in connection with a medicine needed for the protection of children. When one considers, however, that the Federal Government was, for a time at least, the drug companies' sole customer, with authority to bargain respecting the vaccine's price, one can hardly help wondering whether the indictment ought not to include a charge that the Government itself was woefully lax and ineffectual in its whole handling of the Salk vaccine program.

Terrorism and the FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the 45 bombings and dynamitings of churches, schools, and other buildings in the South in recent months are condemned, I am sure, by American citizens wherever they live.

Every society has within it a small, irreducible core of hoodlums and vandals who hate society and every good thing that is in it. Civilization depends upon keeping these elements down—driven back into the corners and dark places where they belong.

The full power of the governments, State and Federal, should be employed in stopping this terrorism in the South. The Attorney General has been asked to use the FBI, with its incomparable resources, to help local authorities combat it. So far he has declined to do so.

Surely it is too late in the day to adopt so crabbed a view of federalism as the Attorney General seems to entertain. These are real bombings. They are inflicting real damage, not only on property, but on the fabric of our collective life. The Constitution is broad enough to meet this challenge to our peace and security, as it has so many others.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Let FBI Hunt the Terrorists," which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on May 19.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET FBI HUNT THE TERRORISTS

The wave of terrorism in the South that has resulted in 45 bombings and dynamitings of religious institutions, schools, and private property during the last 16 months has left Attorney General William P. Rogers unmoved. He has not ordered the FBI to probe the violence.

Rogers apparently is worrying about whether there is an interstate conspiracy behind the bombings. If there is, the FBI would have definite jurisdiction. Meanwhile, the terrorists are at large and the danger that they may strike again is imminent. It has been 3 weeks since the Anti-defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith formally appealed to Rogers to put the FBI on the trail. So far, he has not replied either way.

The acts of violence have been directed at Negroes and Jews. There have been incidents in Alabama, Tennessee, North Caro-

lina, Georgia, Texas, South Carolina, Florida, Arkansas, and Oklahoma.

Arnold Forster, general counsel for the Antidefamation League, pointed out during a recent visit here that the FBI acted in January 1952—on orders from the Justice Department—to investigate racial violence in Florida during the previous year. There had been 13 explosions at Jewish and Catholic institutions and physical violence against Negroes.

The same question arose then as now over whether any Federal laws had been violated. However, J. Howard McGrath, then Attorney General, was more concerned about the inability of the local law enforcement officials to stop the terrorists.

McGrath boldly gave the FBI unusual authority to track down the criminals in Florida. He told the investigators to find the persons responsible and worry about the exact jurisdiction later. McGrath's action abruptly ended the violence and the FBI probe resulted in six grand-jury indictments.

The Antidefamation League's recent appeal to Rogers stated that there appeared to be a virtual southwide conspiracy of lawless elements. Actually, this time the FBI has more justification for stepping in than in 1951–52 because the recent bombings have occurred in nine different States. When McGrath acted, the violence had erupted only in Florida.

Here is a situation where the FBI with its abundance of highly skilled manpower and superior methods of crime detection can be of great service. We hope it won't take continued bombings to convince Rogers of the need for Federal intervention.

The Little Rock Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial "Enforcement Can Create Injustice," which appeared in the Greenville News, of Greenville, S. C., on May 17.

The editorial discusses President Eisenhower's recent remarks at a gathering of Negro leaders, in which he gave some sound advice.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"ENFORCEMENT CAN CREATE INJUSTICE"

The Negro leaders who gave President Eisenhower a citation for distinguished service for employing Army troops to force integration of a school in Little Rock, Ark., should have read between the lines of his remarks some sound advice and an admonition to the Negro to do more with the opportunities he has.

At least one Negro leader at the same meeting in Washington likewise urged his people to do something about the rising crime rate among Negroes in large urban centers, a situation that has been both ignored and covered up to some extent, but which is rapidly becoming a national scandal.

The President has said before some of the things he said in accepting the citation, but he seems to have gone farther in some respects and to have given more emphasis to the thought that the Negro can't depend on laws and force alone to achieve the purposes espoused by the organizations which speak for him.

The Negro, he said, "must have patience and forbearance," and "must depend more on better and more profound education, than the letter of the law."

It has been apparent from the beginning of the law suits seeking admission of Negro pupils to White schools that the NAACP, which successfully pushed them, was interested not in education but in integration for its own sake.

Yet it should be obvious that the Negro's greatest need, in the North as well as in the South, is better education to teach the masses to live decently where they are before thought can be given to moving them elsewhere.

Perhaps Mr. Eisenhower had Little Rock in mind when he made the most significant statement of all:

"Enforcement itself can create more injustice. * * * Laws themselves will never solve the problems in human hearts and emotions."

No greater truth than this has emerged from the whole controversy over integration. The United States Supreme Court was warned during the hearings that preceded the antisegregation decision that such a decree from the court would create more problems than it would ever solve.

And it is true that enforcement already has created more injustice. In Washington, where the school officials voluntarily complied with the decision, educational standards have fallen and many white parents have been forced to move to other communities to find a better environment for their children.

In Little Rock, the presidential action praised as a contribution to justice and respect for the law succeeded in forcing eight or nine Negro children into a white school. But what of the white pupils who came in for rather rough treatment, and what of the effects on the educational process? The Negroes got their rights, but what of the hundreds of other pupils?

Equally telling in the discussion on the occasion were the remarks of Dr. J. H. Jackson, president of the National Baptist Convention, who challenged the Negroes to reduce the mushrooming crime rate. Crime statistics in New York, Chicago and elsewhere show exactly what he was talking about.

The sum and substance of it is that integration as such will solve none of the Negro's problems. He and his leaders must learn to place more reliance on education, religious inspiration and economic improvement.

Need for Expansion of Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, there is growing public recognition of the fact that Congress should act promptly to assist education and specifically see to it that more classrooms are built and teachers are paid decent salaries.

A number of Senators joined in cosponsoring S. 3311, which would help meet this need. My distinguished colleague from Montana, Representative LEE METCALF, introduced companion legislation, H. R. 10763, in the House. The General Education Subcommittee and the Special Education Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor have been conducting joint hearings on the meritorious Metcalf bill.

This bill enjoys widespread support in the teaching profession. Newspapers have also viewed it favorably. Recently the Great Falls Tribune dealt with the issue in an editorial entitled "METCALF Explains Need, Purpose, of School Assistance Bill."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed the Great Falls Tribune editorial, which appeared in the May 14 issue, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

METCALF EXPLAINS NEED, PURPOSE OF SCHOOL ASSISTANCE BILL

While there is continuing public sentiment in this country for some sort of broad expansion of Federal aid to education, the congressional climate does not appear favorable to the passage of such a bill in this session.

Representative LEE METCALF, of Montana, is author of a bill, however, which has the official backing of the National Education Association and which is broad in scope. The current issue of Montana Education magazine carries an explanation by METCALF of the provisions and purpose of his bill (H. R. 10763) and its relation to Montana education problems.

Stressing the critical nature of Montana education financing at the State level, METCALF says in part:

"The School Assistance Act of 1958 is an attempt to meet this national crisis. It would provide Federal aid for school construction and for increases in teachers' salaries. Each State would decide for itself how the money would be spent. A State could decide to spend all its allocation on school construction and basic instructional equipment. It could decide to use all its allocation to increase teachers' salaries. It could decide to spend part of the money for each of the two purposes.

"During the first year of the program, each State would receive $25 per school-age child. That amount would increase by $25 each year until it reached $100 during the fourth year.

"This legislation, cosponsored in the Senate by 13 Senators, among them Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, is of particular importance to Montana.

"At best, it is estimated that Montana will go into the next biennium with a $5 million deficit in the State general fund. If the increased liquor excise tax and the university millage levy are voted out, estimates of the deficit range up to $15 million. As you can see, therefore, there is little hope for increased legislative appropriations for schools. The only other source is Federal aid.

"Montana's allocation during the first year of our program would be $4,388,000, which would increase to $18,851,000 for the fourth, and succeeding years.

"Each level of government—local, State, and Federal—has a responsibility in the effort that must be made unless we are content to become intellectual second-raters. Under the legislation I have introduced the Federal Government's responsibility to prevent this from happening will be partially met."

Supreme Court School Integration Ruling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, recently a South Carolina newspaper published an editorial concerning the Supreme Court school integration ruling of May 17, 1954, and the so-called implementation, enforcement, and interpretation of this ruling by the present administration and the courts.

The editorial is entitled "Fourth Anniversary of Ruling on Race Brings Issue to Harder Ground," and was published in the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of May 16, 1958.

The editorial splendidly outlines the terrible problems we are faced with in the South. Quoting the editor of the Richmond News Leader, James J. Kirkpatrick, the News and Courier says, among other things:

> There is a maxim that no law can be effective when it is imposed upon a community against its will; and when such imposition is attempted it is not called law; it is called tyranny.

No sounder truth has been spoken, and the courts in this land had best pay heed to such things in forcing upon millions of southern people a philosophy and doctrine which is foreign to them and which will not be voluntarily accepted by them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier, May 16, 1958]

FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF RULING ON RACE BRINGS ISSUE TO HARDER GROUND

Tomorrow will be the fourth anniversary of the United States Supreme Court's decision outlawing separation of the races in public schools. It is timely to review what has happened and to look into the future.

Such an examination has been prepared in masterly fashion by James J. Kilpatrick, editor of the Richmond News-Leader, and author of The Sovereign States. Mr. Kilpatrick's article appeared in Human Events, a Washington weekly news letter. From it we submit the folowing summary of the situation today:

"The 17 States and the District of Columbia affected by the school cases have a public-school enrollment of some 9,431,000 white pupils and 2,922,000 Negro pupils. Their school systems are subdivided into school districts, of which 3,000 districts are biracial. The fourth anniversary of the opinion finds approximately 760 of these districts 'integrated,' and 2,240 not integrated. I put the word 'integrated' in quotation marks to suggest that, in some of these districts, integration has been accomplished in the barest token degree: 1 Negro pupil among 6,800 in Winston-Salem, N. C., 4 among 7,700 in Charlotte.

"The statistics on this whole subject are deceptive, and need to be examined with care. When it is said that 2 million white children and 350,000 Negro children are now in 'integrated situations,' it should also be said that except for 9 districts in Arkansas, 3 in North Carolina, and 3 in Tennessee, all these integrated situations are in border States and in the District of Columbia. Four years after the decision, not a single public school is racially integrated in Virginia, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, or Louisiana.

"What carries perhaps the greatest significance is the fact that the trend toward voluntary integration has all but stopped. Of the 760 school districts now classified as integrated, 537 were integrated by the fall of 1955, and 723 were integrated by the fall of 1956. The movement now has stalled. Except for a few mopup districts in fringe areas, the advance of integration will move henceforth an inch at a time. Court orders, directed at resentful defendants and backed by Federal force, will be required, and these will have to be carried out in an atmosphere not of acceptance but of active or passive hostility. There is a maxim that no law can be effective when it is imposed upon a community against its will; and when such imposition is attempted, it is not called law; it is called tyranny. It is in this light that the Court's decrees are viewed over most of the remaining unintegrated districts."

What may southerners expect in the future? The courts are pressing two districts in Virginia to hasten the mingling of races in classrooms. The showdown may come in September. Mr. Kilpatrick forecasts hard resistance.

"These have not been happy years for the South," says Mr. Kilpatrick, "not for the white southerner, and I suspect, not for his black brother either. But we survive. Both races in the South fortunately are characterized by a vast and almost boundless patience; we share a certain genius for procrastination, and facing what often seems to be a crisis, we sometimes are able to resolve the urgency by what John Randolph called a policy of judicious neglect. It may be, in time, that a new relationship of agreeable stalemate will provide us an acceptable modus vivendi. Each race needs the other, at least in terms of the southern economy, and one day the process of gradual adjustment halted by the Court will have to be resumed.

"But on this particular issue of public schools, the white South has not the slightest intention of yielding; and the Negro leadership seems determined to press its legal advantage at any consequence. Both sides, looking to the autumn, are a little apprehensive. We do not know what will happen, but we do know this: Over the past 4 years, the apostles of integration have won the easy ground; and now, for good or ill, the easy ground is about used up."

Mr. Kilpatrick, an acknowledged authority on the United States Constitution, speaks with a great background of knowledge both of law and of people. He reflects the sentiments of many Virginians. We believe South Carolinians share those sentiments.

Trying as the times ahead may be, the qualities of courage, patience, and decency will enable people of both races to surmount their troubles and to work out an acceptable way of life. We hope this result can be attained without violence and with a minimum of outside interference.

Sputnik III and the Long, Long Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last week I had printed in the RECORD an article which deplored the general apathy toward our urgent educational needs which has followed our successful launching of a satellite of our own.

The Christian Science Monitor, in an editorial appearing on May 19, expresses the hope that the very considerable achievement of the Soviets in putting up a sputnik weighing 3,000 pounds will stir us to continue to press hard on our missile program and long-range defense planning. I think the editorial is right. But even more than what is there stated, I think we ought to make use of the sense of urgency Sputnik III should give us to spur our people to build the schools and recruit the teachers, upon which our destiny ultimately depends.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "The Spur of Sputnik III," from the Christian Science Monitor for May 19, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SPUR OF SPUTNIK III

The launching of the third Soviet sputnik was a prodigious achievement. Its weight of a ton and a half makes it the heaviest man-made object orbiting our planet.

It took tremendous rocket power to launch such a vehicle. Thus the Soviets have once again demonstrated their abilities in this militarily significant field.

As with previous sputniks, the new satellite was announced as part of the International Geophysical Year program. We are glad that the Soviets are demonstrating their rocket might as part of this peaceful international scientific effort. But we hope that the implications of this demonstration will again drive home the need for intelligent urgency to American military rocket planners.

The sense of urgency that prevailed following Sputniks I and II began to dull after a few small American satellites were also shot into orbit. The former apathy toward pleas from research managers for sharply stepped-up missile development and truly long-range space defense planning seemed to be returning.

From the viewpoint of western nations, the new sputnik will be of double service if, in addition to contributing to scientific knowledge, it helps keep defense planners on their toes.

The Language Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Jacob Ornstein entitled "The Language Race" which appeared in the May 1958 issue of the Kiwanis magazine.

In this article Mr. Ornstein points out the lack of foreign language training available in our colleges and secondary schools and contrasts the attitude in the United States toward the importance of teaching our young people foreign languages which will enable them to com-

municate with people from all parts of the world with the stress being placed on this phase of education by other countries, particularly the Soviet Union. If we are to achieve better understanding and mutual cooperation of nations in all parts of the world, it is essential that our people in government, in private industry and in other forms of American representation abroad be able to communicate with the peoples of these nations.

In this connection, Senator MANSFIELD and I introduced S. 3552, a bill which would improve the language training proficiency of foreign service officers. It is my sincere hope that this bill, which is a step toward correcting the language deficiency in the Foreign Service, will receive favorable consideration by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during this session of the Congress.

This morning in the Senate Appropriations Committee we heard a discussion of the very serious need for further language study by our Foreign Service officers.

There being no objection, the article was order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LANGUAGE RACE

(By Jacob Ornstein)

Somewhere in the Middle East a crowd listens to a loudspeaker mounted on a sound truck in the village market place. First the listeners hear a news summary, then a bitter propaganda barrage against Washington, and finally a declaration of Moscow's love for the Moslem world. An American official stands by, completely unable to understand the rapid flow of gutteral sounds. Not far away, a Soviet diplomat smilingly turns to a group of bystanders and strikes up a conversation with them in fluent Arabic. This Russian is one of a vast army of linguists trained in the U. S. S. R. to fight the West, not with automatic rifles or atomic artillery, but with the ordnance of foreign tongues.

The Soviet Union, realizing that words are weapons in the struggle for men's minds, has launched an all-out offensive on the language front that no other country has shown the willingness or ability to match. Bright Russian youngsters of eight are sent to special schools for a thorough grounding in French, German, or English, along with their three R's. High-school students spend 5 years at rigorous language study. Talented youths receive scholarships to state institutes of foreign languages, where 5 years of full-time training are given them in 1 of the major world languages. Diplomats must master the language of the country to which they will be sent—as well as 1 or 2 additional tongues—before they ever set foot on foreign soil. Publishing houses are turning out dictionaries and texts in over a hundred languages, including Chinese, Amharic, Uzbek, and even Zulu.

America is many noses behind in this language sweepstakes. The Arabic tongue, key to the culture and peoples of the entire Middle East, is studied by no more than 85 students in all our universities. Chinese, spoken by 650 million people in Mao's militant state, is offered by only 35 of our higher institutions, mostly to small classes. A recent survey, made by the writer and published by the Department of State's External Research Staff, found that of our 1800 colleges, only 165 teach Russian, to less than 5000 students. By contrast, there are about 10 million Russians of all ages mastering English, and Soviet educational authorities have called for an even more vigorous English teaching program.

As a leader in the Free World, we are finding linguistic ignorance to be a formidable stumbling block in international relations. Secretary of State Dulles not long ago declared, "The United States carries new responsibilities in many quarters of the globe and we are at a serious disadvantage because of the difficulty of finding persons who can deal with the foreign language problem. Interpreters are no substitute."

What happened in Indonesia a few years ago has become a classic illustration of the dangers of working through native translators. When that new state was created, we simply had no personnel able to handle the language of the country. Natives were hired, who, out of deference to their employers, translated everything in a manner highly complimentary to America. When linguists trained by the State Department arrived on the spot, read the newspapers, and attended sessions of the legislature, they found that a bitter wave of anti-American sentiment was raging there.

So serious has the situation become that the United States Office of Education last March called a public conference on the language problem. Representatives of some 20 agencies were invited to sound off on their linguistic woes. An official of the United States Information Agency, for example, reported that of the 65 otherwise qualified applicants interviewed by him on a recruiting trip to eight leading universities, only three had a real working knowledge of such simple languages as French, Italian, or Spanish. According to a spokesman for the International Cooperation Administration, which annually sends some 1200 persons abroad, among a typical team of 50 men dispatched last spring for work in underdeveloped areas, only three could speak anything but English.

Why is the American, with all his educational facilities, the low man on the linguistic totem pole? It is simply because our school system has for decades regarded foreign language with indifference, apathy, or outright hostility.

The story of the tragic decline of language study in the classrooms of our Nation can be briefly told. Up to 1914, a knowledge of 1 or 2 languages was considered essential for every educated person. However, during the first World War, anti-German hysteria eventually spread to all things foreign. Heights of absurdity were reached when sauerkraut was named liberty cabbage and the Katzenjammer Kids were rebaptized the Liberty Kids. Twenty-two States passed legislation curbing language study.

After the war, isolationism and the attacks of super-progressive educators combined to deal language a knockout blow. Emphasis was shifted to life-adjustment courses, such as cosmetology, basket weaving, and even dating Indeed, the more extreme theorists confidently asserted that foreign tongues were a frill and a waste of time for young Americans, few of whom would leave our comfortable, monolingual shores.

Pearl Harbor was a rude awakening. From the time of our entry into the war until V–J Day, 11,453,000 Americans went overseas—most of them tongue-tied in anything but English. Reviewing his experience on several fronts, Gen. Jacob L. Devers had the following to say:

"The inability of American troops to communicate with their allies * * * led to frequent misunderstandings which caused frictions and even delays in the prosecution of the common war effort."

GI's returning from the cockpits of war helped bring a mild boom in languages, and enrollments went upwards. A number of universities added new languages to their curricula, overhauled teaching methods, and installed modern equipment. The armed services and the Government, determined never to be caught linguistically flat-footed again, set up their own teaching programs to supply the know-how that they had despaired of receiving from the public schools.

In spite of these developments, America is still dangerously short of language skills. A survey conducted in 1953 by the American Council of Learned Societies for the Department of Defense, identified only 1 person with an advanced knowledge of Thai, and 3 who spoke Burmese. When we need to win friends among the Asian-African nations that are being so ardently courted by Moscow and Peking, this lack of tongues constitutes a dangerous chink in our armor.

Although World War II taught us a bitter language lesson, our school system has still not retooled to meet present-day needs. According to Modern Language Association figures, there are fewer students, percentagewise, learning languages in our high schools today than there were 40 years ago. Although in 1914, 40 percent of American secondary-school students were enrolled in modern-language classes, at present only about 15 percent are so enrolled. Worst of all, fully 56 percent of our high schools do not offer a modern language, even to those interested in pursuing it. Is it any wonder that prominent language educator Donald D. Walsh has termed the high schools our "linguistic wasteland"?

In the colleges the situation is also depressing. Between 1920 and 1952, exactly 90 accredited institutions (13 of them in 1950, 5 years after the war) dropped the language requirement. Unruffled by the ferment in the Near and Far East, many institutions continue to concentrate, as they did 20 years ago, on Western Europe. Of these antiquated curricula, Lawrence G. Derthick, United States Commissioner of Education, recently observed, "Today our schools teach mainly French, Spanish, German, and Italian, yet three-fourths of the world's population do not speak these languages." To make matters worse, the geography, history, and backgrounds of large and strategic areas of the globe are badly neglected. "So far as the American undergraduate is concerned," Prof. G. L. Anderson of New York University has charged, "the Orient is still the land of Marco Polo and Dr. Fu Manchu."

Unfortunately, it is the younger generation that must pay the price of our shortsightedness. Many feel bitter and disillusioned at being sent out as linguistic ignoramuses into a complex, multilingual world. It is small wonder that the young man faced with military service feels cheated when he is sent to an overseas post minus a foreign tongue that might spell survival. Associated Press correspondent Harold Martin, in a dispatch from the Korean War, once wrote, "I saw a battalion badly bloodied because nobody could understand what an excited Korean was trying to say—that a strong Red force was lying in ambush just behind the hill." Speaking before the General Staff School several years ago, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge warned of the shape of things to come when he stated, "An American officer who wants to succeed in the future may have to show his proficiency in commanding some sort of foreign troops."

High school and college graduates in search of jobs learn, often too late, that language know-how can be translated into dollars and cents. An examination of a recent issue of The New York Sunday Times disclosed 57 positions in which language was required. These ranged from bilingual stenographer, in which language skill brought five to ten extra dollars weekly, to Spanish- or Portuguese-speaking auditor, with a $1,200 yearly differential for the linguistic competence. The ever-growing demand for American products creates an increased need for young men able to solicit prospective clients in tongues as diverse as

French and Burmese. Here, too, our young countrymen will find stiff competition from the polyglot Germans, Swiss, Japanese, and Russians, who have bitten big chunks out of our foreign trade balance.

Travel is in the cards for young Americans. By 1960, the United States Passport Office expects to issue one million passports annually. The recipient of each passport is now also given a letter signed by President Eisenhower, reminding him that while abroad he is a responsible representative of his nation. Whether in Naples or Timbuctoo, the American globetrotter who can approach the other fellow in his own tongue helps cement foreign relations more than he may ever imagine. While in Jakarta, Vice President NIXON received a thunderous ovation and made friends for the West by uttering the single word "merdeka"—Indonesian for "freedom."

This is not all. By denying our youngsters a foreign tongue, we also deprive them of the rich byproducts of this subject. The intellectual and cultural values of language study, neglected in America as if by a tacit conspiracy, have long been recognized by leaders and thinkers in most lands. It is not claiming too much to say that the pursuit of languages engenders habits of orderliness, perseverance, and logical analysis, while at the same time opening doors to other civilization. The French writer Anatole France once noted that "the merest smattering of any language that is new to you is a step away from ignorance and a step forward toward more knowledge of men and their thoughts."

The superiority of students presenting language for college entrance has been clearly established by experiments during the past 25 years. Last year, Dr. Robert Skelton, after studying incoming freshmen at Alabama Polytechnic Institute, concluded that students who had pursued a foreign language in high school almost invariably scored higher in all entrance tests, including mechanics of English, effectiveness of English, reading comprehension, mathematics, American history, and linguistic ability. Although this sounds like a panacea for all that ails humanity, the moral is obvious.

What can be done about our appalling neglect of foreign languages? The problem will not be solved by calling more high-level conferences or by asking Congress for increased appropriations, even though these measures have their values. The answer lies in the overhauling of our hopelessly outdated language teaching system.

At the college level, it is necessary to expand the range of languages to include Indonesian, Vietnamese, Tamil, Swahili, Persian, as well as Russian, Polish, and many other vital Eastern and Slavic tongues. The traditional concept of 3 or 4 hours of classwork weekly needs to be scrapped for more intensive instruction. The language requirement for college entrance and graduation ought to be made universal.

In the high schools, foreign languages should be required for all but the mentally deficient. The range of languages also needs to be expanded, with Russian, Arabian, Chinese, and Hindi made available to gifted youngsters. Poorly qualified teachers ought to be replaced by professional linguists with the finest of equipment at their disposal.

Most important of all, the teaching of foreign languages needs to be widely introduced at the elementary school level. It is ironic that American educators have consistently failed to recognize a fact long appreciated abroad—that childhood is the ideal age for language learning. Dr. Wilder Penfield of the Montreal Neurological Institute, and Dr. Frances Ilg, of the Gesell Institute of Child Development, recently emphasized that "the optimum age for beginning the continuous learning of a second language seems to fall within the span of ages 8, 9, and 10."

Although belatedly, the movement to introduce foreign languages in the elementary school (known as FLES by the teaching profession) is beginning to get off the ground. From a small beginning in 1952, the enrollment has now risen to about 300,000 youngsters in some 2,000 schools studying French, Spanish, German, and Italian tongues. Impressive as this may seem, it still means that less than one American youngster out of a hundred can have a chance at language learning—even when it is literally child's play.

Doubting Thomases may look with a jaundiced eye at FLES, objecting that the curriculum is already overcrowded. A look at current practices, however, will allay their fears. Two basic types of programs are now in operation. In the first, a teacher, in circuit-rider fashion, visits a number of classrooms, spending 10–20 minutes in each. Language is usually begun in grade three and continued through the sixth grade, by which time the junior linguist should have a good command of the everyday, spoken idiom and be ready for more advanced work.

The second type of plan does not require that a special period be set aside. Instead, language instruction is integrated by the homeroom teacher into regular classwork. For instance, in geography class the students also learn their geographical facts about Germany, Austria, and other lands both in German and English. In either system, the amount of time consumed by language instruction is so small that no other subject need be sacrificed.

So dramatic have been the results schieved by most FLES programs that television, newspapers, and other public media have accorded it an amount of attention rarely devoted to educational events.

In the final analysis, the language problem must be attacked at the grassroots. When the American public fully realizes how its youth is being hamstrung by inadequate linguistic training, it will demand and receive a language-teaching system geared to modern times. Public leaders can do much to awaken Americans to the seriousness of the situation. The United States Commission for UNESCO has organized several hundred "citizen consultation groups," to acquaint laymen and educators with the facts. Civic groups, particularly the parent-teachers' associations, have put their shoulder to the wheel and spearheaded moves to improve language facilities at the local level. In some communities, they have even carried out "language" drives to provide funds for adding linguists to the school staff.

Unhappily, the teacher shortage may sabotage any real progress in language improvement. Informed estimates reckon that by 1960, about 1,900 and by 1970, some 6,500 new instructors, not counting replacements will be needed. Unless language teaching is made more attractive, through higher salaries and such fringe benefits as travel and study opportunities, we will continue to lose our best linguistic talent to better paying but less critical fields.

Meanwhile, America lags dangerously behind in the language race. When it is entirely possible that the real battle for survival may be won or lost in the classroom, we cannot afford much longer to tolerate our horse-and-buggy language system in an age of space travel.

Marxism in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs, and an eminent authority on the Communist menace throughout the world, continues to inform the reading public with much that is important to apprise us of the evils attendant upon the movements of this ideology. As professor of international relations in the Catholic University of Chile, Dr. Thorning has been an avid student of communism, particularly in the nations of South America.

His views on this matter are among those for which I have a very real personal respect. I commend to the Members of the Senate his recent article, Marxism in Latin America. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARXISM IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Joseph F. Thorning, professor of international relations in the Catholic University of Chile)

Although signs of the stepped-up activity of Marxist-Leninist agents are apparent almost everywhere in Latin America, they seem to cause little apprehension among State Department officials. Speaking at Miami on January 14, 1958, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, R. R. Rubottom, Jr., declared that Marxism-Leninism, although a constant danger, did not constitute an immediate threat to the other American republics. The Kremlin agitators, Mr. Rubtottom insisted, were in no position anywhere in the hemisphere to gain power through legitimate means.

In the same vein, the Assistant Secretary played down the Soviet menace by citing figures on the number of Communist Party adherents in Latin America. The number varied, he claimed, "between a few Communists—as is the case of Central America—and from 50,000 to 80,000 in Brazil and Argentina, respectively." In estimating that the total throughout the 20 other American republics might be less than 200,000, he did admit that numbers frequently do not represent the influence they have.

Obviously taking into account the Kremlin's frantic efforts to promote trade with Brazil and the actual presence of an Argentina commercial mission in Moscow, Mr. Rubottom discounted this threat by pointing to a 12-precent decrease in business between Latin America and the Soviet bloc in 1957.

Mr. Rubottom also mentioned the religious spirt of the Latin Americans, 95 percent Catholics, who have a deep faith in God and spiritual values of freemen. He considered this outlook upon life as an obstacle to Soviet expansion.

Finally, Mr. Rubottom alleged that Kremlin attempts to intimidate the free world with the sputniks have had no effect in the other American republics. Evidently, the United States official considered that Soviet

advances in technology would be more than offset by cultural exchange and an ever-increasing cooperation among the American republics, based on centuries-old bonds which unite them.

In an earlier interview, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles predicted that the Soviets would not be able to penetrate the hemisphere. Acknowledging that a sharp drop in prices for raw materials imported from Latin America furnished the groundwork for the Kremlin's economic offensive in that area, Mr. Dulles expressed confidence that an improvement of business in the United States of America would produce a leveling up of prices. He added that substantial assistance was available to the other American republics through the Export-Import Bank and the United States program of technical aid.

State Department complacency about the situation is not shared by United States leaders in the legislative branch of the Government. Democratic Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS, who has been outstanding in his devotion to the good-neighbor policy, called for a top-level conference of United States policymakers to concert action for freedom against new subversion in Guatemala. The Florida lawmaker also promised that he would introduce a bill to increase Latin America's share in the mutual security program. As soon as Senator SMATHERS announced his plan to provide a $30 million increase, another specialist on inter-American affairs, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, declared that he would support the initiative of his distinguished colleague from Florida. Meanwhile, important leaders in the United States House of Representatives pointed out that the $3 billion that had been wasted on a Marxist-Leninist tyrant, Mr. Josip Broz-Tito, should have been invested in Latin America.

Both Senators and Representatives emphasized that it would be the part of wisdom to strengthen the effectiveness of inter-American cooperation by making more funds available to the Organization of American States. The Secretary General of this valuable regional group, Dr. José Antonio Mora, in an exclusive interview with this associate editor of World Affairs, drew attention to two interesting anomalies: (1) Although Europe, Asia, and Africa receive rich consideration in the United States mutual security program, Latin America gets little or no attention; (2) after all the fanfare at the meetings of Chiefs of State at Panama, the 21 American Republics, although favoring spectacular plans for expansion of health, education and welfare programs through the Organization of American States, scaled down that group's 1958 budget as it applied to specific projects, by three-quarters of a million dollars.

A veteran Washington observer, commenting upon this development, remarked: "Slashing the budget of the Organization of American States is a curious way to profit by the experience of this body in the domain of cultural, technical and economic cooperation. 1958 should be a year of fresh initiative and broadened activity. Latin American farm products, minerals and professional skills are in urgent need of markets. This is bound to accelerate inflation which, in Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Haiti, and Uruguay, is approaching disastrous extremes. Guatemala is not the only country where the Soviets are ready to establish another beachhead. This time, the men under the discipline of the Kremlin are shooting for big stakes: oil-and-iron rich Venezuela. Caracas is Target No. 1 of the disciples of Karl Marx."

In Brazil the Marxists are using the bait of trade as the spearhead of an attempt to get the Government in Rio de Janeiro to agree to the establishment of full diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. Brazil already has Soviet-dominated Legations from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland. It is well known that these Legations are centers of Soviet propagnada and espionage. The Marxist-Leninist agents are supplied with plenty of capital for their subversive operations.

Several members of the Brazilian Cabinet, including the Finance Minister, José Maria Alkmin, are urging President Juscelino Kubitschek to set up an Embassy in Moscow and to allow the Soviets to accredit an Ambassador to Brazil. Finance Minister Alkmin claims that the Brazilians must find additional markets for their coffee, minerals, and fruit. He and other civilians in the cabinet are impressed by the relatively low prices that the Moscovites are quoting to Petrobras, the Brazilian national oil monopoly for exploration, drilling, and exploitation equipment. In their eagerness to do business on what appear to be advantageous terms the civilian officials seem to be blind to the experience of other nations with Soviet inferior machinery which breaks down in the oilfields.

Brazil now has for sale huge quantities, not only of coffee, tropical fruit, cocoa, cotton, wax, and vegetable oils, but also cattle, hides, wood fibres, sugar, and a variety of minerals. Representatives of a newly organized Marxist trade agency, Torgbras, are painting commercial possibilities in bright colors. Promises are made lavishly to the effect that Soviet-Brazilian trade can amount to $560 million.

A curious feature of Torgbras (more than faintly reminiscent of the United States of America Amtorg) is that the frontman is a Brazilian, Col. Eleuterio Tito Lemos Do Canto. His partners are two Russian-born residents of Hong Kong, Klimenty and Valerian Odintsoff. They are a father and son combination. Their trip from Hong Kong to Rio de Janeiro was made with documents from the United Nations Refugee Office. The Odintsoffs and Do Canto now have representatives in the principal Brazilian cities. They acknowledge that they are in contact with Soviet commercial offices in Buenos Aires, Montevideo and other South American capitals. According to the best military sources in Brazil, Chile, Bolivia, and Paraguay, the whole network of trade and political agents is financed by the Soviet Embassy in Uruguay.

On January 16, 1958, Mr. Amaury Kruel, chief of the Brazilian federal police, revealed that all the aforesaid activity was planned at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party in Moscow in 1956. Present at this meeting, according to the report made by Crief Kruel, was the notorious Soviet boss of Brazil, Luis Carlos Prestes. The latter, who is described by his cohorts as the "cavalier of hope," was able to escape from Brazil and make his way to Moscow by means of a Soviet visa furnished in the Montevideo Embassy of the Soviet Union.

It was on the basis of this information that the military members of the Brazilian Cabinet voted to act as a unit in opposition to the proposed diplomatic rapprochement with the Kremlin. It is no secret that Gen. Enrique Teixera Lott, Minister of National Defense, is determined to have no part in the move to give the Marxists an additional foothold in the armed forces and in the nation. His Eminence, Jaime Cardinal da Camara, Archbishop of Rio de Janeiro, also issued a solemn warning to the people about the value of freedom and the need for caution in any dealings with the men in the Kremlin.

In the meantime, the Brazilian unit of currency, the cruzeiro, continues to sag. Whereas the rate of exchange of the cruzeiro to the dollar was 65 to 1, not long ago, it now stands at the rate of 95 to 1. Obviously, this is a condition that prompts all Brazilians to get into debt, to buy on the installment plan and do do nothing to store up savings for the morrow. The whole economy has become the adjunct of a gambling fever and a gambling casino. No end of the monetary inflation is in sight.

Basic to this inflation is the fact that Brazil must import petroleum products valued at almost $300 million each year. This is a huge item in the adverse balance of trade. Nevertheless, the proved petroleum reserves of the country are more than ample for the industrial and transport needs of Brazil. But another fever, rampant nationalism, keeps the populace chanting: "The oil is ours." This is true. The Brazilian economy, however, requires that the oil be extracted from the subsoil, refined and distributed. Under present circumstances, this indispensable mineral resource is simply buried treasure.

No high Government official has the moral fortitude to educate the Brazilians on the virtues of production in cooperation with foreign technicians and overseas money. This could be done, it has been noted, on the basis of the Venezuelan formula, splitting the oil royalties 50–50, or even in a proportion more favorable to the Nation. Until some agreement is reached, the oil will remain in the ground. And the Marxists will have a fertile field of propaganda and agitation. Liberty is at stake.

Savings From Shipment of Surplus Farm Products via Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive today a most informative letter from H. G. Bethune, Jr., of the General Steamship Agencies, of Milwaukee, representing a large number of shipping lines.

The letter pointed out the tremendously impressive savings which have been already realized, thanks to the movement of surplus farm products via the direct, all-water route from the Midwest through the present St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. Bethune estimates that America's taxpayers have saved no less than $600,000 based upon economies achieved by moving these farm items through Milwaukee and Green Bay alone.

Mr. President, this is a most heartwarming report, for several reasons:

First. It demonstrates sound economy for the American taxpayer on the part of Federal agencies' handling the surplus disposal program.

Second. It demonstrates an awareness of the significance of the present seaway—a significance which will, of course, be multiplied manyfold, when the present 14-foot depth gives way to the future 27-foot depth.

Third. It demonstrates the effectiveness of one of the finest humanitarian programs conceivable, and that is, ship-

ments under church auspices to aid needy people abroad.

I cannot too highly commend what America's great religious faiths have done in fulfilling the ancient admonition that we are our brother's keeper.

It is most appropriate that the bounty produced from the fertile soil of America, from the good earth of this continent should serve to feed the hungry and help make whole the bodies of those abroad which have been impaired by malnutrition.

American farm products should not be piled up in warehouses. They should be used as under Public Law 416 and Public Law 480, to bring health and happiness to people who need to consume them.

In the spring of 1959, when the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway opens, then the savings reported by Mr. Bethune, in this one small instance, will be magnified to a vast extent. This will come about, not only through Government-sponsored shipments abroad, but infinitely more important, through an ever-rising volume of private commercial trade.

I send to the desk now the text of Mr. Bethune's letter, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Fjell-Oranje Lines (Lakes-Europe-United Kingdom), Fjell Line (Lakes-Scandinavia), Swedish-Chicago Line (Lakes-United Kingdom, Scandinavia), Niagara Line (Lakes-Mediterranean), Concordia Line (Mediterranean-Persian Gulf), Thorden Line (Scandinavia), West Coast Line (west coast, South America), Brodin Line (east coast, South America), Harrison Line (United Kingdom), Knutsen Line (Far East), Spanish Line (Spain), Vacuba Line (Cuba), O. S. K. Line (Japan), C. T. O. Line (Far East), Chargeurs Reunis (West Africa), Eckert Line (Portugal-north Africa), West Line (Caribbean), Guatemala Line (Guatemala-Honduras)]

GENERAL STEAMSHIP AGENCIES, INC.,
Milwaukee, Wis., May 20, 1958.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator from Wisconsin,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: As the foremost sponsor and proponent of the St. Lawrence seaway and its development and usage, and knowing as we do of your intense and continuing interest, you will undoubtedly be pleased to know that Wisconsin ports, i. e., Milwaukee and Green Bay, are benefiting from the movements of surplus dairy products in overseas relief programs via the direct all-water route.

Several years ago we interested the Department of Agriculture in making available at Great Lakes ports some shipments of surplus cheese and dried milk, which, under Public Law 416, had been donated to various relief agencies for distribution overseas to needy people. The experience proved most satisfactory and economical and, as a result, more and more such shipments were allocated for movement via the Great Lakes to destinations principally in continental Europe, Mediterranean and north Africa, to which areas the ocean rates from Great Lakes ports are the same as the ocean rates from seaboard ports.

With the cooperation of some of the relief agencies, principally the Catholic Relief Services, and also the Lutheran World Relief and Church World Service, plus the encouragement, interest, and splendid cooperation of the various interested branches of the United States Department of Agriculture this movement, during the 1957 lakes shipping season, reached a total of approximately 120 million net pounds of surplus dairy and grain products which moved via the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway route to the destinations mentioned above. Of this total about three-fourths moved through the Wisconsin ports of Milwaukee and Green Bay.

As you know under the terms of Public Law 416 the inland freight charges from point of origin to port of exit are paid by Commodity Credit Corporation, and the relief agency takes possession at the port and arranges for payment of ocean freight charges which are, in turn, reimbursable by ICA. By clearing these shipments from Wisconsin ports and because most of these surplus dairy products originate in Wisconsin and Minnesota the saving in inland rail charges is considerable as opposed to sending the products to eastern or gulf seaboard ports. Figuring conservatively the average rail savings amount to about $15 per gross ton, and if we extend this to the approximately 85 million pounds or roughly 40,000 tons which moved through Milwaukee and Green Bay this past year we come up with a total dollar freight saving to Commodity Credit Corporation and the taxpaying public of about $600,000 on that portion alone. Because, as stated above, the ocean freight rates are the same from both lake and seaboard ports to the destinations listed there is no additional cost to the relief agencies.

These savings in freight costs are quite impressive and certainly a great deal of credit should be given to the Food Distribution Division, Direct Distribution Branch, and the Dairy Operation Branch, shipping section of the Livestock and Dairy Division, and the Grain Division of the Commodity Stabilization Service of the Department of Agriculture for their encouragement and cooperation in facilitating these movements through lake ports. The assistance of the Cincinnati office of the Commodity Stabilization Service has also been of tremendous value in expediting these shipments to the various lake ports for clearance.

The Department of Agriculture, through the various branches mentioned above, is well aware of the economy resulting from the utilization of lake ports and the St. Lawrence seaway and we are sure will continue to take full advantage of these opportunities.

I am sure that you also are interested in its continued use.

Yours very truly,
GENERAL STEAMSHIP AGENCIES, INC.,
H. G. BETHUNE, Jr., *President.*

Our Foreign Policy Seeks To Defend and Advance the Interests of the United States

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, delivered before the Atomic Power Institute sponsored by the New Hampshire Council on World Affairs, New Hampshire Hall, University of New Hampshire, Durham, N. H., Friday, May 2, 1958, at 8 p. m., eastern daylight time.

In presenting Secretary Dulles to the New Hampshire audience, I said:

The Honorable John Foster Dulles needs no introduction to any audience either in the United States or abroad. There is no American in public life today who has a clearer grasp of international problems or who has displayed a greater leadership in solving them than Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. In international conference after conference, he has countered successfully Soviet attempts to confuse, to disrupt, and to dominate the world. The country has every reason to be justly proud of the many diplomatic victories he has won and of his leadership in international affairs. His deep insight, his vision, his dedication to the principles for which the United States stands enable him to give us inspired leadership and statesmanship in this troubled nuclear and space era.

I count it a distinct privilege and a high honor to be on the platform with the Secretary this evening. All of us are grateful to you, Mr. Secretary, for honoring the New Hampshire Council on World Affairs, the University of New Hampshire, and our State with your presence at this banquet tonight. Ladies and gentlemen, I present to you the Honorable John Foster Dulles, the greatest Secretary of State in our time.

The address follows:

There is nothing mysterious about the goals of United States foreign policy. It seeks to defend and advance the interests of the United States. These interests are of several kinds:

(1) There is the life of our people and the physical safety of our homeland. These would be endangered by war.

(2) There is the well-being of our economy. This would be gravely impaired if hostile forces dictated the pattern of world trade.

(3) There is the integrity of the principles for which our Nation was founded. Our Nation is more than population, more than real estate. Our Nation represents ideals. These ideals are an integral part of America, to be defended and promoted by our foreign policy.

Now let me comment briefly on these three aspects of our foreign policy.

I. PEACE

We defend our people and our homeland against armed attack by having the power to hit back hard at anyone who attacks us or our allies. This causes any potential aggressor to pause, for he knows that he could not, by aggression, gain as much as he would stand to lose. In order to have that assured capacity to strike back, we need cooperation with other countries.

Potential aggressors need to be put on notice that they cannot, with impunity, pick up nations one by one, leaving the United States to the last, when even we will be relatively weak. Accordingly, we have made collective defense treaties and similar arrangements with nearly 50 other countries. These commit each nation to help the other in the event of armed attack.

A further benefit from these arrangements is that under them the burden of the military effort is shared. For example, the ground forces of the cooperating free world nations amount to about 5.6 million men. But only about 950,000 of these are American.

Also our Strategic Air Command is afforded well dispersed positions around the world.

This dispersal greatly increases the effectiveness of the deterrent.

Our collective security arrangements are serviced by our Mutual Security Program. It supplies our allies with a certain amount of military equipment. In a few cases it helps them financially to maintain military establishments which are needed but which their economies are too poor to support without some outside help. And we provide development assistance to certain less developed free world countries. We do that to help them build their societies on the principles of freedom and to escape pressure to turn to the Communist bloc with the peril of liberty which that involves.

The Soviet Union tries hard to disrupt our defensive efforts. It portrays the United States as militaristic and our collective defense groupings as aggressive military blocs.

Of course, as you and I know, the American people are among the least militaristic of any people in the world. George Washington called upon us to maintain what he called a "respectable defensive posture." By that he meant a military posture strong enough so that others would respect it. Unfortunately, we have not always done that. At times our military strength has been so negligible that militaristic despots treated us as a cipher, not to be taken into account in their aggressive plan.

We are trying not to commit that fault again. We do not intend to make ourselves weak merely because the Soviet imperialists urge that we do so to prove our idealism.

Our collective arrangements are defensive, as specifically authorized by the United Nations Charter. These groupings are more than expedients. They introduce a fresh concept into the structure of world order.

Within our own country and every civilized country, local security is sought on a collective basis. We unite to provide a central police force, a central fire department, and the like.

Now, at last, within the free world, we are beginning to apply that enlightened collective concept. In that way weaker nations can be made secure from being picked up one by one. In that way a strong nation can avoid having to become a garrison state, and even then, being encircled and strangled, as a result of the smaller nations being picked up one by one. On a collective basis nations get maximum security at minimum cost.

No doubt our people would not hesitate to provide the vast funds needed for our solitary defense and our youth, if necessary, would give a greatly increased measure of their time to military service. But even with that maximum effort we would be less secure.

Every American who wants to see his country safe and solvent ought to get out and actively support our mutual-security program, now before the Congress.

II. ECONOMIC WELFARE

Our foreign policy also tries to assure our people a prosperous home economy. That depends in good part upon foreign trade. Our exports are running at a rate approaching $20 billion a year. Our foreign trade employs about 4.5 million people. Our imports provide many important things that we need and could not readily, or at all, produce here at home. Furthermore, our trade relations help to keep the free world together. Without ample trade with the United States, many countries would be virtually forced to accept absorption into the Communist economic bloc.

The major expression of our foreign trade policy is the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. The principle of the act was first adopted in 1934 and 10 times the Congress has acted to renew it. Under it our trade has flourished. In 1934 our total foreign trade—exports and imports—amounted to $3.7 billion. Last year it amounted to $32.4 billion, excluding military exports.

The latest renewal expires next month, and further extension is now being sought from the Congress. Failure to extend would be a major disaster. A very few might temporarily benefit. But very many, and, in the long run, all, would suffer gravely.

Surely we do not want to go back to the early 1930's. Then our high tariff and monetary devaluation policies wreaked havoc upon international trade and boosted into power, in Germany and Japan, extreme nationalists who later plunged the world into World War II.

Every American who wants to see his country economically sound, who wants allies, and who wants peace, should work for the extension of our Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

III. IDEALS

Let me speak now about our efforts to promote the ideals of America.

Our Nation was founded by men of religious faith. They believed that our Declaration of Independence was not merely rhetoric but truth, and that all men were in fact endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. They believed that they had a mission to help men everywhere to have the opportunity to exercise their God-given rights.

Under the impulsion of their faith and works, there developed here an area of unusual spiritual, intellectual, and economic vigor. It became known as the Great American Experiment. The ideals that stimulated it have been projected throughout the world. They have more than once helped to turn back the tides of despotism.

America would not be America if it were stripped of such idealism.

The values of personal liberty are, of course, best demonstrated by individuals. It is they who have liberty and it is their use of liberty that can make it a dynamic force. On the other hand, their misuse of liberty plays into the hands of despots. That means that individuals should exercise self-discipline and self-sacrifice, and not turn liberty into license. The individual deportment of free Americans is the most decisive force, for good or evil, in the present contest with despotism.

I do not imply that Government has no part to play. It too, can find ways to reflect the ideals of the people whom it serves.

Government may not interfere in the internal affairs of other countries. That is contrary to accepted international law and practice, and forbidden by many of our treaty engagements.

But your Government can, and does, make clear to all the world what are the ideals for which our Nation was founded.

We can, and do, refuse through our Government to give official sanction to the oppression of other peoples and the denial to them of the rights by which they are endowed by their Creator.

Your Government can, and does, see to it that captive peoples know that they are not forgotten and that their hopes for freedom have the sanction of a vast mass of world opinion.

IV. WORLD ORDER

One of the ways to protect and advance the interests of our people is by strengthening the fabric of world order. Peace will never be secure until there is an adequate body of international law and effective means of enforcing that law and means of changing that law as needed to promote justice.

The United Nations was a great step forward. It was largely a United States initiative. But its Security Council is hobbled by the veto power.

President Eisenhower recently proposed that the permanent members of the Security Council should exercise greater restraint in the use of the veto power. The Soviet Union reacted violently against that proposal. Nevertheless, we shall persist in seeking to strengthen the United Nations.

We seek, under its auspices, a rule of law for such newly developing areas as Antarctica and outer space. A Law of the Sea Conference has just been concluded at Geneva as an effort to create and modernize international law. The 86 nations attending reached agreement on important segments of that law. We are making progress in this field.

Still the United Nations has not yet found the way to guarantee law and order. That is why we have to maintain the system of regional collective defense arrangements to which I have referred, and which the charter authorizes. It is our ardent hope, however, that the United Nations can more and more be the framework within which all may find justice and peace.

V. AGREEMENTS WITH THE U. S. S. R.

In the meanwhile, there is an immediate problem that concerns us greatly: Can we reach agreements with the Soviet Government which would mitigate the sharpness of our conflict and reduce the danger of friction which could flare into war?

I can assure you that that is constantly in our minds. There are, however, great difficulties.

For one thing, the Communists do not look upon agreements as we do. We consider ourselves bound to live up to our agreements. This is important, because nations, unlike individuals, are under no superior force that compels them to live up to their promises.

But the Communists feel no obligation to perform their agreements. They have broken one agreement after another, confirming what Lenin said that, to the Communists, "promises are like pie crusts, made to be broken."

It would obviously be reckless for the free world to weaken itself merely in reliance of Soviet promises to perform in the future.

A second obstacle is that the purposes of Communist rulers are so basically acquisitive and aggressive that there is very little common ground between them and us.

Recent exchanges of views with the Soviet Union disclose their negotiating goals. They want:

(1) Our acceptance of Soviet Communist domination of the nations of Eastern Europe. They want us to abandon there the concept of our Declaration of Independence, and the explicit provisions of the Atlantic Charter and of the Yalta agreements, that the peoples of these countries are entitled to choose the form of government under which they will live;

(2) Our acceptance of the continued partition of Germany, or its reunification only on conditions that would give the Communist puppet regime in East Germany an opportunity to extend its rule over all of Germany;

(3) Liquidation of our collective defense associations, such as NATO, and abandonment by the United States of the concept and practice of collective security;

(4) United States recognition of Communist China, its seating in the United Nations with veto power on the Security Council, and acknowledgment of the Chinese Communist claim to Taiwan (Formosa);

(5) Elimination of the present trade controls by which the free world avoids sending strategic war goods into the Sino-Soviet bloc.

Each of these objectives represents an immense gain for the Soviet Union and a great loss to the free world.

Soviet propaganda suggests that if we would accept these losses, then the Communists might end the cold war. However, Mr. Khrushchev has, in other contexts, stated that it was inevitable that the cold war should go on, and he intended that it should go on.

It would be reckless to weaken the free world on the gamble that that would end the cold war. It is more likely that it

would continue under far more difficult conditions for us.

A few days ago Mr. Khrushchev said in Moscow: "We Bolsheviks are ravenous people. What we achieved through struggles in the past is not sufficient for us. We want more—tomorrow." They already have a billion people—and are still ravenous. I wonder how many more they need before their appetite is sated.

Now I do not, of course, conclude that there are no areas for useful agreement.

In 1953 we made an armistice agreement with the Communists which ended the fighting in Korea.

In 1955, we, with the British and the French, concluded with the Soviet Union, the State Treaty that liberated Austria

Earlier this year the United States concluded with the Soviet Union, a cultural exchange agreement of limited scope.

We believe that there can be other carefully negotiated agreements of mutual interest. We have been trying hard to get an agreement for reciprocal inspection in the Arctic area. The Soviet Government professed to fear our air maneuvers in the north. It took these alleged fears to the United Nations Security Council and complained of our activities. We explained that we needed to keep some planes in the air all the time because we fear that a massive and sudden surprise attack might be launched over the top of the world. So, to allay both fears, we proposed international inspection on both sides of the Arctic area to give assurance that there could not be any surprise or accidental attack. The matter came to a vote just a few hours ago. Ten of the eleven members of the Security Council supported our proposal. There was only one vote against—that of the Soviet Union. But that one negative vote constituted a veto. So, at the choice of the Soviet Union, the fears and risks continue. They continue for one reason alone, and that is because the Soviet Union rejects international inspection against surprise attack.

The significance of that is frightening. The result is tragic. It means that at the will and choice of the Soviet Union we have to go on living on the edge of an awful abyss, from which we could, so readily, be rescued if only the Soviet Union did not insist upon retaining for itself the possibility of massive surprise attack.

But we refuse to be discouraged. We remain willing to join in any dependable arrangement which will reduce the risk of surprise or accidental attack or, on a fair basis, reduce armaments.

VI. THE STRATEGY OF VICTORY

We must, however, assume that we face a long period of effort, sacrifice, and strain. That will come to an end when the Soviet rulers moderate their imperialist and idealogical urges.

Today the Soviet Communist rulers seek to implement their materialistic doctrine. They believe that human beings are in effect material particles to be fitted together as cogs in some well-oiled machine. Also they believe that that fitting together should be carried out through the world under Soviet Communist dictation. They profess to believe that this would assure world harmony, peace, and maximum productivity. All of this is a way of rationalizing the usual desire of despots for more and more power.

Experience, however, is teaching the Soviet rulers what has been taught so many times before, that man is not just a vivacious particle of matter. Men have souls and minds and individuality. They can never for long be forced into conformity. The Soviet Communist Party has undertaken the impossible, as they are beginning to learn.

They are learning a lesson in the satellite countries. A former adherent, Yugoslavia, is independent. In the other eastern European countries there is a sustained, and growing demand for independence. It has manifested itself in violent outbreaks that occurred in 1953 in East Germany, and in 1956 in Poland and, most conspicuously, in Hungary in late 1956. There has been a constant flow of refugees from East Germany into West Germany.

In the case of the revolts, and in the case of the refugees, it is the youth who figure most largely. Throughout their mature lives they have never known anything but intense Communist indoctrination and discipline. But love of God and love of country still survive. Human differences still persist. No materialistic regime can wholly or permanently crush them out. Sooner or later the Soviet rulers are going to have to face up to these practical facts. Indeed, there are occasional signs that they are already beginning to do so.

Even within the Soviet Union itself the Communist Party finds that human beings cannot be forced into a single mold of conformity. Under Stalin this was sought to be effected by the brutal terrorism of the secret police. There was a revulsion against that, and the system has been moderated. As the Soviet Union competes in the field of modern weapons and modern industrial techniques, increasing numbers have to be given a high degree of education. Thus there is developed an intelligentsia. And minds trained for one purpose cannot be kept thinking merely in the channels that the Party chooses. They think about other matters, including the unsoundness of the Communist dogma and the cheapness of Communist slogans.

There is more personal security and independent thinking within the Soviet Union now than there has ever been since the October 1917 Revolution.

The Soviet economic centralization has proved unworkable, and now there is economic decentralization. This means more local administration of affairs, with more regard to local differences and local habits.

There has also been a change in the foreign policies of the Soviet Union. In 1939, and between 1945 and 1950, it resorted primarily to violence. It attacked Poland and Finland. It took over Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia by military occupation. It assisted, and in some cases instigated, Communist warfare in China, Greece, Malaya, the Philippines, Burma, and Indochina. It used force or the threat of force to take over Czechoslovakia and to blockade Berlin. It backed open war in Korea.

But these violent techniques no longer pay off. They are checked by the free world network of collective security. So the Soviet rulers now smile, and pretend to be friends, and to adopt what they hope will be winning ways, giving aid in the form of trade, technicians, and loans; and giving pleasure through ballets and the like. In this way the Soviet Union has gained increased influence and acceptability as against the time when it only growled and bared its teeth. But it is impossible to go on smiling for a long time without its having an internal effect on character. In the long run a nation, like an individual, tends to become what it pretends to be.

The essential is that, for this long run, the free world should stay strong and united. It must be willing to make the sacrifices needed to prevent the Soviet rulers from gaining external victories bringing new victims into the Communist camp. That would enhance the prestige of the Communist extremists and embolden them, and enable them to hold back the evolutionary trends at work within the Soviet bloc.

The United States, as the strongest of the free nations, can contribute immensely to giving evolutionary forces of freedom a chance to make themselves decisively felt.

President Eisenhower, speaking at Paris last December at the NATO meeting, said that "there is a noble strategy of victory—not victory over any peoples, but victory for all peoples."

The essential is that the American people hold fast to the ideals bequethed us by our founders and implement those ideals with courage that is traditional with us. We shall need a sustained, sacrificial effort. We may have to do some of the things that we do in war—but without the killing and being killed.

Why should we not make that effort? The stakes are perhaps the greatest for which men have ever had to strive, in peace or in war. And, if we strive aright, these stakes can be won in peace, without the awful horror of World War III. Surely for the averting of war and the safeguarding of freedom men should be willing to make a sustained and sacrificial effort. We can do so in confidence that peaceful victory is attainable, and that our efforts can bring the day when the dark shadows which now oppress humanity will give way to an era of light and gladness.

The Asian Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three articles by Mr. William Clark—The Asian Revolution—which were recently published in the Washington Post and Times Herald. These articles vividly capture the problems which we face in Asia and the special responsibility which the situation of India imposes upon us and other free nations.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASIAN REVOLUTION COULD ECLIPSE MISSILE RACE

(By William Clark)

(First of three articles)

LONDON.—There is far too much talk about this being the space age. It is more likely to be known to historians as the age of the Asian revolution. For it is in Asia, and other undeveloped parts of the world that rapid changes are taking place which affect the lives of two-thirds of the earth's population. For us in the West, in our struggle with the Communist world, this problem of adjusting to the Asian revolution is far more important than the refinements of the missile race.

To anyone who has spent a year in Asia (as I have just done in India) this all seems fairly self-evident, but on returning to the West the thesis appears to be quite startling. Yet it should not be so; the nuclear stalemate has made it less likely that the East-West struggle will be decided by weapons and more likely that it will be decided by competition for the uncommitted countries.

THE DIVIDING LINE

For virtually all the uncommitted countries of the world, the most important aspect of national life is not what form of government they have but how well it succeeds in improving their standards of life. That is what the Asian revolution is all about; how to gain control over nature so as to harness

it for the benefit of the peasant masses who have so long been at its mercy.

This 20th century version of our industrial revolution is something in common between Ghana and China, India and Rhodesia. The dividing line is not the aim (higher living standards); not the practical method (irrigation and hydroelectric power for industrialization); it is the political system (revolution by force or by consent).

Across this dividing line stand the two champions: China, the standardbearer of the Communist world and the revolution by force, and India, the standardbearer of the free world and revolution by consent.

At first sight it may seem rather odd to hear India called our champion, and I must sadly report that it seems just as odd to most Indians as it does to us in the West. But it is the way the world struggle is viewed in other parts of the world.

ALL ASIA KEEPS SCORE

I talked to an African politician in Ghana who was quite frankly watching the competition of India and China to see which paid off better, democracy or communism. In Ceylon, on the edge of the struggle, there is a propaganda battle going on between China and the West comparing the achievements—particularly in rice cultivation—of Communist China and India. Just because the West does not see clearly that India is its champion, there is little doubt that communism is winning the campaign in Ceylon, not against India but against the whole idea of a free society.

No single thing impressed me more in Asia that the fact that our future is bound up in the success or failure of the Indian experiment and that neither we nor the Indians realize it. We remain, as Britain and America so often have in the past, at best sparring partners, unaware that we are involved, whether we like it or not, in a real partnership which is one side in the tug-of-war known as competitive coexistence.

DEMOCRACY AT STAKE

The interdependence of the West and free Asia is as real as the interdependence of the Atlantic Community. If India fails to carry out her industrial revolution by democratic methods, it will be the democratic methods which are abandoned, not the aim of modernizing India. And if India ceases to be a democracy, there will be very few of those countries which are trying to modernize themselves which will not draw the conclusion that somehow democracy and development just do not go together; that it is necessary to establish a dictatorship in order to progress.

If that very plausible political theory became widespread, the West would soon find itself an isolated group of nations which shared only the historical accident of having had their industrial revolution a century before the rest of the world—an accident which made them rich, and plunderable.

To most Indians, as well as Africans, the West does not appear so much the free world as the rich world. That is the basic reason why they do not recognize any community of interest with us. Russia, however much it may boast that it is capable of producing greater wealth, is regarded as one of the poor nations, a have-not which is making good. That is a link of which Russia makes very subtle and effective use, representing herself as the leader of the world proletariat of nations against the oppressive rich.

Until a few months ago, however, the West was also regarded as the only source of the tools whereby the poor could make themselves rich: American technology was the key to wealth. That was all changed by Sputnik I.

GENIUS AND DIVINITY

From the moment that "baby moon" was seen sweeping across the Asian sky (and in no part of the world were so many people convinced that they saw it), Asians were convinced of Russian superiority in technology. The educated few gasped at the engineering feat; the illiterate masses worshiped the divinity which could create a new moon in the firmament; no one was interested in its military potentialities.

Today the West is losing the struggle for the uncommitted nations, and in particular for free Asia. The reason is that wo do not recognize our friends. Russia is now obeying the classic precept of imperialism: Divide and rule.

THE ASIAN REVOLUTION

(Second of a series by William Clark)

NEHRU'S INDIA IS THE STANDARD BEARER

LONDON, May 11.—If we are to save Asia, or rather save ourselves by preventing all of Asia from going the way of China, the first necessity is that we should know who are our friends and allies, what trends we can hope to foster, what policies are hopeless.

So far the West has been slow to recognize that Nehru's India is the standard bearer of the free world in Asia. Equally blind is India in failing to recognize the extent to which her future (as well as her past) is intertwined with the great democracies. Why is there this confusion and mutual misapprehension?

A good deal of the blame can be placed on India's leaders, particularly Mr. Nehru and Mr. Krishna Menon. Both these brilliant men have spent so much of their lives in opposition (it might be called resistance) that they have not fully adapted themselves to the position of responsible leaders. In particular this is so over foreign affairs where they have both confused foreign policy with foreign commentary; in English terms Mr. Nehru has confused being a pillar of the state with being a columnist in the New Statesman; in American terms both men have failed to distinguish between the roles of Mr. Lippmann and Mr. Dulles.

The result is all to well known to those of us who have covered the New Delhi beat, or the United Nations. When any international event occurs it is always posisble to get a detailed commentary on it from one of India's leaders, and the commentary is nearly always idealistic, failing to take into account the realities which practical democratic politicians have to bear in mind. In other words, like most independent-minded commentators, the spokesmen from India are critical, and tend to criticize first their own side.

Inevitably this leaves the impression of carping hostility, of the unwanted candid friend. Neutralism has come to mean for many in the West, neutral against us. Yet that is, in fact, a superficial judgment based on commentary, not on action.

In action Mr. Nehru's policies are very different. First of all in spite of all the pressures, and all the pledges to leave the Commonwealth, Mr. Nehru from 1947 onward has kept India (and thus all the other new colored Dominions) within this West-centered organization. Secondly, one has only to travel in the Himalayas, which separate India from the Chinese Communist empire, to see how desperately India is working to keep that strategic area under her own control. In Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan there are Indian representatives, quite as determined as the British residents ever were, to keep the passes over the Himalayas firmly in friendly hands. Not even Tibet, where India seemed to have been outwitted by China, is wholly written off: the Dalai Lama's visit to India in 1956, and Mr. Nehru's forthcoming visit to Lhasa, are signs that occupation by China has not ended Indian influence in Tibet.

Yet professions of neutralism, or nonalinement, constitute, in fact, a very sensible, hard-headed policy for a state in India's stage of development. It is the policy of creating a cocoon within which, undisturbed, India can carry out the metamorphosis of her state; it is the policy of "no entangling alliances" developed by George Washington, Jefferson, and Monroe.

The West is somewhat to blame for failing to see through the pretenses of Indian policy to the reality underneath. What is our canon of judgment as to whether a state is part of the free world or not? Is it agreement on foreign policy? Or is it more concerned with those values of the individual that we say are basic to our way of life? Which matters more about India, Krishna Menon's dislike of the Baghdad Pact, or the fact that twice in the last 10 years 200 million Indians have trudged through the heat to choose their government in free elections?

The future of democracy in Asia (and so probably in the whole underdeveloped world) depends on its success in India. But democracy is not struggling to survive, it is struggling to be born. That is what makes India so exciting a place to live in today, and should make it a place where the free world feels its most vital interests are at stake. It is easy to think of democracy as something left over from the British rule, which did in fact leave the valuable heritage of the rule of law, but not democracy. All the British statesmen from Macauley to John Simon (in his famous report also signed by C. R. Attlee) agreed that Indian society, divided by caste, religion, language, tradition, and geography, was quite incapable of supporting a democratic system.

When Mr. Nehru came to power he soon saw that these prophets were right. But he did not abandon the idea of democracy because it did not suit Indian society; he determined to change Indian society. That is what lies behind the Nehru revolution in India; this attempt to create a society capable of being democratic, modern, and progressive.

The watchwords of Nehru's revolution are the creation of a new society that is secular, Socialist, and scientific. All three concepts are diametrically opposed to Indian tradition. By secular Mr. Nehru means a society in which religion is not the dominating influence, in which Moslem and Hindu live together, work together, vote together. By Socialist he means egalitarian (the concept has little to do with state ownership) in contrast to the whole Indian tradition of vast inequalities of wealth, and a stratified caste society. By scientific he means modern, changing, progressive, and not superstitious, tradition-ridden, and immobile.

It is on the success of this colossal transformation of 400 million people that the future of democracy in India depends, and on that, too, much of our own future hinges.

THE ASIAN REVOLUTION

(By William Clark)

(Third and last of a series)

WEST NEEDS TO BECOME PARTNER IN INDIA'S STRUGGLE

LONDON.—It is rather disturbing to realize that one of the most important cold war engagements is being fought in the villages of India. Yet undoubtedly it is on the success of India's social revolution, in its attempt to create the conditions for democracy, that the future relations of south Asia and the West depend. After 10 years it is possible to make some preliminary judgment on the success of Mr. Nehru's efforts.

My first impression during a year in India was one of wonderment at how much had been achieved. The foundations of a nationwide industrial organization had been laid; food production was increasing quite rapidly; the stranglehold of the Hindu religion had been broken, and, for instance, the

1950 constitution made it illegal to observe some of the traditional caste distinctions. Universal suffrage had been introduced and two general elections had been freely held.

Yet all is not going smoothly. Undoubtedly today the pace of change has slowed down very considerably, and the self-confidence of the leaders (particularly Pandit Nehru) is sadly shaken. What has gone wrong?

To some extent the Nehru revolution, with its watchwords secular, Socialist, scientific, has simply run headon into the vast inertia of India. Living on the margin of existence, as Indians have done for generations, breeds conservatism because change may so easily be fatal. What I used to feel traveling in India was the immense difficulty of doing anything to improve the lot of so many people—one could feel the downward drag of a population of 380 million increasing at the rate of 5 million a year. Indeed it is difficult to see how India—or for that matter China—can effectively increase standards of living unless it can control that population explosion.

At the same time that these Himalayan-size difficulties are becoming apparent, the revolution is losing much of its elan. The Congress Party which began as a nationalist party to gain independence, has achieved its objective and should properly sing its nunc dimittis and depart. But there is no democratic alternative to Congress at present, so that the energy and new ideas which should be springing up from the people through their political organizations still have to be supplied from above by Mr. Nehru himself. Today he is tiring and discouraged enough to talk of retirement. The people, too, are tiring of Congress and turning to nondemocratic courses.

It is a mistake to imagine that the only possible successor to Congress is communism. There is a strong right-wing movement (which nearly captured the state of Orissa at the same time that the Communists did capture Kerala), toward which a sizable section of Congress is drifting. These conservative Hindus object to Nehru's attempt to modernize (and westernize) India, and wish to return to the traditional virtues of India and Hinduism. They are strengthened (just as Nehru is weakened) by the wretched quarrel with Pakistan, which drains away India's wealth and skill into an arms race, and heightens the anti-secular pro-Hindu sentiments of the population. Another section of this conservative wing consists of the neo-Gandhians, led by Vinoba Bhave. They oppose the whole idea of industrialization, and appealing to the Indian tradition of nonviolence, wish to create a sort of village Utopia in which each village would be self-sufficient, producing its own food, its own tools, spinning its own cloth, and building its own houses. India, for them, should cease to try to progress and, instead, reconcile its population to living in dignified, unchanging poverty.

This right-wing reaction has very considerable support in the country, but its political organization is almost nonexistent. At the other extreme the Communists have an excellent organization, and are playing the political game with such skill that they appear far more popular and powerful than in fact they are. With only a handful of members in the Lok Sabha (Lower House) they have established themselves as the leaders of the opposition, and as the apparent alternative government to Congress. By capturing control of the problem state of Kerala they have given a practical demonstration of their ability to govern. The Communists turn every setback suffered by the existing government to their advantage, for their claim is that though they agree with the aims of the Nehru revolution they do not agree with the doctrine of revolution by consent. They maintain that change cannot take place at the speed of the slowest oxcart, there must be the full use of the state's powers to force change.

I found it difficult, looking at the immense difficulties in Nehru's path, not to sympathize with those who wished to turn back, or even with those who wished to use political high explosive to smooth the way. Sometimes it does seem that the choice before India is to go back to 1300 with the conservatives, or forward to 1984 with the Communists. Yet that is to ignore the strength of the center, which has as its program progress through a series of 5-year plans proposed by the Government and accepted by the people. What has gone wrong in the last year has been that this dynamic policy has lost its momentum because of financial difficulties.

These difficulties are not so enormous, but they have slowed up the pace of India's advance, and so given the impression that the second 5-year plan has failed. It has not, but if it is to avoid the appearance of failure it must obtain rather larger loans from overseas than have so far been granted.

It is at this point that Americans (and to a lesser extent the British and Germans) begin to shuffle their feet and look for the exit. All this sounds as though it were leading up to the routine suggestion that the West should buy India's loyalty for the price of a loan. Unfortunately, it is not so simple as that. America and the West have given large loans (and promised more). They are already the patrons of India's revolution, but that is not all that is needed; it is also necessary that they should become partners in it. The era of interdependence has come for us with Asia quite as much as within the Atlantic community. Somehow we have got to create with Asia that feeling of community of interest, which informs the Western alliance and which is far more important and lasting than the military aspect of NATO, or the economic links between Europe and America.

It is my conviction after a year spent in India and Africa that if we are to play our part in winning this crucial cold-war engagement we must reexamine our relationship with the underdeveloped countries. We must see that unless the West finds friends and partners amongst these nations it will soon find itself an isolated clique of wealthy nations, cut off from the growing, changing, developing world and probably hated by its people.

The Inquiring (Woman) Reporter: Sarah McClendon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this past week has been one of great recognition for Texans of prominence in the fields of music and journalism. The current issue of Time magazine carries a cover story on Van Cliburn, the pianist from the piney woods of east Texas who captured his Russian audience with a piano at the recent music competition in Moscow.

Another Texan, this time in the field of journalism, and this time a woman, also from east Texas, received accolades for her work in a column by Josephine Ripley in the May 17 issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

Sarah McClendon is the Washington correspondent for 13 newspapers throughout the country, from Manchester, N. H., to El Paso, Tex. But Sarah McClendon is a Texan by birth, her newspaper career began on Texas papers, and she represents more Texas newspapers in Washington than she does papers from any other State.

Sarah McClendon's expert reporting of the President's press conferences has received national attention. She is first, last, and foremost an able newspaperwoman. She refuses to be deterred from her job by pleasant smiles. Her questions are to the point. She seeks the news to keep America informed.

Sarah McClendon is descended from one of the oldest and most distinguished and illustrious families of Tyler, Smith County, east Texas. Her career is adding a new luster to the family name of McClendon. Our family have known the McClendon's for generations. Sarah McClendon's father was postmaster of Tyler, Tex. I am proud of Sarah McClendon. The article I am asking to have printed in the RECORD is a fine tribute to her inquiring mind and her courage. It reflects the ability of the independent reporter. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this article entitled "The Inquiring (Woman) Reporter," published in the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of May 17, 1958]

THE INQUIRING (WOMAN) REPORTER

(By Josephine Ripley)

Sarah McClendon, Washington correspondent for a string of newspapers from Texas to New England, attends the President's press conferences regularly; always asks a question, always sits up front under the President's nose where she cannot be ignored.

Of course, it would be hard to ignore Sarah anywhere. "The blond bombshell of the profession," one newspaper called her recently. She is hard-working, vocal, aggressive newspaperwoman.

And if women are devious, as reported, you can't prove it by Sarah. Or by most newspaperwomen, as a matter of fact, when it comes to asking questions. Men correspondents may pussyfoot around a delicate point, or hesitate to put the question at all—but not the women of the President's press conference.

Sarah is a leading exponent of the bluntness technique. She asks the question that is on everyone's mind, and in the fewest possible one-syllable words. It is often her bullseye query which scores the day's headline.

All this has paid off for Sarah who has run up her newspaper representation from 2 papers several years ago to 13 today. Newspaper correspondents, in asking a question, at the President's press conference, must first identify themselves with the paper they represent. Sarah, one week, declares she is from the El Paso Times; next week, from the San Antonio Light or the Sherman (Tex.) Democrat.

Now that her fame has spread and her papers multiplied, it may even be the Camden (N. J.) Courier Post or the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader. This varied representation once caused the President to turn

the tables on Sarah with a blunt question of his own.

"Do you get fired every week and join another paper the next week?" he asked.

"No, sir" replied Sarah, ignoring the general laughter, "I try to give representation to all the papers I work for." And she went on to ask her question.

The President is frequently amused by Sarah and her questions, occasionally irritated. It was a pointed query from Sarah on his Pentagon reorganization program which touched off the President's recent, rare show of temper.

Sarah may ask questions to be heard; she may ask regional questions which bring patronizing laughter from some of her colleagues; but it's serious business to her. For a close-up of the President from where she sits, and the value of the President's press conference from her point of view, here it is in Sarah's own words:

"I don't make the President angry. He does that to himself. Often, I don't honestly see why." An important thing about the President, she feels, is that "he is extremely likeable personally."

Of his press conferences, she says: "To reporters, a press conference is either good, bad, or fair, depending on how much productive news they get out of it. I have seen some of his (the President's press conferences) that were not so good, and from others I have come away actually lifted and thrilled at his expressive leadership and true patriotism. * * *"

Sarah feels the President is a man who "believes so strongly in his heart that he is right, because he has the desire to do what is morally right for the country, that it hurts him to the quick for anyone to doubt him. It seems sort of unjust to him. And this is why he gets angry."

Eternal vigilance being the price of liberty, Sarah firmly believes that the presidential press conference offers modern-day reporters an opportunity and a responsibility to exercise this kind of vigilance in their country's behalf.

As she sees it: "Even though we like Mr. Eisenhower personally, even if we are great fans of his politically; and even should our papers be for him—some of mine are and some are not, and some are at times for and at times against—even so, it is our duty as reporters to observe, to inquire into, to check on, to point out to this man, and to get his observations on the issues of the day."

She feels that "history owes Mr. Eisenhower a great debt for making possible and developing the press conference as it is today." And "if it were not for him, we would never have had the press conference live, on radio and television.

"What other man in history has allowed himself to be so clearly shown in print and on the screen in this way? That alone takes a mighty big personality. This whole operation of the press conference he has given to the American people.

"Remember," she adds, "he does not have to hold these press conferences."

No, he does not have to, but he does, and it is greatly to his advantage—just as it is to Sarah's.

Nixon's Reputation Enhanced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of May 11, 1958:

NIXON'S TOUR
(By Roscoe Drummond)
REPUTATION ENHANCED

Vice President NIXON returns from his Communist-harassed tour of eight Latin American Republics with a bruised shoulder and an enhanced reputation as a brave spokesman for the United States.

What, it seems to me, stands out when you look at Mr. NIXON'S long and, occasionally, rocky road from Buenos Aires to Lima, Peru, is:

That there were no spontaneous demonstrations against the Vice President. They were engineered by known Communists.

That there was only one capital, Lima, in which there were serious incidents—this in a country where American-Peruvian relations are thoroughly cordial.

That Mr. NIXON demonstrated personal courage of a high order.

That he showed ability to expound American ideals and policies under the most adverse circumstances—at emotional student mass meetings dominated by Communist leaders—and to make friends by his actions and by his words.

There are, of course, many others who would do well. Undoubtedly Adlai Stevenson or Senator Lyndon Johnson or Senator William Knowland or Senator John Kennedy would do a fine job. It happens that Mr. NIXON was on the spot and handled himself—and the situation—exceedingly well.

One of the most interesting phenomena in Washington political circles—and probably it is general throughout the country—is the sharpness and depth of feeling about RICHARD NIXON. The pro-Nixon Republicans can see no wrong and the anti-Nixon Democrats can see no right and reporters who try to be objective are usually berated by both sides not matter what they write.

I suspect that it is a very real asset of the Vice President that nobody is indifferent to him. This nonindifference toward Mr. NIXON even rubs off on those who write about him. For example, Max Freedman, one of the most perceptive and objective foreign journalists in the United States—he is Washington correspondent for the liberal Manchester Guardian—recently spent an evening with the Vice President along with other British reporters and afterward wrote his impressions. In the course of a substantially favorable article he said:

"Recent speeches have shown his capacity to speak with courage and conviction on matters of extreme controversy. These qualities gleam with yet more distinction in the relaxed intimacies of private conversation when he lets his mind brood on the overcast world scene.

"Many Americans who carry an ugly image of Mr. NIXON would be very surprised if they heard him expound his personal philosophy in world affairs. He studied these world problems with an incisive and creative mind.

"Most important of all, it is a generous, constructive, and spacious philosophy, akin to the vision which once led Senator VANDENBURG and not very different in essentials from the saving faith of the Democratic sages. The Democrats will not like this comparison but they really must begin to examine Mr. NIXON and not the malignant myth of their own invention."

Mr. Freedman was only partly jesting when he remarked to colleagues that, after his Nixon article reached Washington, all his Democratic friends stopped speaking to him. "But," he added, "I can't in all honesty take any of it back."

In Lima after Communists tried to prevent him from speaking to the students and sought to maim him with rocks and eggs, Frederico Basadre, a reporter for Peru's largest newspaper, said: "NIXON made a great impression with his courage. He won."

Evidently no one, not even the Peruvians, can be indifferent to NIXON.

Reexamination of the Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Idaho Daily Statesman, a newspaper published in Boise, Idaho.

The editorial, written prior to House passage of the foreign-aid bill, brings up some considerations that we in the Senate might well review when the bill comes before us for action. The editorial points out that it will be up to Congress to determine the extent of foreign aid, based on the results obtained by past expenditures, and urges critical reappraisal of this program.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IF IT DOESN'T WORK

Disorders lately flaring in South America and in the Middle East have come in for concerned attention in congressional debate on the foreign-aid bill which is heading toward an early vote in the House of Representatives.

In Lime, the Vice President of the United States has been made the target for violent attack and the United States flag has been defiled.

In Tripoli and in Beirut, mobs have vented their rage with torch applied to libraries established and maintained by the United States Information Agency.

These are offenses that would be disturbing at any time and under any circumstances, but they are particularly grievous coming, as they do, at the hands of peoples who have been the longtime objects of our solicitude and the recipients of rather substantial shares in the unprecedented outpouring of our taxpayers' dollars during the past decade.

Our mutual security program for the fiscal year 1957, for instance, apportioned to Lebanon $2,100,000 and to Peru $2,996,000. This is in addition to whatever loans there may have been from the Export-Import Bank or the World Bank, both operating largely with American dollars. And it's all for the purposes of "strengthening friendly relationships" and to "assist other nations to maintain their security and safety."

During the last few years, Peru's economic life has been guided largely by a United States economic mission and the country has been favored by "northern" capital and technical assistance to advance public works such as roadbuilding, irrigation and electrification.

Lebanese industries have been expanded and, on the whole, it is reported, Lebanese economy has prospered and set new records in several fields.

Notwithstanding, these apparently favored areas now are providing foothold for the machinations of a conspiracy that poses an unprecedented threat to mankind's freedom and that thrives on the exploitation of an-

cient animosities and new hatreds in a world already overburdened with them.

Thus we are not only brought face to face with bitter disappointment over these evidences of ingratitude but we are compelled to recognize that we seem to have failed somehow with our grandiose program to achieve an enduring peace with justice.

This foreign-aid program is supposed to make us firm friends. But there are these significant instances indicating that it doesn't always work that way.

So what do we do now?

That's the question that the Congressmen have to answer.

There is evident thus far a disinclination to even consider that this foreign-aid program on which we have already laid out so much of care and treasure has been in anywise based on error, or that in its concept and administration the heart may have taken over command from the head, and that the wish may have obscured the actuality.

House Foreign Affairs Chairman THOMAS E. MORGAN, Pennsylvania Democrat, opening the debate, won't concede that there may have been any failure in United States foreign policy. He argues that trouble spots around the world are demonstrations of Kremlin efforts to spread communism—which probably is the exact fact.

On the premise he has adopted, though, there is patent implication that we have suffered these reverses because our foreign aid has fallen short, and if that idea is accepted, then it would pretty well rule out any reduction in foreign aid appropriations; because it must follow that any appropriation that is inadequate to do the job must be counted only as so much waste.

Along the same line, the Republican committee leader, Representative JOHN W. VORYS, of Ohio, argues that the anti-American outbreaks are all the more reason to bolster friendly countries with dollars. He says he thinks the American people are not going to take these new challenges lying down.

If that's the prevailing attitude in regard to foreign aid then we might be well advised to do the best we can to be reconciled with the idea that we are stuck with it.

And, if we don't start out taking it lying down, we may count ourselves extremely fortunate if we don't wind up in a prone position, indubitably sadder, and perhaps wiser.

In view of these new and disturbing developments, though, it would seem to us that there is more reason than ever before for a critical reexamination of this foreign-aid program.

It might just be that it is hardly the weapon we should have to counter the Soviet threat, even though the Russians have lately picked it up.

Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce Receives Award in Statewide Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Hazleton Plain Speaker of May 14, 1958, which discloses that the Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce has been selected for an award in a statewide community development contest:

HAZLETON SCORES AGAIN IN STATEWIDE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CONTEST

Hazleton has scored again, receiving an award for the second consecutive year in a statewide contest on community development, it was announced today.

The Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce has just received word that its entry in the 1957 Pennsylvania community development contest won fifth place and $300. Hazleton took first place and won $1,500 in the 1956 contest for its highly successful can-do project.

Four projects won the latest award for Hazleton:

1. Securing at least two new male-employing industries at Valmont Industrial Park: General Foam Corp., and negotiations for a lease with Capitol Products Corp.

2. Operation trees and operation home-improvement programs, including planting of 92,500 trees in strippings, culm banks and in several sections of the city for beautification; and a four-month campaign for remodeling and repairing homes.

3. Improvement of transportation and parking facilities in the Hazleton area, including work toward the Keystone Shortway and Anthracite Expressway and improvements to the Hazleton Municipal Airport.

4. Celebration of Hazleton's Centennial.

This city's certificate of award and ash award will be made here at a date to be determined, according to W. P. Schenck, secretary of the community development contest committee. Schenck said the date would be sometime after June 1.

The presentation will be made by a member of the State chamber's community development committee.

A National Engineering and Scientific Automatic Data Processing Information Center and Clearinghouse for San Diego

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proposal made by American Legion North Island Post of San Diego:

A NATIONAL ENGINEERING AND SCIENTIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING INFORMATION CENTER AND CLEARINGHOUSE FOR SAN DIEGO

A means to shorten the time lag between engineering a project and placing it into production is the most grievous problem facing our national defense effort today.

1. If research and development information obtained from similar projects is not exchanged, long periods of precious engineering time must be duplicated. It is the intent of this proposal to establish a centralized automatic data processing and foreign language translation system whereby scientific and technical information is indexed and stored on magnetic tape or memory drums that are electronically scanned, abstracted, and electronically distributed where needed to engineers and scientists assigned to a Defense Department project or related civilian agency.

(a) The United States has had the equipment and machines available to accomplish this task for a long time.

(b) Russia has had a similar program in operation since 1952 providing her with a means of playing leapfrog over all the other countries of the world in engineering and scientific fields since the program was put into action.

(1) The program is sufficiently successful so that prominent American scientists have said that the best way to find out what American science is doing is to read the Russian literature.

(2) Our research laboratories (and the world) were caught by surprise by the Soviet's use of 20 and 40 megacycles for telemetry in Sputniks I and II, despite 2 articles naming these frequencies in the Russian magazine Radio last June.

(3) Russia is this year spending $4.5 billion for research and development. It is obvious there shall be a vast amount of technical information which could be translated and disseminated for United States scientists use.

(c) Should this proposal be accepted it would directly provide full-time employment to at least 2,000 skilled technicians, librarians, engineers, and scientists. (1) This program would supplement and centralize the work of Research and Development Laboratories and Department of Defense Libraries such as the caliber of the Armed Services Technical Information Agency.

(d) Because of the instability of appropriations and constant manpower supply of civil service, it is suggested that this proposal be contracted by the Defense Department to private enterprise.

2. San Diego is a logical location for this center because:

(a) San Diego is the birthplace of the charactron tube—the fastest automatic data-processing readout and printer in the world today. (1) Rate of printed output is 4,680 lines or 85,000 to 100,000 words a minute.

(b) Our large naval electronics laboratory and library facility located here.

(c) The southern California missile and electronic industries.

(d) Our general atomic laboratory location.

(e) San Diego's large pool of skilled manpower for a project similar to this.

3. This proposal has received national interest since being introduced by the American Legion North Island Service Post, San Diego, January 9, 1958.

Not the Time To Adopt Any Proposal That Will Curb Advertising or Selling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1958

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, on May 27 a public hearing will be held on proposed regulations that will drastically change the longstanding tax treatment of cooperative advertising programs. It is my understanding that many protests have been filed in objection to the proposal which was originally intended to be effective on April 1, 1958.

The notice would provide that taxable prices for manufacturers excise tax purposes includes any amount which manufacturers require dealers to pay to obtain possession of taxable articles. The proposed regulation is particularly

related to so-called cooperative advertising expenses.

To illustrate what the change would involve, let us use the following example. A manufacturer sells an article to a retailer or wholesaler for $200 and makes an agreement to rebate $5 of the price if the wholesaler or retailer later shows that he spent that amount for local advertising. The Internal Revenue Service has for many years treated such a rebate as a reduction of the taxable price from $200 to $195 and in turn allowed the manufacturer a refund of a portion of the manufacturer's excise tax paid at the time of sale. The proposed Treasury regulations would deny that such a rebate is a price adjustment. Accordingly, the manufacturer would be forced to pay the tax on the full $200 even though he receives a net of only $195. The proposal to revise the Internal Revenue Service's long-standing position is not a result of any change in the taxing statutes. Instead, it would appear to represent an attempt to change the law by administrative action.

With Congress today struggling to come up with measures that would reduce a portion of excise taxes, it seems that such a regulation is most untimely. Certainly, it would, in effect, increase excise tax rates on certain items and would compel manufacturers to curtail cooperative advertising programs. This, in turn, would deprive retailers of the assistance they are now deriving from such programs.

I believe that a fundamental change of this nature should properly be made only by Congress. And I do not believe that Congress would make it at a time when its purpose is to stimulate advertising and selling activities. I further believe that any such change proposed by an administrative agency should be provided by the Congress after appropriate hearings in which the business and economic consequences are closely examined.

The proposed regulations expressly state that they would be retroactive to 1939. This retroactive feature is clearly unconscionable. For years the Internal Revenue Service has properly treated cooperative advertising allowances as price rebates and has allowed refunds or credits based thereon. If the Treasury attempts to apply the proposed regulations retroactively, manufacturers would be faced with claims for back tax liabilities aggregating many millions of dollars, even though they merely pursued a course that has had, until now, the approval of the Service.

The injustice of this result is emphasized when it is realized that in 1956 the Treasury represented to the Forand subcommittee that it would shortly publish a ruling expressly approving the treatment of cooperative advertising rebates as price adjustments. A draft of the text of the promised ruling was included in the Forand subcommittee's report to the House Committee on Ways and Means dated April 20, 1956, page 2. It seems clear that the Forand subcommittee was satisfied with the promised ruling and treated the matter as settled, for no clarifying legislation was included in the Forand bill, H. R. 7125, now before the Senate Finance Committee.

The Internal Revenue Service never issued the promised ruling. Instead, the Treasury now comes forward with proposed regulations diametrically opposed to the tax treatment outlined in the 1956 representation to the Forand subcommittee.

Historic and Beautiful Nacogdoches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, recently, while reading the Beaumont Enterprise, a leading newspaper of the Texas gulf coast, I came across the column, It's Like This, by the Enterprise's editor in chief, Robert W. Akers. This particular column was magnificently written and steeped in Texas history—Texas history going back to the year 1716.

Mr. Akers drove a few weeks ago from Beaumont to Nacogdoches, and Nacogdoches and the remarkable and unique role it has played in the history of Texas is the subject of his column.

What struck me so keenly about Mr. Akers' column, though, was the sheer beauty of the language he employed in his description of east Texas, the area when I was born and raised and where my father still lives. It is language such as this that makes full the heart of an old east Texas boy:

> It's a 125-mile trail of easy curves and gentle rises and dips through countryside that has the fresh smell of plowed earth, mowed grass, spring vegetation, and newly sawed timbers. There has been plenty of rain, and the earth is giving forth another generous yield.

I firmly believe that this column is one of the most superbly written and beautifully articulated descriptions of east Texas that I have ever seen in print. The article also deals with Nacogdoches, which was settled by Spain in the 18th century. It narrates some of the incidents in the Fredonia Rebellion, which preceded the successful Texas revolt by about 10 years. It mentions the last resting place and describes the lives of some of those illustrious citizens, including Thomas J. Rusk, who was one of the first two Senators from my State. He was a practitioner of law in the State of Georgia, the State so ably represented in part by the distinguished occupant of the Chair [Mr. TALMADGE]. He came to Texas shortly before the revolution, and his abilities were so quickly recognized that he was elected to the Constitutional Convention. He signed the Declaration of Independence of Texas. Because of his valor on the field on the first day of the Battle of San Jacinto, he was put in command of one of the wings. When Sam Houston was wounded the third time on the field and the third horse was shot from under him, Thomas J. Rusk succeeded him in command of the Texas forces in the Battle of San Jacinto, and commanded them until October 1836.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column, It's Like This, by Robert W. Akers, which appeared in the Beaumont Enterprise of Wednesday, May 14, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise of May 14, 1958]

IT'S LIKE THIS

(By Robert W. Akers)

On the flagpole in front of the fine, new Fredonia Hotel in Nacogdoches fly 3 banners: The Stars and Stripes at the top, then the Lone Star emblem, then the flag of the Republic Fredonia.

The United States is a nation.

Texas was a nation.

Fredonia was to have been a nation.

A Sunday drive from Beaumont to Nacogdoches in May is a journey through the lush green beauty of forests and fields into the very heart of east Texas and more than 2 centuries deep into Texas history.

It's a 125-mile trail of easy curves and gentle rises and dips through countryside that has the fresh smell of plowed earth, mowed grass, spring vegetation, and newly sawed timber.

There has been plenty of rain and the earth is giving forth another generous yield.

Vegetables that will provide good eating at many tables this summer are just now coming up in farmhouse truck patches. Beans are taking hold at the base of poles. Corn is about knee high, with the roasting ears to be only tender folds of green.

Whatever the condition of business in the cities, rural east Texas is thriving.

If you've never been to Nacgdoches, the first mental image you must create is trees. Great, spreading oaks, magnolia, gum, pine. Trees so ancient that their branches hide a whole city beneath a shady, green cover.

Nacogdoches is a place to live serenely—quiet streets, fine old homes, attractive new homes, all sheltered by the forest within which the city has grown.

This is the first center of civilization and culture in the whole of east Texas. It began in 1716 when the Spaniards established the mission of Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe. San Antonio itself would have a hard time proving a prior settlement.

In 1779 came a captain of Spain, one Gil Ybarbo, to erect the Old Stone Fort, the structure from which Nacogdoches grew.

A new century was born, the 1800's, and Americans moved into the promising area called Texas, Sam Houston walked these streets as a citizen of Nacogdoches.

Hayden Edwards, the empresario, came to Nacogdoches about 1825 with a permit from the Mexican Government (which lately had run the Spanish colonial overlords out) to bring in 800 families from the United States.

He found his allotted acreage around Nacogdoches occupied by old families with Spanish crown grants for the same tracts and by Mexican and American renegades.

Hayden Edwards was hot-headed. He kept complaining to the Mexican officials in San Antonio until they were fed up and cancelled his permit. Then the fiery-tempered Mr. Edwards organized a military force and marched through a December snowstorm to capture Nacogdoches and establish the Republic of Fredonia, independent of Mexico, the United States and everyone else.

That's the flag that still waves in front of Hotel Fredonia. It has two horizontal fields, white on top and red at the bottom. In blue lettering on the white field are the proud words: "Independence, Freedom and Justice."

In spite of this attractive flag, however, and the pleasant sound of the word "Fredonia," the new republic lasted only a few weeks.

The Mexican authorities were hopping mad. Even Stephen F. Austin didn't like it, because he was operating under a Mexican grant, too. Austin and the Mexicans started for Nacogdoches with armed men to put down the rebellion.

Before they could get there, though, loyal Mexicans in east Texas had banded together and had driven Hayden Edwards out.

Fredonia wasn't a total loss, though. It was, in fact, the first seed of the Texas Revolution which won independence from Mexico a decade later on the battlefield at San Jacinto. The spirit implanted by Edwards lived and grew.

Weathered headstones in the old Oak Grove Cemetery at Nacogdoches bear names that live to this very day in Texas history books, that are studied in Texas classrooms.

There was Thomas J. Rusk, Charles S. Taylor and John S. Roberts, Nacogdochans who signed the Texas Declaration of Independence

William Clark, who representing the municipality of Sabine as a signer.

Hayden Edwards, who, I was happy to note, returned to the city that was for a brief moment the capital of Fredonia and who now sleeps beneath the Nacogdoches oaks for all time.

Adolphus Sterne, who came from Cologne, Germany, to a new world and whose home, built in 1828, served as a refuge for women and children during Indian raids. The old house still stands.

Dr. Robert Irion, Texas Secretary of State, and Mrs. Anna Raguet Irion.

Hayden Arnold, Thomas L. Buford and David Rusk, who fought at San Jacinto.

Gen. Kelsey Harris Douglass, whose forces drove the Cherokee Indians out of Texas in 1839.

All that seems a long time ago when you loll in the May sunshine at the edge of the Hotel Fredonia's swimming pool, and look up at the modern design of the six-story hostelry.

Only three blocks away is the first university the State of Texas ever had: Nacogdoches University, founded in 1845 by the Republic and operated after statehood.

Of classic academic design, it is built of red brick, 2 stories high, with 4 massive, white, Greek columns in front and a tall white cupola on top. Although it hasn't been used since 1904, you can almost hear those scholars of another and more austere day reciting their Greek and conjugating their Latin verbs.

A little farther out, also in the midst of heavily wooded land, is the modern version—Stephen F. Austin State Teachers College, with its more than 2,000 students and its old and new buildings on a charming campus.

You reach SFA along an esplanade of magnolias.

There's a story of modern Nacogdoches in the Hotel Fredonia:

They tell me the realization of this fine building 3 years ago brought about a unification of all factions in the city as nothing else had done in years. It was built by local subscription—1,200 stockholders. The result is a hotel of which the entire citizenry is proud—and well it may be.

The old Nacogdoches names live on in the new Fredonia, too—you may dine in the Thomas J. Rusk Room or hold a committee meeting in the Anna Raguet Room.

Did I say Nacogdoches is in the very heart of east Texas?

Nacogdoches is Texas.

The Greatest Peace Movement in the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the Army and Navy Union, United States of America, through its national public relations representative, Floyd I. Silk, issued the following statement entitled "The Greatest Peace Movement in the World" on the occasion of National Hospital Week.

I invite each and every Member of Congress to read this statement:

THE GREATEST PEACE MOVEMENT IN THE WORLD

The miraculous medical-research program undertaken by veterans' hospitals has done much to alleviate human suffering and saved many lives.

The doctors at the veterans' hospitals should be given congressional citations for the great developments in medical research that they have accomplished. They have served above and beyond the call of duty.

The veterans, who volunteer themselves for experiments necessary for medical research, should also be recognized by Congress.

These developments in medical research prove that the Veterans' Administration and the veteran are working for the good of humanity, in a fashion that could bring peace to all the world.

Medical Research in the Veterans' Administration, a report prepared by the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, and submitted to the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, 1st session, 85th Congress, on April 26, 1957, states that more than 5,000 successful developments in medical research have occurred. All this despite the curtailment of funds, in the name of economy. The wonderful job that has been done to alleviate the suffering of humanity is all the more remarkable because of their many handicaps; principally the lack of funds to work with.

Every good American citizen should be willing to have our Government continue this work with greater appropriations for the extension of further medical research by the Veterans' Administration. The cost of upkeep is not as great as the amount of good accomplished. There are only 121,000 beds in 173 hospitals.

Most veterans use private physicians and hospitals, where they must pay. When all their money is gone, these hospitals and doctors refer them to veterans' facilities.

At most, approximately 250,000 of the 23 million veterans are hospitalized in a given year. Little enough, when you realize what the veterans have given of themselves in the service of our country.

The amazing results of the Veterans' Administration's medical research are most highly commendable.

The program for the extension of the Veterans' Administration's research is one that will continue to benefit humanity all over the world.

We always have money for wars that bring death and destruction. Why? Why can't we find the money for a program that will benefit humanity and that can and will bring greater health and happiness to all peoples?

If we want a healthy and peaceful world, we must pay for it, instead of paying for war and destruction.

Scholarship Named After Calvin Leichtman, of Hazleton, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Hazleton Plain Speaker which announces that a scholarship has been named by B'nai B'rith in honor of Mr. Calvin Leichtman, prominent Hazleton businessman and civic leader:

B'NAI B'RITH TO NAME SCHOLARSHIP IN HONOR OF CALVIN LEICHTMAN

Calvin Leichtman, 92, of this city, will be honored by B'nai B'rith, the 400,000-member Jewish service organization during its annual convention Monday at Lake Kiamesha, N. Y.

Leichtman, who founded the ice cream company that continues to bear his name in this city, will be honored during a special ceremony by delegates of lodges from Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware and West Virginia.

A YOUTH SERVICE PROGRAM

Maurice Bisgyer, executive vice president of B'nai B'rith, said yesterday in Washington, D. C., that a college fellowship, to be administered by the organization's youth service program, will be established in Leichtman's honor.

The elderly B'nai B'rith leader will be cited at the convention for a lifetime of unselfish devotion to his community and fellow men by Philip M. Klutznick of Park Forest, Ill., president of B'nai B'rith.

The Hazleton ice cream manufacturer is a past president of the B'nai B'rith District 3 and is now its honorary treasurer.

Since he entered the organization's work 68 years ago, he has helped establish 15 lodges, all but one of these in his adopted Pennsylvania.

NATIVE OF AUSTRIA

Leichtman was born in what is now Austria and came to America at the age of 16. With his young bride, he set out for the growing West and settled in Spokane, Wash., where he esablished a general store. The first son of the couple, Milton, was born at Spokane.

It was in this city that Leichtman founded the first B'nai B'rith lodge. Shortly thereafter he returned with his family to Pennsylvania.

They settled in Freeland and a few years later moved to this city where the ice cream company was organized.

Leichtman is a past president of the Hazleton Chamber of Commerce, is a member of the Hazleton Public Library Board, a charter member of the Kiwanis Club and a leader in the United Charities of Hazleton. He was a founder and past president of Beth Israel Temple.

Among the communities in which Leichtman organized lodges are Wilkes-Barre, Pottsville, Scranton, Olyphant, Shenandoah, Mahoney City, Danville, Easton, Shamokin, Stroudsburg, Honesdale, and in this city, where his fellow members renamed the lodge in his honor several years ago.

Arnold Sukenik, president of the local B'nai B'rith, will be a delegate to the New York convention.

TVA's Twenty-fifth Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on Sunday, May 18, TVA had its 25th anniversary.

In Sunday's New York Times appeared an article by R. L. Duffus telling something of TVA after its 25 years.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "TVA's 25th Anniversary," published in the Decatur (Ala.) Daily of May 18, 1958.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TVA'S CHALLENGE—AFTER 25 YEARS

(By R. L. Duffus)

KNOXVILLE, TENN.—The world's most dramatic experiment in the use and control of a river reaches its 25th birthday today under circumstances that would have astounded those who dreamed it up.

When President Franklin D. Roosevelt put his signature, on May 18, 1933, to the act creating the Tennessee Valley Authority, he planned a great hydroelectric system. Today TVA is such, but it is also the largest buyer of coal in the world, and three-fourths of its power is produced by steam.

President Roosevelt, urged on by such down-to-earth dreamers as the late Senator George W. Norris of Nebraska, looked to electric energy to revitalize the life of the valley. He foresaw the power of the Tennessee River furnishing cheap and abundant energy for cities and towns and for rural cooperatives. This has been achieved. But today nearly 60 percent of TVA's power sales are to the Federal Government, most of them to an agency whose name would have had no meaning in 1933—the Atomic Energy Commission.

Thus TVA has moved into a field of extensive preparation for defense, indeed into a new and almost unimaginable world. Even steam is not the last word. To the force of water running to the sea, and the energy extracted from coal, will some day be added beyond any doubt another power. Already a dozen or more young scientists on the TVA payroll are studying at Oak Ridge, Brookhaven, the Argonne Laboratories. They are studying the design and operation of atomic plants that may supplement steam as steam supplemented waterpower—or supplant them both.

Waterpower, once harnessed, is cheap, and it will be a long time before the seaward-moving waters of the Tennessee system cease to turn the turbines in the dams. The cost of steam power, too, is being steadily reduced. But if Congress ever orders TVA to harness the atom it will be ready.

A pilgrim who first traversed the valley a quarter of a century ago, between the old Wilson Dam at Muscle Shoals on the main river and the site of the Norris Dam above Knoxville, on the Clinch, may feel like Rip Van Winkle returning to scenes that are both strange and familiar.

The valley in that late spring of 1933 seemed like a title of one of F. Scott Fitzgerald's books: it was beautiful and damned. The hills and the plains, the winding pools and rapids of the river and its tributaries, the people themselves, largely derived from an old Scotch-Irish stock with a relatively small percentage of hard-working Negroes—all existed in a kind of quietness, but it was not a hopeful quietness.

At Muscle Shoals in 1933 there were 8 generators in the Wilson Dam. Only two of these generators were ordinarily operated at one time. The Army officer then in charge told his visitor that there was no demand for more power. Two plants had been built by the Government to make nitrate for explosives. One of them, its machinery rusty, its windows broken, was a habitation for pigeons that fluttered in and out and made cooing noises among the girders.

A little stir of hope had run through the three little cities at the Shoals. But there had been so many disappointed hopes before. People thought Henry Ford would buy the dam and plants, but in 1933 weeds were growing over the new streets laid out by land speculators.

Up river the situation was not too different. The cities of Chattanooga and Knoxville had been hit by the depression. People living on subsistence farms in the hills were almost too poor to suffer from hard times, but if they depended on sales of corn or cotton they could be hurt.

At Norris, as the visitor saw it in the late spring of 1933, the Clinch came quietly round the bend as it had done from time immemorial. On the right bank, at the site of the proposed dam was a dog-trot cabin that was to be inundated when the dam was finished. On the left bank, just opposite, a lane was cut through the brush where the outline of the dam was to take shape. The scene was infinitely peaceful. It was like a land in a dream.

The river and its tributaries were hardly being used. The Tennessee had a low-water depth of 1 foot to 4 feet. Freight carried on the river was mostly sand and gravel. About three out of every hundred homes had electricity. The per capita income was only 44 percent as high as the national average. Hardly anything had been done to preserve the forests or build up and maintain the fertility of the soil. Thousands of people were sick from avoidable diseases. Malaria had infected 25 percent of the population, and in some communities ran as high as 60 percent.

This is what the valley had come to, many generations after the first surge of settlement. Progress had passed it by, though the people who lived on the land loved it.

Into this picture came TVA, not only with electric energy, but with improved fertilizers, with a system of conservation, with a determination to make use of all governmental and private agencies that could build up the well-being of the valley—and all this with the aid of the native ingenuity and energy of the people who lived there.

After 25 years the change is startling. TVA has constructed 20 new dams on the main river and its tributaries. Norris, the first of these dams, already shows the patina of time, its concrete surface mellow, its reservoir banks, above high-water line, trim and well-wooded. But Norris Dam, imposing though it seemed when it was planned and built, produces only about 100,000 kilowatts as compared with more than 10 million in today's TVA power system.

The completed dams are serene and beautiful. Their very names are like the echoes of long-past battles—Cherokee, Douglas, Fontana and Hiwassee in the Great Smokies, Chickamauga on the main river, Guntersville above the town of that name, and Kentucky, below the beautiful Lake Kentucky, lowest of all on the main river. These are impressive structures and their machinery is tranquil.

The seven major steam plants that were built in haste after the beginning of the Korean war are not so picturesque, but they are tremendous in their power. Three of them—Kingston on the main Tennessee, Shawnee on the Ohio River and Widows Creek above Guntersville—can produce about as much energy as all the hydraulic powerhouses combined.

There are two ways to see the Tennessee Valley. On is to drive through it, the other is to fly over it. Either way one does not find as yet an earthly paradise but even from the air one is in no doubt whatever as to the efficacy of the conservation projects that have been carried out within the last quarter of a century. There are patches of green, enfolded flatland high in the mountains. There are slopes that used to be bleak and eroded but now have been saved by the proper kind of plowing, by crop rotation and by fertilization. The land is greener than it was about the same time of year in 1933. The farm buildings seem better. There are more good roads. But there are still muddy or dusty back roads too, eroded slopes, and farms on which nobody can make a decent living—even within a few miles of cities or in the neighborhood of the Norris, Douglas or Cherokee Dams.

The changes, of course, are not entirely on the land. As elsewhere, the tides of population have ebbed toward the cities. In 1940, 70 percent were still on the land, but in 1958 only 40 percent. The hill people have drifted into Knoxville, Chattanooga, Memphis and numerous other towns. Numbers of them work in the great atomic plants to which TVA sends so much of its power. If one drives to Oak Ridge at quitting time, he meets long lines of workers' cars. Some of these workers go home to sleep in cabins on farms which are farms no longer.

In the lower reaches of the valley at Muscle Shoals, the great chemical plants which make phosphate and nitrate fertilizers are thunderingly busy places, and their presence encourages other industries. Even after weeks of economic recession, the valley, though it has slowed down, is not stagnant. The civilian sales of TVA power have been increasing at the rate of 10 to 12 percent a year.

The material progress of the valley since 1933 can be expressed in dramatic statistics: a thirtyfold increase in ton-miles of freight carried on the river; a fortyfold increase in power generated; a tenfold increase in the residential use of power; an increase in average per capita income from $163 to $1,165, in depreciated dollars. Nevertheless, the TVA area's income has not yet caught up with that of the country as a whole. Its present income is still less than two-thirds the national average.

But the valley is catching up. Its people are living better than they did 25 years ago. It has quickened its stride. It is healthier and happier than it would have been if TVA had not been created. The work that TVA has done was not being done in 1933, and there were no signs that it would be done, by any other combination of public and private enterprise.

Nor has this contribution been entirely to the people of the valley. The valley, with TVA assistance, served magnificently in the Second World War and in the Korean war. It provided aluminum and other basic necessities in the struggle against Germany and Japan. In addition, a score of other industries fed the arsenal of America. It made gas

shells and let the Germans know that it was doing so; they did not have to be used. It is capable of making the terrible compound known as nerve gas. It has made components of today's space rockets and missiles. More dramatically TVA power, swiftly added to, enabled the United States to plunge ahead in its A-bomb and H-bomb programs.

But TVA works also for peace. The great plants at the Shoals send their products into two-thirds of the States, enriching not only the agriculture of the valley, but nearly all the rest of the country. TVA provides a growing market for electrical appliances by the very fact that it generates cheap electricity for their use.

In doing all this TVA has incidentally broadened the tax base not only of the Tennessee Valley States, but of the Federal Government. It has done this without becoming a ward of the Government. The Federal money flowing into the valley States is below the national per capita average.

The lesson of TVA, therefore, is not that the Federal Government can enrich some of its citizens by taking money away from other citizens. That has not happened. The lesson is one of cooperation among many agencies and many people and extending literally into the grassroots.

But one cannot write about TVA without considering whether or not its power-generating apparatus receives a subsidy from the rest of the country. Spokesmen for the power industry say it does. Spokesmen of TVA are convinced it does not. An observer who has been watching TVA for a quarter of a century is willing to report once again that the subsidy, if it exists, is small indeed.

The basic facts here are two. The first is that TVA pays a percentage of its total power revenues to State and local governments in lieu of taxes (as Federal property, it does not pay direct taxes), and in addition the distributors of its power either pay taxes or make in-lieu-of-tax payments; together, TVA and the distributors pay something between the lowest and the highest tax rates paid by private companies in the adjoining areas.

The second fact is that TVA is required by law to pay the Federal Government sums sufficient to amortize the costs of power installations within a period of 40 years. The average has been about 4 percent annually. At the end of 40 years, that is to say, the Government will have recovered the cost of the power structures but will still own them. It may be plausibly argued, therefore, that the Government is not losing anything on its venture and that the Federal taxpayer outside the valley is not being seriously mulcted.

There would be no disagreement with this view from the three members of the present TVA Board: Brig. Gen. Herbert D. Vogel, the chairman, a veteran of the United States Army Corps of Engineers; Dr. Frank J. Welch, an educator and agriculturist; and Arnold R. Jones, an accountant with long experience, who came to TVA after a term as Deputy Director of the United States Bureau of the Budget.

Chairman Vogel, who is no disciple of any kind of socialism, creeping or otherwise, puts it this way.

"The public power aspects of TVA are but one part—an inevitable part—of the comprehensive program for development of the valley's resources. There can be no separation of this function from the whole, and there should be no conflict between the responsibility of TVA in this respect and aims of private industry. In the years ahead it will be necessary to develop to the fullest all sources of power in the United States, by whatever means, if we are to maintain supremacy in productive strength over nations of the Soviet bloc.

"Public and private power, operating harmoniously side by side, can perform great service to the Nation. There is work in abundance for both, and needs of the future will test each to the utmost."

One comes to the final question: Is TVA, born in a time of deep depression, bred during a period of experimentation and adventure, brought to maturity during a world-wide war and the secondary struggle in Korea, profoundly changed by the advent of the atomic weapon and the possibility of cheap atomic power—is TVA to grow and prosper in its own territory, and is it destined to inspire similar public enterprises in other river valleys?

At the moment there are no signs that it will provide a pattern for other rivers and valleys. For one thing, there are not enough rivers. The Colorado has been developed, but not in the TVA fashion; the Columbia, but not in the TVA fashion; the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, but not in the TVA fashion.

For another thing, the future of power is uncertain. The time will almost surely come when power will not require rivers, though we or our children may find it convenient to locate powerplants on river banks. There is an absolute and measurable end to all hydraulic power; when this end has been reached there will be no possible additions.

Accordingly, one may judge that the TVA power formula raises questions, not because it has to do with rivers but because it has to do with the relations between public and private power. The power development on the Tennessee rested on two assumptions: first, that governmental intervention was necessary if all the possibilities of the river were to be harmoniously utilized; second, that it was not safe, in a democracy, to permit private power monopolies.

The shift from water power and steam power to atomic power would not answer the second of these assumptions, though it may be that energy would be made so abundant and so cheap that it would not really matter who owned and controlled it.

As of today, TVA does not seem to the returned pilgrim to be a threat to private enterprise—no matter how spokesmen for a part of private enterprise regard it. It is not even as much of a threat as it seemed to be a quarter of a century ago, for in those days its territorial boundaries were not precisely fixed, its effects on electric rates were not clearly understood and there was no guarantee that it was not merely the first of a flock of similar undertakings.

In the opinion of this pilgrim there will not be, and cannot be, a duplication of the TVA, if only for the simple reason that there cannot be a duplication of the Tennessee Valley. Nor need there be destructive competition with private utilities. As Chairman Vogel says, "there is work in abundance for both."

But, by the same token, the existence of TVA as a splendidly successful going concern is an admonition to private interests to avoid the shortcomings of pre-TVA years, to expedite technological progress (as some of them are now doing in the most admirable fashion) and to develop their retail markets.

TVA, under any Federal administration, will remain a challenge.

[From the Decatur (Ala.) Daily of May 18, 1958]

TVA'S 25TH ANNIVERSARY

This week 5 million people in this valley are quietly celebrating the 25th anniversary of the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority. And they are not alone, for TVA has meant and will continue to mean a great deal to the Nation and to the world.

Created for the purpose of rejuvinating a river valley, TVA has become a symbol of flood control, navigation, reforestation, electric power for defense and low cost electric power for farms, homes, and factories. The example set by TVA has gone around the world for the interests of the people everywhere are the same. They are interested primarily in food, clothing, and shelter for themselves and their families and TVA spells out sound economics.

To better understand the human values contained in TVA you would have to compare the valley today with the valley of 25 years ago. To put it mildly, a transformation has taken place on the farms, in the homes, in the factory, in the thinking of people. We are no longer afraid in this valley for the right economic factors are present. We may have recessions, but depressions are wholly unlikely.

And after all, the measure of any governmental activity, or any partnership between Government and people, rests in what results are accomplished for the people.

Had TVA been unsuccessful there would be no battle fought in Washington today. Private power interests would not be out to scalp TVA. There would be no charges of subsidized electric bills. Nor would there be lower-power bills all over the Nation for there would have been no yardstick. But the yardstick has been there for 25 years and it is still measuring private as well as public-power bills, and the public likes it that way. Sound management backed up by the people has made the first 25 years of TVA an outstanding success. We can keep it that way for the next 25 years with the same qualities of sound management backed up by the people.

Meeting the Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a speech which I delivered on May 16, 1958, before the 20th District Optimist Clubs in Fresno, Calif.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEETING THE CHALLENGE

(Speech by United States Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL before the 20th District Optimist Clubs, Fresno, Calif., May 16, 1958)

In a gathering of this sort, I assume there is a direct and widespread interest in the role of the Federal Government in our Nation's economy. As men active in business, in industry, and in professions, you have a continuing concern about the conduct of public affairs as they affect the financial health and vigor of our people.

The overwhelming majority of Americans believe in the system of free economic enterprise upon which our country was founded and upon which she has grown to her present position of greatness among the nations of the world. They see every day how we have achieved almost unbelievably high standards of living. They are conscious of the conflict of ideologies—individual initiative and free enterprise versus socialistic slave-state theories—which underlie both our international relations and our domestic problems.

As our Nation has grown, our Government has grown. Decisions in Washington—those embodied in legislation enacted by the Congress and in administrative actions of the

executive branch—have profound impact and far-reaching implications on all of us. This is inevitable when you consider that our Government each years spends on the order of $70 billion. That figure is more than 17 percent of our annual four hundred billions a year national economy. When such a vast sum is disbursed for the payment of services, for the employment of people, for the purchase of goods, it necessarily has a tremendous effect upon people and their livelihood.

For this reason alone, only a few short months ago, the fear of runaway inflation was very real. It permeated the thinking of Americans in all walks of life. More recently, there has been discussion, debate, and expressions of alarm about a swing in the other direction. Instead of inflation and sputniks, the recession has been a prime topic of conversation and a motivating factor behind many governmental actions.

We have become painfully aware of some regrettable soft spots in our economy across this country. Sometimes we say conditions are spotty. Because we are not a one-industry or one-crop State, because we have diversification in most areas, California fortunately has not suffered as painfully the effects of reduced consumer spending, of curtailed buying, which have been deadly serious in some parts of our Nation.

Because these soft spots have shown up and because our national economic structure is so complex, it became imperative for our Federal Government to take actions to help get our industrial and business machine back on the track. Without attempting to catalog all of the actions, I should like to note that a variety of steps was taken to counteract the recession. And even more moves still are under consideration back in Washington. In taking any action, we run into the ideological conflict which I already have mentioned: free enterprise versus socialistic theory.

Early in the present session, the Congress took a position that the Federal Government might check the slowdown by speeding up certain regular activities of Federal agencies. We have undertaken to accelerate purchasing and procurement. We endeavored to channel life-giving dollars into the bloodstream of our economic body. We have passed certain laws to provide a stimulus to some distressed industries and thus to create employment.

One of the earliest efforts was enactment of a new housing law. That was designed to achieve a dual purpose. It was written to improve prospects of families in lower income brackets for purchasing a home of their own. It was designed to loosen credit so builders and contractors would be encouraged to step up their activities. It reduced downpayments and broadened and eased loan features of the Federal housing and veterans' housing programs.

Such action as the housing bill was warranted, in my estimation. It makes for better living and for happier families in America. Although that bill became law only a few weeks ago, I have been told by people in industry and business that already it has helped improve the economic climate. And when we build homes, we not only put carpenters and masons and plumbers and other craftsmen to work, but we create demand for materials that will rejuvenate industry, such as California's economically damaged lumber mills, and steel and cement and fixtures.

The passage of the latest comprehensive highway bill is another achievement which will improve our economic health. I was glad as a member of the Senate Public Works Committee to have a direct hand in framing that legislation. It is designed to put the big, the vital 13-year 41,000 mile, Interstate Highway construction program back on the track. Our Nation requires an up-to-date, soundly engineered network of interstate routes to carry our ever-mounting volume of traffic with greater safety. We must have the best built highways to speed goods to market, to expedite personal travel, and to meet needs of national defense.

This bill did more than improve the chances of building such a highway network on schedule. Provided in part that the historic allocation of Federal financial assistance to the States would be more generous for a limited period of time so that necessary contracts could be let at once and men put to work on the traditional primary-secondary-urban highway projects. By provisions for advances of Federal grants, we helped to create jobs, whether they are in California or Maine or Texas.

In passing, I should like to point out that this piece of legislation also contains one significant innovation. It has a provision with which I had considerable to do and in which I feel a degree of pride. For the first time in history, Congress laid down the policy that you and your families as you drive along the new superhighways shall be able to enjoy the scenery with which God endowed this country. We established the principle of giving States and localities—those instruments of government which have police and zoning powers—an incentive to control outdoor advertising on the interstate system. There were violent arguments, of course, against this innovation. For my part, I believed that the Congress had a right—indeed, a duty—to do what it could to preserve the scenic beauty and the inspirational and aesthetic values of America's terrain for our people.

The President has moved to accelerate certain other activities in similar fashion. He has requested additional funds for public works of a sound, worthwhile character. At the same time, he has stood firm against proposed leaf-raking and boondoggling programs which drain the national Treasury without resulting in a long-range contribution to America's wealth or health. Additional funds have been voted and more have been requested and are under consideration at this time in Congress for flood control and reclamation projects.

Here, I want to say that I object to—in fact, I resent—a tendency in some quarters to characterize public works as "pork barrel" undertakings. True, now and then some agency embarks on a project of dubious worth which slipped through Congress. But the overwhelming proportion of these projects are essential to the safety of America, to the efficient functioning of our transportation, to the supplying of ever-growing demands for food and fiber. That is why I twice voted for the omnibus bill authorizing river and harbor improvements, beach erosion work, and flood prevention and control projects. That is why, as I have stated on several occasions, I deeply regretted President Eisenhower's veto of our most recent authorization bill.

I have been in accord with the philosophy and principles on which the Eisenhower administration operates. I generally have supported the positions taken by our President. But I also have a duty to the people of California to exercise my own judgment and to vote as I think best for their welfare. For that reason, I stand ready to vote to override the President's veto of our omnibus public-works bill. I do so because my examination shows 96 percent of the projects in that bill had been thoroughly and intensively investigated and found feasible on the basis of both economics and engineering. Only 4 percent of them were open to challenge as to their soundness and reasonableness of cost.

I may have served in the United States Senate a relatively few years. But I say to you that I have been a Member of that body long enough to realize that if I withhold my approval of a bill until it meets my standard of legislative perfection, I will be unable to vote "Aye" very many times in the Congress.

In thus believing the vetoed bill was about the best obtainable, I think of the fact that for 4 years we have not enacted a single authorization for a new flood-control project. Yet, during that time, storms heavily loaded with rain and snow have borne down on our Nation and dumped their burden of precipitation with disastrous effect on numerous sections of our land.

Only a little more than a month ago, farmers and homeowners in these lush central valleys of California and not far away in our thickly settled coastal region were struggling to reinforce levees. Many families were evacuating their homes. The inexorable runoff from our hills and mountains wrought widespread damage and brought much suffering. Just before leaving Washington, I sent the Senate Appropriations Committee a letter in which I pointed out that incomplete and partial figures showed that the worst of our recent series of storms did $34 million worth of damage. Yet, the flood prevention and control works, built by the Federal Government prevented $113 million worth of further potential damage. Expenditures for flood control are an investment which returns tangible and measurable dividends.

In all the recent uneasiness about the state of our national economic health there have been repeated demands for tax reduction. The President several times has said he is studying the wisdom of recommending such action. But he, like all of us, is aware of the problem of maintaining our Government's fiscal soundness. We must be conscious of the immense outstanding national debt. Incidentally, let me recall that early in the present session, Congress was called upon to raise the debt ceiling by $5 billion to afford elbow room in handling the Treasury's financing problems.

I have not joined in sponsoring any bill to reduce taxes. Even though I personally would like to reduce the drain on your pocketbook and mine, I cannot be unconscious of the possible repercussions of such a step. I do not want my daughter or your children to go through life unnecessarily weighted with the necessity of paying the costs of actions which might better not have been taken.

Furthermore, I question the benefits of most reductions which have been advocated. I voted against one attempt to reduce the personal income tax load because I felt it would have cost the Treasury an indefensible loss of income. Beyond that, I was not persuaded that giving the average family a paltry sum such as $50 per year would have a constructive effect on our economy. In view of the mechanical problems involved now that we have a system of withholding, I question the effectiveness of a modest immediate increase in exemption. At least, I doubt that it would be as a speedy shot in the arm for our economy.

To talk intelligently about tax reduction, one must know what part of the tax structure is meant. If the administration, after its studies and its weighing possible benefits against disadvantages, recommends action along that line, of course, I will consider it carefully. But, at the moment, I am not persuaded that a nation which last year increased its savings to the unprecedented total of $69 billion should hastily move to chop several billions off its revenues when we already are having trouble keeping within our expanded debt limit.

There are a couple of types of Federal taxation which I do think we might properly consider reducing or eliminating. Both of these would have a long-range beneficial effect as well as, I believe, an immediate result. I question whether we are not doing a greater disservice to the Treasury and our economy by keeping on the books the pres-

ent percent excise taxes on automobiles and on transportation of persons and property.

The automobile excise tax is a very direct blow at the consumer's pocketbook. More than that, it is a psychological deterrent to spending. There is good reason to believe that the continuing down-trend in automobile sales may be due in large part to reluctance of potential purchasers to sign on the dotted line while there is talk of cutting or wiping out this levy. Curtailed automobile sales not only mean a drop in income from the excise tax, but reduced earnings by manufacturers and dealers and therefore lower income tax payments next year.

The automotive tax is a particularly significant item. No doubt it is a good revenue producer. But it is far from painless. In the last fiscal year, it brought in nearly $1,150,000,000. When the 1959 budget was prepared last December, estimates were it would yield this current fiscal year $1,290,000,000. This latter guess obviously is—as I was told by a Treasury Department official last week—in need of adjustment. But even before the downtrend in automobile manufacture and sales began snowballing, the Treasury had written down the expected yield for the fiscal year which begins next July 1. The estimate for fiscal 1959 was only $989 million, a drop of $300 million due to the indicated slackening of activity visible last fall and early winter when revenue estimates were computed.

Thus, we might well ask whether it is not better to forego part if not all of the income from this source, stimulate more buying, and therefore more manufacturing, put more workers back on the job, and prevent a progressive decline in Government receipts from individual and corporate income taxes.

In this connection, the role of automobile manufacturing in our total national economy should be taken into account. I have heard that one out of every five persons in our labor force owes his job directly or indirectly to automobiles. It may be time to consider whether an industry with such far-reaching effect on our total economic activity does not warrant the sort of relief, does not qualify for the stimulus to greater productivity that a reduction in the excise tax would provide. At any rate, if tax reduction is to be considered, here, as I view it, is one area for study.

The tax on transportation, on both persons and property, is another which has extensive effects. To us in California, its consequences are particularly obvious. Our agricultural products to a great extent are shipped long distances to market. Many of our industries import raw materials and send substantial proportions of their finished product across our borders to market. The tax on transportation of property thus is an integral part of the sales price of both agricultural and industrial products. In many situations, this levy pyramids, thus unduly influencing the retail price level.

For us in California, a better competitive situation would result if this transportation tax were lifted. Our fruits and vegetables sent to the big cities of the Atlantic seaboard would be on closer parity with those from Florida, Texas, and other competing areas of the East and South. Our fabricated products from Los Angeles, San Francisco, and other industrialized communities would come closer to meeting on even terms similar articles from Illinois, Ohio, Michigan and New England. And for us at home, we would get relief from that footnote we read in so many national advertisements, the line saying "prices slightly higher west of the Mississippi."

There is one field of tax law revision aside from potential rate revision, virtually crying for attention. Our complicated revenue structure imposes many undue burdens on and puts many obstacles in the way of small business. By the phrase "small business," we mean to cover a broad range of enterprises, industrial production, distribution, wholesaling and retailing. These are the establishments typical of the American free enterprise system, the small corporations, partnerships, and family operations. These are the type of organizations which can grow into substantial economic units, given the proper climate and opportunity for development.

Early this session, a comprehensive bill to revise revenue procedure on small business was introduced as the result of nationwide Senate committee hearings. I am a sponsor of this legislation, and I participated in our Small Business Committee hearings.

This bill recognizes that the impact of Federal taxes is not the same on all segments of our economy. This is not class legislation. It does not attempt to set segment against segment. It endeavors to recognize that smaller establishments need more flexibility in dealing with such problems as retention of earnings essential to expansion and in paying estate taxes and in figuring depreciation. It would end double taxation on fledgling enterprises. In essence, tax relief for small business would create opportunity and thereby enable newcomers with initiative and courage to take their place in our national economy. This is an indispensable ingredient of national growth.

Those are some of the considerations which we have faced, and are facing, in the field of our national economy. Congressional action upon some of them, which has thus far taken place has been, I believe, generally good. And in the months ahead, I trust we may, without resorting to too much politics or to unvirtuous extremes, create a climate in which we all may enjoy economic well-being.

The people in attendance at this convention share with all our countrymen the same prayers for the maintenance of liberty under law and for the attainment of a just and enduring peace in the world. We are united in our aspirations that our freedom may be assured and that international conflict may be honorably averted. Politics, American style, do not divide us in these commonly held and exalted hopes; there is nothing partisan about them at all. Indeed, I feel assured that the hearts of plain people of every land beat in unison as they contemplate the nobility of the human life span freed from the fear of another war.

And it is upon our own country—our people and our Government—which passing events have placed the heavy burden of leadership in the ceaseless struggle to attain these goals. The difficulties of this labor are both many and complex, but I think all of us pretty well appreciate both the worth of such exertions and the magnitude of the difficulties.

Within a fairly short number of years, international communism has taken over 17 sovereign nations, in whole or in part, and almost one thousand million people have been swept into the Red orbit to become the subjects of Soviet rule. Nations, great and small, on this side of the Iron Curtain, began to sense the mounting dangers to their own independence. They began to enter into defense agreements, by which it was mutually agreed that any communist assault upon one would be treated as Communist assault against all. This concept of collective defense, of interdependence among free countries against a continuing potential foe has paid off very handsomely, I think. Not one such country belonging to any of the now farflung mutual security agreements has been subjected to armed attack by international communism. Meanwhile, the techniques of the Soviet have undergone some changes. The danger remains. Some in a position to judge believe it has increased. The challenge to freedom has become more farflung.

Mr. Khrushchev has told America:

"We declare war upon you—excuse me for using such an expression—in the peaceful field of trade. We declare a war we will win over the United States. The threat to the United States of America is not the ICBM, but in the field of peaceful production. We are relentless in this and it will prove the superiority of our system."

And he also told America:

"In 50 years, your grandchildren will ask themselves how you could have been so stupid as to fail to rally to the banner of communism when it is evident that communism represents history and the future."

"I have this certainty," said Khrushchev in one of his speeches, "that in a few years, communism will have triumphed throughout the globe."

The economic, political, and cultural things free peoples stand for, indeed, even the fundamental principles of free religion, are subjected to challenge from communism on economic and political as well as military fronts. In responding to those challenges, free governments need continually to make decisions, sometimes basic, sometimes collateral, but always important, in the fields of defense and foreign policy. If mistakes are made, all of us will suffer for them. And to the contrary, if correct decisions now become the basis for strengthening the free world's position, then we shall all share in their beneficience.

I said earlier that politics do not divide Americans in their commonly held prayers for peace and freedom. Neither war nor peace distinguishes Republicans from Democrats. Differences of opinion, there are. But differences based on potential partisan advantage in this top-most important area, there are not, and there must not be.

I respect the United States Senate in its attitude, and in its history, in dealing with questions of defense and foreign relations. This is my sixth year in the Senate, and I am proud to attest that the leadership of both parties has always tried to find the basis on which our country's interest might best be served, and the cause of freedom might best be advanced. Disagreements which have arisen came from individual differences and not because of party politics. Senate support, and Senate opposition, for example, to the Mutual Security Act in the last Congress both came on a bipartisan basis. And in the coming weeks in Washington, we will, I feel sure, once again cast our votes on legislation in this area on the same basis of what is best for America as we, individually, see the light.

THE MILITARY CHALLENGE

First, let us look at the military challenge we face. During the years since the war, Soviet Russia has pushed steadily ahead to develop a great warmaking potential equipped with the most modern scientific weapons, including those of a nuclear nature. We saw evidence of Soviet progress during the Korean war, when the performance of MIG fighters left little advantage to us. We have been reminded of Soviet military strength by reports received on their hydrogen testing. Last fall, the extent of Soviet scientific advance was forcibly demonstrated by the launching of the first earth satellites. In the years since the war, the Soviet Union by strict state control has put steel into military equipment instead of into consumer goods on the scale which we have done in the States.

The Soviet military challenge is not being ignored.

President Eisenhower recently focused attention on the need to adapt our defenses to the demands of modern war. He has called for an increased centralization of military control so that the United States can respond to any attack with coordinated and integrated force with each branch of the military services able to act in the area of defense or offense for which it is best equipped.

I shall support the President in his recommended changes for our Defense Establishment. Most particularly in this kind of problem, his experience and his wisdom are unique and unexcelled. Interservice jurisdictional strife would, as it should, under his proposal, be curtailed, without stultifying esprit de corps. Wasteful overlapping would be eliminated. Efficiency would be increased. It is true that some, in and out of Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, oppose the President. But, I was very glad to see Gen. Omar Bradley and Adm. Arthur Radford, who together have 8 years' experience as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testify unequivocally in favor of the President's plan. They have informed the Congress that Eisenhower's proposal is essential to our country's best interest, and, like the President, are in a position to know what they are talking about. In my judgment, the Senate will give enthusiastic bipartisan majority support to the recommended reorganization. I venture the hope that the House of Representatives would do the same.

We are now in a period of history when war between the two great powers could exterminate all mankind. Until the time comes when an inspection-proof disarmament agreement may be successfully negotiated, we will, unhappily, be required to maintain an efficient, effective—and costly—Military Establishment, of the most modern type, to deter aggression through the sure knowledge on the part of the potential warmaker of what obliterative retaliation his folly would at once entail.

You are acquainted with the constant readiness of our gallant Strategic Air Command and of its powerful retaliatory forces now located at various points around the globe. And you know, too, of our splendid Navy and her expanding nuclear potential, and of the wonderful accomplishment of our great Army, both in conventional and in out-of-space achievements, where all Americans salute her, and in her vast capability for mobility and strength in her ground forces. The Marine Corps will, if called upon, continue to play her dedicated role in our defense, under the new reorganization, exactly as she has in her long history.

I might add that $3 out of every $4 which the President has requested for mutual-security expenditures is for the purpose of supporting the military efforts and forces of our allies. These are allies with bases from which we would operate in the event of attack. These are allies who have permitted us to establish IRBM bases on their territories within range of the Soviet Union. These are allies who have men under arms in greater numbers than do we.

Our modern Defense Establishment is a good investment in security and a sure means of checking the challenge. Overseas bases from which we may operate and from which missiles may be fired are an important part of our defense system. Allies who will stand with us in defense of freedom are a good investment in security for the future as they have been in the past. Just how effective the SAC deterrent is has recently been illustrated by Soviet concern at our state of readiness. Our free friends stood by us in rejecting the recent Soviet attempt to compel us to disarm SAC. And then they upheld our own excellent recommendation that the United Nations establish an inspection and warning system in the vast expanses of the Arctic. It is a tragedy that the inscrutable Russians vetoed this proposal in the Security Council. But unquestionably her veto has served to knit more closely the common bond between our allies and ourselves, and it constitutes a valid measure of the foe of freedom with which we deal.

THE ECONOMIC CHALLENGE

We are challenged, too, on the economic front. The Soviet military challenge must not detract from the Khrushchev boast that the Soviet contemplates overtaking free peoples and engulfing free states. Her economic challenge is two pronged. She places heavy emphasis on her domestic economy. For the first quarter of 1958, for the first time, Soviet steel production was equal to our own, although our own production has been below maximum capacity. The Soviet economy is now expanding at, roughly, twice the rate of our own.

The second economic challenge is in her program of economic penetration. Already we are seeing the Soviet Union searching for export markets and standing ready to import raw materials from abroad, by way of loan repayments or otherwise.

Over the last 3 years the Sino-Soviet bloc has extended some $2 billion of development and military aid to countries outside the Soviet bloc. These countries have been assisted by loans and gifts. Their accompanying indoctrinated technicians are carefully chosen for their ability to spread the Communist doctrine. Nasser's Egypt, astride the lifeline of Europe, has received generous financial and military assistance. Syria, which flanks our NATO ally, Turkey, successfully has been penetrated. Yemen, at the entrance to the Red Sea, where it commands access to oil shipments, has received Russian aid. Ceylon, Indonesia, Laos, all countries which the Communists covet, have had help from Russia or Communist China.

The Sino-Soviet bloc is not helping these countries out of love and affection or of unselfish devotion to the cause of man's freedom. Those countries are receiving aid from Russia, first, to help to make sure they stay outside the free world camp, and, second, to try to put them under Soviet influence and obligation.

I do not believe that we should permit ourselves to be jockeyed into the position of competing with the Soviet Union in supplying aid to any country. And I do not believe that we are. I think the situation is the other way around. We have honestly attempted to extend a helping hand to weak nations and new nations which want to live in peace and whose ideals of human dignity are not dissimilar to our own. In the early days of our own country, we utilized money from abroad by which our own industry originally got underway. One of our policies today is to promote the investment of private capital in constructive projects overseas in friendly lands. But in some such areas, private funds simply are not available because of the risks involved. And by this economic aid program which President Eisenhower has laid down, as part of our mutual security program, the intention is clear: We desire to help ourselves by helping others. We believe it is good for nations which are free to remain free. And we do not believe there is any difference so far as liberty is concerned between a country which goes down the drain through Soviet military occupation and one which goes down the same drain through economic or political subversion. That is the intention by which the President asks the Congress to adopt his economic aid legislation and, here again, as an American, I shall support him.

In discussing the Soviet economic challenge and American economic aid programs, I wish to emphasize that most of our aid—over half—is now on a loan basis. The economic programs for next year calls for total appropriations of $1.3 billion. If this program were to be emasculated by the Congress, I have not the slightest doubt that our own defense appropriation would be considerably increased.

The economic challenge must also be met by a continuation of our reciprocal trade legislation. We cannot grow and prosper in any sanctuary of economic isolation. Our ever increasing labor and productive force cannot be profitably employed to produce for our own consumption alone. And our needs for raw material cannot be supplied entirely from domestic sources.

I believe in reciprocal trade. But, I must say in frankness that I do not believe that the administration of our trade laws has given proper effect to the provisions in our reciprocal-trade laws which deal with the so-called peril point and escape clause. These phrases refer to Federal statutes designed to prevent foreign-trade policies from destroying our own American agriculture and industry. I want to continue mutually profitable international trade, but I do not intend to vote any of my fellow Americans into bankruptcy. I know something about the problems of the American tuna-fishing industry, and something, too, about the fig growers of this Fresno area and the date growers of the Coachella Valley, and the deleterious effects upon them of unfettered competition from abroad.

The Senate Finance Committee will hold extensive hearings on this exceedingly complex problem. And while I tell you that I shall support, as the President has requested, a continuation of reciprocal trade, I trust that the committee may find a proper way to assure that when our own American economy, or any segment of it, is in peril by reason of foreign competition, relief, swift and sure, will be available, exactly as the statutes have ever intended.

THE POLITICAL CHALLENGE

It is difficult, in few words or many, to comment on the political challenge which international communism poses to all. None can honestly question Russia's inexorable desire to communize the globe. Stalinism, then anti-Stalinism, scowls then smiles, collective dictatorship and now, apparently, a return to one-man rule, high-sounding declarations of peace and then the ruthless killing of Hungarians, agreement to Austrian sovereignty, but belligerent opposition to self-determination for the stricken satellites—Russia's Soviet leadership, in international politics, is completely inscrutable. It is also very wearing on patience. The Kremlin is quite unrestrained by moral scruples. She zigs and zags on the basis of what best serves her course at the moment.

Against this formidable, ruthless world power, stand the United States and her allies. Our leadership, in freedom's cause, needs ever to be bold and courageous. It needs to be, as it always has been, honest and forthright, fair to all. We believe in peace with justice for all. And, I think recent events have demonstrated that our proposals for advancing peace have added to our stature. We need to wage peace constantly and with vigor. And it sometimes seems that the very intransigence of the Soviet leaders may, in the long run, contribute to the victory of an honorable peace which we continue honorably to seek.

We will meet the challenge.

Shakespeare's Polonius said it:

"This above all
To thine own self be true
And it must follow, as night the day,
Thou canst not then be false to any man."

George Foster Peabody Award Citation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the theater industry has its Oscar awards, the television industry has its George Foster Peabody awards. Outstanding

people in their respective fields are frequently distinguished by appropriate awards. The George Foster Peabody radio-television award for meritorious and distinguished public service was presented to the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. on April 2, 1958. The Peabody awards have been called the Pulitzer prize of broadcasting. They are highly regarded and deeply cherished. The citation which was presented to the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. was as follows:

The Boston conference of the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. brought into sharp focus the significance of public service broadcasting—both to this company and to the industry. The conference was in a sense a creative sounding board, the message of which was more attention to better local public-service programing.

Westinghouse merits special recognition for this conference, but also for the high quality of its own public-service broadcasting. Every Westinghouse-operated station reflected in 1957 projects and programs too numerous to mention, the admirable concept of which is hereby recognized with this special Peabody radio-television award for meritorious and disinguished public service.

Statement of Mayor Robert F. Wagner on the Current Unemployment Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on May 16, 1958, the House Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member, had the privilege of receiving the testimony of our distinguished mayor of New York City, the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, regarding the current recession and unemployment situation in New York City.

I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to Mayor Wagner's statement, as follows:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT F. WAGNER, MAYOR, CITY OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 16, 1958

Gentlemen, I welcome the opportunity of appearing before this distinguished committee to speak about the recession with which we have all been increasingly concerned over the past several months.

We in municipal government observe the effects of recession not as a set of graphs and statistics but as a series of disturbing human problems. Even if there were no statistics we would know that there was a recession.

We know it because we see more and more families in difficulty arising from the loss of income, as fathers and working mothers lose their jobs or work fewer hours.

We know it because of the increase in idleness among our older workers and minority groups.

We know it from our social agencies who deal with juvenile delinquency and other problems of adolescents. They are deeply concerned by the prospect that many of our young people will not find jobs this summer, and will be forced into a long period of idleness. Lack of jobs for the adolescent and breakdown in the financial stability of the home will seriously hamper us in our program of delinquency control and prevention.

Although the situation is not as bad in New York City as in many other parts of the country, still the picture we see at the local level is indeed not a pleasant one.

How long is this situation to last? I am not going to try to forecast our economic future. Our data on the city's economy does not show with any certainty how soon we may expect an upturn. Nor does it give us reliable evidence as to whether we have or have not reached the end of the decline. In this kind of uncertainty, I believe that unless appropriate action is taken now we do run the risk that the decline which in a relative sense is at present still minor will begin to spiral and may carry us into a severe depression.

The latest available estimate of total unemployment in New York City, which is for March, puts the number of people out of work at 340,000—an increase of 47 percent over March of 1957. March unemployment thus amounted to 7½ percent of the city's labor force. More recent data on insured unemployment indicates that total unemployment in April will be somewhat higher than in March. In fact, the proportionate rise in unemployment in this recession has already exceeded the worst months of the two previous post-war recessions.

In New York City as in the rest of the Nation it is our manufacturing industries that have been hardest hit. As elsewhere, the largest relative increases in unemployment have been in our hard goods industries. For example, insured unemployment for April in the transportation and equipment industry is up 158 percent over a year ago. In fabricated metal products industries the increase is 160 percent; in machinery, 195 percent; in instrument and photo goods, 187 percent.

The largest number of unemployed persons, however, come from our most important manufacturing industry, the apparel industry. The number of garment workers drawing unemployment compensation this April was over 74,000, almost twice as many as April 1957. In addition, other nondurable goods industries have experienced a substantial increase in unemployment, such as textile mill products, leather, and printing.

Construction is another industry that has suffered this year. In April there were over 16,000 unemployed—some 56 percent over a year ago. The first 3 months of this year housing starts have been 20 percent below the first 3 months of last year and nearly 50 percent below the level achieved in 1956. Nonresidential construction in the city is also down.

In short, although New York City is not as badly off as many other areas in the country, some particular industries are in severe distress.

Recession makes itself felt not only through complete loss of job but in partial unemployment and other indicators of economic hardship. Average weekly hours worked in manufacturing in March was 36.7, a drop of 4 percent from last year. Business failures in March of 1958 were up 16 percent over a year ago, with the bulk of these failures concentrated, of course, in small firms.

Economic decline and the rise in unemployment in New York City has affected the city's welfare program. As the recession continues more and more persons exhaust their claims to unemployment compensation. In the first 4 months of this year over 20,000 persons in the city have exhausted their benefits.

Our public assistance caseload is up to 145,100, with over 300,000 persons receiving assistance. This is an increase, during the course of the present recession, of 7,000 cases involving 27,000 persons. We have already exceeded the caseload peak of the 1953–54 recession, and by July we expect to exceed the postwar peak of 353,000 persons reached in June of 1950. This will happen even if we have an economic upturn during the summer. Public assistance caseloads always continue to rise for many months after an economic upturn sets in.

We can measure the effect of joblessness by increased welfare caseloads and their cost in dollars; what we cannot do is to measure its effect in human misery and social deterioration.

We in New York City are aware of the fact that the prosperity of our local economy cannot be dissociated from national prosperity. We know that much of the decline in our city's economy results from recession throughout the State and the Nation. It can be truly said that what is good for the Nation is good for New York City, and every other community.

I would like to advance the following proposals with a twofold purpose: (1) To provide a stimulus to local economies directly; and (2) to raise the general level of economic activity in the Nation as a whole.

One important way in which the Federal Government can act constructively and expeditiously to combat the current recession is to provide grants to local governments to finance short-term public works and improvements. Such grants would provide needed new spending which would be channeled in the first instance into depressed industries. In this way, the Federal Government can give a powerful lift to the national economy, while at the same time getting maximum value for every dollar spent. This is in no way a make-work proposal. On the contrary, the use of idle resources for highly worthwhile purposes would benefit the largest number of people directly and would make an important contribution to our long-range economic progress. It keep responsibility for local action at the local level.

I know that this committee is considering the community facilities bill which would provide Federal loans for public works construction. But I want to emphasize that this bill would not benefit New York City at all. Our problem is not with ability to obtain funds, or with high interest rates, it lies in constitutional restrictions on our borrowing power. Many other cities are in a similar situation; I note that the mayor of Detroit recently indicated to this committee that his city had reached the statutory limit on bonded debt.

Therefore, I advocate that the Federal Government make grants to local governments for the following purposes:

1. Rehabilitation and modernization of run-down physical facilities.

2. New construction which can be initiated and completed within a short period of time.

In New York City alone there are numerous projects on the shelf whose importance has been established beyond question but which we have had to postpone simply for lack of funds. These are projects which have been thoroughly studied, and which are backed by careful plans. If the money were available, today, we could quickly produce many dramatic improvements in the city's facilities and services.

There are well over $100 million worth of such projects which could be started and completed within a relatively short period of time. These projects include modernization of schools, libraries, police stations, health centers, and ferry terminals, and improvement of streets and parks. They would furnish some 2¼ million man-days' work. Should further economic decline justify undertaking longer-term construction, we could increase our projects 10-fold.

Speedy enactment of a program of temporary Federal grants for local improvements for the entire Nation would produce an excellent weapon to fight the recession. The program would provide almost immediate spending but would not tie up our productive facilities for an extended period of time. Therefore, even if an economic upturn should actually come at an earlier date than now seems likely, the program would not be a source of inflationary pressure. We would be using capacity mainly during the time it would otherwise be idle.

I shall shortly transmit to our congressional delegation a draft of a bill embodying our ideas of how such a program might be set up.

It should, I think, constitute a prime element in national antirecession policy, and I wanted to give it particular emphasis before this committee today.

I would now like to turn attention to other proposals related to the recession problem.

There are several programs of long-range social betterment which I feel ought to be advanced at the present time when idle resources are available. These items include school construction, more low- and middle-income housing, and urban renewal and redevelopment, for which I have recently testified before a Congressional Committee, and a much greater effort to combat water and air pollution.

Now is also the time for increasing social security payments. The increase would provide money that would be immediately spent, and thus provide an additional shot in the arm to the economy. It is amply justified by the present high cost of living. Congress has several times in the past increased social security payments to meet changing economic conditions. It should do so again.

I am convinced of the need for extending the duration of unemployment insurance benefits to at least 39 weeks and I believe that the bill passed by the House is a move in the right direction. Also, I believe that ultimately all workers should be included in our unemployment insurance system and that adequate standards for benefits should be established throughout the Nation.

I believe that as an emergency measure, the Federal Government should provide unemployment benefits to those workers not now covered by the unemployment compensation system, who have lost or will lose their jobs during the current recession.

There are many suggestions for Federal tax reduction to combat the slump. There is at present no unanimous opinion on the best form of tax reduction. My own viewpoint is that a tax reduction of $7 to $10 billion is needed, and should emphasize increasing the purchasing power of low-income groups and assisting small business. Tax cuts of this magnitude have already been recommended by many business groups including the Committee for Economic Development.

Your chairman has asked my opinion of H. R. 10345, the bill to establish a small-business capital bank system. I have good reason for favoring the objectives of this bill. Small firms predominate in the New York City economy; one of our important roles is that of a seedbed of new business ventures. Our small firms, like small firms everywhere, have trouble getting capital; this difficulty is magnified in times of recession.

Many small and large business firms in the New York City area have, over the years, become geared to produce a substantial quantity of goods for our defense effort. Many of these firms, and their thousands of employees, are dependent on defense production for their continued existence and livelihood. A number of small firms have suffered in recent months because of the decline in defense production.

Production facilities in this area are presently underutilized.

The size of the city and the diversity of our industry may create the illusion that we can afford to be overlooked when nondefense, as well as defense, contract allocations are made. While we are not a distressed area, we harbor distressed industries. These include shipbuilding, with its excellent facilities for construction and repair; machinery and instrument manufacture, and our very important apparel industries. I, therefore, urge that the Federal program of contract allocation make the fullest possible use of the many diversified production facilities in the New York City area.

In closing let me emphasize that we in New York City are not just going to wait for the Federal Government to act to help our local situation. We are taking action on our own. I have directed various city departments to accelerate to the maximum extent possible all programed expenditures on public works and public improvements.

I have appointed a special committee to study the recession problem in our area and to maintain continuous liaison with the New York congressional delegation. This committee includes representatives of business, labor, and the city government, and will be meeting with the delegation in the very near future with specific suggestions for immediate action.

But efforts by localities taken individually can be of only marginal help in combating recession. This cannot be a bootstrap operation; it is basically the responsibility and the obligation of the Federal Government.

And I urge this committee and the entire Congress to act now.

Meat Promotion Up Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. POLK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Daily Drovers Journal is one of the oldest and most respected journals in the livestock industry. In the April 14, 1958 issue of the Drovers Journal there appeared an editorial on the controversial livestock industry. In the April 14, 1958, under consideration by the House Agriculture Committee.

No matter on which side of this controversy one finds himself, this editorial is worth reading for it expresses the views of a very important spokesman for the livestock industry in the Middle West.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the Drovers Journal editorial entitled "Meat Promotion Up Again":

MEAT PROMOTION UP AGAIN

The House Agriculture Committee is getting set to begin hearings again on a bill to allow market deductions from farmers' livestock checks for the purpose of promoting meat.

We use the word "again" advisedly, for it was just about a year ago that hearings were held on the same subject. Later in the year the House, by a vote of 216 to 175, refused to debate the question and the deduction bills were killed for that session of the 85th Congress.

Evidently the proponents of the deduction legislation are not intending that the current crop of bills—7 identical measures in the House and 1 in the Senate—shall meet a similar fate. It has been announced that a grassroots campaign for the passage of such legislation is being organized and that many representatives of cattle, sheep and swine organizations will testify in favor of the bills.

This projected legislation, like that which was turned down last year, calls for amending the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921. It specifies that "nothing in this act shall be construed as prohibiting a market agency, upon request of a livestock producer sponsored association or organization, from making deductions from the proceeds of sales of livestock or any species thereof to finance research or sales promotion programs, provided that in accounting to the shipper of such livestock, the shipper is advised of the amount of the deduction, the purpose thereof, the organization it was made for and that upon request of the shipper, made within 30 days from date of deduction, the amount deducted will be paid to the shipper."

In other words, it would enable any livestock group in any way connected with livestock producers to go to any market and request the commission firms or other auditing agencies to deduct a specified amount from the check of every seller of livestock. This money would then be turned over to that group for whatever use it wanted to make of it for research or sales promotion programs. If the farmer objected to contributing, he could get his money back by applying to the withholding agency within 30 days from date of the deduction.

Recognizing the need for and value of good promotion programs and being well aware of the fact that livestock producers agree generally on the need for promoting meat to the limit of good economics, we feel duty-bound to raise some of the same questions as were raised last year in consideration of this legislation. These are:

(1) Is it necessary legislation? That is doubtful. There is nothing in the law now to prohibit such deductions if the prior consent of the seller of the livestock is obtained. A commission firm can deduct any amount for any purpose if so instructed by the seller. It is only necessary to have this legislation to permti deductions from the seller's check without his permission. When this is done, the program is no longer voluntary. The seller's proceeds are violated and he is forced to take steps to regain them if he does not wish to permit the violation to stand.

(2) Would it result in more effective meat promotion? We do not know. The legislation is only enabling in nature. It does not set up a program of any kind. It simply opens the door to any or all organizations which qualify—and there are literally dozens of them—for any program they may want to pursue toward the ends of research and promotion of meat. The danger in this is that a number of organizations could engage in a scramble for the promotion money, with the result that the pie would be split too many ways for any program to be effective.

(3) What would it mean for existing meat research and promotion organizations? It could seriously threaten, and possibly even destroy, such organizations as the National Livestock and Meat Board by fragmentizing the meat promotion effort. The latter board, which has been carrying on an effective program of meat research, education and promotion for over 30 years, depends in part on the voluntary contributions of livestock producers made through approved deductions from their sales proceeds. Participating packers match these funds on a per head basis to give the board its operating budget. There is nothing in the proposed legislation to safeguard the existing structure of the board's source of funds. A definite danger is that the funds now going to the board would

be split among many groups and that the board program would have to be seriously curtailed or even given up entirely.

(4) Can more meat promotion funds than are now being spent (an estimated $100 million a year by all livestock and meat and food agencies) be utilized to any great advantage to meat producers? Proponents of the bills say yes, but there is reason to doubt that the total consumption of meat could be increased much or that livestock prices could be raised at all, no matter how many millions were spent. In future editorials this possibility will be explored more fully.

These questions are not raised in the hope that they will discourage any livestock farmer in his belief that meat should be promoted. Meat must be promoted—we subscribe to that belief 100 percent. The question is not whether meat needs promotion, but how it shall be done. Any moves which might result in failure and even in the destruction of already existing, successful meat promotion machinery are wrong. This discussion is intended to emphasize the need of being sure any meat promotion moves are right before they are made.

National Lottery Law Should Get Serious Consideration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to inform the Members of this Congress that national interest in my bill to establish a national lottery in the United States continues to gain support and approval. I am happy to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the April 30, 1958, edition of the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) Daily News:

NATIONAL LOTTERY LAW SHOULD GET SERIOUS CONSIDERATION

(By Jack Gore)

A few weeks ago in Ireland another drawing of the annual Irish Hospital Sweepstakes took place.

All over the world millions of ticket holders who had plunked down the equivalent of $3 for an opportunity to win a large or a small fortune in one of the most famous of all national lotteries, literally held their breath waiting to see if they were one of the fortunate winning-ticket holders.

The vast majority of those participating in this lottery won nothing. Some, however, took down substantial returns on their $3 investment. But nobody really got hurt, and when the drawing was over Irish hospitals were the beneficiaries of a sizable chunk of money for expansion and improvement needs.

The curious thing about this Irish Hospital Sweepstakes is that despite the fact lotteries are illegal in this country, Americans buy more sweepstakes tickets than the citizens of any other nation. Exact figures are difficult to come by but it is estimated that some $25 million was spent by Americans for tickets on this year's lottery.

So great is the interest over here in the results of the drawing that our national wire services will provide member newspapers who request it with a list of the American ticket holders fortunate enough to win a major prize.

All this shows how asinine and ridiculous we are in our official attitude toward legalizing lotteries in this country. There is certainly nothing more vicious about the Irish hospital sweepstakes than there is in parimutuel wagering at our race tracks and jai alai frontons. It doesn't come close to the evils we have spawned through illegal offtrack horse-race betting, bolita and numbers games of various types.

But in hypocritical fashion we won't permit lotteries even though by the very act of legalizing them we could wipe out almost overnight many of the gangster-controlled rackets that are bleeding our low-income groups of millions of dollars every week.

We have never been one to urge unlimited legalized gambling. But when illegal gambling is as widespread as it is in this Nation today, and when it provides a major source of revenue to finance the growing activities of nationwide criminal syndicates, it is perfectly obvious to any clear thinking individual that a reversal of our attitude toward a national lottery in America would produce far more good than harm.

Think, for a minute, of the money that could be made available for medical research through the operations of a national lottery. Most of this money is now being channeled into the pockets of our criminal element who are operating outside the law. Obviously, these people would bitterly oppose establishment of a national lottery in America for it would dry up their sources of revenue right quicklike. Even more important it would put funds now being diverted into the pockets of a few, into projects that could be of vast benefit to all of our people.

If we had no legalized gambling in this Nation, if our people weren't spending millions each year on foreign lotteries, and if they weren't financing a billion dollar a year illegal gambling racket, we could give some weight to the moral arguments against a national lottery.

But all this other gambling, both legal and illegal, is going on in our Nation today and to such an extent that it seems absolutely ridiculous not to recognize the great amount of money that could be raised for extremely worthwhile purposes every year in this Nation through the operation of a national lottery conducted on a monthly or quarterly basis.

The whole thing could be condutced simply and inexpensively under the terms of a bill already introduced in Congress. It would give the Federal Government airtight control over the lottery process as tickets would be available only through post offices and a special commission would be appointed to regulate the entire operation.

As we said above we have no desire to see all types of gambling legalized. But with the Federal Government spending as much as it is today, with taxes as high as they are, and with millions of dollars being siphoned out of America into foreign lotteries and into the pockets of criminal elements via illegal gambling rackets, we can see no valid reason why a national lottery bill shouldn't be given serious consideration.

W. G. Huxtable Honored by Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is my extreme pleasure to advise the membership of the House of Representatives that Mr. W. G. Huxtable, of Marion, Ark., known to many of us in this body as Mr. Billy, was recently honored by the United States Corps of Engineers, the Mississippi River Commission, and his thousands of friends everywhere when he was presented with a certificate and citation signed by Secretary of the Army Wilbur M. Brucker for his 45 years of outstanding service in the field of flood control.

Mr. Billy is well known to Members of Congress, for he is one of the Nation's leading authorities on flood control work and river and harbor improvements. The Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Appropriations subcommittee on civil functions regularly look forward to his appearance. They know him to be highly qualified, the soul of integrity, and a source of unquestioned information on all problems of flood control and civil engineering.

Mr. Billy is chief engineer for the St. Francis Levee District in eastern Arkansas, but in a larger sense, he is Mr. Flood Control throughout that great alluvial valley created by the mighty Mississippi. He knows the river and its tributaries and for 45 years has worked to protect the lands in that alluvial valley. How well he has succeeded is indicated by the noteworthy acclaim given him. With this brief statement I wish to include an editorial from the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal of May 14, 1958 entitled "Merit Recognized." With this editorial I would like to place in the RECORD a news story from the Forrest City (Ark.) Times-Herald of May 13.

And, as a further indication of the work Mr. Huxtable has done and that such work is a continuing task with problems all up and down the river that combine into the great scheme of controls developed by the Mississippi River Commission and the United States Corps of Engineers, I place with this account the story of the Memphis high-water hearing before the Mississippi River Commission as written for the Commercial Appeal by Mr. George Sisler:

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal of May 14, 1958]

MERIT RECOGNIZED

For his 45 years of engineering service in the flood-control field, the Army has awarded a certificate of appreciation to William G. Huxtable of Marion, Ark. It could not have picked a more deserving man.

Billy Huxtable, chief engineer of the St. Francis Levee Board, is one of he best known, best liked and most capable flood control engineers in the Mississippi Valley. The massive and well-maintained front-line levees in his sector of eastern Arkansas are as much a monument to his efforts as to those of any other person. When his imminent retirement takes effect he can look back with pride on what he has achieved and with the satisfaction of knowing that it is recognized by the Army as well as by the people he has served.

[From the Forrest City (Ark.) Times-Herald of May 13, 1958]

W. G. HUXTABLE RECEIVES HONOR FROM ENGINEERS

The United States Army Corps of Engineers thinks highly of William G. Huxtable, chief engineer of the St. Francis Levee District of Arkansas—so highly, in fact, that when the Mississippi River Commission, on annual high-water-inspection trip aboard

the steamer *Mississippi*, docked at Memphis the morning of May 13 a surprised Uncle Billy Huxtable was invited to appear before Maj. Gen. William A. Carter, commission president, who presented to him the Department of the Army certificate of appreciation, signed by Secretary of the Army Wilber M. Brucker and by Maj. Gen. Emerson C. Itschner, Chief of Engineers, with the following citation:

"In recognition of more than 45 years of outstanding engineering effort devoted to the progressive economic development of a large area of the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River through the reclamation of swamplands, the construction of roads and highways, and the construction and maintenance of flood-control works on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and in appreciation of the knowledge, judgment, unity of purpose and action manifested by his cooperative efforts with the local interests of the Valley, the Corps of Engineers and the Mississippi River Commission in combating great floods and in the development, execution, and maintenance of flood-control projects, particularly on the Mississippi and St. Francis Rivers."

Along with the certificate and citation, Mr. Huxtable received a handsome lapel pin bearing the United States coat of arms with the legend "patriotic civilian service."

Mr. Huxtable's association with drainage and flood-control problems dates from his graduation from the University of Arkansas in 1910, with a degree in civil engineering. For 5 years he was in charge of location and construction of many miles of drainage ditches in eastern Arkansas and southeastern Missouri. During the next 10 years, while carrying on his own farming activities at Lansing, Arkansas, he was engineer for drainage district No. 2 and Commissioner for road district No. 8 of Crittenden County and in 1921 was elected to the board of directors of the St. Francis Levee District of Arkansas.

On July 1, 1935, Mr. Huxtable assumed his present position as Chief engineer of the St. Francis Levee District of Arkansas. Since that date he has worked closely with the Corp of Engineers through the Memphis District and Mississippi River Commission offices. His often expressed opinion is that his levee district and the Corps are in partnership in their progress toward making the valley safe from floods, an opinion equally shared by Corps personnel. Because of his intimate knowledge of flood-control and drainage problems throughout his area, he has won the respect and confidence of landowners and government officials alike.

Mr. Huxtable now resides in Marion, Arkasas, not far from his birthplace, Mound City, in Crittenden County. He is a member of the Engineers' Club of Memphis, Arkansas Society of Professional Engineers, and the Rotary Club, and is a registered professional engineer.

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal]

DELEGATION ASKS AID FROM MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION—WEST TENNESSEANS SEEK FLOOD CONTROL FUNDS—HUXTABLE IS HONORED

(By George Sisler)

Witnesses at the Mississippi River Commission's annual high-water hearing here yesterday asked Army Corps of Engineers help in obtaining appropriations for immediate and long-range flood control and river-taming projects.

Representative ROBERT A. "FATS" EVERETT, Democrat, of Tennessee, headed a delegation of west Tennessee landowners at the public hearing aboard the engineers' steamer *Mississippi*. They asked that bank-protection works be installed to prevent the Mississippi from clawing away farmland along its banks.

John L. Yarbrough, of Dyersburg, Tenn., cited a very serious problem in the caving away of Island 18 towhead. Inroads of the river at that point, he said, "have knocked out a State and county road and are about to cave off 10,000 acres of the best land in the region." He asked that dikes be installed at the head of the chute to prevent caving.

GOOD LAND LOST

Lack of channel stabilization at Islands 26 and 27 is causing the loss of "a lot of good land on both sides of the Mississippi," said Lauren M. Shoup, of Ashport, Tenn. General Carter, replying to Mr. Shoup's statement that perhaps the Mississippi River Commission "is not interested in farmland," reminded the group that keeping such land from the river's clutches is the primary purpose of the Corps of Engineers' flood-control programs, which include constructing bank revetments at a cost of $750,000 a mile.

Will T. McKie, of Clarksdale, Miss., chief engineer of the Yazoo-Mississippi Delta Levee Board, reported on bank-full conditions along 100 miles of the Yazoo River. He urged early completion of flood-control work which would, if completed now, result in 3 to 4 feet less water, he said.

Mayor Edmund Orgill and W. B. Fowler, city engineer, expressed hope that channel stabilization work now in progress above Memphis will be effected soon so a site for the proposed new bridge can be located. General Carter said the dredging of a pilot channel above Loosahatchie Chute "is working the way we figured it would, and the river is doing what we want it to do."

CERTIFICATE GIVEN

General Carter opened the hearing with the presentation of the Army Certificate of Appreciation to W. G. Huxtable, of Marion, Ark., chief engineer of the St. Francis Levee District of Arkansas. Signed by Army Secretary Wilber M. Brucker and Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Army Chief of Engineers, the citation recognized Mr. Huxtable's more than 45 years of "outstanding engineering effort devoted to economic development" of the Mississippi River Valley through reclamation projects.

The steamer Mississippi left Memphis at 11 a. m. for the remainder of the downriver inspection trip, with these Mississippi River Commission members aboard:

General Carter; Col. Carl H. Bronn, secretary; E. F. Salisbury, of Kansas City, Mo.; Rear Adm. H. Arnold Karo, of Washington; Maj. Gen. Harry L. Boien (United States Army, retired), of Cairo, Ill.; Dewitt L. Pyburn, of Baton Rouge, La.; Brig. Gen. Lyle E. Seeman, division engineer of the Southwest Corps of Engineers division, at Dallas, and Maj. Gen. Gerald E. Galloway, division engineer of the Missouri River Division, at Omaha, Nebr.

Statehood For Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House have received a great many letters in behalf of statehood for Alaska. It is, of course, impossible to reply to each one in detail.

I have written to Mr. Miller of Fairbanks and have pointed out what seems to me to be an obvious weakness in the pending statehood bill. I hope that it may be of general interest. The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1958.

Mr. ALEX MILLER,
Democratic National Committeeman for Alaska,
Fairbanks, Alaska.

DEAR MR. MILLER: Let me thank you for your letter of the 12th urging my support of the pending bill for Alaskan statehood. As I see it, we would all make a terrible mistake to pass a bill which does not carry out the sound and historically proven policy of the United States in regard to the creation of new States. The Territory of Alaska is approximately the same size as the original Louisiana Territory which was purchased from France in 1803. I presume that the present population of Alaska is about comparable to the then population of Louisiana and the location of this population is somewhat comparable.

The bulk of the population of the Louisiana Territory was centered around New Orleans, in the extreme southeast corner. The bulk of the population of Alaska is located from Fairbanks southeast. When we created the State of Louisiana we cut off the developed portions of the territory and admitted the State with its present boundaries. It was a hundred years later before we finished giving statehood to all the area of the territory, but we did give statehood as the various areas developed, as population became large enough and the economy strong enough to support State governments. Oklahoma was the last full State created from the Louisiana Territory, and it was admitted in 1906 but the last portion of the Louisiana Territory was the northeastern portion of New Mexico which was admitted in 1912 (of course the New Mexico territory had been subject to transfer by the United States to Spain and thence back to the United States by Texas.)

I recognize that we can today probably justify larger States, territorially, than we felt it was advisable to create 150 years ago, but if we were to admit simply the southeast corner of the present Territory of Alaska as a State we would be giving statehood to most of the people. We would not be burdening the new State with the responsibility of building roads, maintaining schools, courts, etc., over such a vast area as the present bill contemplates. The State government would at least have a far better chance to succeed without Federal subsidy. It would still mean an area something comparable to the area of the State of Texas to be supported by a population which is less than my home county. That of itself is a tremendous undertaking but it holds some prospect of success. To burden this small population with the maintenance of governmental facilities over an area one-third as large as the entire United States, seems to me to be perfectly fantastic. Obviously it can only be accomplished through tremendous Federal governmental subsidies, and here is where I think every citizen of the United States has a vital stake in this question of admission of Alaska.

Is it not absolutely inevitable that within a few years after admission that the new State, if it includes the entire Territory, will be asking the Federal Government to give it special treatment in the way of aid for its State institutions and obligations? How else can the State exist? Once the Federal Government has done this, I, as a practical legislator, know that we will inevitably be forced to extend the same kind of aid to every State in the Union regardless of need. My people in Texas and the people in New York and in California are not going to long remain satisfied to pay taxes to support courts, schools,

roads, etc., in the State of Alaska and not get the same kind of aid in the States of Texas, New York, and California. Thus the admission of Alaska, at least on the grand scale contemplated by the pending bill, must mean a further breakdown of our present ideas of the division of State and Federal responsibility. On the other hand, if we would but follow the historically proven formula of admitting new States we could avoid at least a large part of these dangers.

Nor have I been able to understand the attitude of many of the present proponents of this bill. The great majority of those who now favor the admission of Alaska with the gift of eighty-odd million acres of land to the new State, bitterly criticized the quitclaiming of title by the United States of the tidelands to the existing States, even though for generations it has been supposed that the States held the title and the recognition of State title was only a part of the settlement of a good faith dispute.

I find myself completely at a loss to understand the attitude of those who feel that it is "robbing the schoolchildren of America" to let Texas, California, and Florida retain their coastal lands, but who seem to now stand ready to support the gift of a far larger acreage of equal potential mineral value, to the proposed State of Alaska. Apparently they must have been actuated by some venom against the existing States, or they must have suddenly lost their interest in "protecting the schoolchildren."

Personally, I see no objection to giving new States substantial areas of public lands as they are created, but it seems to me that equity requires that we should use a formula which is, at least, somewhat in keeping with that which was used in giving lands to the States that presently make up the western part of the United States. These public lands in the present Territory of Alaska were purchased by the United States of America. They are not the property of any other sovereignty as were the public lands in the 13 Colonies and in the Republic of Texas. They are presently the property of the United States of America. Any grant or gift of these lands is a definite gift of existing public property and it is not made in the settlement of any kind of disputed title. It, therefore, seems almost beyond belief that those who in the past strove so mightily to take the title to the tidelands away from the States, who certainly in good faith believed they owned it, should now come forward and advocate the granting of 1 section out of every 4 to the new State whereas we only gave New Mexico, Arizona, and similar States 1 section out of each 18 which the public or Government owned.

To say the least, Alaska has already made great progress toward securing the specially favored treatment at the hands of the Federal Government which I anticipate will shortly be accorded to any State which may include the entire area of the present Territory.

I am not unmindful of the party platform commitment to which you referred. Of course, the Republican platform contained the same commitment, but I think that these commitments created an obligation on the Congress to present reasonable legislation for the orderly and proper development of this vast Territory—not a commitment to support any legislation which might be proposed.

I stand ready to try to help work out such legislation, but I cannot sacrifice what seems to me to be a sound concept of American government by voting for the admission of the present Territory of Alaska as one new State.

Thanking you, I am

Yours sincerely,

W. R. POAGE,
Congressman.

Lessons From Good Will Tour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "Lessons From Good Will Tour," which was published in the New Orleans Item May 15, 1958:

LESSONS FROM GOOD WILL TOUR

Everyone's sore about the shameful attacks in South America on Vice President NIXON, his wife and his party.

President Eisenhower, "hopping mad," flew paratroopers and Marines into the Caribbean—in case Venezuela had needed them to protect NIXON in his final hours there. (This is the first time we've had to back up a "good will" mission with standby troops.)

The North American public is angered because the United States, personified by NIXON, was shockingly humiliated before the entire world.

We are certain, too, that many Latinos are equally disturbed by the violence. They are a people who place great store on hospitality and dignity—and both have been stained by the anti-United States agitators.

It would be highly unfair to our friends to the south to assume that the actions of a relatively small group reflected the feelings of all Latin America.

In Caracas, for example, leaders of every major Venezuelan political party except the Communists went on the air to express their regret over the Day of Sorrow.

There are, it seems to us, several obvious conclusions to be drawn from the tragedy of the last few days:

The Communists did an effective job of stimulating the demonstrations in Lima, Bogota, and Caracas.

United States restrictions on trade with Latin America added high octane fuel to the flames.

Our intelligence reports from Latin America on the general temper of the people NIXON was to visit either was miserably lacking in facts—or were sidetracked in the Washington maze and never reach the White House. If the latter is true, it won't be the first time.

Where do we go from here?

In the first place, we feel the Vice President should make a public report on his trip, evaluating what happened and why.

Secondly, there ought to be a full-scale review of our trade relations with Latin America, which is understandably disturbed by our new tariffs on lead, zinc, and metal products, by our curbs on Venezuelan oil, and by the overall problem of coffee surplus and falling prices.

(Only last month, President Carlos Ibanez of Chile canceled a state visit to Washington reportedly because of our plan to reimpose copper import taxes.)

Thirdly, the administration—with NIXON taking the lead—should push to extend the reciprocal trade agreements law, now in dire danger in Congress.

Failure to extend would give the Commies and other extremists in Latin America a powerful propaganda club—and would give a major assist to Russia's economic offensive in the hemisphere.

Fourthly, we ought to consider giving more technical assistance to Latin America and less military aid. The point-4 benefits help the people. The military hardware usually is for the personal support of whoever is running the show.

Throughout his South American tour, NIXON handled himself in a courageous and commendable fashion.

The trouble which developed can, if properly handled, be turned into an asset—if the administration moves positively and imaginatively.

Otherwise, we chalk up another loss for the United States at a time when we simply cannot afford it.

Harry Goofed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith a column entitled "The Roving Reporter" of the Clinton Herald of Clinton, Iowa, of May 9, 1958. My colleague Mr. TALLE is serving his district and the country well.

HARRY GOOFED

How Representative HENRY O. TALLE, one of the most serious, thoughtful, and conscientious men in Congress, cut down to size flamboyant and wisecracking Harry S. Truman is something which promises to provide Washington with a conversational tidbit for some time to come.

The two men collided head on when Truman appeared as the first witness at a hearing before the House Banking and Currency Committee, of which the Second Iowa District Representative is a veteran member. The hearing was in regard to legislation to relieve unemployment in chronically depressed areas.

Truman was in fine fettle. He answered questions with one wise crack after another, flashed his stock—what a man I am—smile and in general proved a source of delight to those in the audience section.

But Representative HENRY TALLE was more interested in digging out facts than he was being entertained so be proceeded to pin Truman down on some of his obviously wild and unfounded opinions on unemployment and the Nation's economy.

During the course of his questioning he referred to an interview which the former president gave a New York Times reporter in 1950 while he was in the White House.

The Iowa Congressman reminded Truman that in his interview he was quoted as having said, "It is a good thing that job seeking should go on at all times. This is healthy for the economic body."

TALLE then very quietly pointed out that unemployment at that particular period amounted to 8.1 percent of the labor force. By further calling attention to the present jobless percentage of 7.7 TALLE put Truman in the position of being more alarmed over a 7.7 percentage during a Republican administration than he was over 8.1 percentage during his own.

And then the Iowan let loose with the final barb, "What has happened to make you change your mind?" he inquired.

Resorting to his usual practice when confronted with a question he couldn't answer, the former President said he had been misquoted, that the interview had been taken "out of the air" by Arthur Krock of the New York Times.

TALLE knew better. So did some of the veteran newsmen covering the hearing who recalled all the furore which had resulted from Truman granting Krock an exclusive interview and then heatedly defending his action at a subsequent news conference.

But the Iowan had set the stage for some crow-eating by the former President and he didn't pursue the matter any further.

The New York Times picked it up where he left off. The day after the hearing, Krock wrote an article in the Times giving details of the time, place and circumstances of his interview with Truman. He said further that Truman had read and approved his story before it was published.

There the matter stood until a few days later when the former President admitted he was wrong. His lame explanation went something like this, "I had forgotten about the interview. I regret very much what I said before the committee. But you know when you appear before committees and they throw questions at you, you can't always think as fast and your memory doesn't work so good."

He couldn't even muster a wise crack to divert attention from his blooper.

Meanwhile Representative TALLE, who isn't interested in taking any credit for making the bantam rooster draw in his claws, summarizes Truman's appearance before the committee in these words:

"By his own admission, questions of finance and economics are Greek to him. His testimony before the committee was amusing. He afforded members of the committee and spectators many a good laugh, but it remains for the witnesses who followed him and who will yet appear before the committee to develop a realistic, workable program for meeting the problem of unemployment in depressed areas.

Expansion of Medical Education Overdue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune of May 17, 1958:

DOCTORS ON CALL

If enough doctors are to be on duty in the United States 10 years from now, some major decisions about medical-school training must be made soon.

Opinions on whether or not there is a shortage of doctors already vary widely. The American Medical Association judges that the country is well supplied except for a few problems of distribution in rural areas. But a survey made by the AMA indicated that 20 percent of the physicians questioned and 53 percent of the public said the shortage was here now.

New York and New England States, with important city and university medical centers, are at the top of the list in ratio of doctors to population. Minnesota ranks high. North Dakota, South Dakota, and the far South States have the lowest ratio.

Just keeping the present ratio of doctors will require the establishing of 22 new medical schools by 1975, according to Dr. Vernon W. Lippard, dean of medicine at Yale University. The prospect is staggering in its financial aspects, because medical training calls for expensive laboratories and other equipment, expensive teachers, small classes, and the use of a modern hospital. A university spends about four times as much per year on a medical student as on a liberal-arts student. About half of the operating funds, on the average, now are provided by Federal, State, and local government.

Clearly it will take some study and planning and determined action to see that Americans are not caught short of enough medical services a decade or so from now. It will take analysis of such factors as the increasing percentages of very young and very old people (requiring the most medical care), of medical advances which are wiping out some diseases, of increasing use of medical services by the public and increasingly complicated programs of research and treatment which absorb great numbers of physicians, and of the problem of attracting enough intelligent young people with the right talents to enter the profession.

There should be no question about providing the country with the doctors it needs for a growing population, even if it will be difficult and expensive to expand the training facilities.

Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there are many good reasons why Alaska should be granted statehood. Among them is a very good argument contained in the following article by Albert Colegrove which appeared in the May 1, 1958, issue of the Washington Daily News:

THE CASE OF THE VANISHING SALMON

(By Albert Colegrove)

PETERSBURG, ALASKA, May 1.—It is almost impossible to exaggerate the dislike most Alaskans feel today for the Federal Government overlords who rule this Territory's lifeblood industry—fishing.

They believe Washington's experts have all but ruined them.

Ruin will come inevitably, they think, unless Alaska can get statehood, then take fishing matters into its own hands and save the salmon.

This is a bitterly personal matter for the fishermen and canners who live along Alaska's coastlines.

COMPLAINT

This is their grim complaint:

Twenty years ago, Alaskan waters were giving up 6.5 million cases of salmon a year. The catch has dropped steadily. This year they'll be lucky to get 2.5 million cases.

The Federal Government must accept responsibility for the mess. It has had complete control of fishing regulations, and has made its own rules with little heed for Alaskans.

There are other villains in the Case of the Vanishing Salmon; namely, the fishing industry moguls of Seattle and the Japanese. But they play secondary roles.

To understand this situation, keep in mind that there are two main types of fishery workers:

The 10,000 boatmen and canners who come up here from the States in May and go home in the fall with their year's wages. Most of them don't give a hoot, one way or the other, about Alaska or its statehood bid.

The 15,000 Alaskans who depend on fishing for a living, and live here the year around. Almost 1 out of 3 working Alaskans is in this group.

CONCERN

The disappearing salmon are of great concern not only to this second group but to the entire Territory. For sick as it is, the fishing industry will put about $68 million worth of seafood into cans and frozen packages this year. About $20 million will be paid to those who live here. This is far and above the money Alaska will get from any other single business.

Typical of the year-rounders are those in Petersburg, a community of 850 persons, mostly of Scandinavian descent. Their spokesman is Lew Williams, Jr., 33, editor of the weekly Petersburg Press. He thunders every Friday against the United States Government's Fish and Wildlife Service.

And if the Government is the villain, the symbol of its villainy is the trap.

The fish trap is, in the words of the Petersburg Fishermen's Union, "the most efficient fish killer ever devised." Briefly it works like this:

A fence is built in the water, extending up to 1,000 feet out from the shore. Salmon swimming near the shore on their way to streams where they would spawn, reach the fence. They start swimming out to sea to get around it.

Instead they pass through a series of funnel-shaped corrals, eventually arriving in in a huge, fenced-in underwater room from which there's no escape.

A fishing boat comes along. Its crew raises the room right out of the water and dumps the thousands of trapped fish into the boat's hold. End of the fish.

ILLEGAL

Fish traps have been outlawed in every State of the Union.

But not in Alaska. (States of the Union control their own fisheries; in Alaska the Federal Government has complete control.)

It is odd, but true: Alaskans, whose lives depend on the amount of fish they catch, time and time again have voted overwhelmingly against the fish trap. And—

The Fish and Wildlife Service—supposedly dedicated to conservation—time and time again has ignored Alaskan voters and permitted the fish traps to continue.

"What's more," said Lew Williams, "our fishermen have pleaded with the Fish and Wildlife people for many other conservation measures.

"Few of our pleas have been heard.

"We want conservation because Alaska is our home. We're not interested in making a quick buck and then moving on."

In Juneau Fish and Wildlife officials proudly told me they had drastically cut the number of fish traps operating in Alaska in recent years.

"Sure," said Lew Williams. "They horse trade with the big canners. For example: A cannery will have two fish traps in 'played-out' locations. So the owner will offer to remove those two traps—if the Government will let him put just one in a new location. At the one new location, he catches three times as many fish."

SIGN

Ernie Haugen is mayor of Petersburg. He also runs the Pastime Cafe, Petersburg's only restaurant. Prominently displayed there is a can of salmon packed by one of America's best-known companies. On it is a sign: "This salmon was caught by Japanese fishermen." The implied message is clear: Don't buy it.

Most fishermen with whom I talked had nothing personal against their Japanese colleagues. They simply feel our Government was out-alicked in its dealings with Japanese officials.

In the North Pacific Fisheries Treaty a line was drawn which was supposed to separate the areas of origin of North American and Asian salmon. It now appears that the areas to which the Japanese have access contain many salmon of American origin and

the Japanese have been catching them in quantity.

Further, we have not been able to get the Japanese to agree to conservation rules which our fishermen obey, such as having nets whose meshes are large enough to let the younger, smaller fish escape. The State Department is now negotiating for changes in the treaty to remedy these situations, but no one seems to know whether it will be successful.

Bigtime canning companies in Seattle defend their purchases of Japanese-caught salmon by saying:

"We have to keep our canneries operating. If Alaskans could furnish us enough fish, we wouldn't buy from the Japanese."

They use the same argument for fish traps—that traps provide an almost guaranteed supply of salmon.

OPPOSITION

It's no secret, here or in Seattle, that the biggest opposition to Alaskan statehood comes from Washington State business interest, mainly salmon packers.

They are making money from Alaska. They have supported politicians who have opposed Alaska statehood and who have opposed efforts to get rid of the fish traps. The salmon packers want no change. They also fear revenge measures, such as higher fishing license fees for non-Alaskans if the Territory becomes a State.

Certainly, they stand to lose certain privileges if Alaska makes it. The fish traps are bound to go. So are some other types of fish-catcher devices.

"But there'll be no revenge action," said Lew Williams. "It'll be because we aim to stay here and make this land a better place for our kids and their kids. We want to live in Alaska, not ruin it."

Talle Scores

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith an editorial from the Cedar Rapids Gazette of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, of Tuesday, April 22, 1958. I am glad the people in Iowa have the fine services being rendered by our colleague, Representative HENRY O. TALLE.

TALLE SCORES

The Talle-Truman episode appears to be over, and the winner, by unanimous decision, is Representative HENRY O. TALLE, Republican, of Decorah. A review of the match is in order, especially for Mr. TALLE's constituents in the Second District.

First round came when former President Truman appeared before the House Banking and Currency Committee, of which Mr. TALLE is a member. He was the first witness in the hearings on legislation to relieve unemployment in chronically depressed areas. Mr. Truman was in fine fettle, answering questions with one wisecrack after another, to the delight of all.

In the course of the hearing, Mr. TALLE, whose personality is nothing like that of Mr. Truman's, referred to an interview the former President gave a New York Times reporter in 1950, while he was Chief Executive, regarding unemployment. The Times article quoted Mr. Truman as saying that "it is a good thing that job-seeking should go on at all times" because it is "healthy for the economic body."

"That exclusive interview did not happen," Mr. Truman told Mr. TALLE. "That came out of the air." The next day after the hearing, Arthur Krock of the Times appeared with a column giving details of the time, place, and circumstances of his interview with Mr. Truman. He said further that Mr. Truman read and approved his story before it was published.

There the matter stood until the weekend, when Mr. Truman admitted he was wrong. "I had forgotten about that interview," the former President was quoted as saying. "I regret very much what I said before the committee. But you know when you appear before committees, and they throw questions at you, you can't always think as fast, and your memory doesn't work so good."

What is Representative TALLE's reaction to the Truman appearance before the House committee? "Mr. Truman puts on a good show," concedes Mr. TALLE. "He is clever in turning away basic questions with a wisecrack."

"But, by his own admission," continues Mr. TALLE, "questions of finance and economics are Greek to him. His testimony before the committee was amusing. He afforded members of the committee and spectators many a good laugh, but it remains for the witnesses who followed him and who will yet appear before the committee to develop a realistic, workable program for meeting the problem of unemployment in depressed areas."

Iowa's Second District Representative, who took on a bantam rooster and made him draw in his claws, apparently chooses to be charitable in his attitude toward the Truman appearance before his committee. Mr. TALLE can afford to. He is one of the best informed Members of Congress on economics and is thus in a position to look on Mr. Truman as a committee witnes for what the former President is—a good showman, but no expert on economic matters.

Wilkes-Barre Pastor Appointed Superintendent of Binghamton (N. Y.) District of Methodist Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Record announcing the appointment of Rev. Dr. Norman W. Clemens, pastor of First Methodist Church, Wilkes-Barre, as superintendent of the Binghamton (N. Y.) District, Wyoming Conference:

WILKES-BARRE PASTOR OF METHODIST CHURCH WILL SUCCEED FOOTE

Appointment of Rev. Dr. Norman W. Clemens, pastor of First Methodist Church, Wilkes-Barre, as superintendent of Binghamton district, Wyoming conference, has been announced by Bishop Fred Pierce Corson, of Philadelphia area.

Rev. Dr. Clemens will succeed Rev. Dr. Adrian B. Foote, who died last week in Methodist Hospital, Brooklyn. The appointment of Rev. Dr. Clemens will be formally announced Sunday when Bishop Corson reads the list of pastoral appointments at the closing session of Wyoming conference at Elm Park Church, Scranton.

Rev. Dr. Clemens announced his appointment to his congregation yesterday morning. Following the singing of the final hymn, the clergyman asked the congregation to be seated and then told of being selected for the new post.

Last night, Rev. Dr. Clemens said:

"Deeply though I regret leaving First Church and the Wyoming Valley, where we have had such happy years of fellowship, I have accepted this new position as an opportunity for a broader service to the church and the Kingdom of our Lord. The spiritual leadership of a district comprising 53 pastoral charges offers a challenge which one cannot well ignore. I look forward to the privilege of working with the pastors and churches in advancing the cause of Christ in the local communities and throughout the world. I am profoundly grateful for the love and loyalty of the people of First Church throughout the 13 years of my ministry here, and bespeak their devoted support of the pastor who will be selected as my successor."

Rev. Dr. Harold C. Buckingham, Wilkes-Barre district superintendent, stated:

"The pastors and churches of the Binghamton District are to be congratulated on having Dr. Clemens selected as their new district superintendent. He will take to that important position a rich experience as a pastor and an understanding of church and community relationships. His superior qualities of leadership will undoubtedly find expression in districtwide endeavors that should challenge the Methodists of that district to new heights of achievement."

The new district superintendent has been in Wyoming Valley 26 years. He has been pastor of the Wilkes-Barre church 13 years and, prior to that, served First Church, Kingston, 13 years.

NATIVE OF SCRANTON

A native of Scranton and a graduate of Scranton Central High School, Rev. Dr. Clemens received his AB and MA degrees at University of Pennsylvania. He took three additional years of graduate student at Pennsylvania and special work at Philadelphia Divinity School.

While in Philadelphia he was assistant pastor at Arch Street Methodist Church 3 years. He then served at Castle Creek, N. Y., and Dalton, moving from the latter church to Kingston.

In 1936 he received the Doctor of Divinity degree from Syracuse University.

The clergyman has had a successful pastorate in Wilkes-Barre. In 1956 his church raised about $100,000 for extensive improvements to the edifice.

He has been selected frequently for important assignments both in Wyoming Conference and in the Methodist Church in general. He is chairman of conference board of ministerial training and qualifications and board of hospitals and homes; vice president of Corporation for the Home for the Aged.

He is also a member of the General Board of Education of Methodist Church and a trustee of Wyoming Seminary. He was a delegate to the General Conference at San Francisco in 1952 and at Minneapolis in 1956 and was also a delegate to Northeastern Jurisdictional Conference those same years. He was also a delegate of Methodist Church to the second assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1954 at Evanston, Ill.

Locally, Rev. Dr. Clemens has been prominent in Wyoming Valley Council of Churches, of which he is a past president. He is also a member of Wilkes-Barre Kiwanis Club and Torch Club and serves on YMCA Public Relations Committee.

Mrs. Clemens is also active in civic work, being first vice president of Mozart Club and treasurer of United Church Women. She is a former vice president of Wyoming Valley Woman's Club and was a member of World Fellowship Committee of YWCA.

The couple has two sons, Norman Drew, a third-year student at Harvard Medical School, and David Bowman, a junior at Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

They will move to Binghamton district parsonage after May 15.

Major Health Organizations Announce Program for Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I am including an interesting and comprehensive statement issued jointly by the American Dental Association, American Hospital Association, American Medical Association, and the American Nursing Home Association.

These organizations outline a constructive program for the aged people of this country. The project is worthy of our consideration:

MAJOR HEALTH ORGANIZATIONS ANNOUNCE PROGRAM FOR AGED

CHICAGO.—Better health care for the Nation's 14 to 15 million aged is the goal of a comprehensive program announced today by the Joint Council To Improve the Health Care of the Aged.

The council's attack on the more knotty problems of health care for the aged is designed to: (1) increase opportunities for older people to obtain voluntary health insurance coverage, (2) expand health care facilities tailored to the needs of the aged regardless of economic status, and (3) develop more community health services for the aged.

The program will be implemented through the active and aggressive leadership of the council's four sponsoring organizations—the American Dental Association, American Hospital Association, American Medical Association, and the American Nursing Home Association.

"Member organizations of the joint council," said Dr. Edwin L. Crosby, director of the American Hospital Association and interim secretary of the council, "have already undertaken studies and work projects aimed at improving the health care of the aged." Among the many activities which these groups have undertaken or in which they have cooperated he listed the following:

(1) The American Hospital Association, in cooperation with the Public Health Service, is conducting a conference on the care of patients with long-term illnesses.

(2) An American Medical Association committee is working with the American Nursing Home Association in preparing upgraded standards for nursing homes which will result in improved nursing home care for the aged.

(3) A national conference on homemaker services is being arranged under the joint auspices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and 26 national voluntary organizations including the American Medical Association. This project is aimed at reducing the financial expense of disabling illness among the elderly by performing the necessary household tasks to enable them to remain at home among their family and friends, with qualified nursing and medical attendance in the home.

(4) Six regional conferences have been held under the auspices of the American Medical Association to help doctors cope with problems of the aged, and a national conference will be held in September

The joint council will appraise the success of these programs and seek their application through united effort.

"The long-range aim of the council is better health for all the aged," Dr. Crosby asserted. "This can be achieved by helping everyone to prepare throughout his life for the later years. Our more immediate concern is better care for the aged who are chronically ill, and better ways to meet the financial and social problems that accompany such illness."

He said, "The joint council has found that sufficient up-to-date information concerning the problem is not available. A series of research projects has been launched to pinpoint the problems that require the most urgent attention."

"In addition," he continued, "the joint council will seek the expansion and improvement of health care facilities by encouraging legislative action to accelerate construction and remodeling of hospital and nursing home facilities for the aging."

To better meet the problems of the financial expense of prolonged hospitalization for chronic illnesses, the joint council is working with the voluntary health insurance industry, including Blue Cross and Blue Shield prepayment plans, to accelerate and broaden their programs that have already resulted in some degree of coverage of 6 million persons over 65 in a few short years.

The joint council has emphasized the need for State and local government to assume their proper responsibility to indigent patients, by providing realistic financial support for medical, dental, hospital, and nursing home care for the aging who are unable to pay.

Dr. Crosby said, "The broad health care plan of the joint council includes an educational program at the National, State, and local levels. Its purpose is to make all citizens aware of the growing health problems of the aging and what can be done by the individual to assist in this field. The council plans to enlist the continued aid and support of America's voluntary community organizations."

Progress Report of Reserve Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I set forth a letter from Assistant Secretary of the Army, Hugh M. Milton II, regarding the attendance record and participation of the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard. This short report of May 20 should be of interest to every Member of Congress:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C. May 20, 1958.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROOKS: Because of your deep and sincere interest in the Reserve forces programs, I am taking this opportunity to apprise you of certain significant facts which indicate the progressive improvement of the Reserve forces.

Individual participation in the weekly drills is necessary to insure a high standard of individual and unit readiness. In this regard, the United States Army Reserve has shown steady progress during fiscal year 1958, with officer participation rising from 85 to 88 percent attendance, and enlisted participation increasing from 70 to 78 percent in attendance. The Army National Guard individual participation in weekly drills is maintained at approximately 95 percent for officers and 88.5 percent for enlisted men.

The number of individuals participating in the Reserve programs in a paid drill status is a clear indication of the progressively improving readiness posture of the Reserve forces. In January, February, and March of 1958, the National Guard increased from 404,182 to 407,083, and the United States Army Reserve increased from 252,318 to 273,336.

It appears to me that the foregoing is a clear indication of progress being made by the Reserve forces toward meeting the mobilization readiness goals that have been established.

Sincerely yours,

HUGH M. MILTON II,
Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Moline Daily Dispatch, May 17, 1958:

FOREIGN AID

It was a tribute to the sense of the Members of Congress this week when, in the midst of unrest and anti-Americanism, the House of Representatives approved the $3.6 billion foreign-aid measure.

In this climate, there is a temptation to believe that present and past recipients of American generosity are not very grateful and that, therefore, they should receive no more gifts. There is a temptation to abandon the program of foreign aid as a failure in an expensive attempt to buy friends.

The foreign-aid program is not an international Christmas charity. It is not a crude attempt to buy friends.

If humanitarianism or bribery were the excuse for sending dollars overseas, they should be kept home.

The foreign-aid program is really a composite of programs, designed to advance the economic and military interests of the United States.

It recognizes that the principles of production machines produce more than Americans can consume, and that consumers must be developed in other lands.

It recognizes that the United States must maintain access to raw materials to feed its consumer-production needs and its military-production needs.

It recognizes that it is cheaper to arm and maintain foreign nations than to attempt to police the world with American servicemen, guarding American economic and political commitments.

It recognizes that the principles of the free world are only as good as the ability of the free world to defend them.

As Representative ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD, Republican, of Illinois, said in a major floor speech:

"The economic and military programs should be continued for our own self-interest. Without them we might find ourselves standing alone in a hostile world with neither friends nor allies to support us in our resistance to the totalitarian, alien doctrines of the Kremlin."

Not for globalism but for Americanism, the program is sound.

Address by Secretary of Defense at Armed Forces Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable Neil McElroy, the Secretary of Defense, at the Armed Forces Day dinner held in Washington, D. C., a few days ago.

Secretary McElroy delivered the address before one of the largest gatherings which I believe has ever observed Armed Forces Day at a dinner in the city of Washington. In view of the pendency of the President's proposals for reorganization of the Department of Defense, the address by Secretary McElroy has special significance at this time, and I believe it should be read by all Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE NEIL MCELROY, AT THE ARMED FORCES DAY DINNER IN WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 16, 1958

We are gathered on this occasion to do honor to the men and women of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard and their Reserve components and auxiliaries.

It is fitting that we should honor them. For to a degree that is hard for us as a peaceloving people to realize, this Nation is dependent today, and in the years to come, on the alertness, dedication, and abilities of our Armed Forces.

We are living in a period almost unique in our history—a period which can be called peacetime but one in which the thought of war is never far from us. For the first time in history, this Nation finds itself still surrounded but no longer protected by vast stretches of ocean, because of new weapons which can cross those oceans in a matter today of hours, tomorrow of minutes. Weapons have been developed which can on short notice bring major disaster to our centers of population. And we know these weapons are in the hands of powerful forces which are committed to world domination.

We have always owed a great debt to our Armed Forces. Throughout periods of peace, they have formed the core around which we could in wartime quickly mobilize the larger Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine, and Coast Guard forces which have so successfully defended this country in times past. But the nature of war has changed. If all-out nuclear war comes—an event which surely all intelligent people throughout the world will work constantly to avoid—it may well last a matter of days or, at the most, weeks. It is unlikely that in such an event we would have time to train our nonmilitary citizens, equip them and make them part of an effective military force. More than ever before, we are dependent on our existing defense forces. They and their weapons must be our shield.

We hear much these days concerning new weapons systems, and indeed they are of immense importance.

The speed with which one technological development outraces another, so that the fantasy of today becomes the practical reality of tomorrow, makes a weapon system obsolescent almost literally by the time it can be produced in sufficient quantities to be widely available to our forces.

The importance of science, of our ability to press forward with vigor our programs of research and development, is immense; our security 5 or 10 years from now undoubtedly rests on the skill and energy with which today we are pursuing the development of weapons of the future. Our very survival as a nation in modern war will depend on our ability to move forward on the technological front.

I would like to interpolate at this point something, which you may or may not have noticed in your newspapers, because it has been an example today of just what I've referred to—this tremendously rapid advance in our technological capabilities in the weapons field. Today an Air Force jet boosted the airspeed record a whopping 200 miles per hour by flying between 1,412 and 1,420 miles per hour over a measured course, and this single jet 104A which reached a new speed today is the same type of plane which 9 days ago smashed the world altitude record back from France for the United States. It hit 91,000 feet. I cite this as a typical example of what I'm referring to as the essentiality of our retaining a priority in the new weapons field.

But weapons without people are valueless. It is inevitably true that the strength of any organization, military or otherwise, rests on the people in it. As we employ more and more the advanced equipment and weapons that are so vital to the present military, we need to an ever greater degree people skilled in handling them—people with aptitude who may be trained in the handling of communications equipment, radar, and the other complex equipment involved in the modern airplane, ship, or tank. As the time we are given in which to react is increasingly shortened by new weapons, and as warfare becomes more complex, we need to an ever greater degree men and women who are alert, intelligent, and imbued with leadership qualities as well as the devotion to country and freedom which must be the basis of all military service.

Both Houses of Congress have seen fit to pass legislation which recognizes this need and which increases the pay incentives provided for our Armed Forces personnel. This legislation is now awaiting the President's signature. The revised pay bill embodies principles developed by a committee of public spirited citizens under the very able chairmanship of Ralph Cordiner, chairman of the board of the General Electric Co.

The results of its studies, plus the able and intelligent work done in the Armed Services Committees of both Houses of Congress to build sound pay legislation—and again I should interpolate, that on the platform tonight there are members of both of those Armed Services Committees (Senactor FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, and Congressman MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois)—have produced results which can be of great importance in helping to attract to the services in sufficient quantities people with the high qualities of leadership needed, and the capacity to learn the skills required in modern warfare. The military career makes severe demands on those who pursue it: we must see that it offers also the rewards that are commensurate to the high type of service that is demanded.

Of almost equal importance to the quality of people in their ability to work together to achieve common goals. There is great strength in competition; it has been a key vitalizing factor in the development and progress of this country, in industry, education, throughout our society. It has been a constructive force in the military field as well, where the traditions of the individual services have built loyalties and enthusiasms which have contributed much to the strength of these services. Constructive competition must be preserved; but with it must go the overall desire and intent to work effectively together.

The need for cooperation and coordination is a primary one today for many reasons. First, we no longer can think in terms of separate ground, sea and air combat. The developments of modern warfare have obliterated such distinctions, and future wars will be fought with whatever combinations of forces and weapons are needed to win. There must be no confusion of responsibilities, no delay in our responding with all the power that may be required in the form of unified, completely coordinated forces. Second, the size of our expenditures makes it imperative that we get the most we can for our dollars. If we are to buy the sophisticated and increasingly expensive weapons that we must have for our modern defense forces, our budget either will grow to appalling proportions or we must find ways of using our dollars with increasing efficiency. This cannot be done with duplication of effort, overlapping activities and lack of coordination and direction.

Another impelling need for us to work effectively together arises from the fact that our defense activities now call for the services, in the military or working for it, of something more than one-half the people in America who are trained in advanced science and technology. These people constitute one of the Nation's valuable resources; they are needed in industry, in teaching, in medicine, in many fields which are of importance to our normal development as a nation. We cannot be wasteful of their talents; we must organize ourselves to make maximum use of their scientific capabilities.

The reorganization of the Defense Department which has been recommended by the President and legislation for which is now under the consideration of the Congress, recognizes this need for unity.

Again I must interpolate because things seem to move rapidly on Armed Forces Day and Armed Forces Week in Washington, and I must compliment the Armed Services Committee of the House which today brought out a bill to implement the proposals of the President, and in my judgment—and I believe that it was clearly stated also by the President—that a most constructive effort was made by this committee to implement these objectives of the President and with what I think are exceptions that will be—can be—worked out and not the most serious exceptions either, but nevertheless important exceptions, a bill has been brought out which will meet most of the objectives of the President. And I must compliment that committee, of which Mr. PRICE is one of the members. This committee report was adopted 32 to 0, I believe.

It is centered on the concept of the unified command, such as the one which in World War II under then General Eisenhower grouped in Europe the forces of this

Nation and its allies into a magnificently articulated, powerful, and fast-moving force. Or the Pacific Command under Admiral Nimitz and the Southwestern Command under General MacArthur which combined our ground, sea, and air forces into two of the most gigantic striking forces in history. The unified command is derived from lessons learned in World War II; it ties in with today's need for quick decisions and greatly stepped up speed of reaction, and it assures full coordination of our available power.

The President's plan proposes to make absolutely clear the authority of a unified commander over all the component units at his disposal. It provides the needed unity in our strategic planning and in the operational direction of our unified commands. It also proposes shortening and clearing the line of command between the President as Commander in Chief and the commander of the unified command. The stepped-up tempo of modern warfare makes this imperative. In every war this Nation has fought during the last hundred years, we have had to change our military organization after the war had started. In the future we will no longer have time in which to revise our command lines or shift from a peacetime to a wartime organization. We therefore propose to make the necessary changes now.

The President has made very clear, and the proposed legislation repeats with assurance, that there is no intent or desire to merge or abolish the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force. The separate traditions of these services are sources of great strength to the Nation and will be preserved. But, they need not and must not constitute obstacles to the development of truly unified and efficient military commands.

I have spoken of the importance of future scientific developments through research and engineering. I should like to spend a moment on this part of the President's proposal.

Our present rate of expenditure for research and engineering is close to six billion dollars and so far as we can see the rapid advance in technology of all types pertinent to weapons development indicates that there will need to be continued major attention assigned to the research and engineering programs of the Defense Department. In order to make more effective this essential part of the Defense Department's program the President has proposed the creation of a major new position under the title of Director of Defense Research and Engineering. It will be the responsibility of this executive to supervise and direct all Defense research activities, regardless of which portion of the Department may actually be undertaking the projects.

This unified supervision and direction protects the program in two ways: It avoids any possibility of undesirable duplication and overlapping with resultant savings in expense; and also it makes certain that there is no failure to support a needed program because of any doubts as to which of the services might appropriately take up a given high-priority project.

This proposed unified supervision and direction of the program of Defense research and engineering must be accomplished not only to avoid the waste of our resources but also for our very security.

Undoubtedly by far the largest part of our research and development activity will continue to be done by the military departments themselves. These military departments will also continue to have the tremendous responsibility for recruiting, training, equipping, and supporting the component elements of the unified commands. It will leave in the departments responsibilities and functions of major significance—in fact, practically all of those they fulfill now. These departments will remain as today indispensable administrative and operating units, each preparing its parts, human and material, of our Military Establishment.

The defenses of our Nation rest on a great many shoulders. They rest in part on every one of us who pays taxes, a large share of which goes to support our defense budget. The rest in part on the hundreds of thousands of men and women in manufacturing concerns, large and small, which make the weapons, equipment, and supplies needed in our great defense program. They rest in part on the dedicated men and women of science whose steady assault on the boundaries of our knowledge promises to continue the technological advances on which our future security so greatly depends.

Our defense rests also on the thousands of civilians who make up such a large part of this great Defense Department. Day after day and often far into the night these people quietly apply their strength, energy, and intelligence to the many complicated problems of running an enterprise of this scope. Anyone who has had the experience of working with them can have nothing but respect for the high quality of their service and their wholehearted devotion to what they are doing.

But most of all, of course, the security of all of us depends on the men and women in uniform. Although there is strife in many parts of the world and open warfare in a few, at present our Armed Forces are not engaged in active fighting anywhere. But their alertness, their readiness to expose themselves at a moment's notice to any situation that may arise and to make any sacrifices that may be demanded of them is in itself a great shield which permits us all to enjoy peace and security.

The men separated from their families at outposts in the frozen north, those spending endless days and nights in the lonely patrol of our early warning line, the men living in constant alert, ready in a matter of minutes to move resolutely into action, the officers on whose calm judgment may well depend the course of history and the safety of all of us, the countless men and women who are devoting themselves to the manifold stern demands of military life—to all of these, the men and women of our Armed Forces, our debt is beyond all measurement.

They are making many sacrifices for us. They must find much of their compensation in the knowledge that our Nation depends on them, and that we are conscious of the debt of gratitude we owe them.

It is a great privilege for all of us to join here this evening in honoring the members of our Armed Forces. For their services in the past, for their continuing unselfish dedication, let us unite in extending to them an expression of our honor and esteem, and the heartfelt thanks of a grateful nation.

Wilkes-Barre Church Celebrates 50th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilkes-Barre Record on the 50th anniversary of St. Stanislaus Kostka Church of Wilkes-Barre:

ST. STANISLAUS CHURCH MARKS JUBILEE MASS—BISHOP OFFICIATES AT CHURCH SERVICE—500 AT DINNER

Fiftieth anniversary of the founding of St. Stanislaus Kostka Church, North Main Street, was celebrated yesterday with a solemn pontifical high mass of thanksgiving offered by Bishop Jerome D. Hannan of the Scranton diocese. Approximately 500 parishioners and friends attended an anniversary dinner last night at Sacred Heart Hall, North Main Street, where Msgr. Wenceslaus Losieniecki, pastor of Maternity of the Blessed Virgin Church, Park Avenue, was main speaker.

Delivering the sermon at the thanksgiving mass yesterday morning was Rev. Anthony Kozlowski, pastor of St. Mary's Church, Nanticoke. Rev. Father Kozlowski discussed the meaning of the Jubilee Year when God called upoh Moses to set aside every 50th year as the year of Jubilee. He also cited the fact the Church in Rome proclaims a Jubilee Year every 25th year and pointed up the importance of a jubilee to parishioners in their own home parish.

Looking back at the history of the St. Stanislaus Kostka parish, Rev. Father Kozlowski spoke of the pioneers who came here from Poland and the hardships they faced. "Despite these hardships and not knowing the language, they established the church because they never forgot their religion," he said. He also lauded the acomplishments of Rev. Francis J. Zolcinski, pastor of the church, and his parishioners.

Assisting Bishop Hannan at the mass were: Rev. Father Zolcinski as archpriest; Rev. Joseph Pilny and Rev. Simon Struckus, deacons of honor; Rev. John Piontek, deacon of the mass; Rev. Henry Zapotocki, subdeacon; Msgr. Joseph Madden, master of ceremonies; and Rev. Thomas Gola, assistant master of ceremonies.

Organized in 1908, St. Stanislaus Kostka Church saw dedication of a new edifice October 25, 1933. Rev. Father Zolcinski has been pastor there since April 1940.

What the People Think About Our Nuclear Tests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on the 7th of May of this year, the day following my return from the Eniwetok Proving Grounds in the Marshall Islands in the Pacific Ocean, I reported my findings and recommendations to the Members of this House.

In the course of my remarks, which were carefully checked and cleared by the Atomic Energy Commission, I noted that the first of the atomic tests of the Hardtack series had been exploded before my arrival.

This was the first time the people of our Nation or the world had been told our tests had started. Contrary to what a few people have said, I did not "jump any gun" or carelessly release classified information.

A stunned American public realized with alarm that the secrecy surrounding the operations of the AEC once again had effectively kept them uninformed.

For a long time I have deplored this secrecy curtain just as I have spoken against the search for that ultimate detergent, the clean hydrogen bomb.

I have made three proposals. Simply they are: Stop the testing, and arrange

immediately for international inspection under U. N. auspices; tell the world more about our atom policies and programs; and finally, as mature adults, let us realize the always present danger of unauthorized or accidental nuclear explosions.

I am delighted that this country now seems to be moving toward cessation of testing and that the United Nations may have its overdue opportunity to set up international inspection.

Mr. Speaker, space limitations prevent my placing in the RECORD all of the letters I have received from the men and women who wrote to say they agree with my stand. But I would like to place in the RECORD at this sime some pertinent examples of their written and telegraphed remarks.

I hope they will be read. As samples of United States thinking, they ought not be overlooked. I should add that the ratio of letters and wires favoring an end to the tests is better than 12 to 1:

Thank you for standing up to the big brass on the matter of stopping bomb tests. We need more men of courage and conviction, and I hardly ever meet a person that does not admire you for your courageous stand.

WILLIAM GOOLD.

LEBANON, OREG.

It was indeed encouraging to have you call attention to the danger of continuing the atomic tests and asking why the AEC has not announced the first test in the Congress.

Please continue to press for cessation of the tests and for more controls over AEC. The program can only lead to suicide of the human race. We are all supporting you.

JOHN E. MAGRAW.

WALDRON, WASH.

A group of a dozen housewives here wish to send you their thanks for your stand on stopping nuclear testing. We hope you make a good fight for your convictions and ours. We feel this is the biggest issue ever to face mankind, this and a solution to wars.

As a group we are very actively working in our community for a ban on nuclear testing for we are greatly concerned about the futures of our children and all mankind. If there is anything we can do to help you, we would be pleased to do so.

F. F. FODOR.

150 BROOKS STREET, CLAREMONT, CALIF.

Deeply pleased with your stand on nuclear tests. You have our moral support in any efforts made to prevent bringing dishonor on our Nation by continuing explosions at Eniwetok.

PERRY and GRACE DILLEY.

BERKELEY, CALIF.

We heartily uphold your position in demanding immediate cessation of United States atomic testing.

Mr. and Mrs. NORMAN HOWARD.
Mr. and Mrs. CHARLES MOORE, Jr.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.

How I admire your stand on ending nuclear testing. What can we do to further your stand?

Mrs. ROBERT HALL.

RAMSEY, N. J.

It has come as a shock that our country secretly conducted such tests in late April. You have spoken for the concern and conviction of many of us.

EDNA C. HAVILAND.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

Thank you for what you have done and are doing toward halting of nuclear weapon testings. I am expressing my appreciation as a mother, and know that untold mothers of the world also thank you.

Mrs. C. D. HORNIG.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.

In behalf of the Farm Bureau members of Vanderburgh County of Indiana, I want to thank you for demanding the end to the nuclear testing.

Not only are we who till the soil alarmed by the unusual weather throughout our country for the past year, which has not been favorable for many crops, but we feel that the fallout undoubtedly will affect the health of all the people of the world if an end is not soon called to these nuclear weapons tests.

Keep on with your good work. Thinking people are with you. Individual letters will soon be on their way to our Congressmen to support your stand.

LAWRENCE STAHL,
Chairman, Vanderburgh County Farm Bureau, Evansville, Ind.

Your voice is all the more important because it is apparently the only one in Congress.

NORA STANTON BARNEY.

TARU, FRANCE.

I read in this morning's paper that you have renewed your demand for an end to nuclear testing. Congratulations. It's about time we get some congressional concern and leadership on this matter.

Rev. ROBERT M. BRASHARES,
Granada Park Community Methodist Church, Alhambra, Calif.

Your report to the people over NBC news last night concerning the news blackout with regard to the current nuclear weapons tests was most revealing to the American people. Your position on this subject is commendable and most important to the public welfare.

JAMES M. SIMS.

ARCADIA, LA.

Please pass on my protest on testing. That radioactive rain in Japan is too chilling. Can't Congress stop all these tests? Russia did.

A. MOREAN.

PETALUMA, CALIF.

The rapidly multiplying trouble spots in the world emphasize the necessity of complete renouncing of nuclear weapons if suicidal war is to be averted.

MARY H. DOUGLAS.

GRANTHAM, PA.

Please accept my heartfelt gratitude for your recent remarks to the House following your return from the Pacific. They certainly pointed up the deep moral vacuum now hovering over Washington. There exists in this country and in the world in general, a great ground swell of sentiment against continued nuclear testing. Cannot those in Washington who make the decisions feel this swell? A decision by us to halt tests would result in the biggest victory we could ever achieve in the struggle for the minds and hearts of mankind.

The danger of fallout cannot be minimized by a Dr. Teller's word against over 12,000 scientists including the 15 in Germany who refuse to work on atomic weapons. What has happened to us as a people when we can glibly talk of a clean bomb? Is a bomb clean that kills millions at a time? Is it not time for an agonising reappraisal of our national ethics?

I sincerely hope and pray that people in high places will awake before it is too late. May God give you courage to continue to fight for the things you know are right, regardless of the pressures put on you.

MAHLON R. HAGERTY, Jr.

PHOENIX, ARIZ.

On the west coast and Nevada there is increasing protest against this crazy policy of devastation—petitions, meetings, etc.—and yet, it goes on in defiance of God, man, and history.

I urge you, Mr. PORTER, to use your influence in behalf of poor humanity caught in this incredible political power trap. If men in Washington were not so paralyzed by fear and absence of imagination, I'm sure these manmade problems could be settled without ruining our planet.

M. WHEELER.

BERKELEY, CALIF.

You are to be congratulated on the stand you have taken to remove the veil of secrecy from atom-bomb testing. The arrogant and possessive attitude of Lewis Strauss is an unbearable situation to find in a Government by, for, and of the people.

The elements of air and water belong to the public domain, but again Lewis will not even let the Public Health Service have the last word in their protection. I say again, you are to be congratulated in firing the opening gun which may bring to light the dictatorship of this man who claims all things are his alone.

WILLIAM J. CURN, Jr.,
President, Stanton Products Co., Steubenville, Ohio.

Tobacco and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article by Aubrey Graves which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on May 4, 1958, and a letter to the editor by the Honorable James P. Richards, former chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Those sharing my interest in tobacco will find both articles interesting:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 4, 1958]

SEEMS A PACK OF CIGARETTES OUGHT TO COST A FORTUNE

(By Aubrey Graves, the Squire of Grigsby Hill)

In Upper Marlboro's auction warehouses, farmers linger around their "burdens" of tobacco long after they have been knocked down to the highest bidders. They seem almost sad to part with the fruits of their labor.

And small wonder. Perhaps no other type of farming is so exacting, or so intensively personal. In the five counties of southern Maryland, for 325 years, culture of the plant has been carried on almost entirely by hand labor.

While the crop produces a high money return per acre, it requires complete devotion and a prodigious amount of backbreaking work.

Seeds are sown in cold frames early in the spring, at the rate of a heaping tablespoon to each 25 square yards. Large sheets of

cheesecloth protect the seedbeds from late frost, strong sunlight or heavy rains.

When 6 inches high (from 6 to 10 weeks, old), the plants are taken up and reset in heavily manured and commercially fertilized fields, about 4 feet apart in rows, each way. Each plant must be watered at time of transplanting.

After flower heads have developed, the plants are topped. This consists of cutting away the top which carries the flower head and upper leaves. Suckers in the axils of the leaves must be pinched off. All this is done by hand, from a stooping position. This pruning sends all available nourishment to the 16 or so leaves left on the stalk.

As they grow the plants must be cultivated and protected from their chief enemies—root rot, mosaic disease, and blue mold. Hail or heavy rains can also play havoc with an entire crop.

In July and August, the leaves begin to mature. As they ripen, they are plucked from the stalks, beginning at the bottom. From 2 to 5 leaves are taken at each picking. During a single week, a field may be gone over as many as five times.

The base of the midrib of each leaf is pierced with a needle and a cord run through the hole. From 20 to 40 leaves are tied to curing sticks, each about 4 feet long. First, the tobacco is dried by leaving it out in the sun. Next, the sticks are strung horizontally across rafters of a well-ventilated barn. Air curing, completed here, takes from 3 to 12 weeks, depending on the weather.

After the leaves have been cured, they are too brittle to be handled without breaking, except after a period of damp weather. If such weather doesn't arrive, moisture must be applied by hand sprinkling.

The leaves are separated by hand into various grades (10 or more), according to size, color, and texture. Grading completed, they are tied into small bundles or "hands." This is done by wrapping a folded leaf around the butt end of all leaves in the bundle.

Tobacco is heavily assessed by the Federal Government. If you smoke 20 cigarettes a day, you pay $21.90 per year in taxes. The 6 cents tax per pack is greater than the amount received by the farmer and the manufacturer combined. Distribution costs take a lion's share.

Many of Maryland's farmers harvest only 900 pounds, or so, per acre. At 50 cents a pound (which last year's crop is now averaging) that amounts to $450, not enough to live on after expenses are deducted.

With increased yield goes better quality, however. The skilled farmer who gets 1,600 pounds of tobacco per acre and sells it at 60 cents can pay his higher production expenses and still make a good profit.

All segments of business are on edge each year as the southern Maryland tobacco auctions open. Tobacco is the chief cash crop of the entire area.

Of Calvert County's total agriculture income, 96 percent comes from the weed. In Charles County, the percentage is 85 percent; in St. Marys, 75 percent; and Prince George's, 65 percent. In more diversified Anne Arundel County, 57 percent of all agriculture income is from this source.

Since 1952 domestic use of relatively bland Maryland tobacco has dropped by 10 million pounds annually. For one thing, filter cigarettes require a greater percentage of coarser, more tasty leaf. This is giving the industry acute concern.

The tobacco experimental farm operated by the University of Maryland recently found that Maryland tobacco contains less nicotine than the other two major domestic types.

If this finding can be sold, industry leaders are hopeful of stopping the decline in its consumption.

[From the Washington Post of May 12, 1958]

PUFFING FOR PROFIT

The squire of Grigsby Hill on May 4 wrote a fascinating account of how the culture of tobacco has been carried on for 325 years in southern Maryland and why no other type of farming is so exacting, or so intensively personal.

He also indicated the tremendous importance of tobacco growing to the economy of the State—running as high as 96 percent of total agricultural income in Calvert County.

Then he added the inevitable observation: "Tobacco is heavily assessed by the Federal Government." Indeed, the headline writer emphasized it with this: "Seems a Pack of Cigarettes Ought to Cost a Fortune."

However, the squire was low by 2 cents in his basic arithmetic—and thus by many dollars in his calculation of the taxes the smoker pays. Instead of 6 cents tax per pack, the Federal levy on cigarettes is actually 8 cents per pack. Thus his conclusion should read: "If you smoke 20 cigarettes a day, you pay $29.20 per year in taxes"—instead of the $21.90 he figured. And he certainly is right in saying that the 8 cents per pack is greater than the amount received by the farmer and the manufacturer combined.

Since 64 percent of the people of the United States smoke, the cigarette tax produced more than $1 billion in Federal revenue in 1957 alone—no small item in the national upkeep—not to speak of the additional hundreds of millions of dollars poured into State and municipal tobacco taxes.

It should not be forgotten that the District collects in addition 2 cents tax on every pack of cigarettes. Montgomery County does the same. The State of Maryland will put a 3-cent tax into effect July 1.

Is there any other pleasurable habit of the American people which figures so mightily in the economy of this country and pours so much into the public treasuries?

JAMES P. RICHARDS,
President and Executive Director, the Tobacco Institute.
WASHINGTON.

We Are Not Yet Winning the Battle for the Minds of Asians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the first target of the Communists in China beginning 35 years ago was the mind of the students and the intellectuals who have always been the most influential group in that country. It is clear our American tendency to concentrate on food, dollars, guns, and other material measures for assistance to people in Asia has kept us from being as smart and effective as the Reds have been in their approach to Asians. To fill that gap at least partially, a few of us recently organized American-Asian Educational Exchange, Inc. I am pleased to include with my remarks an editorial supporting it from the New York Times of May 19, 1958.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times of May 19, 1958]

ANOTHER APPROACH TO ASIA

A new organization has come into operation to deal with some of the problems of our approach to Asia. This is the American-Asian Educational Exchange. Its founders are a distinguished group of American citizens who have had special interests in the Asian field.

The technique to be employed, however, is somewhat different from what has usually been tried in our efforts to help our Asian friends. This organization proposes to publish short works of importance in the international field, to translate them into some of the Asian languages and then make them available for distribution. It is frankly an effort to make a contribution to the winning of men's minds.

It has often been asserted that we are far behind the Communists in the use of the printed word to win supporters for our cause. This group is trying to catch up on that score. It can be more specific than can a Government agency and can, perhaps, more effectively spot its work.

The first of its publications is a short monograph by a distinguished American, Dr. Stanley K. Hornbeck, on what communism has done and is doing on the Chinese mainland. It is terse and factual and undertakes to set the tone for the publications that are to follow.

We are, all of us, rightly sympathetic to appeals to give something to alleviate suffering in various parts of the world. But this is an attempt to give something to men's minds rather than to their bodies. The emphasis is sound and the objective praiseworthy. We need to embrace all our opportunities to encourage human freedom and to make it known how and why we think as we do.

Report on the Civil Air Patrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. MAHON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Air Patrol held its annual dinner on March 6, 1958, in Washington, D. C. On that occasion Gen. Walter R. Agee, the National Commander of the Civil Air Patrol, made a report on the work of the patrol. The report by General Agee follows. It gives a clear picture of the important work of the patrol:

REMARKS OF MAJ. GEN. WALTER R. AGEE, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, NATIONAL COMMANDER, CIVIL AIR PATROL, AT THE 1958 CIVIL AIR PATROL CONGRESSIONAL DINNER, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 6, 1958

When the 79th Congress of the United States enacted Public Law 476 it was decreed that each year the organization so chartered to foster aviation, provide aviation education, and minister to the public welfare, would make an annual report to Congress of its activities.

It is most gratifying to look around this room tonight and see that so many of you are able to be here to receive our report for the calendar year 1957 and to meet the men and women who lived that report.

The year just past has been a most interesting and productive one. In the operational field, at the request of the United

States Air Force, the Civil Air Patrol launched a program to train hundreds of amateur astronomers to man observation posts across the country as part of Operation Moonwatch. The Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory recruited the volunteers, and the flight crews of the Civil Air Patrol took to the air to train them.

CAP planes, towing behind them a small, 62 gadget designed by the Naval Research Laboratory and the Air Force, crisscrossed our skies. At the right altitude and speed this almost exactly simulated the appearance of a real satellite and provided the ground observers with both realistic and inexpensive training.

When the Soviet satellite appeared in orbit this training turned out to be invaluable to the Moonwatch people.

Still other volunteers were called on for assistance—amateur radio operators and electronics experts to take part in Operation Moonbeam—an electronic tracking program. Members of the American Society of Photographic Scientists and Engineers were asked to put the Satellite Phototrack project into operation.

Suddenly the men who had the responsibility for these programs realized they were faced with a problem. The problem of communications.

If the men and women of Operation Moonwatch, Operation Moonbeam, and the Satellite Phototrack project were to do their part, certain technical information available only in Washington had to be transmitted to them on a daily basis.

This is where the years of organization and training that went into the Civil Air Patrol's nationwide communications network paid off. Twenty-four hours after CAP assistance was requested the first scheduled broadcast of orbital predictions on the Russian satellite was made from the Civil Air Patrol national headquarters station Victor Pappa Zero. In every State this information was rebroadcast to the men and women waiting for it. These broadcasts have been made every day since.

In Louisiana, Kentucky, Colorado, Texas, West Virginia, Tennessee, Pennsylvania—in fact, in almost every State in the Union—Civil Air Patrol flight crews and communicators, ground rescue personnel, and first-aid technicians gave freely of their time and effort to bring assistance to their neighbors.

In air search and rescue mission an all-time high in flying hours was recorded by the Civil Air Patrol—more than 15,000 hours or an equivalent of a million and a half miles.

This amounted to 3,000 more hours than in 1956 and 6,000 more than 1951. It represented 64 percent of all the hours flown by all agencies—civilian as well as military—on the 176 official search missions directed by the United States Air Force in the United States and Alaska.

The gasoline and oil used by the CAP on these missions cost the United States Air Force $36,500 last year. If this same time had been flown in the Beechcraft C–45 smallest multiengine plane in general Air Force use, it would have cost $640,000. If it had been flown in the Grumman SA–16, standard aircraft of the Air Rescue Service, it would have cost $1,705,000. To this cost you would have to add the salaries, allowances, flying pay, and per diem of the crews if the military performed the same number of hours.

Further, Civil Air Patrol pilots know their own territories like the back of their hands. Their planes are able to fly low and slow—the only way an effective search can be carried out.

In July 1957 the Continental Air Command assumed responsibility for all search and rescue activities in the continental United States. This enabled the Air Force to provide even more direct supervision to CAP units engaged in search missions.

World War II surplus aircraft donated by the military services totaled approximately 1,100 at the beginning of the year. At the end of 1957 less than 900 still were operational. This was due primarily not only to the age of the aircraft but also to the fact that replacement parts are no longer readily available except at high cost from commercial facilities and the units are unable to bear the financial burden of commercial major overhauls. The Air Force has few, if any, spare parts left as they were donated to CAP at the time the surplus aircraft were donated.

It appears that unless some solution is found, and we are certainly trying to find one, that Civil Air Patrol flying will be reduced to such an extent that eventually certain of our programs will be seriously curtailed or even have to be discontinued.

On the bright side, we were successful in obtaining a rather large amount of surplus office, vehicular, and communications equipment from the Department of Defense and this has been most helpful in our program.

I have already referred to the valuable work accomplished by the Civil Air Patrol radio net. As 1957 drew to a close the organization had 13,158 licensed radio facilities situated in every State in the Union. Certain stations in every State are on the air day and night. Others can be in operation only minutes after an emergency is declared. These stations are divided almost equally between fixed stations at permanent locations and mobile or portable stations.

Originally conceived to provide a command link for CAP's air and ground activities, the communications network now is assuming the importance of one of the organization's major operational capabilities.

The watchword in our adult or senior program for 1957 has been quality rather than quantity. We instituted new, streamlined personnel procedures and a considerable amount of deadwood has been weeded out. Our goal is to establish a hard core of dedicated, thorouoghly trained men and women with the resources to perform whatever noncombatant task is given them.

Now, as to our education and training programs, during 1957 the Civil Air Patrol cadet program brought some 36,000 young people in direct contact with the airplane and helped educate them to the economic, social, and political effects of this air and space age in which we and they live. In addition, through the Civil Air Patrol-high school coordinated aviation education program students in 289 American secondary schools were given the benefits of the same academic courses provided for CAP cadets.

Nearly 300 teachers from all over America attended the Civil Air Patrol sponsored national aviation education workshop held at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio. Over a thousand other teachers attended courses in aviation education at 31 local and regional workshops held in cooperation with the Civil Air Patrol.

During the year more than 17,000 sets of the new Civil Air Patrol aviation text books were distributed. We believe that these texts are the best in this field in the Nation today. A revolving fund, using a portion of the annual dues paid by its adult or senior members has been established. This, combined with the talents available in national headquarters for research, preparation of manuscripts, etc., enables us to make these texts available at a minimum cost not only to our own members but also to any school or individual that wants them.

During 1957 more than 1,800 young men and women received the Civil Air Patrol certificate of proficiency attesting to their completion of the academic and military training requirements of the program. This training is such that any young man or woman holding such a certificate may enlist in the Air Force in the grade of airman third class—the first rung up the promotion ladder.

The excellence of our cadet training is further attested by the announcement I was privileged to make only this morning. A new category of selectees has been established by the Air Force, especially for female CAP cadets and senior members who would like to become WAF officers. For these candidates a Civil Air Patrol certificate of proficiency will be accepted in lieu of 2 years of college training required of all other civilian applicants.

You might also be interested to know that 86 former Civil Air Patrol cadets are enrolled in the Air Force Academy. From reports, the leading officials are highly pleased with the training and motivations which these young men have had.

Legislation was prepared and introduced into the Congress in January and February 1957—H. R. 3232 and S. 1233—which was designed to authorize appropriation of Federal funds to assist Civil Air Patrol in its efforts to provide aviation education and training for its cadet members and to further motivate the youth of our country to seek careers in the aeronautical sciences and related technologies.

The funds were to be used in establishing flight scholarships for outstanding Civil Air Patrol cadets, the flight training to be conducted by recognized fixed-base operators and flight schools across the Nation.

Although the benefits sought by this legislation were widely recognized, the Bureau of the Budget could not look with favor upon the use of public funds for such an undertaking by Civil Air Patrol. As a result action has been suspended on this legislation.

I will not go into any further facts and statistics about 1957 except to say that the international cadet exchange, the summer encampment program, the jet orientation and the national and international drill competition were carried out most successfully and that you will find information pertaining to them in our printed report. The fact that I am not covering them in detail does not mean that they are not most important to our youth program.

In conclusion, the challenge of the space age is one our Nation cannot afford to avoid. In this respect the Civil Air Patrol will continue to contribute its full share within its capabilities.

Operational assistance to the United States earth satellite program, begun in 1957, will be continued and expanded as required.

The Civil Air Patrol's aviation education program already is geared to preparing young men and women for technical and scientific careers in aviation as it applies to space as well as aviation as we know it today. In both, the basic fundamentals are the same.

As it becomes necessary this program will be enriched with additional material relating directly to problems of this new age. A new text, Missiles, Rockets, and Astronautics is already in preparation and will be available by early fall.

The citizens of this Nation can be assured that the members of the Civil Air Patrol will use their skills, their resources and their efforts in the public interest, be it on a local or national basis.

Devaluation Great Disaster Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, on May 5 there was in the Appendix of the RECORD a very eloquent appeal for devaluation of the currency. Because it came from a successful businessman of considerable stature, and because he appeals for "sound money" and "to stop inflation and further dollar depreciation" but advocates the opposite, his speech calls for a reply.

I must take emphatic issue with his advocacy of the cause of raising the price of gold from its present price of $35 per ounce to $100 per ounce or in fact any other price. That, in my judgment, would, indeed, be one of the greatest disasters that could hit this country. I also take issue with him on several of his predicted results and certainly on the desirability of all the rest of them.

Here are his five distinct steps in the economic cycle which every nation at some stage has passed through, and the United States is no exception. They are:

1. Currency debasement.
2. The issuance of irredeemable paper money which is followed by great government and consumer credit expansion, leading to higher prices, higher costs, spiraling inflation, and a steady decline in the purchasing power of money.
3. When inflationary forces become too great to be controlled, a collapse of the economic structure built inflated prosperity.
4. Depression.
5. The return to sound currency which brings a drastic shakeout with attendant misery and suffering.

If he is correct in his analysis, why does he want us to follow in that tragic path? The very move he advocates is exactly the No. 1, debasement of the currency.

He even alleges a Russian threat of convertibility. We are all aware of rumors that the Russians have developed large gold reserves, but why indeed should they even consider making the ruble convertible? The whole history of the Kremlin masters is the exact opposite. They not only have devalued it many times, but even repudiated their own bonds. And what does he mean by convertible? Surely he does not imagine they would make the ruble convertible internally. Would not the Russian peasant hoard every gold ruble he could earn or steal? Can you imagine the Kremlin masters letting Russians have gold?

Or, what meaning can external convertibility have when there are no rubles outside of Russia? The gold with which Russia settles her balances is bullion, the same as all other international settlements, and at the United States price of $35. International settlements cannot be made in coin. They are book entries or gold bullion at $35 per ounce. And lastly, is there any reason at all why we should imitate the Russians, even if they should make the ruble convertible?

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it. I am in favor of making our dollar convertible. That would be a great step in strengthening our national economy. That would, indeed, establish a sound currency, the finest in the world. And I believe not only West Germany, but Canada, Switzerland, and other nations, such as Holland, Belgium, and then Britain would soon follow us.

However, the gentleman advocates the direct opposite, almost complete debasement of the currency. He states that our gold reserves are "wholly inadequate." How would devaluation change this? We would simply have vastly more and smaller-valued dollars. The ratio as commodity prices rose would be the same.

Perhaps some people regard the Swiss franc, the deutschmark, or the Canadian dollar as more sound than the United States dollar, but if these people are more than a very few we would witness a large flight from the dollar into those currencies. Each of these currencies is highly regarded because these countries balance their budgets and refrain from wild and unrestrained spending projects beyond their means. The "premium" he refers to for the Canadian dollar is a misnomer. The Canadian dollar is an entirely different and independent currency and has nothing to do with the United States dollar. If it had been called a pound or a ruble it would have no different relation than at present.

And what does he mean by that crack about "our Nation caught without gold"? How could that possibly happen at present? We now can refuse to convert. Of course, under his plan of gold at $100 per ounce the pressure for our gold might be three times as great as at present. And if, as he advocates, it were "freely convertible" would it not rush out of this country faster than ever?

And he claims that devaluing the dollar would not only thwart Russia but at the same time arrest the depression, and he states the results would be 11 in number:

First, the immediate reopening of "closed and marginal gold mines," putting back to work thousands of miners. I agree, that would be a bonanza to the 3,000 people in the gold mining industry, but what a disaster to 170 million people of the United States.

Second. He claims an official devaluation of the United States dollar would strengthen the sagging price of all commodities, particularly farm products and nonferrous metals. I agree, possibly prices of lead, zinc, and copper may be "sagging," but when he talks about all prices, just where is the "sag"? Consumer prices now above 123.3 in the aggregate are at an all-time high. Food prices at an all-time high, 120.8. Housing, 127.5, rents, 137.1, transportation, 138.7, medical care, 142.3, personal care, 128.3, all at record highs, and wholesale prices in the aggregate, all commodities in March, 119.7, an all-time high. Farm products, 100.5, highest since 1952. Processed foods, 110.7. And farmers are doing all right. The April 15 figure, 266, for the consolidated Farm Price Index, higher than any time since 1952 in the middle of the Truman-Brannan downslide on farm prices.

But do we want our prices for food and everything jumped? Is that the way to cure the claimed recession? The savings of the millions of American people who have accounts in savings banks and savings and loan associations are at an all-time high. The people have the money, department store sales and consumer demand, except, of course, for automobiles and durable goods, are excellent.

With 186 percent increase in the price of gold, marking down the buying power of our present dollar to 34 cents would mark down the value of the prewar dollar all the way down to 16 cents. What folly. I do not defend subsidies, any of them, but if we subsidize one commodity, we simply put up its price in relation to the dollar or the basis of the value of other commodities. But gold is different. If we subsidize gold, we debauch the dollar in relation to all the thousands of other commodities. We upset the whole standard of all values. Why create this bonanza for a few to the disaster of the 170 million?

Third. I agree that "the high cost of labor has priced some manufactured products and to some extent our farm products, out of world markets." But I emphatically disagree that devaluation of the dollar "would quickly restore our competitive position." Do you not think that all of these nations with pegged currencies would very quickly follow us and devaluate their currencies by two-thirds? Of course. They did in 1934. Thus, would it "clear out our astronomical surplus of farm products—at a loss of over $2,000 million to Uncle Sam—and stimulate manufacturing, conceivably to boom proportions?" Is that what we want? It is tantamount to turning on the dollar printing presses, as was done with the French franc, the German mark, under Hitler, and all other currencies that have been devalued as a result of inflation. It is another step toward horrible disaster. And who pays for it? Those in the lower income group, especially those on fixed incomes, pensions, et cetera. To them it is real and stark disaster.

Fourth. "Corporations struggling with inflexible costs and diminishing volume," he says, "would quickly have a resurgence of buying" and "improving profit margins." That I deny emphatically. Anyone who has traveled around in these countries where the beautiful paper money runs into the 50 and 100 thousand francs, lira, cruzeiros or pesos, knows the disaster that those business firms have faced and struggled against. What he claims would happen did not happen all the way from 1933 until 1940 when war orders poured in. Devaluation itself simply did not do it. And it never will.

Fifth. Exports, he claims, would step-up as a result of devaluation. There again the immediate devaluation of the other currencies would put them in the same relative position. And as for "re-

duction in the billions of give-away money," that surely we would like to do, but how would this infamous measure help? Would not the demand triple to offset the shrunken dollar?

Sixth. "The intolerable burden of gigantic national debt—and taxes—would become bearable." Just how? The value of the dollar's interest we pay on the national debt would be less in purchasing power, but how about the disaster to the millions of widows, orphans, investment company stockholders, insurance companies, whose stockholders and policyholders run into the millions, and who are owners of United States bonds, also devalued automatically. Had he thought of that? Imagine the millions of people suddenly thrown on public welfare.

Seventh. Marking up gold to $100 per ounce would very possibly "create a Treasury surplus of around $41 billion," as he says, but how would it "permit a sharp reduction in taxes for many years to come"? Do you not think we would need three times as many dollars to run the Government, and tax our people three times as much?

Eighth. He suggests that the "increment created by the new gold price could be used to reduce our national debt." Yes, indeed, that could be done, but again, what of the disaster to the many millions of people holding United States bonds who put their savings into them at hundred-cent-dollars, only to have them paid back in 34-cent dollars. That is worse than Russia's repudiating the interest on her national debt. It is confiscation. And what is devaluation except confiscating the savers?

Ninth. "If not a single informed economist in the world believes the United States can measurably reduce its national debt until the dollar is devalued," God help our country. I have heard that before, and perhaps you have. But I suggest that is a sad commentary on the integrity of the American people. Only crooks disavow their honest obligations. Surely we have not sunk that low.

Tenth. "Restoration of full convertibility, both internally and externally," I agree is desirable and practicable. But how would it block the Russians? I see no possible connection. Furthermore, I do not believe the Russians have any idea of establishing a convertible ruble.

Speaking of Russia, who would benefit from the devaluation of the dollar in terms of gold? In addition to the gold-mining industry, obviously the countries with large gold production and holdings, especially the largest, Russia. One hundred dollars per ounce would nearly triple the valuation of her gold holdings in international trade. Ponder that one a moment.

Eleventh. This "hysterical grasping for straws to arrest the downward plunge in our economy," is, as far as I can see, only in the shoutings of those who would spin us into a real depression. The great American economy must be mighty sound and solid to have withstood the vicious attack of these gloom and doom howlers without disaster, and every day we are getting more and more signs of the leveling off. Perhaps at a little lower level than the extreme peak of 1957, but a sound and stable American economy.

As for his comparison with the 1930's, who can call that devaluation a success? As far as we can see, all it did was to raise prices drastically, stretch out the depression until 1940 when there were approximately 10 million still unemployed. It destroyed the value of the insurance policyholder's assets, the value of the savings of investors in bonds of all kinds, and threw disaster right into the teeth of a great many families on fixed incomes, who suddenly did not have the price of food. Does he want us to repeat that type of a disaster?

Actually, the 50-plus measures the administration has taken to step up the economy and combat unemployment are now having effect. But they are becoming effective without the frantic and wild spending orgies for which the gloom and doom howlers are screaming.

Is not the way out of this leveling off, or recession, if you wish to so call it, a sound working our way out by sane methods, rather than by wild, frantic panic gestures that can be ruinous?

Apparently, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has given no thought to the financial chaos that would result from such devaluation. The banks would have to recapitalize immediately and they would have to put up more reserves with the Federal Reserve. Their capital now totaling some 18 billion and insured for roughly 1.8 billion would present problems. They would have to put up enough to keep their ratios in line and immediately, and from where could the money come? The purchasing power of the Deposit Insurance Fund would be only one-third of what it now is.

Fancy the consternation and chaos in the vast financial institutions of our land, insurance companies, investment trusts, mortgage companies, holders of fixed-price guaranteed bonds, debentures and especially land contracts and mortgages.

I do not know where this gentleman gets his information from inside Russia. What does he mean by "persistent reports from informed—Russian—sources"? Who are these sources? The intelligence services do not seem to have it. Could it be purposely pipelined out of the Kremlin to get us to destroy our currency? Maybe we have not debauched our currency as fast as Lenin predicted when he outlined the way to conquer a nation.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that about the worst thing we could do at this time would be to devalue the currency.

Americans Fiddling While Monster Grows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I wish that every American could read the splendid editorial entitled "Americans Fiddling While Monster Grows," which appeared in the Courier-Record on May 15, 1958. This weekly newspaper is published by the Nottoway Publishing Co., Inc., of Blackstone, Va. This is one of the best editorials I have read on the present condition of our country.

I realize that we have gone a long way in this country toward creating a socialistic, welfare state dominated by a power-crazed Federal judiciary and would-be bureaucratic dictators in the executive branch of the Government. It is still not too late, however, for our people to awaken and to arouse themselves so as to throw off the shackles and put this country back into its proper perspective as intended by our Founding Fathers.

Most of our people have been so busy trying to amass material wealth that they have failed to keep up and understand the rapid deterioration of our republican form of government and to note its fast change into a socialistic, welfare state.

I desire to commend not only the Courier Record for this splendid editorial but to compliment the editor for his thoughtful presentation and to personally thank him for the effort he is making now, and has been making, in an endeavor to point out to the people the dangers that confront us and the pitfalls that are ahead unless we stop the octopus-like growth of the Federal oligarchy that is about to engulf and devour the rights and liberties of our people. The editor and his associates on the paper are dedicated Americans striving to protect and maintain our way of life and the Constitution that we have known and loved so long and which has meant so much to the well-being of this country. I only wish there were more editors like him in every section of our country. If there were, we would not be in the crisis in which we now find ourselves.

I am including the editorial with my remarks in the hope that it will be widely read by people in other sections of our country and that as a result thereof they will awaken to what is happening to us before it is too late.

The editorial is as follows:

AMERICANS FIDDLING WHILE MONSTER GROWS

We have just finished reading a little booklet entitled "Nine Men Against America" and at his moment we are both angry and discouraged. Our anger is toward all Americans, ourself included, who have allowed the power of the central government of the United States to grow into a mammoth, foraging off the freedoms we once knew and ripping the American way of life to pieces with its ugly tusks.

We are discouraged because we can see no immediate way to revive these freedoms nor do we know where one big gun can be found to slay the giant with one shot. The giant that lurks in Washington has become immune to the small arms fire of individual citizens and even to the volleys of the few States, mostly Southern, that realize the kill must be made while there is still time.

The predicament in which we find ourselves today did not come about overnight. Americans, dreaming of a Utopia, where 37½ hours of being on the job could provide enough income for everyone to have two $4,000 automobiles parked in the double garage at the end of a 3-bedroom rambler, plus color TV, swimming pool, and everything else our hearts desire, have been caught in a trap. There's nothing wrong

with dreaming and certainly nothing wrong with wanting new cars and nice homes but the cost of our Utopia has been high.

While we gained a higher standard of living we lost our freedoms and became a slave of the monster in Washington which has been put together by both political parties. So cleverly have the powers of States been usurped and so painlessly have we gradually lost individual freedoms that few have awakened to the reality. We have even been fools enough to believe that our central Government could give us choice tidbits with one hand without plucking something from us in return. We have run to Washington every time we needed a handout and have really believed we were getting something for nothing. Some people, even today, don't realize that when the Government provides money for some project or the other, it's their money, that's being handed out. There are others, too, who know the cost, but don't care as long as they can get Federal aid.

Then, of course, there are individuals and organizations who know well what has, and what is continuing to happen to America. Virginia and some other States have Senators and Congressmen who have been fighting the Washington monster for a long time. They have helped to slow its growth, and organizations, to mention only one, like the Defenders of State Sovereignty and Individual Liberties, are doing what they can. The question remains, however, will they be able to slay the beast in time?

This is where you come in as an individual citizen. Only when all of us become determined that we will not sit by and see ourselves further enslaved will there be a change. When all Americans look up from their TV sets and see clearly where Washington is leading us, no doubt they will rise up and demand a return to the constitution and the ideals of government we once took for granted.

On page 2 of the booklet we just read is a quote from Thomas Jefferson, who saw the dangers of strong central government in 1821. We print below that quotation with the suggestion that you take time out to read the entire pamphlet.

Said Jefferson:

"It has long been my opinion, and I have never shrunk from the expression * * * that the germ of dissolution of our Federal Government is in the constitution of the Federal judiciary; an irresponsible body—for impeachment is scarcely a scarecrow—working like gravity by night and by day, gaining a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step like a thief, over the field of jurisdiction, until all shall be usurped from the States, and the Government of all be consolidated into one.

"To this I am opposed, because, when all government, domestic and foreign, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it will render powerless the checks provided of one government or another, and will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated."

"Israel Healthful at 10"—Analysis by Howard A. Rusk, M. D., in the New York Times, Sunday, May 18, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of an article appearing in the New York Times as aforesaid from a recognized medical authority: to wit, Howard A. Rusk, reporting as to health standards and achievements in the State of Israel of its recent 10th birthday. Not having observed any such report or information recently when the 10th birthday of this young Republic was being observed, I felt sure that this information would be timely and very helpful to all who read this record of very worthy, and I would say remarkable, achievement under very difficult circumstances:

ISRAEL HEALTHFUL AT 10—ANALYSIS OF HOW NEW NATION ACHIEVED STANDARDS EQUAL TO THE MOST ADVANCED

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

As the State of Israel observes its 10th year as an independent state, it has many reasons to be proud. Primary among these are its health services.

Health conditions in Israel are comparable with those of the most advanced nations and stand in sharp contrast to the low health standards in many other parts of the Middle East.

Israel's ratio of physicians to population is one of the highest in the world—one physician for each 400 persons. Comparatively, there is one physician for each 760 persons in the United States, 700 in Switzerland, 7,100 in India, and 3,500 in Egypt.

Life expectancy among the Jewish population in 1956 was 69.4 for males and 72.1 for females, as compared to 66.6 and 72.7 in the United States.

This writer well remembers when he visited Israel in 1951 that it was a common occurrence to find several dead infants in the refugee-crowded airplanes arriving from Yemen. Emergency hospitals were set up next to the landing fields for immediate care for the acutely ill. Through this program, infant mortality was reduced among this group 90 percent within 6 months. Now the general infant mortality rate is 32.3 per 1,000 live births as compared to 26.6 in the United States.

Maternal mortality rates are also very low. This is a particularly significant achievement since the largest part of the recent immigration has been from countries with low health standards.

During this 10 years, hospital facilities have almost doubled. Israel now has 102 hospitals with 12,500 beds as compared with 63 hospitals with 4,626 beds in 1949. These are supplemented by 200 infant welfare clinics, mental health clinics and a polio rehabilitation center.

OTHER HEALTH FACILITIES

Other health facilities are operated by nongovernmental agencies, the largest of which is the Workers Sick Fund, a health insurance association organized by Histadrut (General Federation of Labor). Two-thirds of Israel's population of a little under 2 million belong to the fund, which has a budget more than twice as large as that of the Ministry of Health. The fund operates 910 clinics, 14 hospitals, and 12 convalescent homes.

Additional medical facilities are maintained by Hadassah of the United States; Malben, the American Joint Distribution Committee's program for the care of sick, aged or physically handicapped new immigrants; Mogen David Adom, Israel's equivalent of the Red Cross, and a number of smaller voluntary agencies.

Hadassah supports 7 hospitals with a total of 750 beds and a number of urban and rural health centers. Within the next few years Hadassah's health and medical training facilities will be consolidated in a new $21 million Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center. This center, now being built at Kiryat Hadassah, 5 miles west of Jerusalem, will have an American-type medical school in which almost all of the faculty will have had graduate training in the United States. Hadassah has provided 130 fellowships for advanced study outside of Israel (primarily in the United States) in medicine, nursing, and public health.

One particularly difficult health problem has been disease-control programs among the Arab population. Israel's Arab population of 204,000 is the only minority group in the nation. It is mainly Moslem, but includes some 50,000 Christian Arabs and about 20,000 Druses.

The infant mortality rates of 61.2 among the Arab community has nearly doubled that of the nation as a whole, but still represents a 50-percent decline since 1944.

CLINICS FOR ARABS

In 1950, the Ministry of Health established twenty-eight clinics at the Arab population centers and four mobile clinics to serve Arab citizens in Galilee and the Negev. All public clinics are open to the Arab population.

A tuberculosis hospital has been set up in Nazareth, the largest Arab community, special clinics for maternal and child care have been established and special training courses for Arab nurses have been developed.

Among the Jewish physicians assisting in these programs is Dr. Eva Landsberg, a pediatrician who was formerly head of the Bureau of Physically Handicapped Children, New York City Department of Health. Dr. Landsberg, whose husband is a government economist, practices in the Israeli portion of Jerusalem.

On her day off she gives her services to a children's clinic which she herself established in the small Arab village of Abou Gosh, which has a population of about 1,000. This village, like many other Arab communities, had no modern medical care until Dr. Landsberg started her free clinic.

Through its new Academy of Medicine and its research centers, Israel is now also conducting basic and clinical research in medicine, of significance not only within that nation but internationally. Reports of such research appear regularly in medical journals throughout the world.

Israel is but 10 years of age. Courage, imagination and vigor, however, have caused it to become of age medically.

Latin America: The United States Reappraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Life magazine which appeared in the issue of May 26, 1958:

LATIN AMERICA: THE UNITED STATES REAPPRAISAL

When Vice President NIXON called for a reappraisal of our policies in Latin America, the State Department had already launched one, and so now has a Senate committee. Let us hope these reviews get at the real roots of the problem, and avoid such partisan bypaths as whether the whole Nixon trip was a diplomatic mistake. It is never a mistake for a nation to learn unpleasant facts about itself.

The real roots of our problem lie deep. They run back to the profound difference between the Spanish and the Anglo-Saxon heritage; to the many brave attempts (beginning with the Monroe Doctrine) to bridge that difference in the name of hemisphere freedom; to North America's long political and economic lead. Latin America has been a backward area by our standards. It is still working to master the art of self-government and the secret of wealth.

Its people have usually given outsiders the least trouble when under discipline by their own revolving strong men. When a strong man departs with his loot, an attempt is made at free government, which the Communists exploit until the next strong man drives them to Mexico or underground. Meanwhile the wreaths pile up on Bolivar's many monuments, currencies fall, the Communists gain, and the near-unanimity of our votes in the U. N. makes Pan America look healthier than it is. Such at least has been the tedious pattern. But it is not the trend.

The trend is hopeful—and our problem in Latin America is to help the trend break through the pattern.

Economically, Latin America is in the van of the revolution of rising expectations which has swept all backward nations. But the United States recession has given these expectations a sharp check. Latin America is still a group of one-crop countries (coffee, oil, copper, lead and zinc, tin). Their exports make them too dependent on too volatile world markets, whose prices are now all down.

The Latin Americans want the United States to help them stabilize these markets by long-term agreements. On sound free-market principles we have refused. However, our own big export crops, wheat and cotton, enjoy as much stability as the United States Treasury can buy; and minerals are protected against Latin American competition. This hypocritical policy, made worse by tactless timing of our protectionist measures, has smoothed the way for Soviet trade missions, now doing a brisk South American business.

Take Venezuelan oil, on which United States consumers increasingly depend. When oil sales fell off last summer, the President, under Texas pressure, imposed a voluntary cut on United States oil imports from Venezuela (also from Canada). Our excuse is national security, but the effect is to export our recession.

Texans last week heard a sound lecture from a Venezuelan oil expert, Eduardo Acosta. Why should not United States oil policy be hemispherewide? "From a continental point of view," said he, "oil found in the [Americas] is domestic oil." Certainly if our defense policy is continental, an oil policy which invokes defense arguments should be no less so. The moral applies to other vital raw materials as well.

United States capital, both public and private, has been amply available to Latin America. Our loans and investments total more than $10 billion. We are officially committed to better balanced and more industrialized Latin economies. Our capital problem is chiefly to sustain and deepen this commitment. In doing so, we could well give a friendlier hearing than hitherto to certain Latin proposals for formalizing the commitment—such as an inter-American development fund or bank.

Politically, the root of our problem is to be as democratic in Latin America as we are at home. This is not as simple as it sounds. In deference to old Latin fears of United States intervention written into Pan American agreements, we tolerate petty tyrants whom neither we nor their subjects like. This dilemma is an old one. Dictators able to boast of United States official favor have stunk up the political climate of the Americas for many years. By 1957, however, there were only 5 such dictators left in the hemisphere and 2 of the worst have since been overthrown: Colombia's Rojas Pinilla and Venezuela's Pérez Jiménez. Great was their fall. And great is the trend toward democracy and freedom which must sooner or later doom their three lone survivors: Stroessner in Paraguay, Batista in Cuba, and the incredible Trujillo of the Dominican Republic.

Pérez Jiménez left a legacy of hate in Venezuela which Americans grossly underestimated during his 10 years of corrupt and murderous rule. A United States Ambassador even pinned a medal on him; the fact that Pérez Jiménez and his policeman, Estrada, got an easy visa and now live comfortably in Miami is additionally offensive to free Venezuelans and was part of the reason for the outrage against NIXON last week. Although the United States must remain formally impartial to all American governments, even Trujillo's, it is now time for a marked shift of emphasis in our policy toward dictators. It is time for us to show more clearly whom we are neutral against.

The Latin Americans can be trusted to clean their own political house eventually; education, the press, recently the Catholic Church are all helping to force the democratic trend. The United States Government is considered, somewhat unfairly but unquestionably, to have blocked this trend, to have been indifferent to the great Latin effort toward political maturity. Latin Americans hate dictators and want freedom as much as we do. Let us rejoice at that, and find more ways to support in their continent the feelings and hopes we really share.

Voting Restrictions: A Report From the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have previously included in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the introductory address of Mr. Aubrey Williams, president of the Southern Conference Educational Fund delivered at its recent conference on voting restrictions in the Southern States.

Mr. Williams pointed out that relations between the races in the South have worsened since the 1954 Supreme Court decision. Although channels of communication have closed, he went on to note that while an atmosphere devoid of antagonism would be desirable, nonetheless, there is something positive in the Negro's present attitude which seems more and more to reflect a determination to insist on his rights. The harmonious relations between the races had been purchased at the price of the Negro's self-respect. The tensions which exist now are at least honest. Peace at any price will no longer do.

In closing, Mr. Williams devoted some time to an examination of the effect that the situation in the South can have on the political complexion of the area. The political emancipation of the Negro could well presage a major political realinement among the liberal and conservative forces in the two major parties, and the overwhelming weight of evidence is that the Negro has made up his mind to secure his rights as a citizen.

The barriers in his way are illustrated by the following reports on voting restrictions in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and Louisiana which I include in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks:

VOTING RESTRICTIONS IN ALABAMA

(By Charles G. Gomillion, chairman, division of social sciences, Tuskegee Institute, and president of Tuskegee Civic Association)

In 1956 Negroes represented 30 percent of the total population of Alabama of voting age, but only 6 percent of the number of persons registered to vote. Currently there are only about 50,000 Negroes registered in my State.

There are many factors which contribute to the low rate of voting and registration among Negroes in Alabama. Some do not qualify to vote because of their limited recognition and appreciation of the significance of voting.

Others who are greatly dependent on the white community for their economic well-being are afraid to manifest any interest in, or to participate in, politics. Perhaps the most important factor is the difficulty of getting a certificate of registration.

The questionnaire which each applicant is required to fill out contains 21 questions, some with several parts. Persons who do not like to fill out questionnaires postpone applying for registration, sometimes for a very long period. Those who read and/or write slowly often prevent others from appearing before the board.

In many counties, if a Negro applicant fails to answer every question, or if he makes a single mistake, the application is not approved, the applicant is not notified, and he is not given an opportunity to complete or correct his application.

In some counties, the registrars do not work full days. They come to work late, and/or leave work early. Occasionally, only one of the registrars reports for work, and cannot work because the law requires that at least two be present when applications are accepted and/or applicants certified.

The registrars themselves retard the process by holding conversations with the applicants. In some counties, the registrars do not function regularly because they lack adequate supplies or equipment, or there is no room available in which they can work. Some boards have resigned rather than provide opportunities for Negroes to qualify as electors.

Several times within the last 15 years Macon County has been without a functioning board of registrars. The last period extended from January 16, 1956, to June 3, 1957. When the State appointing board delays filling these vacancies, prospective voters are denied the opportunity to register.

Some boards of registrars require Negro applicants to secure white voters to vouch for them. The voucher must state that the applicant has lived in a stated place for a specified time and that the voucher knows of no reason why the applicant should be disqualified from registering. In many cases it is a very difficult task for some applicants to obtain vouchers, and impossible for others. There are known instances in which a Negro applicant appealed to at least a dozen white voters in his efforts to secure a voucher.

Even in cases where the boards permit a Negro voter to vouch for a Negro applicant, the board will recognize and accept only a Negro voter who is known to a board member. Often when Negro voters are permitted to vouch for Negro applicants, they are restricted by having a quota assigned, such as 2 or 4 applicants per month. Some applicants have filled out as many as five

questionnaires before receiving their certificate of registration.

Of those who receive such certificates, many do not vote. Some fail to vote regularly because of placing little value upon the act, because of not wanting to pay the poll tax, because of forgetting to pay the tax, or forgetting to go to the polls on election day. Some do not vote because they believe one vote does not matter or Negro votes are not counted.

Other registered Negroes do not vote because they are afraid that if they vote they will lose the good will of white citizens or will lose their jobs, or will not be able to secure credit. Some are discouraged from voting by whites who tell them that the whites have always been good to them, that they will continue to look out for them, and that they should not become involved in politics. Some who work for whites are not permitted time off to go to the polls. Some are threatened, told that if they attempt to vote harm will befall them and/or members of their families. Many Negro businessmen in the rural areas, towns, and small cities who have encouraged Negroes to vote have been forced out of business because wholesale dealers refused to sell them commodities. Some have met with violence.

In Macon County, Ala., in 1957, approximately 400 Negro voters were gerrymandered out of the city of Tuskegee by a legislative act in order to prevent them from voting in municipal elections, and a legislative committee has been holding public hearings in 6 counties in an effort to formulate a recommendation as to how Macon County should be reduced or abolished in order to reduce or scatter the voting strength of 1,100 registered Negroes. The majority of white citizens in Macon County are determined that the number of Negro voters not exceed that of white voters, and that no Negro be elected or appointed to public office in Macon County or in any municipality within the county.

VOTING RESTRICTIONS IN FLORIDA

(By the Reverend Ben F. Wyland, executive secretary, Florida Council for Racial Cooperation)

In Florida we are facing two ways. We have political leaders who face the future and favor the Negro's basic right to vote and to advance himself. And then we have political leaders who face the past, determined to block the path of the Negro by threats and intimidation.

The Negro population in Florida is around 600,000. Of these, 369,463 are old enough to vote but only 148,636 have been able to avail themselves of that privilege. There are thus 220,827 who are politically nonexistent, silent, and unable to express their will.

Five counties in northern Florida use intimidation whenever necessary to prevent or discourage Negroes from registering. There are 16,533 Negroes old enough to vote in those counties, but only 110 have been able to register. Union County has 2,542 Negroes over 21 and not 1 is registered to vote; Gadsden County has 10,930 with 5 registered.

At one courthouse, loungers told Negroes who came to register: "Go ahead and register if you can take what comes afterward." In Liberty County, where there is 1 Negro registered, the Reverend Dee Hawkins and 3 others went down to register.

Mr. Hawkins said the supervisor was polite and told them to go ahead and register, but that night "all hell broke loose." The minister wrote me a letter saying "they are causing me to leave home. I was bombed-shot in my home." He fled from Liberty County.

Madison County, also in northern Florida, deserves special mention because it shows what can be done when Negroes act together and some white people display a little good sense. Fifteen years ago not 1 of the 3,151 Negroes over 21 was registered to vote in that county.

During the 1944 primary period, 586 Negroes went to the courthouse in a body to register—and they were registered. The following year, many people wondered whether the new registrants would have the courage to vote. Many did vote, with the result that a white man flourished a gun and cried that no Negro would vote so long as he lived.

Other white men intervened and persuaded him not to use the gun on the Negro voters. Negro registration in the county has since increased to 1,010 and Negroes continue to vote without any show of violence against them.

There is a more favorable atmosphere in St. Petersburg, Pinellas County, but only 3,208 of the 12,118 Negroes over 21 have registered to vote. The situation is different in Jacksonville, where 27,368 Negroes have registered out of 52,832 old enough to vote.

However, Jacksonville has also shown what happens to Negroes when they try to exercise civic responsibility as well as civil rights. To vote means to have the right to hold office when qualified to do so, but not in Jacksonville.

Ernest D. Jackson, a well-known and highly qualified Negro attorney, decided to run for justice of the peace 2 years ago. He has a law degree from Howard University, is a disabled veteran, is a member of the Baptist Church, the American Legion, and the Masons, and is active in Boy Scout work—among other things.

He was nominated for justice of the peace, receiving 7,716 votes to 6,103 and 950 for two opponents. It appeared that he would be the first Negro elected to public office in Florida in modern times. So the county attorney ruled that the justice of the peace setup was illegal. The Circuit Court and the Florida Supreme Court upheld that opinion.

So the former system of having 9 justices of the peace instead of 5 was reinstated. The County Democratic Committee nominated one of the men that Attorney Jackson had defeated in the primary. As a result, Jackson ran as a write-in candidate. He received 5,379 votes and was beaten by only 875 votes.

In Jackson's district, Negroes voted 10 to 1 for Adlai Stevenson over Eisenhower in 1952. After the Jackson incident, they voted 55 to 45 for Eisenhower in 1956.

Republican leaders also asked the Negro voters: "How can you vote for the party of Eastland?"

And that is becoming a good question all over the country, both North and South.

THE STATUS OF NEGRO REGISTRATION AND VOTING IN GEORGIA

(By Austin T. Walden, attorney)

Negroes in Georgia have had, and in some areas still have, great obstacles to overcome in the acquisition and exercise of the ballot. With great labor, trial of spirit, and expense grandfather clauses and white primaries were declared illegal and unconstitutional. However, that did not end the Negroes' troubles nor make a free ballot possible.

There are slightly more than a million Negroes in Georgia in a population of more than 3 million. One hundred and sixty thousand are registered out of a potential of 650,000, remembering that 18-year-olds may vote in Georgia. More than four-fifths of that registration was placed on the books within 2 years following the legal demise of the white primary. It is noteworthy that the above increase in registration was directly responsible for doubling the white registration during the same period. Approximately a million and a quarter of the more than 2 million white population are qualified to vote.

The Negro registration is pretty largely concentrated in the larger cities and other urban areas. Our problem, therefore, arises in the rural areas. This is to some extent attributable to the county unit system, which often affords politicians the opportunity to ride to office on the Negro question.

In the immediate past, lives have been lost and property practically confiscated. Negroes have been driven out of the community, their homes fired into at night, because of their efforts to register and vote. Threats, intimidation, economic reprisals, cross burnings in their neighborhoods on nights before elections—these have been some of the devices used to deter Negroes from exercising their suffrage rights. In some areas, registration and election officials have been conspirators in various schemes to accomplish the above objectives. They have used every kind of technicality to avoid registering Negroes.

It is true that the law permits an appeal when a registrant's name has been stricken from the rolls, but such appeals are of no avail because the election at which the registrant intended to vote will have long since passed before an appeal could be heard. Such appeals have no priority over pending cases triable at the next term of court following removal of the registrant's name. The latter makes it highly desirable—if not imperative—that a challenge to a citizen's right to remain on the registration rolls should have to be made in ample time to permit final determination of the issue before the election in which the registrant intended to participate. Such a provision, which is included in one of the proposed Federal civil rights bills, would nullify one of the most nefarious devices used to deprive citizens of the rights guaranteed by the supreme law of the land.

Candor and fairness demand that it be stated that the evils complained of are not really sanctioned by the great majority of the people of our State. It is the political demagogues who cause the trouble—those to whom in the past it has been politically profitable to exploit the prejudices of the uninformed at the expense of a racial minority. Georgians are fair-minded but, in many instances, are afraid to be vocal for obvious reasons.

Now it would be inaccurate and unfair to say the picture is totally dark. Over the years in my State, for instance, there have been quite a few occasions when prominent white citizens have boldly and forthrightly protested against arbitrary and illegal purges of Negro registrants. This has righted some injustices. It is fair to say in this connection, however, that instances of fairness on the part of some registration officials are partially nullified by the actions and attitude of the chief officials of the State of Georgia, including its legislature, aided and abetted by illiberal groups like the White Citizens Council.

The legislature recently adopted more stringent qualifications for the exercise of the electors' franchise, particularly for those not able to qualify under the educational clause and, therefore, would have to qualify under the provision relative to good character and good citizenship. The intent and purpose was to curtail the increase of the Negro vote in the State. However, the new regulations are so burdensome and ominous that great opposition to them has already developed among the white electorate. This is because if the rules are halfway decently administered they will likewise result in reducing the number of whites who could qualify under the law.

We have every reason to believe, therefore, that when this law is put into effect it will prove to be such an obstacle for the average citizen to register that the white electorate, as it did 8 years ago, will revolt against its operation and thereby bring about repeal of the same.

You will recall that the 1949 law, wherein the whole registration list was abolished, saw Negroes re-register in much larger proportion than did the whites.

In all candor, and notwithstanding the attitude of the State officials, it should be said that the greatest obstacle in the way of registration of Negroes arises from the indifference and timidity on the part of too large a segment of the Negro people of Georgia. This observation is not made at all for the purpose of justifying the discriminatory practices which prevail in some remaining areas of our State, nor to condone the unjustifiable attitude upon the subject manifested by the top political figures of our State. Our biggest job, therefore, is one of education among our own people.

VOTING RESTRICTIONS IN LOUISIANA

(By Kenneth Walker, editor, the Colfax (La.) Chronicle)

About voting restrictions in Louisiana: the situation is, shall we say, more white than black.

Politics is the favorite game of Louisianians. Everybody plays. Politics is the very big reason why there are 118,758 Negroes registered in Louisiana today. Many, many more will register before the next big campaign, I assure you.

There are two distinct factions in Louisiana politics—the Longs and the anti-Longs. The Long faction expects, and deserves, the bulk of the Negro vote. Generally speaking—and this is important—the opposition to Negro voting comes from the anti-Longs. The mainspring behind any move to bar Negroes from the polls is both racial and political. On the surface, blame, or credit is given to the racial situation. For the life of me, I do not know if this is more important than the political side of things.

The "purges" of registration rolls—there have been many, there will be more—are conducted strictly according to ancient law. These tricky stipulations as to how to fill out a registration card are being enforced in quite varying degrees over the State—reflecting local opinions and politics.

Under the law, any voter may challenge the registration of any other voter for the slightest flaw in the registration card. A hundred cards, taken in alphabetical order, were checked in Grant Parish. Ninety-nine were subject to challenge. A "purge" is an organized move to go through the voter rolls and challenge imperfect registrations. In most parishes, only Negroes are challenged; in some parishes both whites and Negroes are challenged.

Yet, Negroes presently registered equal 16 percent of the white vote. Between December 31, 1957, and January 31, 1958, white and Negro registrants increased at about the same rate. In 1952, statewide Negro registration was 97,101; in 1956, it was 152,387. During this 4-year period, white registration decreased while Negro registration increased by 55,000.

In 1952, 23 out of 64 parishes in Louisiana had no Negro registrants. Now there are just four such parishes.

At the polls, in contests that I know about, hot segregationist candidates have fared badly. In New Orleans, several Negroes have become candidates. They didn't win but still they didn't do so badly.

As mentioned in some few parishes, and this is a fascinating facet of the whole thing, whites have been challenged right along with Negroes. In one parish, 6,778 white voters were challenged and 5,940 Negroes. Not answering the challenge were 4,318 Negroes and 2,434 whites. Of the 1,632 Negroes who answered the challenge, 961 were reinstated.

Colfax, where I live, is a little country town in the small, poorish parish of Grant. Eight years ago there was an attempt to move the courthouse from Colfax. Colfaxians—there are Negroes on only the Colfax side of the parish—went out and brought in Negroes to register. They did it in such numbers that the election was never held.

A leader in that move, Williams Jennings Bryan Jones, is now president of the local White Citizens Council and as such recently sparked a purge. Again, politics. The move, pushed over by State Citizens Council leaders, came just before the last presidential election and before the voting on a batch of Long-inspired constitutional amendments.

These political overtones enabled politicians on the other side of the fence, without raising the racial issue, to take steps to defeat the purge. Some 800 Negro voters were challenged. Of these, 488, or 64 percent, answered the challenge and were reinstated. (There are several methods of answering the challenge. I can only tell you of one method. The challenged person merely presents an affidavit signed by three voters certifying that he is who he is and has lived in the political area long enough to vote.)

Considering the number who had died or moved away, 64 percent is a high proportion to be reinstated. This purge received full coverage in the Colfax Chronicle—the only instance I know of where such goings-on have received full, honest reporting. And this was done with the full cooperation of the citizens council. As a result, there are few hard feelings in the community and the purge was 64 percent unsuccessful. The council has lost face and prestige and members. Negroes are registering without restrictions in Grant Parish.

It is my conclusion that in any political situation, Negro votes, in proportionate degree, assume the absence of effective restrictions on Negro voting. I think the shortage of Negro registrants in Louisiana stems from essentially two things. One is lack of concern on the part of the Negro—a don't-want-to-cause-no-trouble attitude. The other is plain lack of ability to read and write well.

Negro registrations in Louisiana will continue to grow, in part because of the schools on how to fill out registration cards, but more so because of the coming of a better educated generation.

Voting restrictions do exist in Louisiana—with political as well as racial overtones. Where voting restrictions exist, that is bad. You know, though, when there is a shortage of meal in the house but the corn in the field is ripening, that's good. In this sense, the situation in Louisiana is good—and getting better.

The Great Mail Robbery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD today an editorial from one of our fine midwestern newspapers, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. This editorial, captioned "The Great Mail Robbery," appeared in the May 12, 1958, edition.

I would like to call attention to that portion of the editorial which reads as follows:

The Globe-Democrat, like other right-thinking newspapers, hates to accept this handout. We are against subsidies, and we would like to pay our own way.

This statement reflects the commonsense of our free-enterprise system. It is a plea to place our Post Office Department on a sound fiscal basis:

THE GREAT MAIL ROBBERY

Every year, American taxpayers pick up the bill for a $250 million subsidy that Uncle Sam's postal service gives to the Nation's magazines and newspapers. This is the difference between what the magazines and newspapers pay for postage and what it costs to deliver copies of them to subscribers.

The Globe-Democrat, like other right-thinking newspapers, hates to accept this handout. We are against subsidies, and we would like to pay our own way.

For that reason, we have urged Congress, time after time, to hike second-class postal rates. Once again, this appeal seems to have fallen on deaf ears.

The news from Washington is that a joint Senate-House committee has refused to face this problem squarely. Instead, it has made a face-saving gesture. Its members agreed to hike the second-class rates, but only by the token amount of $25 million a year.

Worse still, this increase won't become effective at once, in time to help wipe out the Nation's large postal deficits. Instead, it will be spread over three annual installments. The first increase will start January 1, 1959 and the last on January 1, 1961.

On the matter of second-class postal rates, Congress can deal fairly with the taxpayer who foots the postal deficit in one way, and one way only. As we said last October 28:

"Newspapers have for years pleaded with the Postoffice Department to set up an accounting system separating newspapers from magazines, and have urged the Congress, when costs have been determined, to pass legislation raising second-class rates for newspapers and magazines to a point where we no longer receive, in effect, subsidy from the Government for mailing our newspapers. * * *

"According to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the estimated loss in handling 5 leading magazines in 1955 was as follows: Life, $9,494,000; Saturday Evening Post, $6,069,000; Readers' Digest, $4,809,000; Look, $3,482,000, and Collier's * * * $3,177,000.

"Contrasted with this, the itemized breakdown of the amount of deficit occasioned by handling the 5 newspapers listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is: Chicago Tribune, $1,788,000; New York Times, $1,700,000; St. Louis Post-Dispatch, $452,000; Detroit Free Press, $232,000; Los Angeles Times, $180,000."

We hope that the Senate-House committee will think over the way it has pussyfooted around the postal rate issue. Let's give John Smith, Jane Doakes and all the other taxpayers a break, by ending the mail subsidy.

Report of New York County Lawyers' Association on S. 3275

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Federal Courts of the New York County Lawyers' Association adopted, on April 28, 1958, a report recommending enactment of S. 3275 which provides for the representation by lawyers of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States.

The report of the committee is as follows:

NEW YORK COUNTY
LAWYERS' ASSOCIATION,
COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION,
New York.

Report of Committee on the Federal Courts on S. 3275, which seeks to amend section 3006 of title 18 of the United States Code, in relation to providing counsel to indigent persons charged with a crime.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL

This permissive bill is approved because:

1. It provides means of assistance to indigent defendants, and

2. It provides that the district court shall choose the method of providing counsel for the indigent which is most appropriate to the judicial district.

Respectfully submitted.

COMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL COURTS.

Who's Sorry Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] has in recent weeks, become greatly alarmed over the injuries supposedly suffered by the Pacific fir industry from imports of Japanese hardwood plywood. Despite the fact that Douglas-fir plywood is softwood and hence, as stated by the United States Tariff Commission, not competitive with hardwood, imported or domestic, and despite the fact that the Pacific fir plywood industry is producing at the greatest levels in the industry's history, Mr. MACK's heart still bleeds for the alleged injuries to this thriving business from Japanese imports.

I want to call my distinguished friend's attention to a news story appearing in the May 15, 1958, issue of the Aberdeen (Wash.) Daily World. The headline reads "Vancouver Door Plant Closing; MACK Blamed."

The story goes on to say that because of Mr. MACK's sponsorship of a bill imposing an import quota on hardwood plywood, the Japanese Government has imposed an export quota on hardwood plywood, thus shutting off imports from Japan. The Vancouver Door Co. has been unable to obtain its requirements from domestic manufacturers and hence will have to close its doors indefinitely on June 1. If the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] has any more tears to shed, let them pour out for this company in his own district, whose 40 employees will be out of work because of his misguided activities.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following article from the Aberdeen Daily World:

[From the Aberdeen (Wash.) Daily World of May 15, 1958]

VANCOUVER DOOR PLANT CLOSING; MACK BLAMED

MONTESANO.—Restricting the import of mahogany plywood skins from Japan is forcing the Vancouver Door Co. to close down on June 1, according to Paul Anderson, company representative.

Speaking before the Montesano Chamber of Commerce, Anderson said: "Pending legislation sponsored by Representative RUSSELL MACK on restricting imports has been primarily responsible for the decline of imported mahogany."

He explained that mahogany skins are very essential to the flush-door industry, and that other door plants eventually will suffer because of these restrictions.

To show just how detrimental the restrictions are to the door industry, Anderson said that Vancouver Door Co. will have to close down indefinitely starting June 1.

"All of our 40 employees are from Grays Harbor County," he said. He also pointed out that most likely the employees in other plants also will be deprived of work because of the restrictions.

"Roughly, 70 percent of our production has been dependent on plywood door skins. And there is no domestic supply to meet this demand."

BAD EFFECT SMALL

"The main reason given for these restrictions is that import of plywood from foreign suppliers is harmful to the fir-plywood industry in this country. However, only a small percentage of our plywood industries are adversely affected by these imports.

"The flush-door industry is unable to obtain its requirements from domestic manufacturers. This is the prime reason why we have been forced to close down.

"We hope that Representative MACK will reconsider his position on imports of mahogany door skins," he concluded.

Hon. Brent Spence

SPEECH
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of deep appreciation of his high qualities of statesmanship and of affection because of his warm human attributes that I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the Honorable BRENT SPENCE. In three Congresses it was my good fortune to serve on the great Banking and Currency Committee. In the 81st and 84th Congresses BRENT SPENCE was the chairman and in the 83d Congress the ranking minority member. In the 83d Congress the Honorable Jesse Wolcott was the chairman and in the other two Congresses the ranking minority member. I doubt if any committee in the Congress ever was more ably chaired. To me it was a great and inspiring experience to serve under statesmen of the caliber of BRENT SPENCE and Jesse Wolcott.

The career of BRENT SPENCE is a story of Americana. When the history of these almost three decades of his service in the House is written the name of BRENT SPENCE will be high on the roll of glory. So much of the legislation in the economic field that saved our Nation in time of crises and that bolstered us in times of uncertainty and danger bore the imprint of the brilliant mind and warm heart of BRENT SPENCE that there is not time even to start in the recital of his accomplishments and legislative achievements.

I am very happy at this opportunity to pay tribute to a truly great American and to voice the prayer that for many more years the Congress of the United States will have the benefit of his experience and of his legislative genius.

Walter Reuther's Socialist Background

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1958

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, before I am once more chastised as a labor baiter or labor hater, let me make one point clear. I believe in voluntary organized labor. Having been an employee for many years; the years which saw the formation of much of the labor movement, I am of the opinion that organized labor has done much good.

When it comes to conspiracy, embezzlement, goon squads, and acid throwing, many thousands of honest, hard working union members want no part of it. I have received letters from hundreds of such Americans who back my stand on labor and my bill, H. R. 10351, the workers bill of rights, designed to help curb abuses of union power.

Just as strongly as I support voluntary organized labor. Just as strongly as I oppose corrupt union leaders and gangster labor tactics. Just that strongly, I also oppose socialism and Socialist leaders wherever they are found. One prominent Socialist leader is also a labor leader. I am referring, of course, to Walter Reuther.

About 2 years ago I called Reuther America's No. 1 Socialist. Nothing has happened since then to change my mind.

Reuther came out of the recent labor rackets hearing smelling like the proverbial rose. Whether that was by accident or design is another story. For the moment, review with me, if you will, just a part of Reuther's Socialist background.

This man is not a Johnny-come-lately to socialism. He is a third generation socialist. His grandfather, who came to the United States in 1892, has been described as a German Socialist Democrat. Reuther's father was a labor organizer and a known Socialist.

Walter and his brother Victor attended Wayne University in Detroit for 3 years. During this period they were associated with many red, pink, and racial movements on the campus.

Later, Reuther studied and lectured at Brookwood Labor College at Katonah, N. Y. This school received great renown as a center for Socialist, radical, and leftwing activities.

Walter and Victor went to Europe in 1933. They worked and studied in an industrial plant in Russia. On January 20, 1934, they wrote a letter to a friend in Detroit which has received consider-

able attention, though not nearly so much as it deserves. Excerpts from the letter are quoted below:

The daily inspiration that is ours as we work side by side with our Russian comrades in our factory, the thought that we are actually helping to build a society that will forever end the exploitation of man by man, the thought that what we are building will be for the benefit and enjoyment of the working class, not only of Russia, but the entire world, is the compensation we receive for our temporary absence from the struggle in the United States.

Mel, if you could be with us for just 1 day in our shop you would realize the significance of the Soviet Union. * * * Here are no bosses to drive fear into the workers. * * * I tell you, Mel, in all the countries we have thus far been in we have never found such genuine proletarian democracy.

We are watching daily socialism being taken down from the books on the shelves and put into actual application. Who would not be inspired by such events?

And finally, the Reuther brothers sign off with:

Carry on the fight for a Soviet America.

The letter is signed, "Vic and Wal."

In 1935, Communist Nationalist Students League for Industrial Democracy merged. This was done at a conference in Columbus, Ohio. Three Reuthers, the brothers Walter, Victor, and Roy, participated in this conference. Celeste Strack, representing the central committee of the Communist Party, vouched for them.

Walter Reuther was an active supporter of the Young People's Socialist League. On March 18, 1936, at a meeting of this organization Reuther was introduced as "Comrade Walter Reuther." He made a speech and then answered questions. One question put to him was, "Do you believe in religion and God or in science as a religion?" His answer was, "We do not believe in God, but that man is God."

This could go on and on. Reuther has denied being a Communist. He has never, to my knowledge, denied being a Socialist. Therefore, it isn't really necessary to document his background of socialism, except as a reminder.

The leopard has not changed his spots.

Van Cliburn, an American Boy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the tremendous ovation accorded to the young and brilliant American pianist Van Cliburn is evidence of the virility of our system and also of the universality of the arts. Much has been said and written about his great triumph—much more undoubtedly will follow but the article which appeared in the New York World-Telegram of May 20, 1958, written in the inimitable and fascinating style of the well known and reputable staff writer, Ed Wallace, is one that might well be recorded for all to read. In it Mr. Wallace happily has portrayed the momentous event in typical American fashion so that one need not himself be a Horowitz, Rubinstein or even a Van Cliburn to sense the tremendous genius of this young American:

WONDER BOY WINS THROUGH

(By Ed Wallace)

By 7:30 last night a great crowd had gathered at the place where the young man was to go on trial. It was an orderly crowd which made no move to liberate the boy.

A woman said, "I'd give anything if I could go in there."

Her companion played down the excitement. "Two months ago these people never heard of this kid. Now they're all worked up because he plays the piano. So what's a piano player?"

Inside, where the trial was to take place, every seat in Carnegie Hall was filled. The ushers (female) were fidgety. The crowd leaned heavily to society, that is to say many of the ladies wore very little above the waist, and the men were either meek, or forceful and bored.

As at every trial or execution one thought filled the crowd—what does he look like? The symphony of the air played through one piece and then Van Cliburn, the piano's wonder boy, came dangling out on stage. The boy is so tall and thin, he had the appearance of a rope hanging from the ceiling, until he bowed and smiled.

MOSCOW WAS RIGHT

There was a polite ovation, but nothing wild. Van Cliburn came back from Moscow this week where he won the Tchaikovsky International Contest. The Russians said he was the greatest player in the contest—but who's going to believe the Russians?

Van Cliburn sat down at a 9-foot piano and Kiril P. Kondrashin, a conductor he brought back with him, sicked the band on Tchaikovsky's B-flat minor concerto.

Van raised his hands and looked at them, like Ted Williams making sure the trademark is up, then attacked the first movement: Allegro non troppo e molte amestoso. That means that Tchaikovsky meant for pianists to belt the living daylights out of it.

In this Mr. Cliburn proved no disappointment. In 3 minutes he proved that the piano was well made. At the end of the first movement, world peace seemed a possibility. Moscow had told the truth. There was no trick to this report. Van Cliburn is not just good, he's great.

When the concerto was finished the kid unfolded, loped over and kissed the conductor on both cheeks and wrung the hands of several nearby fiddlers. I investigated this kissing matter and was told that the Russians have a custom, chacun a son gout, or something like that.

NEW RUBINSTEIN?

The first concerto had relieved the tension. Half the crowd had wondered if the kid would fall on his face and prove to be just another pianist. At the intermission people were calling him the new Horowitz, or the new Rubinstein, according to their preference.

When Mr. Cliburn came back for the final concerto it was possible to get a better look at him. To me he looks like a kid who would work for an Astoria roofing contractor, or maybe be a lineman for the Southwestern Bell Telephone Co. Put levis on him and he could be deputized by Marshal Matt Dillon. Down there in Texas they call that kind, a big old long drink of water.

Van came to bat again in the ninth and got the good wood on Rachmaninoff's D minor concerto. One chord in the allegro ma nontonto would have gone 400 feet if it hadn't hit the 57th Street wall.

When it was over Van had entered that select little group of a dozen or more men who can make a living in this country playing concert piano.

He had proved that he is both great and lucky, and also proved that hundreds of other young talents are wasted like water because they never get the big break.

Outside Carnegie arguments were raging at the concerto's end, but one young man was making more sense than all the rest.

"Van Cliburn or Joe Blow—thank God it finally happens to somebody," he shouted. "Who cares who he is? It finally happens to some guy. Who cares if a hundred others can play as good. * * *

"This is fabulous—the good luck, the big break didn't keep on not happening to anybody. Tomorrow the automat will be full of concert pianists, but the greatest thing in the world has happened to this guy."

Reorganization of the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, many questions have been asked about the reorganization of the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve, as proposed by the Defense Department. A complete report on this subject was made on May 21, 1958, by Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chief of Staff, United States Army, before the State Governors' Conference at Miami, Fla.

I am pleased to present to the Congress this report, for careful study. It is as follows:

ADDRESS BY GEN. MAXWELL D. TAYLOR, CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES ARMY, AT THE GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, MIAMI, FLA., MAY 21, 1958

I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you to discuss the planned reorganization of the Army National Guard resulting from what we, in the Pentagon, call the 1960 Reserve Forces structure. I know that this is not a new subject to you. Secretary Brucker discussed the matter with your adjutants general at their meeting at Phoenix on April 15. The Vice Chief of Staff, General Lemnitzer, went into the matter in considerable detail at the conference of senior National Guard commanders and their staffs at Fort Leavenworth some 2 weeks ago. Although I am sure that much of this information has reached you, I was most happy to receive the opportunity to come to Miami and talk directly to you gentlemen about this very important readjustment of our Reserve Forces structure.

This proposed change in the Reserve Forces structure is not an isolated incident unrelated to the events which are taking place throughout our defense organization. It is but one part of a broad program designed to aline all of our Army forces, active and reserve, in consonance with the requirements of modern warfare. It is the direct outgrowth of our estimate of the role to be played by the National Guard in the execution of our approved war plans. It follows in the trace of the reorganization of active Army units which began some 2 years ago and was completed last March. It is the interrelationship of this National Guard

problem to our overall defense problem which I want to make clear in my discussion today.

I would like to initiate the discussion by posing the question: Why is it necessary to reorganize the National Guard at this time? I would then answer by saying that there are two fundamental reasons. First, it is essential to reorganize the National Guard divisions in accordance with the so-called pentomic structure which has been adopted by the Regular Army divisions. Second, it is essential to adjust the Reserve Forces structure to the requirements of approved war plans. Now, if you will permit, I would like to develop both of these points.

After several years of study of the effects of modern atomic weapons and their impact upon the tactics of future warfare, the active Army decided in the autumn of 1956 to initiate the reorganization of its divisions in line with the pentomic concept. This concept derived from the need to equip our divisions with atomic weapons, while at the same time giving them a pentagonal structure by increasing the basic combat units within the division from 3 to 5. Hence this artificial word, "pentomic," to describe the new structure.

The new organization of these divisions was based upon four considerations. The first was to give the division commander atomic weapons within the organic structure of his division. The second was to organize the division so that it could disperse readily in the case of atomic attack into semi-independent battle groups replacing the present infantry regiments. Third, the new organization was to take full advantage of the progress in signal communications which permits a division commander to control more subordinate units than formerly. Finally, it was considered important to reduce the organic equipment in a division to that which is habitually needed in any theater of operations.

The resulting divisions are considerably smaller than those of World War II. For example, the infantry division has been reduced in strength from 17,500 to 13,700. At the same time the number of companies in a division has gone from 114 to 77. However, whereas there are 37 fewer companies in the pentomic divisions, in the case of the infantry rifle companies, their strength has increased from 196 to 243. In short, the trend, particularly in infantry, has been to fewer company-size units but with greater strength.

The reorganization of National Guard and Army Reserve divisions along these lines has been deliberately held back pending the completion of the reorganization of the active Army. We took this decision with the thought that experience of the active Army would perhaps develop solutions which would assist in the conversion of the Reserve forces. It is now time for the reorganization of the Reserves to begin. Plainly, all of our divisions, active and Reserve, must have a common pattern. They must be trained along similar lines and have a similar measure of combat effectiveness. I believe that all, or virtually all, of your National Guard generals will tell you that they heartily favor this kind of reorganization.

However, you will note that its acceptance implies a rather drastic reorganization of units and a reduction in company size units within the division. It does not account for the whole problem facing the guard, but it does account for a substantial portion of it. Nonetheless, the National Guard officers with whom I have talked seem to accept this problem and are anxious to get on with the business of reorganizing along pentomic lines. I emphasize this point to establish that, regardless of other features of the plan we are discussing, a considerable measure of reorganization is inevitable if we are to give a modern configuration to the guard divisions.

The second requirement for the reorganization of the Reserve forces which I mentioned was the need to aline our Reserve structure to the requirements of approved war plans. We are in a critical period in our defense preparations, when the demands made by the Armed Forces are constantly mounting. Our weapons systems are becoming more complicated and more expensive. In order to man these new weapons, we require better people who in turn must be better trained and better paid. The consequence is a constant mounting of the military budget to the concern of all of us who are involved in national defense.

At such a time, the armed services are properly called to an exact accounting as to the essentiality of their needs. We must verify that the assets entrusted to us contribute materially to the improved security of the United States. There is no room for the nonessential nor the nice-to-have. Every part of our military organization must be prepared to pull its weight in time of war.

In such a climate, all of our Army forces—active and Reserve—come under the probing scrutiny of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and of the Secretary of Defense. We Chiefs examine each other's forces and demand an accounting as to how they contribute to the deterrence or the winning of war. If the responsible Chief is unable to justify his forces, we feel compelled to insist upon their elimination or modification.

Thus it is that the Army's Reserve structure, both that of the National Guard and the Army Reserve, has been very closely examined to determine whether all of the individuals and units have a role to play in approved war plans. If this relationship cannot be established, they have been earmarked for elimination or for conversion. In particular, Reserve units have been examined to determine whether or not they must be in existence in time of peace in order to meet the mobilization schedule approved for implementation in time of war. If they can be organized and trained after M-day and still meet their schedule, they should be scratched from the peacetime roster.

I can illustrate the problem by describing a hypothetical mobilization plan which shows in the simplest form the basis for establishing the need for Reserve Forces. Let us assume that an approved war plan requires the deployment overseas of 4 Army divisions per month for 12 months following mobilization day. Let us also assume that we can ready high-priority reserve divisions for deployment by the fourth month following mobilization. Let us also assume that we can create entirely new divisions from scratch, without having been in the peacetime reserve structure, by the tenth month after mobilization. Question: How many divisions should be in the active Army and how many in the Reserves?

Under the terms of these assumptions, the active Army should consist of those divisions deployed overseas plus the 12 divisions to be deployed in the first 3 months of war. Currently, we have 7 divisions overseas, so that in this exercise, the active Army should consist of 19 divisions, whereas the reserve divisions should amount to 24, corresponding to the 4 deployed each month for the 6 months from M+4 to M+10. Of these 24 divisions, those to be deployed earliest, in the fourth and fifth months for example, will need to have a higher degree of readiness in peacetime than those required toward the end of the deployment schedule. That is to say, it will be necessary to favor the earlier divisions over those which do not have so high a degree of urgency. By favoring I mean giving them greater peacetime strength in personnel and equipment than others farther down the list.

For this particular hypothetical war plan, then, the Army needs 43 divisions, 19 in the active Army and 24 in the reserve structure. I have spoken only in terms of divisions because they are the most visible units of Army strength. Our actual mobilization plan is much more complex. For example, not only must we have divisions, but also the supporting troops necessary to balance these divisions. Our antiaircraft units must be ready to fire on M-day and, as you know, we are counting heavily on National Guard units to reinforce the antiaircraft missile units of the active Army. Finally, we must have hundreds of thousands of individuals to fill positions which do not exist in time of peace.

The actual war plan and its supporting mobilization plan are similar in general outline to this hypothetical plan which I have presented. Without going into detail, I can tell you that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have determined that the reserve divisions strength corresponding to the 24 in the foregoing exercise is 27 for the approved mobilization plan. This then is maximum reserve divisions strength for which the Army can seek budgetary support. If additional divisions are needed in case of war, they can be formed from scratch after the commitment of these 27 reserve divisions. Hence the Army should readjust the reserve component structure so that it will contain no more than 27 tactical divisions with the necessary supporting units and individuals. This is the requirement to realine our forces to the approved war plan which I mentioned at the outset.

As you know, in the present Reserve component structure there are 37 tactical divisions—27 National Guard divisions, and 10 United States Army Reserve divisions. If we proceeded in accordance with the logic of the foregoing discussion, we should now convert 10 of these divisions. Until quite recently we had proposed to convert 6 National Guard divisions to so-called combat support divisions and 4 United States Army Reserve tactical divisions to replacement training commands. This plan which was described by Secretary Brucker at Phoenix and by General Lemnitzer at Leavenworth was developed by the Army in strict compliance with the directives of proper authority.

However, as an outgrowth of the meetings mentioned above we have received a large number of comments and suggestions from members of the National Guard and the United States Army Reserve. Many of you governors have communicated your thoughts on the subject to the Secretary of Defense or to the Secretary of the Army. This morning Secretary Brucker and I are happy to announce that there has been a relaxation of the original guidance upon which our plans thus far have been based. The Army has been authorized to develop a plan looking toward the retention of the present 37 divisions in the Reserve Forces structure, that is, 27 National Guard divisions and 10 USAR divisions, provided that this troop structure is maintained with no increase of cost or personnel beyond currently programed levels. As a result, the Army will make a complete review of its present plans in order to bring them in line with the revised guidance. We are indebted to the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McElroy, for giving us the authority to take another look at the problem under less restrictive guidelines.

I am sure that you would like my estimate of the probable outcome of such a review. Prior to a thorough study by the staff, I would not wish to say anything which might imply a commitment. My off-the-cuff re-

action is that it will be possible to retain all 37 divisions under the conditions laid down by the Department of Defense; however, it will be essential to establish priorities, both in personnel and equipment, consistent with the requirements of the mobilization schedule. In other words, those divisions which must be ready at an early date must continue to receive priority treatment. The problem, in the case of the National Guard, will be to spread over 16 infantry divisions the personnel and equipment presently planned for 10 divisions. In order to create 16 divisions in this way, it will probably be necessary to scale down each of the present triangular divisions to pentomic divisions of 3 battle groups. However, the great advantage of such a plan would be that no State would lose a division presently organized, and that each division would have a balanced tactical structure permitting ready augmentation for its combat employment.

I might say for completeness that a parallel adjustment is being considered in the case of the plan for the USAR divisions. The thought is that the four divisions previously earmarked for peacetime conversion to replacement training commands would retain their present tactical organization.

Now, a few words as to how we propose to implement this reorganization plan. First, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau will inform each State of the units and personnel strength allocated to it. Based on that allocation, the State will draft its own plan for the reorganization of its units and submit it to the Chief of the National Guard Bureau. Then, when the State plan has been approved, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau will specify the time for the plan to be put into effect. This program will be phased over a period of about 2 years to allow ample time for consultation with the States and to avoid involving the entire Guard at one time in the turmoil of reorganization.

You will note that I have said nothing about the reduction in paid drill strength of the Reserve Forces. This is a completely separate matter. As you know, the President's budget before Congress proposes a reduction from 700,000 to 630,000 for the combined National Guard and Organized Reserve paid drill strength. This action would result in a reduction in the National Guard paid drill strength of some 40,000, to a new paid drill strength of 360,000. Whether or not this reduction wil be effected depends, of course, upon the action of Congress and higher authority. But such a reduction, I would emphasize, has no direct bearing upon this matter of the reorganization of the force structure. A higher paid drill strength would allow a somewhat increased authorized strength level in certain units. It would not result, however, in the creation or the retention of additional units.

I have described this matter to you as viewed through the eyes of the Chief of Staff who is deeply concerned over obtaining maximum combat effectiveness from the resources made available to the Army. I know that this point of view is not the only one to be considered. I recognize that you gentlemen, as Governors of the States, have a vital interest in this matter. Furthermore, I realize that you may see the matter from a somewhat different angle than mine. It is for that reason that I wanted to come here today to talk very frankly to you about the problem as I see it. I hope that, in the question period, you will be just as frank in expressing your point of view about this whole matter. I do want to state, however, that it is my unqualified professional opinion that the acceptance and implementation of a reorganization plan such as I have described are essential to the vitality and effectiveness of the National Guard as an essential component of our national defense.

Parity Prices and Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to make a few observations which were prompted by the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished majority leader, with reference to the current prosperity on the farm. The gentleman says that the administration has broken its promises to the farmer, and intimates that although the Republicans are responsible for the decline in farm income, they have nothing to do with the present upturn in prices.

It is becoming increasingly clear that political management of agriculture does not work very well. By the time Congress can recognize a new situation and enact legislation to deal with it, the situation has changed and the legislation enacted no longer fits.

A rundown on the farm situation in the May 12 issue of Time commented as follows:

The best economic news in the United States last week, bar none, was the boom in United States agriculture. From all over the country reports trickled into Washington showing that the farmer, after being the lowest man on the economic totem pole since 1955, is making an astonishing comeback. Agriculture Department experts scarcely dared believe some of their own figures. As of mid-April, the prices that farmers get are up 9.8 percent over the same time last year. The prices they pay are up, too—some 3 percent. But the net improvement is pushing their annual income to $13 billion versus $11.5 billion last year.

Moreover, the picture in individual farm commodities is even brighter. Items:

"Thanks to a brisk competition between steak-hungry consumers and farmers trying to rebuild their drought-depleted cattle herds by holding back or buying up heifers, beef prices were running 30 percent above last year, spreading joy from Texas to the feed lots of Kansas City."

"Hogs were up 20 percent above last year and holding long after most farm economists expected a seasonal price break; many counties in the corn belt reported the most favorable corn-hog ratio in history—up to 25–1. (Usual make-money point for hog raisers is when 1 hundredweight of live hog sells for 12 bushels of corn.)"

"Even the egg—a big thing from California to Delaware—was selling for 25 percent above last year, so high that many poultrymen feared consumers might rebel."

"Partly because of the Florida freeze, but also because of continued high food demand from city folks, fresh vegetables were selling 40 percent higher than last year."

"And the one heavily subsidized potato was selling, unaided, more than 150 percent higher, carrying the new farm prosperity all the way up to Maine's Aroostook County."

I note with amusement an item in the May 19 issue of Time:

Running unsuccessfully for the United States Senate against Indiana's Republican HOMER CAPEHART 2 years ago, Claude R. Wickard accused the Eisenhower administration of basely betraying the United States farmer. Cried President Franklin Roosevelt's Secretary of Agriculture (1940–45): "I have before me (Candidate) Eisenhower's promise to farmers in 1952 and (President) Eisenhower's veto message of the first 1956 farm bill. Like the man on the flying trapeze, he has switched from one to the other with the greatest of ease."

Last week, with farm prices rising rapidly (Time, May 12), Claude Wickard, no longer running for public office, abandoned agricultural recession as a Democratic issue. Confiding to reporters in Kansas City that his 620-acre farm at Camden, Ind., is making money hand over fist, Wickard said: "I can't complain about $21 hogs. My son-in-law and I sold 10 Holstein cows the other day for $250 each. I didn't believe in Santa Claus until then."

Had we succumbed to the specious reasoning of candidate Wickard 2 years ago—had we been so reckless as to adopt the remedies proposed by candidate Wickard—I doubt that farmer Wickard would today be enjoying the hog and cattle prices he is now receiving.

Farmer Wickard attributes his newfound prosperity to Santa Claus. But his gratitude is misdirected. He should attribute his prosperity to the stubborn persistence of our Secretary of Agriculture in adhering to economic principle and sound commonsense. Had Mr. Benson listened to candidate Wickard, had he chosen to take the easy road of political expediency, I do not think farmer Wickard would have any reason to thank Santa Claus or anybody else today.

Now it is interesting and perhaps instructive to note that the commodities currently making the most contribution to better farm income are the commodities that, comparatively speaking, have been neglected in national farm legislation. They have been neglected largely because no one has been able to figure out practical and workable ways and means whereby production and marketing controls may be instituted. How fortunate they are.

But there has been no lack of interest in trying to devise schemes for political intervention in the price, production, and marketing of these products. In recent years the Secretary of Agriculture and the Congress have been pressured from time to time to institute programs for beef, for hogs, for poultry products.

Had the Secretary or the Congress responded to these pressures the market outlook for these commodities would be far more pessimistic today. Had we gone along with these pressures, a tremendous stimulation to production would have been provided. We would find ourselves today in the situation that our cold storage warehouses would be full and overflowing with meat products. The problem of rotating stocks would be a major difficulty. We would be seriously debating impractical and unworkable production control programs to keep from being buried by the deluge of meat production encouraged by Government price fixing.

The reason for the new hope in many fields of agriculture today is not what Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture have done, it is what they have avoided doing.

The short run expedient that looks like it will help an existing situation, will often do so, on a short run basis, but it creates long run consequences that are disastrous to the future earning ability and opportunity of farmers.

The May 12 issue of Time went on to report:

Main Street Evidence. But as far as the general United States economy was concerned the best evidence of farm recovery was on the main streets of farm towns. In Oskaloosa, Iowa, a typical midwestern farm market town (population 11,000), where farmers long were sullen and resentful over drought and low farm prices, Time correspondent Jonathan Rinehart found cash registers jingle-jangling more merrily than in years. * * *

Clay Carriker, manager of Green's Ford, said that his new-car sales for the past 60 days were 20 percent ahead of 1957, used cars, 30 percent; highpriced new trucks were slow, but lower-priced used trucks were hot. Another major beneficiary of the farmer's new-found prosperity was the farm machinery business. Owner Don Berkemeir of the Lytle Implement Co., reported that he sold 25 new tractors so far this year; * * * "Business," said Berkemeir, "is within a few dollars of double last year."

Not only has returning farm prosperity benefited virtually every Oskaloosa business (lumber dealer Jim Mathew figures his sales are up 50 percent due largely to farmers fixing up the old home place or repairing the barn), but it has brought a flock of new civic improvements in progress, e. g., three new schools, a $200,000 bowling alley and amusement center. * * *

Oskaloosa's good fortune was not unique. The Central Iowa Farm Business Association completed its annual report on 153 representative farms, reported net income in 1957 averaged $11,200, or 32 percent over 1956's $8,467 and more than 2½ times 1955's low of $4,235. For a national view, the Farm Journal polled its regional correspondents, found business noticeably better in every section except the Southeast, where row-crop farmers have been hit by weather and acreage cuts, but livestock and poultry farmers are prospering.

It is time that the Congress stopped dealing with farm problems in political terms.

It's time to recognize that sound economies must be the foundation of farm programs.

As an Iowan, I am particularly interested in corn, and the livestock products produced from corn. Thank goodness that the corn farmer has gained a relative degree of freedom from government.

But it is time for Congress to eliminate the present ridiculous program for corn—a program that few farmers comply with except by accident.

The annual establishment of unrealistic corn allotments that nobody pays any attention to, is a waste of money and effort that can be better expended for other purposes. I can see no warrant for the continuation of corn allotments. I hope the Agricultural Committee is not going to come up with proposals designed to tighten up on corn production, or any program based upon the erroneous assumption that price fixing and production control programs will work for corn or other feed grains. They won't.

It is also time for Congress to permit corn price supports to reflect market factors, so that corn producers can produce for the market and market what they produce, and avoid the creation of burdensome surplus stocks. The future of corn producers is not to be found in comprehensive Government programs involving regulation of the production and marketing of corn.

Report of the Honorable Perkins Bass on the Mutual Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a report by Hon. PERKINS BASS on the mutual security program:

Foreign aid or mutual security—call it what you will—this much is certain: No other Government program has been subjected to such constant and intensive critical investigation and study, year after year, by so many different groups and individuals, the motives of most of whom have been, at least originally, severely critical.

And yet, year after year, Democratic and Republican Presidents have recommended multi-billion-dollar military and economic aid programs for countries all over the world.

And, year after year, Congress has first authorized and later appropriated most of the money requested for these programs—almost always reluctantly but nevertheless regularly and substantially in the amounts needed.

As a further paradox, all the evidence points to the conclusion that the mutual security program has been the least popular of any Government activity, in the sense that there's no interested or spontaneous public demand for what so many condemn as a giveaway.

How can one account for this paradox?

I've seen no more effective justification than the simple and direct words of the President last week: "No nation, not even the United States, can isolate itself from its friends and still be secure."

Or in the equally compelling words of the House Foreign Affairs Committee report: "The termination or drastic curtailment of the mutual security program would inevitably mean that we would lose the cold war."

Neither of these views is new. Rather, it is the increasing evidence that these statements are true, which has convinced more and more of our people we need this program.

It has been most revealing over the past 3 or 4 years to watch this conviction sink in. It has been impressively demonstrated in the results of opinion polls taken in their districts and States by a number of once-opposed Congressmen and Senators.

Behind this growing support has been greater public understanding of the fundamental facts of foreign aid—facts which were more effectively brought home in many cases as a result of the studies and investigations their own earlier opposition and questions had caused.

Facts like these: That this is no giveaway program. Instead of sending dollars abroad, we are providing military equipment, food, loans, and technical advice to help strengthen allied military forces and encourage higher living standards in underdeveloped countries.

That without friendly military forces and bases, it would cost the United States about five times as much to station Americans abroad where they would be required for our own security.

That more than 80 percent of all foreign aid is spent immediately in the United States to purchase military hardware, equipment and supplies from our factories. This provides jobs for about 600,000 persons, including 24,000 jobs in New England.

That we are not trying to buy friends, which we know is impossible, but rather we are helping to build genuine independence among weaker countries, based on political and economic stability, as the best way to resist the spread of communism.

That many, but not all, of the weaknesses in the foreign-aid program have been eliminated and its administration tightened up as a result of the constant pressure for better performance directed at the agency by Congress and other public and private watchdog groups.

This year's mutual-security authorization bill included a request by the President for approximately $3.3 billion, which the House Foreign Affairs Committee carefully pruned to $2.96 billion—$1.64 billion for military and $1.32 billion for economic aid.

The most controversial area of foreign aid—assistance to Poland and Yugoslavia—is only slightly involved in this bill. Poland is not included at all, since aid to that country has been limited to the sale of some of our agricultural surpluses and to loans through the Export-Import Bank—two separate programs. No more military aid is scheduled to Yugoslavia, though a certain amount of economic aid is provided in this bill. In view of the fact that Yugoslavia's insistence on her independence is infuriating the Soviet Union, such aid may be justified as a calculated cold-war risk, though I have some doubts about this.

In the last analysis, it seems to me the question of our mutual-security program is nothing less than the question of our national security. We've stopped the Russians and are continuing to hold them in check militarily. But the cold war is now being fought in the shops and factories and steel mills of the world. The prize is the power to guide the industrial and economic growth of the world toward freedom or slavery.

Khrushchev, in his recent declaration of economic war on the United States, bluntly warned that the Soviet threat to the United States is in the field of peaceful production. "We are relentless in this," he said, "and we will prove the superiority of our system."

Unless we meet them successfully on this ground, ground we always considered our strongest, the alternatives are, as President Eisenhower put it, "grim." "They are," he said in this order, "a fortress America, then a regimented America—finally a defeated America."

These are the reasons why I shall again support this program.

Report of New York County Lawyers Association on H. R. 11102

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the committee on the Federal courts of the New York County Lawyers Association adopted, on April 28, 1958, a report recommending against enactment of H. R. 11102 which seeks to amend the jurisdiction of district courts in civil actions with regard to the amount in controversy and diversity of citizenship.

The report of the committee is as follows:

NEW YORK COUNTY
LAWYERS ASSOCIATION,
COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION,
New York.

Report of committee on the Federal courts on H. R. 11102, which seeks to amend sections 1331 and 1332 of title 28 of the United States Code, in relation to increasing the amount-in-controversy limitation in original jurisdiction civil actions and in diversity cases to $10,000.

RECOMMENDATION: DISAPPROVAL

This bill would tend to make the Federal district court a rich-man's court by denying access to persons having causes ranging from $3,000 to $10,000.

Respectfully submitted.

COMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL COURTS.

Midland Tex., Junior Chamber of Commerce Election Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. T. RUTHERFORD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, the Midland, Tex., Junior Chamber of Commerce has recently made what I believe to be a fine contribution to good government. It was my thought that perhaps the Members of this body would be interested in knowing the details.

In Texas, cost of elections are not paid for by tax funds. Candidates for office must pay a filing fee sufficient to take care of all election costs. Early this year, Democratic County Chairman Frank Bezoni of Midland announced the costs would be high enough to make it necessary to assess each individual candidate some $600 to cover all costs.

Mr. James N. Allison, Jr., who is vice president of the Midland Reporter-Telegram Publishing Co., and also president of the Midland Junior Chamber of Commerce, immediately went into action. After contacting members of the Jaycees, Mr. Allison offered to furnish volunteer workers at the polls in order to eliminate the $20 per day per person cost of having paid election officials. This made it possible for the candidate to pay only $25 each in Midland County as opposed to the $600 each earlier contemplated.

Both County Democratic Chairman Bezoni and County Republican Chairman Tom Culberson of Midland have expressed appreciation to the Midland Jaycees for their offer. They said such a program should be of great value in encouraging greater participation in political activities.

Several other county chairmen in Texas have asked for details of the plan to be carried out by the Midland Jaycees, and for a report of the results. With the eyes of Texas on them, I have no doubt the Midland Jaycees will prove themselves equal to the task they have cut out.

The Midland Junior Chamber of Commerce has long been recognized for its nonpartisan, constructive work in the field of government. They won statewide recognition in advocating a plan whereby substantial salary increases would be paid to the members of the Texas Legislature. These acts, and their other many civic services, are much appreciated by the people of Midland, a progressive, modern city of some 55,000 people in west Texas. I wish to extend my congratulations to President Allison and the membership of the Midland Jaycees for their continued fine work.

Although each individual State has its own election laws, it may be the actions of the Midland Junior Chamber of Commerce will be helpful in other States and will open up new and unexplored avenues of approach toward solving election costs. Their plan could be the first step in getting many Americans, both as members of organizations and as individuals, to help with Government at the local level. This would be a great thing for the Nation. I am happy to have the opportunity to call to the attention of the House this most commendable action on the part of the Midland Junior Chamber of Commerce.

American Labor and Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by AFL–CIO President George Meany to the Commonwealth Club of California.

This speech, entitled "American Labor and Foreign Affairs" sets forth with great eloquence the interest and enthusiasm the American labor movement is showing in foreign affairs.

The address follows:

When I last had the pleasure and privilege of appearing before you—almost 12 years ago—I spoke to you in a broad and general way about the American trade union movement—its aims, principles and ideals. At that time, I emphasized the fact that American labor was an integral part of the American system and, as such, it had to make its contribution in every way possible to the preservation of that system.

Today, I wish to discuss with you the trade union attitude in regard to the most important problem facing our Nation—the position of the United States in world affairs or, even more explicitly, might I say the role our country must play as the leading Nation of the free world in the titanic struggle now going on between the free way of life as represented by the democratic nations and the slave system represented by the Soviet Union with its clearly defined objective of Communist domination over the entire world.

American labor's interest in foreign affairs is not something new. When I was with you last, I think I told you that during all the years of its existence American labor had a keen and vital interest in the welfare of workers throughout the world. Back in 1919, Samuel Gompers was the dominating influence in bringing about the creation of the International Labor Organization when the Peace Treaty was signed after World War I. Ever since that time, American labor has been active in all international problems which have an impact on the overall question of world peace.

In recent years, American labor's interest in the international situation and its pressing problems has become more and more intensive. For one thing, with the rapid advancement of transportation, science and technology, the world itself has become much smaller. Happenings in far-away places that tend to develop political and economic tensions have an almost immediate impact on our country's position in world affairs. It is quite natural, in view of our Nation's new world position, for workers—as citizens—to try to help our country meet its many world responsibilities. In a sense, labor's growing interest in our Nation's foreign policy and our increasing involvement in international labor affairs reflect the rising interest of the American people, as a whole, in these matters.

Today, no voluntary, nongovernmental organization is as keenly interested and as actively involved in foreign affairs as American labor. In this light, you will be interested to know that our interest and participation in world affairs have already reached such a point that our policies arouse worldwide attention and response. Of course, the response from overseas is not always warm and friendly. When it is from Moscow, it is always hot and hostile.

The other day, Pravda, the mouthpiece of the Soviet Communist Party and Trud, the voice of the Kremlin's labor front, bitterly denounced the AFL–CIO for sponsoring an exhibit, in Washington, portraying forty years of Soviet dictatorship and aggression. I am sure that there must be some who ask: Why should American labor be so vitally interested in world affairs? Isn't the trade union movement just a bread-and-butter movement? Why should the bricklayer in San Francisco, the steelworker in Pittsburgh, or the garment worker in New York be so interested in what happens in some village in Tunisia, or in what goes on in Indonesia or some other faraway place?

The answer to this is quite obvious—in this age of sputniks, explorers, vanguards, and other scientific advances—American labor for its own preservation must have an interest in preserving peace and promoting freedom. That is why we face the present world crisis both as American citizens and as free trade unionists.

As citizens, we have a duty to contribute everything we can to our Nation's efforts to preserve freedom for ourselves and others who likewise cherish freedom.

As trade unionists, we have a natural urge to advance the cause of democracy as the only way of life under which it is possible for workers to join one with another in creating and maintaining unions for their mutual aid and protection.

Mankind's experience with modern totalitarian dictatorships—whether they be Fascist, Communist, Nazi, Falangist, or Peronist—has taught the wage earners of America some valuable lessons.

We have learned from bitter experience that workers are the number one victims of dictatorships of every type—right, left, Fascist or Communist. We know that there cannot be a free movment of workers dedicated to a better standard of life in a society that is not free.

More than this, we know without question that there cannot be a free society unless workers are free to form and maintain trade unions. Every dictatorship of modern times has destroyed the free trade union movement as a necessary first step to the establishment of complete state control. So, by their very nature, trade unions are the mortal enemies of dictatorship and injustice.

We have come to believe that in this atomic age it will not long be possible for the world to remain half free and half slave. The 20th century slave state, as exemplified by the Soviet Union, is a barbarous and brutalizing power. It does not hesitate to destroy tens of thousands—yes, even millions of lives—in order to maintain and extend its hold on more and more people—more and more territory.

It has no regard for the value of human life. It is not deterred or turned aside by any religious or moral concepts of human decency. Its spreading influence and control over more and more peoples; its implacable, constant, and sustained warfare on human freedom in every part of the world, compels those of us who cherish freedom and decency to give what aid we can to others who are struggling to achieve or maintain the right to govern themselves.

Applying this yardstick of supporting all peoples aspiring to freedom, American labor—in line with the best anticolonialist traditions of our own Nation—has been in the forefront of the fight by the international free trade union movement against every form of colonialism—the old western type as well as the new Soviet colonialism which masquerades under the designation—people's democracies. American labor favors the national independence and freedom of the Algerian people no less than it favors national freedom and democracy for the people of Hungary, Korea, Poland, Germany, Albania, Israel, and Egypt.

Fully aware of the direct relationship between economic well-being and political independence, American labor was in the forefront of the campaign 10 years ago for the Marshall plan which contributed so much to the economic buildup of the war-ravaged countries of western Europe and without which, in my opinion, all of Europe would have gone down under the subversive tactics of the Communists. We have consistently championed other foreign-aid programs to help people develop and strengthen their economy, their freedom, and their human rights. In the same spirit, the AFL-CIO has been supporting our country's reciprocal trade program.

With these lessons uppermost in our minds, we of the united American labor movement have utilized our strength and influence in the community to help build an ever-better and stronger America. We are convinced that only a prosperous and progressive America can provide the free world with the effective leadership and support it must have in order to deter Soviet aggression and defeat communism. Social injustice, low living standards, unemployment, and racial discrimination at home seriously impede our Nation in meeting its worldwide responsibilities abroad.

The present economic recession that we are experiencing here in America cannot be looked upon as a purely domestic affair. It has, without question, a definite bearing on our position as a nation in world affairs.

Today, with much of the free world prosperity, stability and security dependent on American economy being healthy, a sustained economic depression in the United States could prove fatal to the freedom and well-being of all democratic countries.

We cannot afford to risk delay in taking measures to keep our economy healthy, strong and growing. The Communist enemy within and outside our borders is cunning, ruthless and tireless in its drive to destroy our way of life. Never forget that Soviet economy is based on inhuman exploitation of the individual worker for the benefit of a militarized totalitarian state dedicated to aggression and world domination. Never forget that the Kremlin is ever on the alert to exploit for its own sinister ends weaknesses in our economy—no less than weaknesses in our defense system.

Nikita Khrushchev, the present czar of Russia, has boasted that his Communist dictatorship will beat us in technical progress and higher living standards.

Let me tell you how American labor feels about such Soviet boasts. As we see it, the Kremlin does not stand a chance of beating our free American economy, if, we increase our productivity, raise the purchasing power of our people and help improve the living standards—especially of the economically under-developed countries which are devoted to human liberty and peace. But, if we do not follow such a course, while making ourselves and our allies militarily strong enough to deter, and, if need be, defeat Soviet aggression—then Moscow can and will secure global domination and remold the world on the Soviet pattern of Communist enslavement.

Our freedom and our future depend on what we do with out country and what our country does abroad—far more than on Khrushchev's boasts and threats.

We must have much greater integration of our foreign and domestic economic and political policies. We cannot afford to permit our great industrial potential and mighty technical resources to run down or fall behind and yet expect to beat the Communist challenge or meet the Soviet threat effectively.

Positive action must be taken by Government to meet the economic situation now. There is too much at stake for us to wait any longer in the hope that things will right themselves.

In the field of foreign affairs, the American people as a whole have a duty as citizens of a democracy to seize every opportunity that avails to become more knowledgeable as to the position of our country in relation to the other nations of the world.

We have no right to sit back and leave the formation and implementation of national policy to a comparatively few elected officials. Under our system, with its free press, the columns of the country's newspapers are the daily medium for the transmission to the American people of all the vicious and subtle propaganda that is spewed forth daily from the Soviet Union by means of speeches, letters, raido broadcasts and statements from the Soviet rulers in the Kremlin.

Unless the American people, as a whole, take the trouble to find out the real truth about the so-called Communist paradise and its rulers, the constant stream of propaganda is bound to have an effect on American public opinion and, of course, that is just the end result which the Communists are seeking.

It would be in our best interest and in the interest of our future security as a nation for us to take a look every so often at the Soviets and ask ourselves—if no one else—certain questions like these:

What kind of a country is the Soviet Union?

What kind of men are those who rule in Russia?

When the leaders in the Kremlin speak of peace and freedom, just what do they really mean?

Can we find anything in the 40 years of Communist rule in the Soviet Union that would justify our acceptance at face value of Soviet promises?

What really happened in Hungary 17 months ago?

How did the people of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania, Albania, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, and Bulgaria lose their national independence and become slaves behind the Iron Curtain?

What has happened in East Germany since it was occupied by Soviet troops at the end of World War II?

How many treaties of friendship with neighbor states have been treacherously violated by the Soviet Union in the last 40 years?

What was the agreement reached by the so-called Summit Conference of July 1955 regarding the re-unificatiton of Germany? Did the Soviet Union keep this agreement?

What was the real reason for the brutal attack by the Soviet Union on the people of Hungary in November of 1956?

What was the official action of the United Nations on the Hungarian matter taken after months of investigation by a committee from five of the small member nations?

Do the Russian people have anything at all to say about the foreign and domestic policies of the Soviets?

What is behind the present—almost frantic—propaganda campaign of the Soviets for a summit conference?

Do the Soviet leaders really want to reduce world tensions?

I am not going to attempt—because of time limitations—to answer all of these questions at this time. However, any one listening can get the factual documented answers to all these questions, and more about the Soviets, by writing to the AFL-CIO in Washington, D. C Incidentally, the American press could render a great service to our country if they would, from time to time, tell the American people the real facts in regard to the Soviet Union.

At this time, I would like to comment briefly on a few of these matters.

First, what really happened in Hungary in late October and early November of 1956? Simply this. The Hungarian people completely fed up with more than 10 years of Communist rule imposed upon them by Hungarian Communists—backed up by Soviet troops—turned on their oppressors; dispersed the cruel Security Police and took over the reins of government. This was a spontaneous revolt of the ordinary people of Hungary which came after years of the cruelest kind of oppression, amounting to virtual slavery and culminating in a situation where workers—despite long hours and constantly increasing norms of production—could not earn enough to keep their families from starvation.

For a few short days the Hungarian people were free. They made plans for the formation of a democratic government by holding free elections, allowing all political groups the right to participate in these elections and guaranteeing basic human rights to all. The Soviets withdrew their troops and entered into negotiations with the representatives of the Hungarian people under a flag of truce. A few days later, without warning at dawn on Sunday, November 4, 1956, the Soviets launched a brutal attack on the Hungarian people with thousands of tanks and planes and tens of thousands of fresh Russian troops.

As a result, thousands of defenseless Hungarians were brutally murdered, several hundred thousands fled into self-imposed exile and countless tens of thousands more were shipped off to the slave labor camps of Siberia.

Why this insane attack by Khrushchev on a defenseless people?

For many years, Soviet propaganda has emphasized a desire for peaceful coexistence between the democratic world and the Communist nations. In November of 1956, the Hungarian people gave the Soviets the opportunity to demonstrate the sincerity of their desire for peaceful coexistence. Here, the Hungarian people—after definitely rejecting a Communist form of government—merely desired to set up a democracy and live at peace with their giant Comunist neighbor.

The Soviet Union had no reason to fear economic or military aggression from defenseless, poverty-stricken Hungary. By no stretch of the imagination could little Hungary be a threat of any sort to the Soviets. What then did they really fear? It is quite simple. They feared freedom.

They could not afford to have the Soviet people look across the border at a country that had gotten rid of its Communist overlords and had set up a form of government dedicated to human freedom.

They could not afford to have the Soviet people gazing across the border into a former Communist country which was now holding free elections in which all political parties were free to participate. In short, they could not allow the enslaved people of the Soviet Union itself to get any ideas about such things as individual freedom, human rights, free elections and things of that sort. This then is the real reason behind the brutal murder of tens of thousands of Hungarians by Khrushchev and his ruling clique in the Kremlin.

This is why the United Nations, after months of investigation by a committee from 5 of its small member nations, condemned the Soviet Union by a vote of 60 to 10.

Now another item. Let us look at the present propaganda campaign by the Soviets for a summit conference—and, also look at the record to decide whether or not the Soviet leaders really want to reduce world tensions by such a conference.

First, keep in mind that there was a summit conference with the Soviets in July of 1955, in which our Nation participated along with the French and the British. Agreement was reached by the heads of government calling for the reunification of Germany by free elections. This was agreed to unanimously by the heads of state of the four great powers.

The American people and the world at large felt that, at last, there had been a step taken to relieve world tension and that, at last, the world could hope for peace.

But, at a meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the summit nations, called in November of 1955, to implement the decisions reached and the agreements consummated at the July meeting, the Soviet delegation repudiated every single agreement to which they had committed themselves at the conference of the heads of state.

Remember, too, that the present rulers of Moscow have become past masters in the arts of chicanery and hyprocrisy. They have learned well—by experience—the art of devious diplomacy used to make agreements to further their own objectives of the moment and then to break these agreements when it suits their purposes to do so. Actually, by the record, they have been making and violating agreements for 40 years.

So, in considering the Soviet drive for a summit conference in order to reach agreement with our Nation and its allies, keep this one amazing fact in mind—that the Communists took over control of every single one of their neighbor countries, who are now Soviet satellites, in the face of a treaty of friendship with each and every one of these nations.

Also, from the record, you will find that every time Mr. Khrushchev or his recently demoted mouthpiece, Mr. Bulganin, have called for a summit conference in recent months, they have hedged and fenced in their call with restrictions and prohibitions against the leaders of state even discussing the vital issues and differences which are at the bottom of present world tensions.

It must be obvious to anyone who has studied the situation that they do not want to eliminate the causes of world tension through the medium of a summit conference but rather desire to exploit these tensions in the interest of Communist world domination.

This is why our Secretary of State, in commenting recently on this Soviet propaganda drive, stated that America does not want to be a party to a fraud or a hoax; or be a party to a conference which did not actually deal with anything of significance but would merely be a spectacle and could possibly increase, rather than reduce, world tensions.

One of the conditions which Moscow has set up in its communications calling for a summit conference is that there be an understanding barring discussion of problems like the plight of the Hungarian people and of other captive peoples in the Soviet satellites. Also, under the Soviet terms, the question of German reunification could not even be placed on the agenda of the conference—let alone be considered and settled in a just and decent manner by the conferences.

If our Nation, Britain, and France were to submit to this maneuver by the Soviets; if the western statesmen were to go to a summit conference on these terms, it would be disastrous for world peace and freedom. If President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles were to agree to attend a summit conference, under the present Soviet terms, they would, in effect, be placing the stamp of approval and final legalization on Communist Russia's destruction of the national independence and democratic liberties of the people of the 10 European nations now held as captive states of the Soviet Union.

This would be a disastrous step toward the domination of free democracies and independent people all over the world. And this, let us remember, is the real Communist goal, to be attained by brazen fraud or brute force, or both.

An other field in which Communist propaganda has been hammering away at the free world is the testing and production of nuclear weapons. If we were to fall victim to the constant hammering of the propagandists of Moscow, you might get to believe that the Soviets were willing to give up nuclear tests and were in favor of banning production of fissionable material.

The truth of the matter is that the Soviets have never been ready to accept an agreement which could guarantee that both sides would keep their commitments in these matters.

For years, our Government has consistently proposed an agreement which would ban further nuclear tests and also ban the continued production of fissionable material, through enforcement and supervision, under a system of international inspection.

As long ago as December of 1953, President Eisenhower presented his atoms-for-peace plan which would have directed the use of nuclear material exclusively for the benefit of humanity. This plan was never accepted by Moscow, nor was any plan yet proposed which could be enforced through a system of international inspection accepted by the Russians.

Yet, if we were to listen to Soviet propaganda, it is the Soviets that want to ban nuclear tests and the production of nuclear weapons.

Now, one more item. What has happened to Eastern Germany since it was occupied by Soviet troops at the end of World War II—13 years ago? Here, we find 20 million people brought into the so-called Soviet paradise.

Actually, for the past 13 years, Eastern Germany has been one gigantic slave camp with millions of Germans working under conditions that add up to virtual peonage. Here we find a continuing situation that is practically without precedent in world history. Over a period of 13 years, more than 10 percent of the population of East Germany have become refugees and voluntary exiles despite the efforts of tens of thousands of Soviet troops to keep them prisoners behind the Iron Curtain.

More than 2 million people of East Germany have fled to the West in the past 13 years. And, despite the fact that today it is a capital offense, punishable by death, for any person in East Germany to aid a refugee with technical or mechanical skill to escape to the West, there are still 1,500 East Germans coming across the border to freedom in the West every week. Just think of it, after all these years, the East Germans are escaping from this Soviet slave-labor camp at the rate of more than 75,000 a year.

Place this stark, brutal fact alongside of Khrushchev's boasts of the wonderful conditions and living standards behind the Iron Curtain.

Incidentally, I wonder what would happen if Mr. Khrushchev, in one of his more boastful moods, should decide to lift the Iron Curtain that separates the Soviet Union and its satellites from the West. I am quite sure that if this happened you would find out, for the first time, that there are far more anti-Communists behind the Iron Curtain than there are in the free world. Never forget, that the first and major victims of Communist repression and cruelty are the people of Soviet Russia itself.

A few days ago, a prominent British politician, who has been marked as the next Foreign Minister of Great Britain—that is after the next election, stated that he was tired of hearing Americans ask the question: "Can you trust the Russians?"

Well, I think the time has come for us to stop asking ourselves that question and answer it in pretty frank language. The answer: No, you cannot trust the Russians. No individual anywhere on earth who cherishes freedom for himself and for his neighbors has the right to trust the Russians unless and until they prove by actions rather than words that they are worthy of trust.

The American people, as a whole, must squarely face the facts in this most vital field of foreign affairs which finds our Nation in the forefront of the fight to preserve human freedom. We must be aware of the propaganda methods of the Soviet rulers who really believe that they can, by constant repetition, convince the rest of the world that white is black.

The American people should not allow their natural yearning for a peaceful world to influence them to the point where they become victims of this Soviet art of constant propaganda by repetition.

This so-called cold war between the forces of communism, headed up by Mr. Khrushchev, and the forces of freedom, represented by the Western powers, could undoubtedly go on for a long time. The American people must have the fortitude and patience to insist, no matter how long it takes, that our statesmen deal with the Soviet Union on the basis of their actions rather than their statements or their promises.

In addition, the American people must be prepared to make every necessary sacrifice to insure that our country and its allies will always be militarily strong enough to deter and turn back aggression, if the Soviets should decide that this is the immediate way to Communist world domination. In this way, our officials who must deal with the Soviets will be able to negotiate on a basis of strength—which is the one thing that the Communists understand above all else.

A Good Will Fiasco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very timely article concerning our Latin American policies, which appeared in the Boston Daily Globe, on May 15 1958:

A Good Will Fiasco

The screaming mob attack upon Vice President Richard M. Nixon and his wife in the Venezuelan capital has carried to an unhappy climax one of the most ineptly handled episodes in this country's foreign relations in the entire postwar period. What was undertaken as a good will tour of eight Latin American States has carried inter-American relations to a new low.

Twice within a fortnight the Vice President's life has been in danger. Neither the President's dispatch of Marines and paratroopers to the Caribbean, nor the explanations offered by Mr. Eisenhower yesterday, obscure the patent fact that Mr. Nixon was unwisely sent on a mission without adequate preliminary study as to its feasibility at this time.

Under the Constitution, responsibility for the direction of the foreign policy of the United States rests solely upon the President himself. The Secretary of State is merely his chief adviser in such matters. The public, understandably indignant at the discourtesies visited upon Mr. Nixon, who traveled as an official spokesman for the United States, still awaits an explanation of our own Government's delinquencies in conducting thoroughly such an advance survey of the risks involved.

Mr. Nixon, who has handled himself ably and with level-headed commonsense during this protracted ordeal, obviously fell victim of that default back home. Once embarked on this tour, he had no recourse but to see it through. The fiasco was not of his making.

In the various Latin American capitals visited by the Vice President, it was apparent from the outset that troublemakers had been preparing against his arrival, and that tightly organized and centrally directed Communist groups were awake to the opportunities his journey offered. In each capital they sought to ignite the tinder of nationalism aggrieved by economic adversity. In several, their efforts spluttered out or were effectively dispersed. At Lima and Caracas they flared out of control.

The important point in all this isn't the disposition of Moscow's obedient followers on the South American continent to carry out orders. There, and elsewhere throughout Europe and the Middle East, such tactics have become familiar enough. Mr. Eisenhower himself noted this at his press conference yesterday.

The question of primary importance is—why has such tinder been permitted, by those directing this country's policy, to accumulate around United States relations with our neighboring continent during the past several years?

Peddling of arms to Latin American dictators whom we later receive as refugees, after their outraged peoples have expelled them, does not make for neighborly relations. Nor do abrupt reversals of our tariff and trade policies, which accentuate distress among Latin American nations heavily dependent upon us for markets.

For well over a decade, the United States has been distributing foreign aid plenteously elsewhere around the world. The allotment to the 20 Latin American States has been and remains trivial. This despite the fact that Washington pledged full postwar assistance, during World War II, in return for the unbalancing of Latin American economies to provide us with the materials for victory.

President Eisenhower declared yesterday that the time has come to overhaul our Latin American policies. The truth is that it came long ago. Once more we have been taking traditional friends for granted. Let us hope that this time, with the embarrassing experiences of Tuesday before it, the administration means what it says.

Uncle Dudley.

The Italian National Elections on May 25

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, every American, like myself, whose forefathers came to this land from Italy, is looking forward to the 25th of May with hope and expectation. On that day the citizens of Italy will vote for a new Parliament. Our hope is that the Italian nation will rally to support the democratic parties and that a coalition can be formed to continue the postwar development of Italian democracy. We expect that this will happen and that the new Italy will continue to grow as a political, economic, and social democracy with a firm commitment to cooperation in the Atlantic community.

Since World War II there has been a vast expansion of Italian-American friendship and of the mutual concerns of our two countries. This has led a great many Americans with no Italian background whatever to be deeply interested in the May 25 elections. The reconstruction of Italy after World War II was the result of the energy and courage of the Italian people and of their Government, but Americans can feel proud that through the foreign-aid program we were able to contribute in a small way to the birth of the new Italy. In the years from 1948 to 1955, the United States extended more than $1½ billion in economic assistance alone to Italy.

Our cooperation has been continued in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization where we are allies in the common struggle to prevent Soviet domination of Western Europe.

Americans in general are more interested in Italy today than ever before. Italian motion pictures have won a warm reception in the United States. The books of Alberto Moravia are on our best seller lists. Capezio shoes and Fontana dresses set the fashions for American women. Even the men are wearing Italian-neck sport shirts, low-cut shoes, and silk suits from Italy. Italian typewriters, cars, and other precision equipment are common in the United States. And, of course, American tourists flock to Italy each year in ever-increasing numbers. All of this testifies to the new burst of Italian vitality and creativeness that has shot up in the last decade.

The new Italy is a land where the old sources of economic dissension are being eradicated and where political and personal freedom exist once again after more than 20 years of Fascist dictatorship. The 10-year Vanoni plan, instituted in 1955, is designed to tackle the twin problems of how to increase the national income and how to decrease unemployment. It places particular emphasis on building up the economy of southern Italy. Reforms have been instituted providing formerly landless farm workers and peasants with good inexpensive farmland which they can pay for over a long period of years. And the per capita national income rose from $296 to $429 in the last 7 years.

I had the good fortune to make an inspection tour of Italian industries during the last 2 weeks of September 1957. In the short space of 2 weeks, from September 14 to September 30, I travelled far and fast examining factories, inspecting plants, talking to workers, and drawing conclusions and impressions. I visited the following cities of Torino, Milano, Lake Como, Vicenza, Venezia, Rome, Frascati, Napoli, Capri, Palermo, Corleone, Pisa, and Larderello, as well as many other small towns and hamlets.

In passing through Italy, I did not fail to note the artistic beauty of Milan, the romance of Venice with its canals and gondolas, the lore and history of ancient Rome, the enchantment of Naples with its resorts of Capri and Ischia, a teeming city without comforts and adequate housing, but whose people still live with a song on their lips and love in their hearts. I did not overlook Palermo, a vibrant city, and its surrounding towns whose people are eager to know when the American immigration barriers would be let down. I could not pass by the opportunity to visit the Vatican City, where a humble and stately figure in white instills peace to all who are fortunate to come within his presence, and who, daily, encourages nations to discard the sword to follow the cross.

I was impressed mainly by the fact that Italy is in the midst of revolution; not a political revolution, but an industrial revolution. Industries are booming and factories are springing up everywhere. I expected to see a country helpless and groaning amidst ruins of devastation of war, but I found very little evidence of destruction caused by World War II. I found a people grateful to the United States for past aid, and a country seeking trade not aid. I found a country and a people asking to be treated not as sick offspring, but as a healthy adult. Communism as a threat has been frustrated in a large measure by the Catholicism of the native people and the ambition to go ahead under democratic principles.

The youth, while yearning passionately to emigrate to the United States, the land of opportunity, are practical. They are not sitting back in resignation, but are aggressively determined to march forward on the economic front with technical skills.

Few countries have accomplished so much with so little resources, and while wages are pitifully low compared to our standard, they have been increasing, and there exists certain social programs which United States industry and government could adopt with beneficial results, such as, dependency allowances to married workers. Italy has not utilized, however, the full potential of 50 million people, who can be a major purchasing power if their wages were substantially increased and if the unemployment of 2 million was reduced. However, Italy through its L'IRI, the modern govern-

ment organism, partly governmental and partly private, together with strictly private organizations, is making a laborious attempt to raise wages, to reduce prices by destroying monopolies and to create employment.

Italy is a land of very rich and very poor. There is no middle class. It is a land of workers with inventive skills and determination born of necessity. Italy lacks the art of public relations insofar as industry is concerned. Too much attention is paid to tourist trade and not enough to its industrial accomplishments.

Italy has emerged from the devastation of the last war. Its industries are booming. American aid has contributed immensely to Italy's development and the people are appreciative of our aid, but Italy has failed to publicize her extraordinary ability to produce much from little and her technological advancement. What the people from Italy want from us now is trade, not aid. Its representatives have not publicized widely its economic works and tremendous developments. Our industries can profit by working with Italian industries. I have confidence that Italy, with its native inventiveness and highly technical skill, will overcome its obstacles and deficiencies in resources and will soon take its proper place among the nations of the world.

Most of the advances which Italy has made in the last decade will be at stake on May 25. If the unexpected should happen and the Communist Party gains the power either to control or obstruct the operations of government, Italy would gradually retreat from its new democracy and its foreign policy would come under the influence of Soviet Russia. On the other hand, if the parties on the extreme right should increase their strength so markedly as to threaten the democratic character of the center coalition of parties, we shall most likely witness the decline of Italian international cooperation.

As an American of Italian origin, I urge my friends in Italy and the friends of Italian democracy and Atlantc cooperation in Italy to support the democratic parties in the forthcoming elections. The new Italy must not falter and the hard won gains of the Italian people must not be sacrificed. Avanti Italia.

Taking Science Into the Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. O'HAHA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 47 eminent members of the faculty of the University of Chicago, including such world-renowned nuclear scholars as Samuel K. Allison and Herbert L. Anderson, are participating in a TV educational program over station WBKB in Chicago, that is literally taking science into the homes.

The program started on March 17, 1958, with the purpose set forth in the following statements:

Science is the foundation of the future for all mankind. To increase understanding of the basic principles of science and to awaken at all levels a desire to study it more intensely, station WBKB, in cooperation with the University of Chicago, offers Science, 58, a 13-week television series. This presents a rare opportunity for Chicago television viewers to acquaint themselves with the sciences of today—an opportunity which the American Broadcasting Co. is happy to offer the community it serves.

STERLING C. QUINLAN,
Vice President, Station WBKB.

Awareness of the methods and achievements of science is essential for every citizen, for science is a major force in shaping our world. The University of Chicago is cooperating with station WBKB and the American Broadcasting Co. in presenting Science, 58, in the belief that this program by eminent scientists is a valuable service in informing the public and encouraging an attitude of continuing awareness of the dimensions of science.

LAWRENCE A. KIMPTON,
Chancellor, University of Chicago.

The program, now at about the halfway point, has met with a tremendous reception. Schools open an hour earlier to permit students the opportunity to listen in; whole families gather at breakfast tables to learn and discuss together the secrets of science. It has shown the intense awakened interest of the American people in science and their great hunger for scientific knowledge. I am sure that my colleagues will join with me in extending to station WBKA, the American Broadcasting Co., and the University of Chicago the commendation of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States for a great contribution in meeting the challenge of the space age.

In order that this experiment in getting science into the homes might be evaluated, I wrote Dr. Herbert L. Anderson, director of the Enrico Fermi Institute for Nuclear Studies of the University of Chicago, and S. C. Quinlan, vice president of the American Broadcasting Co., and received the following replies:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It is always a pleasure to hear from you and to find that you do seem to follow the work of the University of Chicago with interest.

The television program to which you refer is probably the one entitled Science, 58, which has been appearing locally here on WBKB, channel 7. It comes on at 7 in the morning, lasts one-half hour, and it is 5 days a week. It is about halfway through its scheduled 13-week run.

The program selects various of our professors who attempt to provide coverage over a very wide area of science. The array of talent which the University of Chicago can bring to bear on this subject is really quite impressive. When it comes to explaining things, the professor is, after all, a professional. A great many things in science are being explained in Science, 58, and anyone who takes the trouble to turn on his television set at that rather early hour in the morning stands to learn a good deal about the nature of the world in which he lives.

Since the speaker is a different person every day, it isn't necessary to start at the beginning and follow each program through to the end in order to keep up with what is being said. Each lecture stands somewhat on its own in that each speaker attempts to explain in rather simple terms something about the subject in which he is currently interested and actively exploring himself. Scientific developments today are really terribly interesting and exciting. It is always a thrill to gain some new understanding about the nature of things. This kind of experience has now become available to a much wider audience than was previously possible. The University of Chicago has taken a great step forward in leading the way to show how this can be done. It is only a bit unfortunate that the present effort is limited to the local Chicago area, and that it is a bit of a strain (speaking personally now) to have to get up at 5 in the morning in order to do the job.

A great deal of credit should be given to Miss Lee Wilcox, of the university, who has put the program together and to Prof. Julian Goldsmith, who is doing a wonderful job of getting the program across.

Sincerely,

HERBERT L. ANDERSON,
Director.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Thank you for your very kind letter with regard to our series of programs Science, 58, which are being televised over WBKB in cooperation with the University of Chicago.

We have received a most gratifying public response to the series and the University of Chicago and its great staff of scientists have done everything in their power to make the programs a success. WBKB has done its part by promoting the series with hundreds of spot announcements on the station. In addition we have placed numerous, eye-catching advertisements in the Chicago papers. The results have been heartening.

More than 100 primary and secondary schools in Chicago and vicinity have written us notes of commendation. A number of high schools, notably Lane Technical High and Foreman High in Chicago, have opened their doors 1 hour earlier in order that special classes might watch the series on television.

In addition we have distributed, on written requests, more than 15,000 booklets outlining the topics to be discussed. I might add that it was most gratifying to us and to the University of Chicago to find that thousands of the letters we received told us how whole families gathered around the breakfast table to watch the programs.

It also was very encouraging to find that many of our viewers were teen-agers both in the primary and secondary schools.

We believe we are achieving the goals we set for ourselves when we initiated Science, 58:

1. To arouse an interest in the basic principles of science in our young people.

2. To awaken in students of all ages a desire to study science more intensely.

Again, Mr. O'HARA, thank you for your interest.

Sincerely,

S. C. QUINLAN,
Vice President.

PARTICIPATING PROFESSORS FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Astronomy: Joseph W. Chamberlain, Subrahmanyan Chandrasekhar, Gerard Peter Kuiper, George Van Biesbroeck.

Biochemistry: Earl Elison Evans, Jr.

Biophysics: Aaron Novick.

Botany: Paul D. Voth.

Chemistry: Robert A. Clement, Robert Gomer, Earl A. Long, Norman H. Nachtrieb, Stuart A. Rice, Hermann I. Schlesinger, John Willard Stout, Henry Taube.

Geography: Gilbert Fowler White.

Geology: Julian R. Goldsmith, Everett C. Olson.

Meteorology: Roscoe R. Braham, Jr., Alan Faller.

Microbiology: William Burrows, Aaron Novick.

Pathology: Dr. Robert W. Wissler.
Pharmacology: Dr. Lloyd J. Roth.
Physics: Samuel K. Allison, Herbert L. Anderson, Subrahmanyan Chandrasekhar, Richard H. Dalitz, Roger H. Hildebrand, Mark G. Inghram, Nicholas C. Metropolis, Peter Meyer, Eugene N. Parker, John R. Platt, John A. Simpson.
Physiology: Daniel L. Harris, John O. Hutchens, Dr. Rachmiel Levine, Dr. John F. Perkins, Jr.
Statistics: W. Allen Wallis.
Zoology: Hewson H. Swift.
Argonne National Laboratory: Winston M. Manning, Bernard I. Spinrad, Louis A. Turner.
Chicago Midway Laboratories: Kenneth H. Jacobs.
Enrico Fermi Institute for Nuclear Studies: Nandor Balazs.
Institute for the Study of Metals: Lothar Meyer.
Conducting Science, 58: Julian R. Goldsmith, Ph. D.

Mr. Speaker, it is heartening to us in the Congress, and to all Americans must be reassuring of the future, that entirely as a public and patriotic service a great TV station is willing to give the use of its facilities to bringing science into the homes and that 47 eminent scholars donate their service and their learning to acquaint the people of Chicago with today's science and to encourage its study.

American Hospital Association Views on Community Facilities Administration Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter which I received from Kenneth Williamson of the American Hospital Association, dated May 12, 1958. Mr. Williamson enclosed a copy of his letter to Chairman BRENT SPENCE of the House Banking and Currency Committee, which committee is presently conducting hearings into the proposed expansion of the Community Facilities Administration public-loan program.

The letters follow:

AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., May 12, 1958.
Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
United States House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULTER: For your consideration, I am enclosing a copy of my letter of May 9 to the Honorable BRENT SPENCE, chairman, House Banking and Currency Committee, expressing the views of the American Hospital Association on several bills which would expand the public loan program of the Community Facilities Administration.

I thought you would be particularly interested in the fact that the American Hospital Association is urging this committee in its action on such bills to make nonprofit private hospitals equally eligible for loans with public hospitals.

Sincerely yours,
KENNETH WILLIAMSON,
Associate Director.

AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., May 9, 1958.
Hon. BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SPENCE: The American Hospital Association appreciates the opportunity of submitting its views to this committee on several bills under consideration which would expand the public loan program of the Community Facilities Administration.

This association strongly favors and endorses the development by the Federal Government of a low-interest, long-term loan program for the construction and renovation of the Nation's hospitals. Such a program will make possible the construction of many needed new hospitals as well as necessary and far-reaching improvements in many existing ones. The construction and renovation of hospitals can contribute in a most significant way to stimulate business activity and provide employment to substantial numbers of persons.

In the study of various proposals to combat recession and to encourage the stability and growth of the American economy, we particularly commend a loan program for construction and renovation of hospitals to the committee's attention. Such a program would have a more immediate impact on the national economy than might many other construction and renovation programs. The demands for services and the tremendous variety of goods which would be required would be more quickly reflected. These results are made possible—and more rapidly than would be the case in most other kinds of construction—because of the years of advanced planning in hospital construction and renovation that has taken place in the communities and States throughout the Nation.

Some extent of the needs of the Nation's hospitals may be seen from the following:

A recent survey report by the Public Health Service indicates that the need for general hospital beds alone, at present construction costs, averaging in excess of $17,000 per bed, would require the expenditure of over $3 billion.

A tremendous need exists for facilities to care for patients suffering from long-term illnesses, especially mental diseases where there is a shortage of 400,000 mental hospital beds.

There are also, according to Public Health Service reports, demands for over 300,000 hospital beds of other kinds.

Merely to keep pace with our rapidly growing population, about 30,000 additional hospital beds are needed each year.

A 1956 study made by this association, with the collaboration of the Public Health Service, found an accumulated backlog of need of $1 billion for renovation and modernization of our older hospitals. This study found, for example, that of 2634 hospitals reporting 435, or 1 in 6, were more than 50 years of age.

This same survey developed that of 1,303 hospitals reporting no need for renovation, 401 of them said that their buildings were too old to warrant the expenditure and that what they needed was to have the facility entirely replaced.

A recent intensive study made of New York City hospitals established that they had an acute need within that city alone for renovation work amounting to about $250 million.

Many of our over 50-year-old hospitals, particularly those in urban centers, suffer major loss of efficiency from their physical inadequacies. Based on an obsolescence factor of 2 percent of existing beds per year, approximately 9,500 general hospital beds ought to be replaced annually.

Every section of the country was found to have obsolete facilities, though the proportion differed greatly. Obsolescence, we may observe, is not merely a matter of age, nor is it just confined to the buildings. Rather it applies also to design and equipment. Rapid advances in medical techniques make many institutions inefficient despite the fact that they may have been constructed within the last decade.

The construction and renovation of hospitals would have far-reaching effects, greater in fact than most construction work. The demands for construction materials, particularly steel, heavy equipment and specialized hospital equipment would stimulate employment in production plants while local labor and suppliers would largely be called upon to do the actual construction and renovation work.

The association's survey, mentioned above, also disclosed that major repairs to utilities and mechanical equipment and the modernization and improvement of equipment and systems represented nearly half of the cost of the renovation work needed. Our survey did not include movable equipment. But an exhaustive study of these needs has been recently made by the Public Health Service, shedding further light on hospital requirements for equipment to make many of the latest advances in medical science available to the American people. The production of this equipment will assist materially in providing stability of employment to large numbers of workers. Additionally, the installation of all kinds of hospital equipment in the renovation and modernization of hospitals will require the services of many types of highly skilled workers.

In terms of the security of the country it is singularly important to keep our highly skilled workers at their specialties. America can ill afford to lose their skills. More importantly we may not in the event of crisis have time to retrain them or train new workers in such skills.

Hospital construction and renovation can then be seen to serve the purposes of stimulating and providing employment quickly in local communities, making business for local contractors and suppliers, sustaining production plants and keeping highly skilled workers in their specialties.

Several bills before this committee expanding the public loan program of the Community Facilities Administration, particularly H. R. 11474 introduced by you and H. R. 11272 introduced by Congresman ALBERT RAINS, makes possible the construction and renovation of public hospitals. We respectfully urge this committee in its action on these bills to make nonprofit private hospitals equally eligible for loans with public hospitals. The reasons for the inclusion of public hospitals in this program apply with like force to nonprofit hospitals. They include the following, among others:

1. Nonprofit hospitals render service to the American people as do the public hospitals.
2. Nonprofit hospitals care for large numbers of patients as do the public hospitals.
3. Both are community institutions financed and supported by their communities.
4. Both nonprofit and public hospitals are the center of our whole system of institutional care for the seriously ill.
5. Both carry large burdens in the provision of care for those persons who find themselves unable to pay.

There is no doubt that if private nonprofit hospitals did not exist State and local governments would have had to build public hospitals to perform the very services now provided by these nonprofit hospitals.

Another consideration which strongly supports the inclusion of nonprofit hospitals in a construction loan program to combat recession is the fact that they normally have greater difficulty than public agencies in borrowing funds from private sources and are compelled to pay higher rates of interest. This does not mean in

any way that hospitals are poor risks. In fact, the situation is quite the contrary. Many hospitals have proven to be good risks. Their financial integrity is a matter of broad community concern. But lending institutions tend to look with disfavor upon nonprofit hospitals principally because they are nonprofit institutions, and because of the one-purpose nature of their facilities.

Regular business rates are prohibitive to many hospitals because of the increase in the cost of patient care which they impose. Each percentage point of interest charged adds at least 50 to 75 cents and often more, to the cost for each patient each day. The time factor in the amortization of principal also effects per diem costs. The present 5¼ percent to 6 percent interest rates available in the commercial market means an increased cost for each patient each day of some $2.75 to $4.50, without adding cost for amortization of principal.

Funds from the hospital survey and construction program have been inadequate to meet a growing backlog of hospital needs. In fact, this program has left largely untouched the serious and rapidly growing need for renovation and modernization of our older hospitals. Since most of these older hospitals are in metropolitan areas, the growing deficiency of their physical plans is important to the total health picture not only because of the large population they serve, but also because they are the centers of medical research and professional training and exert influences which are felt throughout the Nation

The American Hospital Association believes that in expanding the loan program of the Community Facilities Administration the construction of new beds should not be made possible unless they are in accord with the State plan under the Hill-Burton program. We urge, therefore, that loans to non-profit or public hospitals calling for the addition of new beds be conditioned upon certification of need from the State Hill-Burton Agency. But where in renovation or modernization work no additional beds are called for, we do not feel that certification of need is necessary.

Under the Hill-Burton program the States have since 1946 determined what health facilities they need to provide adequate care to their population and where such facilities should be located. We believe this has been a most important factor in guarding against the building of unnecessary facilities, either public or nonprofit. The States have kept these plans up to date, and as a consequence, there is in existence an available body of knowledge reflecting where, what size, and what kind of health facilities are needed. We are confident that your committee desires to limit loans under the bill to needed projects. The existing State Hill-Burton plans furnish a ready-made test of utility.

To accomplish this objective we commen to the consideration of this committee the language adopted by the Senate in its action on S. 3497, "The Community Facilities Administration Act of 1958." That language reads as follows:

"No financial assistance shall be extended under this section for the construction, repair, or improvement of any public or nonprofit hospital involving an increase in the number of beds, or for the construction of any public health center, unless the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service finds, and certifies to the Administrator, that the project is in conformity with the applicable State plan approved under section 623 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C. 291 f)."

The American Hospital Association also urges that the interest rate in the program be reduced to the lowest practicable figure. As we understand it, the basic philosophy behind this bill is that it is an antirecession measure. The rate of interest charged, therefore, will very largely determine the use which can be made of the program and will affect the objectives which this committee has in mind. With the success of the program the Federal Government stands to benefit materially, through taxes and otherwise, from bolstering the economy of local communities and States and from stabilizing and increasing employment. It is difficult to envision any appreciable financial contribution on the part of the Federal Government if there should be insistence on a high rate of interest for this program. We note that Mr. Rain's bill, H. R. 11272, proposes the rate of 2 percent. That figure would clearly make this program more attractive.

In summary the American Hospital Association believes that a loan program for public and nonprofit hospitals, as is provided for in S. 3497, is desirable; and that the interest in such a program should be at the lowest practicable rate.

It would be deeply appreciated if you would incorporate this letter in the hearings of your committee.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH WILLIAMSON,
Associate Director.

The Air Force Mission and Capabilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, there are several kinds of survival—individual survival, family survival, and national survival. In this nuclear age, survival of all kinds is and should be the concern of all mankind. The world-conquest designs of communism, however, are strong indication that the Kremlin playboys might be willing to gamble international survival against Soviet world domination.

Survival of ourselves, our families, our country, and the world can be assured only by working for it. By working for it, I mean producing, creating, and maintaining the essentials of survival.

The United States Air Force is the primary essential of our survival. But more than that, survival and war deterrence are one and the same thing and deterrence of war is the Air Force mission.

The Air Force has grouped its weapons—its missiles and its aircraft—so that it can speedily apply long-range strategic forces or short-range tactical forces against any source which threatens our national survival. Local war or general war—and do not be mistaken, local war can easily lead to general war—the Air Force has the built-in forces to handle either or both.

These concepts, and others, are well described and defined in a speech recently made by Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force, before the annual convention of American Newspaper Publishers Association. I ask that the text of his speech be made part of the RECORD.

The address follows:

THE AIR FORCE MISSION AND CAPABILITIES

(Remarks by Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Vice Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, before the annual convention, American Newspaper Publishers Association, New York City, April 24, 1958)

You gentlemen know, and the Air Force knows, how vital your communications medium is to the national security.

My discussion is designed as background to your task of reporting the news and building better public understanding.

There is no audience more challenging, and probably none more knowledgeable. You can believe me when I say that the Air Force wants to be heard and understood. We, therefore, welcome the chance to appear before you.

The Air Force mission derives from the national strategy, including general war, lesser conflicts, and the cold war. This strategy is reflected in an agreed military concept which the armed services have translated into forces, weapons, and capabilities. Service missions are specific charges laid down as part of this method of achieving national objectives.

Briefly, the Air Force is charged with the employment of airpower in the national interest. With equal brevity, I can say that the Air Force can do this job today in all its variations.

We must, under our guidelines, contribute the primary force to the total United States effort to deter general war.

We must also provide for the air defense of the United States.

We have a significant responsibility, together with the other services, for deterrence or resolution of local aggression.

The Air Force has other responsibilities, ranging from the provision of airlift to the development of the first reconnaissance space vehicle.

These tasks require consideration of all possible activities in the airspace field. The activities of a possible enemy also must be considered.

This means that we must know the possible threat, assess it realistically, and help achieve so strong a posture as to deter the attempted application of enemy power against the United States.

There is no threat to the security of the United States that can remotely compare with the ever-present possibility of general war. Nuclear weapons and advanced delivery systems make general war a struggle for survival in near-absolute terms.

The military posture of the Soviet Union is a clear example of dedication to the development of overwhelming force. They have a large nuclear capability, modern and effective, backed up by sizable conventional forces. They can mount a two-sided offensive in peacetime. Their nuclear striking power can be used for atomic blackmail. Communist bloc conventional forces can be used as political pawns in lesser conflicts. These capabilities, supported by a controlled economy, give the U. S. S. R. a safe basis on which to argue the case against nuclear weapons.

Even while propagandizing against nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union retains a general war capability in nuclear striking power and declines to join in genuine steps designed to reduce that power on both sides under adequate safeguards.

This attitude and capability leave the threat of general war a very real one in my mind.

The general war I speak of may come as an outgrowth of local conflict. Since the U. S. S. R. would sacrifice any subsequent element of surprise, this case seems less likely than the possibility that general war will begin with a surprise attack. In either event, the issue is nothing less than survival.

You will wonder, perhaps, whether this threat is on the wane.

Various supporting reasons for this idea have been advanced—including the fact that relative nuclear parity will be a constraint on general war. There is constraint on general war, and in fact on all conflict, when nuclear weapons are clearly understood to be involved. But this constraint, derived from nuclear capability, is a far cry from being mutual deterrence. Let me elaborate briefly on this issue.

Life insurance does not eliminate the threat of death; it is a provision to ensure family survival. The prudent man does not assume immunity to disease just because he pays his policy premiums regularly.

Preparedness does not eliminate the threat of general war; it is a provision to ensure national survival. The prudent nation does not assume immunity to general war just because of regular payments for preparedness.

This is not to say that general war, like death, is inevitable.

General war is, however, inevitable for any nation in the path of Communist bloc ambitions and unable to achieve a deterrent posture alone, or in combination with others determined to stay free. General war is death for the nation that cannot provide or share, in the event deterrence fails, some measure of survival during and after the decisive phase.

The Air Force believes in deterrence. We do not, however, believe in the false security that derives from believing in the myth of mutual deterrence. In our view there is no similarity between the United States and the Communist bloc when it comes to the use of aggression as a national instrument. We will not enter into conflict except in defense of ourselves or the free world. The Communist bloc will aggress whenever and wherever the opportunity looks profitable. We did not aggress while possessing nuclear monopoly nor with clear superiority; they are under no such moral restraint should they achieve nuclear superiority.

As to deterrence, there is no more transitory state in world affairs than that of stalemate. The human impulse is for change and improvements. Stalemate is a natural enemy of progress, even progress in warfare. Our probable enemy is a believer in progress—in fact he is a demonstrated success at it.

The general war threat was never at a lower ebb than when the United States possessed an atomic monopoly. It was at a low ebb when the United States possessed atomic superiority. With every passing day the general war threat is increasing simply because the Soviet Union, who believes in aggression, is achieving a general war capability where none existed before. Their progress is marked and their confidence is real. Where before they had no capability for general war, today they have a nuclear stockpile, 25,000 operational aircraft, and a strong scientific and technical research and development program. The danger of general war is on the increase as these capabilities are moulded to fit their desire for world domination.

The Air Force is dedicated to deterring war. We see this as a savage uphill battle. It is a day-in, year-out struggle to maintain a deterrent posture in pace with new techniques and developments, some of which are the object of tremendous and successful efforts by the Soviet Union.

At the same time we are confronted with U. S. S. R.-induced weaknesses and diversions on the world scene which are aimed at undermining our best capabilities.

The primary threat we must deter is an air or an airspace onslaught. We must assume that it would be delivered with every particle of the enemy's strength. It would recognize no moral or physical bounds.

This means the maintenance of a safeguarded and responsive deterrent force. This force must be able to deliver such punishment as will convince an enemy that aggression represents an absolutely unacceptable risk. It must do more than this. If an enemy is not convinced of this risk or if our determination, then this force must so act as to curtail his ability to destroy us or to capitalize on his initial attack.

We must face this situation realistically. We must be prepared to take the lethal element of the Soviet striking power, represented today by his air forces and their supporting structure, under direct and effective attack. The alternative is to suffer not only the first blow but subsequent blows. The nation which emerges from the initial, decisive phase of general war with a residual capability—with a populace able to work at survival and reconstruction without interference—will have the essentials of survival.

The United States must, therefore, maintain a force which can present the prospect of an unacceptable exchange in general war, concurrent with the ability to use a residual capability to maintain the initial advantage.

This is precisely why the Secretary of Defense has named, as the first of our essential military needs, the existence of a powerful nuclear retaliatory force.

The Air Force has the primary role in this task. The Air Force today has this capability.

The essentials of this capability involve the fundamental attributes of airpower—the speedy application of adequate force against the source of the strength which threatens the national security.

The Air Force has grouped the weapons—missiles and aircraft—to apply this principle into the long-range strategic forces and the shorter range tactical forces.

That these forces are the primary deterrent is apparent when you consider that between them they would be called upon to deliver 90 percent or more of the decisive United States retaliatory effort.

We must maintain this capability in the future and project it into space as the advances of science and technology permit.

There are practical essentials to the immediate preservation of this capability.

It must, first of all, be instantly ready to react in response to the national decision to do so.

It must be secure.

Finally, it must be able to get to the target and destroy it.

These three requirements involve many details of which I will mention only these:

First, the force must be highly motivated, trained, and equipped.

Second, the logistic and communications systems built into the force must be highly effective and in operation all day every day.

Third, the force must be made secure from a knockout blow. The security we seek for the strategic forces is no simple matter of going underground. We must look for improved warning, we must disperse the force and are doing so, and we must harden bases. No one of these produces a secure force—a combination of them can do a great deal. In addition, we are keeping the force on an alert status, ready to launch yet so controlled as to secure from false alarm.

Next, the force must have every possible advantage in skilled personnel and adequate equipment to guarantee that once launched it can do its job.

Involved in the technical side of this process are decoy devices and electronic countermeasures. We are also seeking to avoid the penetration of heavily defended targets by using air-to-surface missiles with nuclear warheads for launching at some distance from the target. This process can have no end, since this force must be constantly modernized, improved, and recast as the state of the art and the enemy threat continue to change. However great, this is a small price to pay for deterrence of a war of survival.

One aspect looms over all others, yet is commonly ignored or taken for granted.

To be responsive to the national will, the strategic force, and in fact all other forces, must be instantly responsive to the highest authority. Only when such forces are, in fact, unified and integrated under single control can this be achieved.

It has been said that if World War II was a war of production, then the next struggle will be a war of organization.

Organization, the framework within which control is exercised, is a deciding feature of the composition of the nuclear retaliatory force. When a nation can combine speed, power, and control, then it has at hand the essential elements of an adequate military force.

We have this force today.

As strategic missiles enter the picture, we will augment our force with these weapons. When we learn more about them and prove them out as effective weapons, strategic missiles will replace a portion of our piloted forces. However, as far into the future as I can see, I feel we will have integrated forces of both piloted and unpiloted systems. In this way we will be able to exploit the best features of each. Among the missiles systems which the strategic forces will use are:

The Snark, a long-range missile with a current capability.

The Thor and Jupiter, both intermediate-range ballistic missiles.

The Atlas soon and later the Titan, both intercontinental ballistic missiles.

In this connection, there is in the offing a new ballistic missile system of startling potential. This system, called Minuteman, can provide an entire family of missiles in quantity and quality, ranging from a theater ballistic missile to an ICBM, at an acceptable cost.

Minuteman is the first real sign I have seen of the breakthrough in missiles. It shows clear promise of making possible a major change in the aircraft-missile mixture. The Air Force is striving to achieve this promise, and this system looks like the right answer.

Development of Improved piloted systems also continues. The B–58, the first supersonic bomber to achieve operational status, will replace a portion of the present B–47 force. Another addition in the near future, designed to preserve the flexibility inherent in piloted weapon systems, will be the B–70. This system will be chemically propelled and should achieve 2,000 miles per hour.

It will be followed by a nuclear-powered aircraft of tremendous range and endurance. Development of this vehicle may give us a permanent airborne alert force.

Thus far I have been discussing the strategic forces. Grouped alongside them are the tactical forces at home and deployed overseas.

This also is a mixed force, today, with both aircraft and missiles. Tactical forces around the world can react with speed, selective weapons, and advanced penetration techniques. They can in fact put atomic weapons of other weapons down at ranges up to 1,000 miles and speeds over 800 miles per hour. These forces are deployed throughout the free world. Their location, dispersal, and rapid nuclear response makes them a real problem to a potential enemy. They are, at the same time, visible evidence of United States determination to deter and resist aggression outside as well as inside our own borders, and hence serve to strengthen the status of our allies.

The maintenance of these forces in a ready state of high effectiveness involves factors paralleling those bearing on the strategic forces.

There are equipping, manning, and allied problems, including reaction time, protection, and the provision of warning.

We have made slower progress with the modernization of the tactical force but new and improved aircraft, such as the F–104 and F–105 are about to enter the tactical inventory. The Air Force has had a tactical missile—the Matador—in operational and deployed status for a considerable time. We are now introducing an improved version of the Matador, called the Mace, which is an advanced surface-to-surface guided missile.

It is apparent that neither the strategic nor the tactical forces provide a direct air defense for the United States. They are, however, the essential element of our defensive posture in that they represent a powerful deterrent to any form of conflict. There is, just the same, the need for active defensive forces.

This is the second category of forces to which the Secretary of Defense has referred—the forces with which we can defend ourselves from attack, particularly air attack.

As with offensive forces, there are essential characteristics to look for when examining defensive forces.

Basically these are:

First, the warning system incorporated in these forces. We need the earliest possible warning to institute civil defense procedures and to launch our retaliatory force. The need to get warning as far away as possible has caused the United States and our Canadian partners to construct the Dew Line and the Mid-Canada Radar Lines in the north. The Navy has established radar patrols in the Atlantic and Pacific with airborne and seaborne early warning units. Offshore radars have been built into Texas Towers; a unified radar network has been built within our borders.

The entire air defense system, active and passive, has been brought into close knit organizational unity in an international military organization, the North American Air Defense Command, in close cooperation with Canada. You will note that already in this discussion there appears this vital link between the defensive and offensive force.

Second, defensive forces must carry out their function so that they do not deny us the use of our own airspace. They must defend so that our retaliatory forces can move to their missions, so that our bases and cities are protected before the enemy can get over them. The kind of defense we need is rapid and far-reaching repsonse to attack, extending beyond the hemisphere and eventually into space.

You will note that there is a similarity between the retaliatory striking force and the defense force. They are keyed to the same problem, they are mutually supporting and interdependent. The Air Force has a primary responsibility fn both of these vital security areas. We have developed a system of control and coordination designed to mold these forces into an integrated operation—any artificial division between them would be counterproductive.

Before leaving the Air Force's air-defense mission, I mention the pressing and probably decisive defense problem of providing a defense against ballistic missiles. The Army and the Air Force have the task of providing ballistic-missile defense under current plans. The development of the detection capability is well underway in current programs. The study of the active defense weapon system is progressing rapidly—but the problems involved are such that no proposed system can be said to now warrant the ultimate go-ahead.

There remains the third mission for military forces as described by the Secretary of Defense—mobile, versatile forces which, with the aid of our allies, can deal with situations short of general war.

The Air Force general war forces contain built-in local war strength. Deployed forces, tactical and strategic, can perform local war missions with speed, power, and finesse.

The real deterrent to local conflict of any significant nature is the availability of nuclear firepower in support of free-world forces. It is the Air Force view that the manifest determination and ability to apply adequate firepower are fundamental to deterrence.

The Air Force is interested in the local war problem and has studied it with great intensity in recent years. We have examined local war from the standpoint of likelihood, the conditions apt to prevail, and the dangers involved in the conflicts themselves.

We note that local wars are frequent, and have always been so. There are air-power tasks involved in local wars, and there is a particular demand for the control of hostile air forces. Finally, it is obvious that local wars can lead to larger conflicts. As we move through this examination we see no insurmountable difficulties and we always come face to face with the real problem.

Local war can lead to general war.

It appears, therefore, that we have gone full circle back to the beginning of this discussion when I said that general war is the primary threat to United States security.

Our general war capability is our general war deterrence. It is the existence of this same general war capability, not any lesser provision, which makes it possible to fight local war. Without the general war capability, any conflict, local or general, would be an automatic victory for the aggressor.

The Air Force believes local war can be deterred. But if deterrence fails, for whatever reason, and United States forces are required, then local war requires the prompt and decisive application of adequate force to end hostilities before they can spread.

To this end the Air Force has, and will, maintain a local war posture of significant capability. This posture can, in conjunction with that of the other services and our allies, make the United States response to local war adequate to the demands of the situation.

You will appreciate that in this brief talk I have not attempted to cover ether Air Force missions and capabilities. I have nŏt mentioned the airlift forces, the Reserve forces, and other essential elements of the Air Force mission in the interest of brevity.

Similarly, I have not mentioned the capabilities of the other United States services. The presence of Army and Navy spokesmen here makes this unnecessary. This is not to say, however, that the Air Force in any way minimizes the effective capabilities inherent in other service forces.

As a closing note, I return to the problem of deterrence of conflict today and in the future.

I am sure you will agree that the United States determination to deter conflict is clear, even to potential enemies. At the same time we have made it obvious that we will prevail ff conflict is thrust upon us.

The free world depends on this determination for its survival.

The force on which we depend today is the nuclear striking power we have labored so long and hard to build.

There are those who would cast doubt upon our determination to come to the defense of our friends and allies with nuclear weapons if necessary.

The Secretary of State pinpointed this problem recently when he indicated that our allies desire "to have greater assurance" that the defensive power of nuclear weapons will in fact be used to aid them.

The Air Force believes that deterrence requires more than armed force. There must be a manifest determination to use this force if need be.

While seeking peaceful avenues of approach to the resolution of tension, we must not cast doubt on our deterrent posture. The search for resolution without conflict can only succeed so long as conflict is effectively deterred.

Our present military air capability is the dominant deterrent force in the world today. The Air Force believes that it will suffice to make good our commmitments. The Air Force is determined to keep this capability fit and responsive to the national will.

It is natural at this point to wonder about the future.

Air Force research and development is now striving for the swift adaptation of current military power to the space age. We have a solid basis for work in this area, with pioneer efforts in the missile field as the foundation. We are looking to space flight, piloted and unpiloted, as the eventual, but by no means the ultimate, achievement. Work on the X–15, an initial entry into the space flight problem, is progressing and we expect to fly this vehicle in 1959. At the same time reconnaissance from space is around the corner. The transition to space operations will be difficult but there is every reason to accept it as being inevitable and timely.

From all of this there is a conclusion I would draw to leave with you.

In these efforts which the Air Force and the other services are making to meet mission demands, we need your active understanding and support. To this end, the Air Force welcomes your attention and your comments, now and in the future.

Islam and Its Culture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the Moslem religion is certainly one of the world's great faiths. Closely allied with it is the whole culture and way of life of Islam.

This was most eloquently pointed out in a speech delivered by Madame Moussa Al-Shabandar before the Capital Speakers Club at the Westchester on May 20, 1958. Madame Al-Shabandar is the wife of the Honorable Moussa Al-Shabandar, who until recently served so ably here as Ambassador of Iraq. Believing that this speech will be of very wide interest, I include it herewith:

ISLAM AND ITS CULTURE

One of the most beautiful buildings and perhaps the most unusual looking structure in Washington is the Mosque. It is unusual in Washington but anywhere in the Moslem world it would be a common sight. Since its opening the Islamic Center, as they call it in Washington, has become one of the prime tourist attractions and one of the outstanding landmarks of the Capital.

To really understand what the structure stands for, one has to study the building, and also understand the religion it represents.

In the opening of the seventh century, Europe was in the dark ages. Religion, morals, cultures, philosophy, and learning, were at their lowest degree. At the same time, Arabia was in darkness too. Life and property were insecure because of absence of real organized government. There were only family and tribal pacts which helped to keep a little order and to maintain a rough balance. Nobody thought in these dark ages

that salvation will come from the Arabian desert. But this is what happened. A solitary voice was heard calling people to worship one God and proclaiming that in response to this call, mankind will have honor and dignity. The voice of the prophet Mohammed was received with scorn and laughter because the oneness of God infuriated the Arabs who worshipped many gods made of stone or dates, when hungry.

In spite of persecution and scorn, Mohammed continued his call though his life and the lives of his followers were in danger. He and his followers fled from Mecca. Then he was forced to fight in defense of the freedom of conscience which he preached.

Mohammed was a real leader and a statesman. The wisdom he showed in judging difficult cases, with the Qur'an, became the basis for religious law which governs Islam today. He established a religion dedicated to one God. The Qur'an states, "Allah the Creator, the Maker, the Fashioner, whatever in heaven and earth declares his glory and He is the mighty, the wise."

It was this call which swept away all the idols and inspired men and nations to change their way of life. In later years the revelation from God dealt with the organization of society, its laws, procedures, and problems.

Mohammed was a great reformer and established social justice. Among drunkards he abolished alcoholism. Among lazy people he ordered individual prayer five times a day; and in a nation which was in constant feasting he ordered a daytime fast from dawn till after sunset, for one month. He raised woman's position from bondage and abolished the desert custom of burying little girls. The Qur'an speaks of the relationship between man and woman as one of mutual affection and compassion. The prophet recommended the loving care and kindly treatment of women. Islam recognized woman as an independent being. The Moslem law gives her complete power over what she possesses and could dispose of it freely. She is a guardian over minors. She has the right for divorce and the marriage contract assures her security if divorced by her husband. A man cannot dispose of more than one third of his property by will so that woman can never be entirely dispossessed.

The first convert was a woman Khadijah, the prophet's wife, a woman of noble birth and great wealth. She offered her hand to Mohammed when he was a youth, at the beginning of his mission. Other women helped in propagating the faith and some distinguished themselves in religious studies.

An Italian author likened the rapid spread of Islam to an abundant spring of water which became a creek, then a river, and finally it overflowed and broke into channels. Islam spread all over Arabia, soon it triumphed in Syria, Egypt, Persia, lower Russia, reached India, China, Malaya, Indonesia, and even the Philippines, and on the other side from Egypt across north Africa, then covered all Spain and reached southern France.

What was the power behind all this?

1. The Qur'an and its teachings.

The revelations of God that came to the prophet were compiled into this Qur'an. This book is unique in the combination of the dedication to one God, plus down to earth practical instructions. It says, "When ye deal with each other in transactions involving future obligations, reduce them to writings and get two witnesses so that if one errs, the other can remind him."

In addition to the Qur'an, Islam relies upon traditions that is what the prophet said and did. The prophet loved to pray with a congregation so our congregational prayer is taken from the traditions. Till now the Moslems and Arabs greet each other with the traditional salutation, "Peace be with you."

Some of the traditions influenced western behavior. One day the prophet saw a donkey being branded on the face. When the owner was asked why this was being done, he said, "The Romans taught us this to prevent theft." The prophet after reflection answered, "An animal's face is the most sensitive part of his body. If you must brand, do it on the flank where the flesh is thicker" and from then on the custom spread.

Another secret of the spread of Islam is its simplicity. A Moslem does five things.

1. He has to believe in and say "there is no god but God and Mohammed is his prophet."

2. A Moslem must pray five times a day. The reason for this is not only to be reminded of God, but also an exercise for the lazy. The reason that all Moslems take off their shoes on entering the Mosque and put their heads on the floor is to emphasize one of Islam's important teachings, that all men are equal.

3. A Moslem must fast 1 month every year. If he cannot do it for health reasons, he should pay a poor man a day's meal for each day.

4. A Moslem should pay 2 percent of his fortune to the poor every year.

5. A Moslem must go to the Holy Mecca to the pilgrimage, at least once in his life. This might be likened to the gathering of the United Nations because Moslems from all over the world come to the pilgrimage at the same time. This is not only a religious gathering, but serves to unify them.

Islam does not profess to be a new religion, but a continuation of Judaism and Christianity. The Qur'an contains part of the Old and the New Testaments. The Holy Book contains the revelation to all the prophets. We Moslems believe that Jesus and Moses are prophets of God. But Mohammed does not mean to Moslem what Christ means to Christians. We worship only God and Mohammed is only a prophet to us. This is why Moslems object to being called Mohammedans. The word Islam means submission to God.

When Mohammed's son died, an eclipse of the moon took place, so people said this is God's condolences to Mohammed. Mohammed said, "An eclipse is a phenomenon of nature. It is foolish to attribute such things to the birth or death of a human being."

At Mohammed's death his followers tried to make a deity of him, but his administrative successor dispelled the idea by one of the noblest speeches in religious history, "If there are any among you who worshipped Mohammed, he is dead. But if it was God you worshipped, He lives forever.

There are no miracles in Islam and no clergy. Every Moslem has the right to communicate with God directly according to his religious feelings and needs. When there is no mosque, a Moslem can pray in a church, in a synagogue, in his home, in the desert, on a horse, anywhere.

The Quar'an teaches equality and indiscrimination. It says, "O ye people verily, we have created you from a male and a female and have distributed you into nations and tribes that ye may know one another. Verily, the most honorable of ye in the sight of God is the most pious." This passage is significant because it is directed to mankind and not only to Moslems.

The Qur'an commands and recommends tolerance to the people of the Book, that is to the Christians and Judaists, in a time when toleration was a synonym for cowardice.

The sentence of the Qur'an that raised and revolutionized the life in Arabia is this "Read, in the name of the Lord who created man from a clot of congealed blood." This made Moslems and Arabs seek knowledge and spread it. Islam not only accepted and adopted all the scientific theories, but encouraged every Moslem to learn and study as much as he can. Mohammed said, "Seek learning even in China." And that was at a time when other religions considered philosophy, geography, medicine, and astronomy as witchcraft which should be avoided, and books, except the holy ones, to be burned and destroyed.

A Christian author said, "It is to the eternal glory of Islam that it succeeded for the first time in the history of the human thought in harmonizing and reconciling monotheism with Greek philosophy, the greatest contribution of the ancient Indo-European world. Islam thus led Christian Europe toward a modern point of view. To the Moslem thinkers Aristotle was truth, Plato was truth, and the Qur'an was truth.

Because of this new conception in religion almost all Moslem leaders were highly educated, learned men, like Averoes in Arab Spain and Avicenna in Baghdad were philosophers, physicians, astronomers, and theologians.

Ladies, this is what the mosque in Washington represents: Brotherhood, a practical good life, democracy, and tolerance. This same tolerance and democracy was practiced by President Eisenhower on June 28, 1957, when formally he dedicated the mosque. Before his speech, the President and Mrs. Eisenhower toured the mosque. Although slippers were provided to them they walked in stockings on the Persian rugs. In his speech the President said, "I should like to assure my Islamic friends that under the American Constitution, under the American tradition and in American hearts, this center is just as welcome as could be a similar edifice of any other religion. Indeed America would fight with her whole strength for your right to have here your own church and worship according to your own conscience. There will be a broader understanding and a deeper respect for the worth of all men and stronger resolution to work together for the good of mankind."

To me a Moslem, this is not only a monument of worship, but it is a symbol of the long friendship and mutual cooperation between the United States and the nations of Islam.

It is beautiful not only because of its structure, but more because of its symbolic character. To me it is a monument of the United States belief in religious freedom and a living symbol of alliance between the crescent and the cross.

Who Cashes in on Drainage Subsidies?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, there are now pending before various committees of the Congress several bills intended to resolve, or at least reduce, existing conflicts between the federally aided farm drainage program and other Federal programs to protect our Nation's water resources and to conserve our waterfowl and wildlife resources.

There is not the slightest doubt that the Department of Agriculture's farm drainage program, as administered un-

der existing law, has in many cases worked directly counter to the best interests of wildlife, water, and even soil conservation. The farm drainage program has already destroyed nearly one-third of the Nation's finest migratory waterfowl breeding grounds, in Minnesota and the Dakotas. It has depleted water reservoirs and undoubtedly lowered water tables in many areas. It has contributed to soil erosion by hastening runoff.

I do not contend that the entire farm drainage program is harmful. But I do contend that where proposed farm drainage collides head on with conservation interests, farm drainage should not automatically prevail. Put another way, where the Department of Agriculture comes into conflict with the Department of the Interior, Agriculture should not be declared the winner even before the battle starts. That, however, is the present situation.

One approach to correct this situation is contained in 4 bills—S. 2496 by Senator WATKINS, of Utah; H. R. 8631, by Mr. METCALF, of Montana; H. R. 8747, by myself; H. R. 9053, by Mr. DIXON, of Utah—which would give the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the Secretary of the Interior an opportunity to review and make recommendations on proposed drainage projects with a view to preventing damage to wildlife resources.

Another and more far-reaching corrective approach is proposed in H. R. 10641 and H. R. 10642, introduced by myself and Mr. MCGOVERN of South Dakota. These bills would (a) cut off Federal assistance for farm drainage projects in cases where the Secretary of the Interior finds that wildlife preservation will be materially harmed by the proposed drainage; and (b) amend the Soil Bank Act to provide that farmers can be paid, under the conservation-reserve program, for maintaining their wetlands instead of draining them.

Of course it might be expected that the Department of Agriculture, or at least some persons in that Department, would oppose both of these legislative approaches, because they would restrict the free-wheeling, uncontrolled farm drainage program by requiring that more than lip service—be paid to conservation interests.

But there are other private and special interest groups who badly want the farm drainage program to roll on unimpeded, regardless of damage done to wildlife, and water resources, because they look upon the program simply as a profit-maker for themselves.

One such special interest in the case of farm drainage was exposed in a recent issue of Conservation News, the publication of the National Wildlife Federation.

In an article titled "Who Cashes in on Drainage Subsidies?" this publication stated:

> In the case of farm drainage it is the manufacturers of bulldozers, draglines and other heavy, earth-moving equipment.

And Conservation News then substantiated that statement by reprinting a widely circulated letter from one of these ditching machinery manufacturers—Gar Wood Industries, Inc.—urging all persons interested in farm drainage to express their opposition to all bills that would make conservation sense out of the farm drainage program.

Mr. Speaker, in answer to the questions of who cashes in on drainage subsidies, and who supports virtually uncontrolled Federal farm drainage programs at the expense of conservation, I submit a portion of the Conservation News article and the Gar Wood Industries letter, which eloquently speaks for itself.

(The article and letter follow:)

WHO CASHES IN ON DRAINAGE SUBSIDIES?

In the case of farm drainage it is the manufacturers of bulldozers, draglines and other heavy, earth-moving equipment. Some soil conservation districts are trying desperately to pay out on ditching machinery that slick salesmen talked them into buying on time. Understandably the district officers panic when someone mentions cutting off the drainage subsidies.

Recently conservation news came by an interesting document that throws a good deal of light on the situation. It is a letter, reprinted below, that was sent to soil conservation district leaders in the Dakotas—and probably in many other States—by a corporation that manufactures big, and expensive, ditching machinery. S. 2496 and companion bills mentioned in Mr. Davis' letter are the proposed amendments to the Coordination Act that have been recommended by Secretary of the Interior Seaton. This legislation has been endorsed by the National Wildlife Federation and many other conservation organizations. The facts reported by Mr. Davis are distorted or downright untrue—but his purpose is to frighten farm leaders into opposing the bill.

H. R. 10641 and H. R. 10642, also opposed by the dragline makers, are the Reuss and McGovern bills to eliminate ACP payments for draining marshes that are valuable for wildlife and to substitute soil bank payments to farmers for retaining such wetlands.

GAR WOOD INDUSTRIES, INC.,
Findlay, Ohio, April 1, 1958.

Urgent message to all persons interested in farm drainage:

There are now several bills before the House of Representatives and Senate which could—if passed—inflict serious handicaps on all drainage programs in the United States.

Here are some of the facts about these bills:

The proposed legislation would give the Department of the Interior power to control the Department of Agriculture's drainage policies. This legislation, promoted by wildlife interests, is very vague about how restrictions on drainage would be imposed. But it adds up to this: The Fish and Wildlife Division of the Department of the Interior would exercise control of drainage outlets whenever technical assistance or funds from any Federal agency were connected with such drainage—thereby restricting or controlling a great amount of private drainage needing such outlets.

We have no argument with those who argue for the preservation of our wildlife resources—but we do know that legislation such as this is too awkward to accomplish anything without seriously crippling our country's progressive farm drainage program.

It is imperative, for the preservation of your own interests, that you write or telegraph both your congressional and senatorial representatives and vigorously object to this legislation. When you write, be sure and refer to this legislation accurately. The Watkins bill, the one with the great likelihood of passing (unless you raise your voice), is formally known as:

Senate bill S. 2496 and House of Representative companion bills H. R. 8631, H. R. 8747, H. R. 9053.

Other legislation, even more restrictive—though without too much possibility of passing—should also be referred to by you in your correspondence. This is known as House of Representative bills H. R. 10642 and identical bill H. R. 10641.

There is no time to waste. Your future is at stake right now. Write, wire, or telegraph your Representatives and Senators today.

Very truly yours,

D. J. DAVIS,
General Sales Manager, Construction Machinery.

The Watkins Case Reflects Misunderstanding of Congressional Procedures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD today correspondence which I received from the St. Louis Civil Liberties Committee which contains a plea for limitations on the Un-American Activities Committee. I was quite disturbed with the thesis behind this plea because I feel it is grounded in error. There has been so much misunderstanding about the Watkins case that I feel it important that we take another look at it and for this reason I place in the RECORD my reply.

The correspondence follows:

ST. LOUIS CIVIL LIBERTIES COMMITTEE,
St. Louis, Mo., February 3, 1958.

Mr. TOM CURTIS,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: In view of decisions by the United States Supreme Court concerning the investigating power of congressional committees we urge that you and other members of the Missouri delegation take early leadership for revocation of the mandate of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The Supreme Court, by its decision in the Watkins case, has made plain the illegality of the resolution creating the Committee on Un-American Activities. The committe is instructed to investigate "un-American propaganda activities." As the Court said in the Watkins case, "Who can define the meaning of un-American"? In addition to this fatal vagueness, "propaganda" as such—speaking and writing is and of itself, whether its source and however offensive to Congress and the public—is not a matter under the first amendment concerning which Congress can constitutionally legislate. Therefore, this area is excluded from congressional investigation. Investigation of propaganda cannot be saved merely by calling it an investigation of "activities."

The American Civil Liberties Union has never contested the right of Congress to investigate in legitimate areas of its authority, although we have emphasized that such investigations should be conducted with due regard for the right of individuals. We are as deeply concerned as any Member of Congress that the Constitution, and the demo-

cratic society it protects, shall not be subverted.

The experience of the last 2 decades makes clear to us however, that establishment of a separate legislative committee for the sole purpose of investigating matters of internal security almost automatically brings by-products destructive of civil liberties and produces little in the way of effective results. If the responsibility for investigation of internal security problems is returned to an established committee experienced in examining into the enforcement and adequacy of the Federal criminal laws, such as the House Judiciary Committee, it is our conviction that investigations relating to the security of the Nation will be far more likely to proceed in a responsible, efficient manner calculated to respect basic individual rights and at the same time produce practical results rather than eye-catching headlines.

In addition to these recommendations, we wish to call your attention to another difficulty concerning not only the Committee on Un-American Activities but congressional investigating committees generally. This is the problem of the witness who is unable to determine, before criminal prosecution what would be the consequences of his decision to challenge a committee's right to ask him certain questions. Fortunately, H. R. 259, proposed by Congressman KEATING and adopted by the House Judiciary Committee would alleviate this problem.

This bill would authorize congressional committees to apply to a Federal district court to pass upon the propriety of a question which a witness has refused to answer. If the court found the question proper, it would order the witness to answer. Under this procedure a witness would have the opportunity to raise all defenses—first amendment, lack of authorization, impertinence, etc.—and obtain a judicial determination of the committee's right to ask the question before facing a criminal prosecution. The Keating bill suggests what might prove to be one of the most significant safeguards yet proposed against investigative abuse, and has the union's support.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL B. GUZE, M. D., *Chairman.*

MAY 19, 1958.

Mr. HUSTON SMITH,
Department of Philosophy,
Washington University,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. SMITH: Thank you very much for your letter of May 5, 1958, in which you state that "you received from the St. Louis Civil Liberties Committee a letter * * * protesting against the Committee on Un-American Activities and the way it has ignored the Watkins decision." I am happy that you enclosed a copy of this letter as I have checked my files and find no record of ever having received it. Because we receive a hundred letters a day in this office, it is entirely possible that it was mislaid, however, this rarely occurs. Under the circumstances I would appreciate your checking to be certain this letter dated February 3, 1958, according to your copy, was actually placed in the mail.

I am happy to reply to this letter and to your letter of May 5, 1958. I am deeply disturbed by the tone of the letters and the obvious misunderstanding of what the Watkins case decided and the apparent unfamiliarity with congressional procedures.

I have publicly criticized the Watkins case ever since it was handed down by the Supreme Court primarily on the basis of its unscholarly approach to a serious problem affecting the Nation. There is ample room for disagreement between judges and lawyers about what decision should be reached in particular cases, but there is little room for disagreement about decisions which, on their face, show a lack of scholarly study, of the subject at hand. The Watkins case shows such an ignorance of congressional procedure that one can only conclude it came from a failure to have made a study of congressional procedure. Regrettably the decision not only reflects ignorance, which is bad enough; it deliberately misstates facts in some instances and in other instances omits important facts.

In my judgment the Watkins case strikes a new low in legal scholarship on the part of the United States Supreme Court. Having said this, I want to go on to state that in my judgment two wrongs do not make a right and accordingly, I have openly opposed the recent attempts on the part of the Congress to limit the jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court. In other words, I am opposed to the Jenner bill, even as modified.

It is my belief that the basis of civil liberties rests in the maxim that society must be ruled by laws and not by men. The basic structure of the laws of our society is set out in the United States Constitution. The Constitution provides the method for amending it, if at any time the society feels it needs amendment. In spite of the provisions for amendment certain people being so impatient in getting certain things done which they think should be done for the welfare of our society, finding the Constitution blocking their desires, undertake to subvert the Constitution instead of amending it. I am satisfied that the majority of the present members of the Supreme Court generally adhere to the philosophy of amending the Constitution by subverting the English language rather than by amending the Constitution in accordance with the clear cut provisions for amendment. I criticize them greatly for this philosophy. On the other hand, I am convinced that the only way in which the Constitution or any form of government can be followed is through the self-discipline exercised by the individuals who are entrusted with power. So the only manner in which the Congress in pursuit of most of its powers can be restrained to follow constitutional government is through self-discipline. The same is true of the executive and the judiciary. An attempt by either of the three branches of Government to attempt to discipline the other is bound to undermine the very system of Government.

If the Congress wishes to discipline the Supreme Court it should do so through a proposed constitutional amendment. If the Supreme Court wishes to discipline the Congress it should do so as individual citizens by suggesting that the people propose a constitutional amendment. And so if the Executive wishes to discipline either of the two coequal arms of Government he should resort to constitutional amendment.

It comes as strange philosophy from a group which proclaims itself interested in civil liberties to advocate government by men rather than government by law. Because your group does not like what the Congress has done apparently it would encourage the Supreme Court to disregard self-discipline and seek to encroach on the powers of the Congress. I may presume that if the Supreme Court happened to do something your group disliked such as the Dred Scott decision you would propose the reverse procedure and urge the Congress to disregard self-discipline and seek to encroach on the powers of the Court. In other words, it isn't procedure your group is concerned with but specific results. Procedure is government by law; specific results is government by men. I believe every civil-liberties group should have this fundamental belief, embedded in its own constitution.

The letter of February 3, 1958, states "The Supreme Court, by its decision in the Watkins case, has made plain the illegality of the resolution creating the Committee on Un-American Activities." Bad as the Watkins case is, it is not that bad. Nowhere in the decision does the Court state that the resolution creating the Committee on Un-American Activities is illegal. The most that it says is that the resolution is not sufficiently specific to authorize the committee to ask certain questions of a witness.

The Supreme Court in its discussion of delegation of powers by the Congress as a whole to its various committees is completely unaware of the history of the Congress. The oldest committee of the House is the Ways and Means Committee. This committee like most of the committees has never received any clear mandate of its jurisdiction. In fact, it can truthfully be stated that powers and jurisdictions of congressional committees are almost entirely a development of custom and tradition. This is true in spite of the attempt to define somewhat the scope of committee powers and activities in the reorganization of the Congress. Incidentally, the reorganization of the Congress was done by the Congress itself and required no concurrence on the part of the executive branch of the Government. If the Congress wished to operate under no rules of procedure at all it could do so.

However, the Un-American Activities Committee was set up with considerable more formality than any other committee of the House. Its rules of procedure are probably the most exacting of any committee in either the House or the Senate. (I might state that when I was first assigned to the Joint Economic Committee in the 83d Congress I was shocked to find that this committee had no rules of procedure whatever. After several months of fussing with the chairman of the committee, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, he appointed me on a subcommittee of two to write the rules. This was done and these rules were adopted in 1955, almost 10 years after the committee had been operating.)

The Supreme Court in the Watkins decision shows a complete ignorance of the history of congressional procedure and the manner in which congressional committees operated in the past and in the present. If it looks for formal delegation of authority from the parent group of its committees as is done in the executive branch it will have to look a long time. This is not done and actually would interefere with proper congressional functioning if it were done. The Supreme Court is naive in trying to make the point that * * * "it is evident that the preliminary control of the committee exercised by the House is slight or nonexistent." It is also making a completely false statement. Every committee must make reports to the House and must come to the House for money to operate. Any committee that goes beyond the bounds of what the House wants is called to task pretty quickly. Actually the Un-American Activities Committee has done what no other committee has done, it has insisted that its authorization and appropriation of funds be approved by record vote in the House. The record votes are there for all to see and only 1 or 2 brave souls over a period of years have ever dared vote against the appropriation of the funds the committee requested. And this was after a rather lengthy presentation on the part of the committee on the floor of the House both as to what they had been doing and what they intended to do.

The Watkins decision is so replete with statements made out of ignorance it is difficult to grapple with it on a scholarly basis. I will just point out one more and desist. On page 14 this statement appears: "In the decade following World War II, there appeared a new kind of congressional inquiry unknown in prior periods of American history." This is untrue, as the statement on page 20 points out: "The authorizing resolution of the Un-American Activities Committee was adopted in 1938 when a select committee under the chairmanship of Representative Dies was created." But even this later statement does not give the real his-

tory of the Un-American Activities Committee. The Dies committee was a follower of the select committee set up for the same purposes chaired by the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, now the majority leader of the Democratic Party in the House of Representatives.

Belief in government by laws rather than by men and disbelief in the doctrine that the ends justify the means should be the basis of any group dedicated to civil liberties. I would add another qualifying remark that is implicit in the disavowal of the doctrine that the ends justify the means. Search for the truth is the basis of all true scholarship and leading from ignorance and the tampering with truth is the surest way not only to destroy civil liberies but to stop any advancement into the unknown for mankind.

Yours very truly,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Jimmie Aston Has Made Imprint on City of Dallas, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, James W. Aston, of Dallas, Tex., at the age of 46 years is president of one of the Nation's outstanding financial institutions, the Republic National Bank of Dallas.

Jimmie Aston, as he is known to many thousands of Texans, was a civil engineer, who became a city manager, who became an Air Force officer, who became a banker.

Highlights of Mr. Aston's career are set forth in an article, written by Bernard Brister, of Dallas, which appears in the May issue of Texas Parade magazine.

I ask unanimous consent that this inspiring story about a man born to lead be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLIC'S JIMMIE ASTON

(By Bernard Brister)

The words flow easily from the big, solidly built man sitting behind the big desk with cowboy-in-the-saddle ease.

"The banking business in its simplest terms is concerned with people and money. Modern banking is complex only because of the many legal, mathematical, scientific, and other technical factors which color the manner in which we conduct the bank's operations. Cutting through this modus operandi, our basic concern is people and money."

Through thin, rimless glasses he regards his surroundings with simple directness. When he meets you, he pumps your hand vigorously. And when he talks, his deep voice is buoyed by his enthusiasm and ready vitality.

"The long-range prediction is that Texas will overtake California and then New York in population," he continued, "and we are constantly planning the development of our bank to meet the challenges of the times. We must always find ways adequately to serve the needs of the people for money, if the country is to grow and to expand in the terms of its full destiny."

The speaker was James W. (William) Aston, 46, who recently completed his first year as president of the Republic National Bank of Dallas. He has reached this eminence in his field at the end of 12 years in the banking business. Before he entered banking, he already had enjoyed two successful careers—one in city management, another in organization, planning, and administration in the Army Air Forces.

The career of Jimmie Aston to date has been steady, swift, and always upward. He is both disciplined and diligent, and probably most important of all, he has been a team player from boyhood.

He grinned in reminiscence: "You learn a lot about teamwork when you are the oldest of six kids in a small country town, particularly in a town like Farmersville, Tex., in those days."

His grandfather Aston moved from Tennessee to Farmersville right after the Civil War and settled there. The farms which he acquired are still in the family today. Jimmie's father, Joseph A. Aston, worked for a while as cashier of the Farmers & Merchants Bank in Farmersville, but soon got into the cotton exporting business on his own.

Farmersville then was a blacklands town of about 2,000 in the center of a prosperous cotton, corn, and onion growing area.

"We lived in a town, but it was just like living in the country," Aston remembers. "There was a barn behind the house with cows to milk and hogs to feed. And there was a vegetable garden to tend. We learned all those things and did our share of the work."

His first job for pay was in a grocery store on Saturday, and later he and his oldest brother, Joe, worked together in a hamburger stand. They also worked Saturdays and during summers on the farm.

All six of the Aston children—Jim, Joe, Hub, Martha, Paul, and Gertrude—went to college, the boys to Texas A. and M. and the girls to TSCW. And behind this story is the story of a father's concept of family teamwork.

The senior Aston set up a farming operation known as Aston Bros. It was started with 20 acres of cotton and 5 acres of corn. All the money which the boys produced from this farming enterprise went into a college educational fund at the bank for all six of the children.

The Aston Bros. account gave each of us a send-off in college, Jimmie says.

Aston played football his last 3 years in high school, quarterbacking the team which won the bidistrict championship from Highland Park High School in Dallas in 1928.

"I didn't know what it was to lose until I went to college," he said. "We played hard and won 'em all."

He decided early in life that he wanted to be a civil engineer, and his dad left his choice of schools up to him, but football helped him to make up his mind. His high school coach had gone to Texas A. and M., and when the time came, Jimmie Aston headed for College Station. To help pay his way, he ran a private postal service for fellow cadets, sold pecan pies, and worked at various other odd jobs.

In his 4 years at A. and M. from 1929 to 1933, he had the kind of career which serves as a forecast of his whole future success. He was elected a colonel in command of the cadet corps, played quarterback and fullback and captained the 1932 Aggies football team, earned a civil-engineering degree, and was graduated with honors. Late last year, approximately 25 years later, Sports Illustrated magazine named him to its Silver Anniversary All-American Football Team.

Today he still has the ruddy, showered look of the athlete, and his big 6-foot-1-inch frame carries exactly the same 200 pounds of weight that he had when he was playing football his senior year at A. and M.

When he got out of college in 1933, Aston went looking for a job. By that time he had decided he wanted to get into city management. He wrote two letters, one to V. R. Smithham, city manager of Wichita Falls, and the other to John N. Edy, city manager of Dallas, and received interesting answers from both.

"It was the only time I ever applied for a job," Aston says.

He visited with Mr. Edy, and decided he wanted to go to work for him.

"He was truly a fine man and I knew I could learn a lot from him," Aston recalls. "He was very interested in me, but just didn't have a job for me. I told him that if he would let me work as his apprentice and learn the functions and background in every department of the city government and let me have 1 hour with him every week, I'd work for nothing."

"Mr. Edy said he'd think it over and let me know. When I went back to see him, he said, 'We have decided to take up your offer, but will pay you $50 a month. You see, we'll have to pay you something so that we can discipline you as a regular city employee,' he explained to me.

"Of course, I took the job on the spot."

At the end of the year, he became assistant to City Manager Edy. He also continued his studies, taking nightwork in government and finance at Dallas College of Southern Methodist University.

Early in 1939 the city of Bryan offered him a job as its city manager. He held the post for only 7 months however, for Dallas called him back as its city manager when he was only 27. It was a big advance and he handled the job with thoroughness and efficiency. He was on the way up.

In early 1941 with the United States on the eve of entering World War II, all city managers with reserve commissions were called into active duty. Aston entered the Army April 15, 1941, as a first lieutenant. In October 1941, he was promoted to captain. In 1942 he was promoted to major and made Director of Organizational Planning, Army Air Forces, and later the same year moved on up to lieutenant colonel and was appointed Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff for Management Control.

Aston became a colonel in 1943 and Assistant Chief of Staff, Supply and Service of the Air Transport Command. In November, 1945, he became Chief of Staff of the ATC. During this time he was awarded the American Defense Service Ribbon, American Theater Ribbon, Asiatic-Pacific Theater Ribbon with two bronze stars, Legion of Merit, and Distinguished Service Medal.

Back in Dallas his tenure as city manager was still remembered.

"One day in 1945 while I was still in Washington, I got a letter from Mr. Florence." (Fred F. Florence, then president and now chairman of the executive committee of the Republic National Bank.) "He asked me to come to see him," Aston said.

"I was on my way from Washington to Honolulu, and I was still in uniform when I stopped off in Dallas to see him on my way out to the Pacific.

"Mr. Florence asked me about coming to work for the bank when I got out of service. A short time later I wrote him that I'd take him up on the offer."

On December 1, 1945, he was named vice president of the Republic National Bank of Dallas. And as in the past, his career hasn't stood still for a minute. He became execu-

tive vice president in December 1955, and president of the bank in January 1957, when he was only 45 years old.

One of his major jobs with the bank was the supervision of its new $25 million home and office building. The design job took 5 years and and put to good use his engineering background and talents.

Aston not only maintains his status as a registered professional engineer, but finds his engineering training of tremendous assistance in his performance of banker to business in the growing technological and scientific fields in the Southwest.

Aston attacks his job with vigor and enthusiasm. He is up every morning by 6:30, breakfasting at 7 and in the bank by 8 o'clock for a meeting of the executive committee where teamwork starts and carries through the whole banking operation. Here in company with Karl Hoblitzelle, chairman of the board, Fred F. Florence, chairman of the executive committee, and other senior officers, vital top policy of the institution is developed.

His duties are primarily executive and administrative, but he still makes loans. He is also involved in the management of the Howard Corp., owned in trust for the shareholders of the bank, and in the separate corporation which owns the bank building. Altogether, he has about 1,240 officers and employees under his direction.

Jimmie Aston has participated in some of the Republic Bank's most accelerated development, first as head of its business development department, and now as its president.

The Republic made national news again last November when its shareholders voted approval of an increase in total capitalization of the bank, including contingency reserves, to approximately $102 million.

"I have had lots of breaks, wonderful breaks," he said in a philosophical moment as he puffed a cigarette. "Lots of people have helped me along the way. You don't really do anything by yourself. It's people working together—teamwork—that really counts."

He looked out his office door which stood ajar.

"This bank is a perfect example of teamwork. We are all working together to do a good job."

"We are trying to do a constructive job. Our challenge is to mass merchandise our services safely, profitably and constructively with appropriate consideration for the welfare of our customers, our stockholders and the whole future growth and development of our country."

"To achieve this goal, we daily engage in the most highly competitive business in the world today—competition for the dollar."

Maritime Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared regarding Maritime Day be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In recognition of the fundamental importance and great services of our merchant marine the Nation is today observing national Maritime Day. This observance has become an annual occasion to commemorate the sailing of the steamship *Savannah*, the first transoceanic steam vessel, 139 years ago. Since that momentous occasion the American merchant marine has become one of the most modern and efficient in the world.

The history and development of the merchant marine is closely entwined with the history and development of the Nation. Our merchant fleet has always been one of the mainstays of our economy in fulfilling the great need of moving goods and people to and from the United States. In time of war the merchant marine has been our fourth arm of defense and has maintained the supply lines around the world which made possible the operations of our military forces. In short, the record is very clear: The United States must maintain a strong and effective merchant marine in order to continue strong in both world commercial and military affairs.

Maritime Day 1958 is a particularly significant observance. Not only does it focus attention on the great contributions and maritime traditions of the past in which my own State of Maine has played a prominent role, but also it marks the opening of a new era in marine commerce. On this day the keel of the nuclear ship *Savannah*, the first nuclear-powered merchant ship, is being laid. Despite the rapid advances in man's ability to move through space, it is very clear that for a long time to come the bulk of man's goods will continue to move between nations by ships. The American merchant marine is to be praised for its forward-looking, constructive leadership, and its complete readiness to move into the atomic age at sea.

Texan To Represent United States at International Cotton Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Mr. Harrell West, of Bishop, Tex., one of the Nation's outstanding farm leaders, has been named as one of three United States representatives at an international cotton meeting to be held in London in June.

Pertinent comment on this announcement was offered recently by Grady Stiles, agricultural editor of the Corpus Christi Caller-Times, and one of Texas' top farm reporters. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stiles' observations be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMBASSADOR

"J. H. West of Bishop, president of the Texas Farm Bureau, has been selected as 1 of 3 men to represent the United States at an international cotton meeting in London next month." (The Bishop News.)

This was a wise selection, Editor Newton; and the American cotton industry will know that it is well represented. We do not know of any person who could perform this important assignment with greater sincerity and broader knowledge than Harrell West. He knows every phase of the cotton business; he is a cotton producer, a cotton ginner, and his association with the cotton trade has given him an intimate knowledge of the problems of the shipper, the buyer, and the spinner. He realizes that cotton is in a precarious situation, at least as far as American producers are concerned. He has long sounded the alarm against further drastic reduction of cotton acreage; for, as he has pointed out, reduction of American cotton acreage brings on an increase in foreign acreage. He is fully aware, too, of the serious threat of synthetic fibers to the cotton industry; and he, as a member of the National Cotton Council, has constantly urged more intensive research to find new uses for cotton. The American cotton producer's cause will be competently stated at the London conference; and, we predict, representatives from other cotton-producing countries attending the meeting will gain a new outlook on the world cotton situation as they listen to the man from Texas. West, as much as any other one person, has been responsible for bringing together the cotton producers of Texas, persuading them to forget their regional differences and present a united front for the cause of cotton. This is an amazing accomplishment; and anyone who can persuade cotton farmers of west Texas, the Rio Grande Valley, the Coastal Bend, and central and east Texas to share the same bed has done a job that has always been considered impossible. For years these regional groups have eyed each other with suspicion and have not hesitated to make their sentiments known. We hope Harrell West's efforts at the London conference will bear fruit not unlike his efforts at unification and understanding among Texas cottongrowers. If he can accomplish this, then we think he's about ready for Mr. Dulles' portfolio.

Tom Stokes, a Salute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a moving and eloquent tribute to Thomas L. Stokes by Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution, which appeared in the Constitution and other papers. I join in this tribute to Tom Stokes.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Miami News of May 20, 1958]

TOM STOKES, A SALUTE

(By Ralph McGill)

When a really good man dies each of us dies a little. One thought of that on reading of Tom Stokes' death in Washington, and of the last prayers said over his grave at Arlington.

This kind of gentleman, who could be all steel in a fight, had come out of the South to become one of the Nation's top reporters and then, for years, one of its most respected columnists. In the days before the coma of death came over him he knew that a score of Washington's outstanding personages in government, Congress, the military and business had joined to write guest columns so that his column might appear despite illness. Republicans, Democrats, independents—all joined to write for him.

The Washington correspondents themselves had voted him the correspondent who had done "the best all-around job as measured in terms of reliability, fairness, and ability to analyze the news."

He had exposed the corrupt Huey Long machine in Louisiana and started its collapse. He had won a Pulitzer prize for exposing the sweatshop operation in Southern States by fly-by-night operators. He, an ardent Roosevelt supporter, had blown the lid off WPA scandals in Kentucky. Harry Hopkins had denounced him and called him liar. The Senate investigation proved Stokes had uncovered most, but not all, the corruption.

He had come out of Georgia with what he called the southern chip on his shoulder. As a boy he remembered his home in the old West End section of Atlanta, hard by the home of Joel Chandler Harris and the old Evan Howell home.

FIRST BOOK

The first books he remembered were those of the War Between the States, and the Bible. He went each Sunday to church school and preaching and then, after lunch, with his father to a mission Sunday school in the nearby mill section, down Gordon Street, out West End under the railroad trestle to the unpaved streets, the squalor and poverty of the mill village of that time. He remembered the Christmas tree and the look of joy on the faces of the mill children at the toy, the apple, the orange, the candy.

Each of us is a part of all that we have met. Stokes learned pity then. He learned, from all the preaching and Bible raising, that Christ had turned against greed, had scourged the money changers out of the temple, had looked always to the lowly and poor. This was the essence of his own religion. He too, looked always away from the privilege to the people.

He was in a small town when there was a lynching of a Negro who protested he was innocent, and who was never proven guilty. He saw them storm the jail and he saw them take him away. He waited in his room in the Y. M. C. A., torn with emotions. The man had been burned to death. The next day the local judge excoriated the mob.

"Where was he on the night of the lynching?" wrote Stokes, "and where was I?"

That, too, was one of the things he met along the way. And always he stood against mobs and violence, prejudices and hate.

FAITH IN UNION

He came to feel, did Stokes, an almost mystic faith in the Union. He dedicated himself to being an American. He loved the South, and he was to write of it:

"It will not out of me, and I must go back ever so often to warm my heart in its sunshine, for it has healing power for me. It is blood of my blood and bone of my bone. It is my home, my native land, the land of generations and generations of my family, back beyond the War Between the States, back beyond the Revolution * * * and so, love it as I did, I also hated some of it, but can never pluck it from my soul."

The South carries, he wrote in a book in 1940, "a perpetual chip on its shoulder * * * there is in its soul a confusion of emotions and prejudices and loyalties not worthy of loyalty, a retreating into legends."

His 4 years at the University of Georgia were a fountain of beauty, 4 years of pleasant unawareness.

In September 1921 he went to Washington. From that time on, of Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower, he wrote and analyzed what he saw.

To him the United States was a great answer to the prayers of those who wanted democracy and faith. But he knew only courage and opposition to greed and privilege would save it. And all his life he fought for what he believed best in his country.

When a really good man dies, each of us dies a little.

Eleven Projects for Ashland, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have a letter from Mayor Harry Simon of the City of Ashland, Wis., listing 11 projects costing a total of $1,107,000, which his community is prepared to go ahead with when public funds are available. This is just one more example of what can be done in putting men to work and providing needed public improvements if the Community Facilities Act is made law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mayor Simon be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF ASHLAND, WIS.
May 15, 1958.

The Honorable WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: Attached is a list of projects as submitted to me by the city engineer, should public funds be available.

I want to thank you very kindly for the two letters I received from you. I am in hopes to cross paths with you on your return to Wisconsin when the session is over.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY SIMON, *Mayor.*

Projects they've been crying for—Memo to Harry Simon, Mayor

1. East End interceptor, sanitary sewer and laterals, from 27th Ave. East to Lake Park (estimate)	$190,000
2. Storm sewers, East End on St. Claire and Front Sts	65,000
3. Rural roads in city limits	60,000
4. Primary street improvements (other than State and Federal)	125,000
5. Secondary street improvements (residential and other)	135,000
6. Business and industrial streets	175,000
7. Parks:	
(a) Prentice Park (new pavilion and ground improvement)	25,000
(b) Lake Park (new pavilion and ground improvement)	20,000
8. Off-street parking lots	30,000
9. Second Street Bridge, Bay City	32,000
10. West End sanitary sewers and lift station	140,000
11. West End storm sewers (residential districts, 7th Ave. West, 8th Ave. West, 7th St. West, 12th Ave. West, and 3d St. West)	110,000
Total	1,107,000

R. WHEELER,
City Engineer.

Wayne Flint, Winner of Birmingham News Oratorical Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently Wayne Flint, 1045 Michael Lane, Anniston, Ala., was announced a winner in the Birmingham (Ala.) News oratorical contest. Wayne is a student in the Anniston High School. I have obtained from him a copy of his oration. It deals with a great and beloved character of the Confederacy, Stonewall Jackson.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the oration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOMAS JONATHAN JACKSON: THE STONEWALL OF THE CONFEDERACY

"You may be whatever you resolve to be."

"Through life let your principal object be the discharge of duty."

"Sacrifice your life rather than your word."

These bits of wisdom sound like hundreds of others scribbled in college notebooks on many campuses, but what distinguished them was the man who wrote them. He lived by the lines he had written. Though not unusually original or especially deep, these maxims of Tom Jackson's do show an unswerving sense of honor, determination and selfdiscipline. They became guiding principals throughout his life.

Tom Jackson was the third child born into the family of Mr. and Mrs. Jonathan Jackson. Tom's father was a Scotch-Irish lawyer practicing in the small town of Clarksburg, Va. Tom was not destined to have a long family life, however, and in quick succession his father, mother, stepfather, and aunt died. The young boy then went to live with Cummings E. Jackson, his uncle. It was here that the foundation for many of Jackson's later accomplishments was laid.

In 1842, almost penniless, Jackson began seeking an appointment to West Point. The road was exceptionally difficult for the young man, who had attended only a small country school in Virginia. Even after receiving his appointment he found the going very hard. Hampered by a poor memory and a slow mind, tortured by the daily demand to recite, he stuck out the weeks and months at the Academy. Jackson later did many things of heroic valor, but none could surpass his first year at West Point as an example of sheer determination. At the end of his first year he was 51st in a class of 72. After 4 years of study, however, his determination brought success, and he graduated 17th in rank from the Academy. One classmate paid a great tribute to Jackson by remarking about him: "Had the course of study at the Academy been longer, he would probably have graduated at the head of his class." After his graduation from the Academy, he served in the United States Army during the war with Mexico, where he gained renown for his bravery and ability. But when the war was over, he resigned his commission in the Army to become a professor at the Virginia Military Institute.

It was while a professor at V. M. I. that Jackson showed his profound love for man—black or white. He used much of his spare time preparing for the Negro Sunday school class that he both originated and taught. He never forgot that group of Negroes and throughout the war he sent back a portion

of his salary to keep his class in existence. The Negro race never forgot Jackson, either, and the first contribution to his beautiful monument in Richmond, Va., was made by the members of a Negro Baptist Church. Incidentally some have said that the only person who really understood Jackson was his Negro servant during the war.

When war broke out in 1861, he quickly cast his lot with his beloved Virginia. It is unnecessary to ennumerate his successes as a soldier and tactician. His value at Bull Run, Antietam, in the Shenandoah Valley, and on the Peninsula, is summed up by a letter written to Jackson by Gen. Robert E. Lee, his commanding officer. Incidentally, it was just after Jackson had lost his left arm by amputation. The letter states: "You have lost your left arm, but I have lost my right."

In 1863, after one of his numerous reconnaissance missions, he was shot by one of his own sentries. On Sunday, May 10, he uttered those immortal words: "Let us pass over the river, and rest under the shade of the trees."

Was his soul wandering back in dreams to the river of his beloved valley, the Shenandoah, whose rolling valleys and green hills he had redeemed from the invader, or was this the Jordan over which he must cross to find the peace he sought for his battle-scarred Southland? This was one battle that even his ingenuity and bravery could not win for him. But the same determination and faith that so typified his life helped him to resolve that even death was another victory.

Thomas "Stonewall" Jackson—a man whose nobility of character, unaffected piety, and great determination—became the treasured possessions of the South; but finally they have become a part of the heritage of America and of the world.

"You may be whatever you resolve to be."

Resolution Adopted by the Texas Retired Officers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Texas Retired Officers Association urging passage by the Congress of Senate bill 1085 and House bill 689.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Texas Retired Officers Association, incorporated under the laws of Texas has always supported the principle of equalization of rights and benefits, including retirement rights, for the personnel of Reserve components of the Armed Forces as compared with Regular personnel of those forces, and as between the services themselves; and

Whereas such equalization is not only in the interest of justice and fair play, but by force of example encourages participation of younger personnel in the national defense, maintains the active and favorable interest of older reservists, and promotes a high morale among those engaged in the national defense; and

Whereas it has long been the declared intent of Congress to grant equal treatment to Regulars and Reserves, as evidenced by legislation through the years, including the Selective Service Act of 1917, such equalization being also one of the major purposes of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 (Public Law 810, 80th Cong.), and of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.): Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Texas Retired Officers Association, in called meeting assembled at Dallas, Tex., this 6th day of April 1958, That we urge the Congress to pass clarifying legislation such as Senate bill 1085 and its companion, House bill 689, so that Regular and Reserve component officers will be accorded equal treatment with particular reference to retirement benefits, and be it further

Resolved, That we urge our United States Senators and our Representatives in the Congress to support the above-mentioned bills, S. 1085 and H. R. 689, both in their respective Armed Services Committees and on the floor of the Congress.

MELVIN CROAN,
President.
FRANCIS B. UPHAM,
Second Vice President.
BERT H. DAVIS,
Secretary.
FRED A. COOLEY,
First Vice President.

Senators Kill Bill To Boost Own Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Chicago Tribune of May 14, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATORS KILL BILL TO BOOST OWN PENSIONS—SPONSOR FLEES FLOOR AS ACCUSER APPEARS

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, May 13.—The Senate today hastily shelved a bill which might have made it profitable for some Members of Congress to be defeated next November than to be reelected.

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS (Republican, of Delaware), who stopped passage of the measure last week when Democratic leaders had scheduled it for quiet approval, received congratulations for having prevented "a raid on the Treasury."

WILLIAMS exposed features of the bill, revamping the pension system for Capitol Hill employees, including Senators and Representatives, which would have permitted veteran legislators to retire with pensions higher than their salaries of $22,500.

SPONSOR FLEES FROM FLOOR

"I shudder to think what the voters around the country would have said if we approved that bill," said Senator CHARLES E. POTTER (Republican, of Michigan). "With 5 million unemployed Americans, this is no time for a 'bundles for Congress' bill."

Chairman OLIN JOHNSTON (Democrat, of South Carolina) of the Senate Civil Service Committee, who sponsored the bill, was absent. Yesterday, JOHNSTON had charged WILLIAMS with making "misleading statements in a search for newspaper publicity."

WILLIAMS, a quiet man known as the Senate's one-man investigator who has exposed scores of instances of corruption in the Government, marched on the Senate floor today to repeat his original charges, backed by an armful of documentary proof. JOHNSTON fled from the floor.

COULD DRAW 115 PERCENT

WILLIAMS noted that JOHNSTON had proposed to remove the present limitation in the pension law which sets a ceiling of 80 percent of earned salary on pensions granted Members of Congress.

The pension fund is made up of 7½ percent of annual salary contributions which are matched by 7½ percent payments from the Treasury.

TAKES THEIR CANDY

"When you take candy away from a spoiled baby," WILLIAMS told the Senate, "it's going to bawl. And I've taken a lot of candy away from some people around here by revealing the features of this bill. Now, let's bury it and let it rest in peace."

The Senate quickly agreed to pigeonhole the legislation.

Senator EDWARD MARTIN (Republican, of Pennsylvania), former major general, told WILLIAMS that he had merited "a decoration for performance above and beyond the call of duty."

The Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there is no paper in America which has more faithfully, strenuously, and vigorously crusaded for liberal principles than the Capital Times of Madison, Wis. Mr. William T. Evjue of Madison occupies the unique position in American journalism as the Nation's outstanding crusading editor.

Recently the Capital Times carried a typically brilliant and forthright editorial in honor of the Tennessee Valley Authority on the anniversary of its 25th year of service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this eloquent expression in honor of the great Tennessee Valley Authority and its magnificent accomplishments be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TVA'S 25 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE NATION AND TO DEMOCRACY

Twenty-five years ago this month the Government of the United States established the Tennessee Valley Authority to tame a river system that was pillaging the countryside with its floods and carrying away to the sea the precious top soil.

TVA was set up to reclaim this wasteland, and despite the constant campaign carried on to cripple and destroy it the program has succeeded far beyond the expectations of those who fought for its establishment. In addition it has made a great contribution to the Nation as a whole and has provided the world with an example of river valley development. Today the TVA idea is among the proudest of our ideological exports.

Its nonpower functions—flood control and navigation—are accepted. The record cannot be denied. But it was only 10 years ago that completely false reports of floods in the area were being circulated to the newspapers around this country in the campaign to discredit it.

The propaganda campaign against TVA is concentrated today on its production of power. It is financed and promoted by the private utilities who want to get their hands on the distribution rights of the power, which has changed the way of life for the whole seven State area.

TVA has endured against the campaign because here, too, its record is unassailable. Its power is distributed through public and cooperatively owned distribution systems. They are serving more than five times the number of customers served under private ownership in the pre-TVA era. Four percent of the farms in the valley were electrified when TVA started; today 95 percent have electricity.

TVA consumers use twice as much electricity as the national average and pay half has much for it. Its power supply has made the valley an indispensable part of the national defense effort. More than half of the power it produces goes to the atomic energy plants at Oak Ridge and Paducah at a savings to taxpayers of from $50 to $60 million a year.

The low rates in the TVA area have benefited those in the surrounding region also. The TVA yardstick has forced down the rates of the adjacent private utilities. And the records show that their stockholders are doing better than the national average.

The arguments used against TVA in the utility propaganda are that it can sell power at lower rates because it is subsidized and pays no taxes.

The subsidy argument is one that comes with ill grace from the utilities. R. C. Rainwater, chief accountant of the Federal Power Commission, recently testified that in the 1955–57 period private utilities were subsidized by the Federal Government to the tune of $2,621,318,000 under the fast tax writeoff policy. This means that they have received subsidies in a 2-year period that exceed the total Government investment in TVA through a quarter of a century.

And if there is any doubt about whether these writeoffs constitute subsidies, the testimony of Walter H. Sammis, president of the Ohio Edison Co., should settle it. Sammis admitted on the stand in testimony before a Senate subcommittee last year that tax writeoff allowances are subsidies.

As for the tax argument, TVA, of course, does make payments in lieu of taxes to local government units. It does not pay Federal income taxes, for the simple reason that it is federally owned. If TVA had been a private utility it would have paid taxes of some $170 million over the past 24 years. But its earnings, after deducting the interest that would have been paid on the invested capital, during this period have been $212 million—giving the Government $42 million more than would have been paid in taxes under private ownership.

TVA is a great monument to democratic planning to conserve, harness, and make intelligent use out of our natural resources. Its importance to this country and the world was summed up as follows by John Gunther, the distinguished American author:

"Quite possibly the TVA is the greatest single American invention of the century, the biggest contribution the United States has yet made to society in the modern world."

What About Extending Unemployment Insurance Benefits for the Unemployed Railroader?

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on May 1 the House of Representatives passed H. R. 12065, authorizing temporary unemployment benefits for individuals who exhaust their benefit right under existing State unemployment compensation laws.

The request for the extension of unemployment compensation benefits in President Eisenhower's message to Congress on March 25 not only included unemployed persons in covered employment under the State unemployment compensation system, but also the unemployed railroader covered by the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. Thus, the bill the House passed on May 1 and sent to the Senate did not include unemployed railroaders.

Mr. Speaker, railroad employment in the United States as of February 15 of this year dropped to 861,928, the lowest in 70 years. This was a loss of 125,197 jobs as compared with February of 1957. Since last February the number of unemployed in the railroad industry has constantly been increasing as jobs are being abolished because of depressed conditions.

As of May 1, 1958, according to the Railroad Retirement Board which administers the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, there were in excess of 143,000 unemployed railroaders drawing unemployment benefits. Already, nearly 40,000 of this number have exhausted their eligibility for benefits. By July 1 another 55,000 will suffer the same fate. As each month goes by additional thousands will lose their right to unemployment insurance benefits.

Mr. Speaker, in my congressional district in Pennsylvania we have nearly 15,000 unemployed and over half of them are unemployed railroaders. The majority of them live in Altoona and vicinity and the remainder in the DuBois-Clearfield-Osceola Mills area.

In this central Pennsylvania area over a thousand of these unemployed railroaders have already exhausted their unemployment benefits, and the number will increase monthly. The situation has been serious for several months, and it becomes more acute as the days go by.

It is common knowledge that the average weekly benefit an unemployed railroader receives is $40. When you consider that he has not had steady employment for years because of frequent furloughs, his economic plight becomes plainly evident. When he loses his unemployment insurance benefits, he is without any income from any source.

Mr. Speaker, recently when in my congressional district I talked to many unemployed railroaders whose unemployment insurance benefits had terminated. In each instance, they had families, their homes were partially paid for, their savings were exhausted, and monthly bills for the necessities of life had to be paid. In short, these men are truly desperate as they reveal their pathetic circumstances.

The only recourse these unemployed railroaders have, unless railroad unemployment insurance benefits are extended, is to apply for State public assistance. To be eligible for such benefits it is required that they convert to cash all assets, such as insurance policies or savings bonds, and in addition give to the State of Pennsylvania a lien on their partially paid for homes.

Mr. Speaker, conscious of the sad plight of unemployed railroaders in my congressional district, as early as March 11, I introduced H. R. 11338 designed to extend railroad unemployment insurance benefits from the present 26-week period to 39 weeks, or a total of 13 weeks. This bill was introduced several weeks in advance of President Eisenhower's message to Congress requesting extension of State unemployment compensation benefits and railroad unemployment insurance benefits. My bill, H. R. 11338, was referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, together with other bills on the subject, where no action has been taken or scheduled at this time.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress cannot in good conscience dare to discriminate against unemployed railroaders. We have taken care of their neighbors in other industries covered by the State unemployment compensation laws, and in simple justice to unemployed railroaders it is imperative that they receive equal treatment by extending railroad unemployment insurance benefits without further delay.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have a recollection that the representatives of the railroad employees did not want to be included in the bill that was reported out of the Committee on Ways and Means. I have not heard from them, and I would welcome their views as to what they have in mind. Usually they contact me, because the relationship between the representatives of the employees and myself throughout the years has been very friendly. I felt it a little strange that I had not heard from them, but my distinct recollection is that they did not want to be included in the bill reported out of the Committee on Ways and Means. Now, if they are interested in some other avenue, I would welcome hearing from them.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Well, what the gentleman from Massachusetts has said is true about the bill which already passed the House and is now pending in the Senate. They did not want to be identified with that bill because it covered another phase of employment in the United States. However, since then representatives of the labor unions, railway labor groups, unions in my home town of Altoona, Pa., have been in Washington and have contacted me and have asked me to insist on congressional action on the bill that I introduced last month.

Milestone Labor Contract Celebrated at Mount Carmel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I want to call the attention of the House to the wise action taken by a group of fine conservative labor leaders in Mount Carmel, Ill., in cooperation with the Thordarson-Meissner Corp. in writing a 5-year contract agreement, which action, if followed throughout the Nation by labor representatives and management would stop this recession, stop inflation, and cause the economy of this country to surge forward with a prosperity that we have never before witnessed.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also compliment the fine management of the corporation, Mr. Eugene Powers, and others who in cooperation with these fine labor leaders have contributed, and will continue to contribute greatly to Mount Carmel, Ill., and the entire area.

I am inserting an article from the press which will give further details, which I am sure will be of interest to the Members of Congress.

MILESTONE LABOR CONTRACT CELEBRATED AT MOUNT CARMEL

MOUNT CARMEL, ILL.—A unique labor contract began today in Mount Carmel's main industrial plant and the occasion was celebrated with parties, parades, and a half day off from work.

Victory against the recession was the theme of floats in the parade honoring the 5-year pact between the Thordarson-Meissner Co., and the International Association of Machinists, Local 2042.

The contract provides no wage increases and no new benefits for the 400 employees of the electrical parts firm. It is a straight renewal of the old 3-year contract.

Mayor J. Roy Dee, calling it a milestone in labor-management relations, issued an order proclaiming the day Thordarson-Meissner Day.

Because of the contract, plant manager Eugene Powers said the company has been able to expand and hire 230 additional employees.

"It gave us a stable basis for progress," he said. Powers said he believes it is the first contract of its kind.

At 45, Powers has been with the firm for 19 years as an executive. As part of today's celebration the union presented him with an engraved plaque.

Local president Maurice Lawrence, who made the presentation, said the inscription sums up the union's dealings with Powers. It read:

"Eminently fair, always understanding, completely trustworthy, truly just with a profound knowledge of labor-management relations."

His formula for good relations, Powers said, is "just be honest." He cited the new contract as an example.

"When I knew we were going to expand, the question was, if I start hiring additional labor, what about the contract which expires next year?"

In a meeting with union officers, Powers told them he must have assurances that he wasn't creating a labor force the company would be unable to afford after the next contract.

Powers promised expansion of the plant and no layoffs except in an emergency. The union agreed to sign for 5 years.

"The people felt that their jobs were worth a good deal more to them than a temporary pay hike and that those jobs might be in jeopardy if the contract called for pay increases which would increase the cost of the products and hold down employment."

Lawrence said the international union approved the contract. Powers said sales are 20 percent ahead of last years figures when the company's total was $3 million.

Boasting about prosperity is nothing new for Mount Carmel. The town, with a population of 10,000 claims registration of 100 Cadillacs.

Metropolitan District Water Policy Finally Revealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. F. SISK
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, the State of California has been developing a State water plan, which includes the Feather River project to transport water from northern California to Kern County, Los Angeles, San Bernardino, San Diego, and other points in southern California. During consideration of this State water plan, and in water proceedings before committees of the Congress, the Metropolitan Water District has assumed the right to speak for all of southern California. On last Thursday, May 15, 1958, the Los Angeles Times published an account of a hearing in Los Angeles in which Mr. Joseph Jensen, chairman of the board of directors of the Metropolitan Water District, for the first time publicly revealed the true plans of the district for receiving and distributing Feather River project water in the southern part of California. I expect it may come as a shock to the people of Kern County, Antelope Valley, San Bernardino, and San Diego. I think it would be fair to conclude that officials of the Metropolitan Water District have very little regard or consideration for the water problems of any area except their own.

The article follows:

COAST ROUTE DESIRED FOR WATERLINE—METROPOLITAN HEAD REVEALS ROW OVER FEATHER RIVER DUCT

"There is no choice except the coastal route."

This flat ultimatum was issued publicly yesterday by Joseph Jensen, chairman of the board of directors of the metropolitan water district, on the controversial issue of the route to bring Feather River water to southern California.

His statement was made at a hearing in the State Building being conducted by a seven-man consulting board, headed by Ralph Tudor, of San Francisco, which is to advise the State on the matter. The State's report on routes is due December 31.

MOUNTAINS OR COAST

Jensen's statement brought out into the open a long-smoldering regional difference of opinion as to whether the proposed 1,800,000 acre-feet of imported water should be transported over the Tehachapis at an elevation of 3,400 feet or along the coast at an elevation of 1,500 feet.

"The coast route is cheapest," Jensen said. "The coast route is good. We protest against an inland route based on convenience for San Bernardino."

He added that the metropolitan wants the water delivered in the San Fernando Valley.

"We are ready to contract for all the water the State delivers to us and to distribute it throughout southern California," he added.

KERN MUST PAY FOR OWN

Jensen also clarified another issue:

He declared that if the Antelope Valley and southern Kern County want Feather River water they must contract for it and pay for its transmission to them on their own, in line with the announced policy of Director Harvey Banks, of the State department of water resources, against paternalistic handouts in the water program.

JENSEN'S statements climaxed his discussion of the three proposals for bringing the water to this area from the north: (1) a long tunnel through the Tehachapis, (2) the 3,400-foot line over the mountains and (3) the coast route.

EARTHQUAKE DANGER

He dismissed the long tunnel as unacceptable because of earthquake danger. Then he challenged the so-called high line which would go up 3400 feet, water the Antelope Valley and Mojave Desert areas and then go via San Bernardino County to San Diego County.

He dismissed this plan as economically unsound, because he contended the idea of getting enough electric power from falling water on this side of the mountains to pay a reasonable part of the pumping cost is not feasible. He declared permanent contracts for the power on this side cannot be made with the power companies—except with ruinous penalties—because of the uncetainty of the amount of water to be delivered, particularly in wet seasons.

"Each area to be served must carry a fair share of the cost of the project," he said. "Director Banks has enunciated this policy. If an area cannot pay, it cannot be included."

SAN BERNARDINO MUST JOIN

However, he went on to say, Antelope Valley can get a cheaper connection to pump water for its own use by hitching onto the coast route than it could if all the water were taken over the high lift. Southern Kern County can arrange to extend the aqueduct to its area, he said. And San Bernardino County can get its fair share of water by joining the metropolitan water district.

In response to a question from Chairman Tudor, JENSEN said the metropolitan will not serve as an agent for San Bernardino County if the latter remains outside the district and hopes to get water from the San Fernando Valley delivery point which the district favors. The price would be prohibitive anyway, he added.

Before JENSEN'S appearance, numerous units of the metropolitan had pledged to abide by the policies to be enunciate by him.

The President's Address on the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post carries an excellent editorial analysis of President Eisenhower's recent speech. The report points out how unwise and unrealistic it is for the President simply to place so much reliance on calling upon business to hoist its way out of the present recession by its own bootstraps. It calls for Government action to provide progress in education, health, social security, urban living patterns, and a redressing of the world's dangerous economic imbalances, rather than empty Government words.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT ON BUSINESS

President Eisenhower indicated in New York that if he were a businessman faced with the present recession he would know what to do about it. He would bring costs under control, hold the line against unearned wage increases, modernize his plant, improve his product, hold inventories at something more than minimum levels and get in a strong competitive position for the inevitable upturn. By doing so, he would expect to shorten the recession's duration and contribute to some of the needed corrections in pricing and other policies.

This advice may have been a sound, if somewhat wishful, prescription for business leaders, but it was not a very conforting substitute for governmental action. One of the flaws in the administration's handling of the recession has been its seeming failure to recognize that business simply cannot do all of the things the President enumerated and that, in consequence, Government's role in the furthering of economic growth and stability must be correspondingly more vigorous.

In taxation, the Government has a powerful instrument with which to influence and facilitate some of the steps which Mr. Eisenhower called for. It is good to know that a decision on the use of this neglected tool is coming soon. But procrastination has made things worse, and it remains to be seen whether the administration will put aside its obsession with budget balancing and seek the sharp temporary stimulus that is desirable.

For the longer pull, the administration ought itself to heed one piece of advice which Mr. Eisenhower gave the businessmen. "One of the hopeful developments of recent years is that new knowledge is rapidly being accumulated about the aspirations and wants and motivations of our people," he noted, and he called upon business to explore these wants more intensively. We suggest that it is Government, not business, which faces the largest challenge here—and that Government, by concentrating narrowly on yesterday's budgetary standards, is flubbing its responsibility.

Surely any catalog of today's popular aspirations must begin with more progress in education, health, social security, urban living patterns and a redressing of the world's dangerous economic imbalances. These are tasks which Americans must tackle through Government, Federal and local, and the initiative here will not and cannot come from business even though business will be a beneficiary. These are the tasks around which the President could rally a great new productive effort.

Reciprocal Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee today opened hearings on the reciprocal-trade legislation. No doubt this bill will be on the floor of the House for consideration next week.

The following editorial by H. B. Snyder, editor and publisher of the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, reflects in general the thinking of the majority of citizens in the industrial Calumet region of Indiana.

VICTORY FOR TRADE POLICY

The reciprocal-trade bill as proposed by the administration has won a substantial initial victory in the House. It has been approved by the Ways and Means Committee with only minor revisions that have been given the unqualified support of Commerce Secretary Sinclair Weeks.

The committee action demonstrated the wisdom of the White House refusal to accept weakening compromises even before the measure reached the House floor. The bill, as originally drafted, already had more protectionist safeguards than are desirable.

The major battle still to be fought on the House floor, and again later in the Senate, will be over President Eisenhower's request for a 5-year extension of the law. Since its original enactment in the early years of the Roosevelt regime, the trade act has never been continued for more than 3 years, and usually for a shorter period.

The President should consider no compromise on the 5-year proposal, however. The victory in the House committee gives much assurance that he can win the full extension if he stands firm. There are various reasons why the act should be continued for the longer period, but the most compelling one is the development of a common market now in progress among the countries of Western Europe. It is highly important to us that there be no uncertainty about our tariff policy at the time the common market plan is taking effect.

The one House committee amendment to the administration bill which has aroused question is that authorizing Congress by a two-thirds vote to override presidential vetoes of Tariff Commission recommendations. Under the existing law, the Chief Executive has the final word.

The Committee for a National Trade Policy, which has been working actively for the bill, has voiced disappointment with the amendment, and Charles P. Taft, its counsel, has objected strongly to congressional review as one of the oldest means used by protectionists to weaken the program.

As the amendment stands, however, it is more window dressing than anything else. Without it, Congress still would have the power to enact a law accomplishing the same thing and, if it was vetoed, to override the executive by a two-thirds vote just as the amendment provides. So while the amendment might be disappointing, it actually gives no extra authority to Congress.

John T. O'Rourke Editorializes on Independence in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, John T. O'Rourke, editor of the Washington Daily News, is active in the Inter-American Press Association and is now its president. When he writes about Latin America he does so with knowledge, experience, and affection.

The Vice President now believes we should change our foreign policies to treat dictators and democracies in accordance with the principles on which this Nation was founded and which correspond with public opinion here today.

Clearly, we should change our present policies which are based on a perversion of the nonintervention doctrine. 'Cuba, as the cloest and most critical area, deserves first attention. If Mr. NIXON follows through, as we hope he will, he will support logical concrete implementations such as:

First. Public official statements by our Government making our disapproval of Batista and his police state emphatic and unequivocal.

Second. Withdrawal of our military mission to Cuba.

Third. Instruction to our Ambassador to Cuba to use either the formal handshake or the cold shoulder, rather than the warm embrace.

Editor O'Rourke's editorial, included here under leave to extend my remarks, in the Washington Daily News, May 22, 1958, is a forceful statement fully in keeping with what the American people believe but which somehow continues to elude Mr. Dulles:

INDEPENDENCE

Reading our Eve Gordon's report yesterday of the Cuban Embassy's party to celebrate Cuba's Independence Day, gave us, as they say, pause. What's the operating word—"independence" or "day"?

It was, of course, a "day"; the proud anniversary of the throwing off of Spanish dominion.

But "independence"? Independence connotes freedom. That must have seemed a sour joke to millions of Cubans.

In Cuba there is no free press.

In Cuba there is no free speech.

In Cuba there is no free assembly.

In Cuba there simply is no freedom; there is no independence.

And so, apparently as an offset to the bad publicity, the Batista dictatorship has been getting, and in best modern press relations counsel style, the veteran career diplomat who had served here for years, was removed a couple of months ago and a nice, personable, talented young couple installed in his place. Both the Ambassador and his wife

are architects. They had done well planning the new Hilton Hotel in Habana. Before that, the new Ambassador also had done a hitch as Batista's Minister of Public Works. He brought his yacht along to his new post here.

The handsome old Embassy, which had gotten fairly dingy over the years was given a fast facelifting to celebrate current Cuban independence. And night before last the Embassy glowed with new paint, mossy, swamp-soft wall-to-wall carpets, curtains of nerve-soothing green and calm offwhites to help banish back-home visions of sadistic police, beaten-up women, castrated boys, dead bodies, jailed newspapermen, murdered foreign correspondents and the stink of fear, cruelty and corruption that today envelops the island only 90 miles off our shores.

Independence, indeed.

Some Great Smears

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Lauderdale Daily News of Saturday, May 17, 1958:

SOME GREAT SMEARS
(By Richard Milne)

Well, Paul M. Butler didn't let us down, after all.

The political midget with whom the Democrats are struck as national chairman for a while has accused the Republican Party of sending Vice President NIXON to Caracas so he could be covered with slimy spit and come home a hero.

Although careful to say he did not countenance the treatment given the Vice President, Butler made it clear he considered the NIXON visit to Caracas a propaganda stunt.

This is about what we expected of the mouthpiece of the Democratic Party.

Butler claims the whole episode was set up to conceal the fact that the Vice President has gained his reputation as a master of the smear technique.

Those are Butler's words, not ours, and we couldn't more strenuously disagree.

First of all, bully-boy Butler is alleging that NIXON readily agreed to imperil his wife's life, as well as his own, simply to knock off some sympathetic front-page publicity.

How idiotic can the top brains of the Democratic Party get?

Butler has been shooting from the hip like this ever since he took over, perhaps in a gallant effort to succeed Harry Truman as his party's top light artilleryman.

We don't know what he means by NIXON'S smear technique, unless he is referred to the Vice President's leading role in putting Alger Hiss behind bars.

A lot of apologists for the lefties in the party never have got over that one, and even today, after Hiss has served a sentence and should be just another ex-con, there are those who still insist he wasn't really proved guilty. It was just a matter of one jury's opinion—too bad the jury wasn't made up of lefties. Communists and fellow travelers who might have brought in a different verdict.

We think bully-boy Butler is on pretty weak ground when he makes charges about smears.

Who smeared Herbert Hoover? Who smeared Charles A. Lindbergh? Who smeared Martin Dies?

It wasn't Republicans, Butler; it was you and your own party who applied some of the greatest smears of this century to some of America's finest men.

And remember James Forrestal?

Appropriate Uniforms for Medal of Honor Winners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to introduce in the House of Representatives today a bill to amend section 772 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that the Government furnish to Congressional Medal of Honor winners appropriate uniforms, including insignia.

I am advised, Mr. Speaker, that these Medal of Honor winners are asked at least 6 to 8 times a year to participate in civic events, such as Armed Forces Day, Memorial Day, Veterans Day, Medal of Honor conventions, conventions of various organizations, dedications, and other commendable affairs.

Most of these men have been out of the service for years and they do not have uniforms suitable for these occasions. It is highly appropriate, Mr. Speaker, that these men of valor, who have earned the highest recognition within the gift of a grateful Nation, be outfitted with the necessary uniforms to wear at the many public functions which they are expected to attend.

This would be done by authorizing the Secretary of the service involved to furnish, upon request and not more often than once every 5 years, an appropriate uniform, including insignia, without charge.

Approximately 340 men upon whom the Nation's highest military honor was bestowed are still living. They are, Mr. Speaker, symbols of the highest traditions of bravery and devotion of the armed services. This is not, I emphasize, a matter of money. Rather, it is a matter of acknowledging our eternal debt to these brave men.

After all, Mr. Speaker, when the holder of a Congressional Medal of Honor is asked to appear at some public meeting, he alone is not being honored. Rather, all of the armed services and the men and women who comprise them are being honored.

It is fitting that the Congress, in whose name the honor was bestowed, see that these men have suitable uniforms for these public functions.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the Congress will approve this proposed legislation before adjournment this summer.

Anti-REA Drive Picks Up Steam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in my judgment there has never been any farm program which was more universally popular—and more universally successful—than the rural electrification program. Rural electrification has progressed from only 1 farm in 10 before REA was established to about 9 farms in 10 today—and more than half of the farms which have received electricity since 1935, when REA was started by President Roosevelt, have been electrified by REA-financed co-ops.

There is a grave threat to the REA's today, I am sorry to say. The nature of this threat is brilliantly described in an article by Mr. Roscoe Fleming and his son, the nationally recognized team of journalists in Denver, Colo., who have specialized in issues concerning natural resources development. This article appears in the May issue of the National Union Farmer.

I was particularly impressed by the point which is documented in the Flemings' article, that the proposed legislation to change the REA's basic program which the farm leaders regard as a threat to its continued success would actually result in much higher costs to farmers and much greater financial risk and burdens to the Government.

So far in its history, the REA program has been a truly unprecedented financial success. Losses are almost nonexistant. But some of the proposed legislation would immediately require the Federal Government to sacrifice its first mortgage rights which secure the funds which the Government has advanced, in order to provide what is, in effect, a subsidy to private lenders to induce them to furnish the additional loans that will be needed by the farmers and their co-ops.

Mr. President, this proposal would result in far greater financial risk to the Government than continuing under the present program. It would greatly increase the interest burden upon the farmers. It is contrary to the interests both of taxpayers and of farmers—and contrary to the general public interest, for it could only result in slowing down the progress of the rural electrification movement in expanding to meet the rising demands of farmers for electricity. Any handicap to the further electrification of agriculture would be a severe blow to the industries and the workers who manufacture and merchandise electrical appliances, and all the other industries which serve them.

Mr. President, because of the timelness of this article, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the National Union Farmer of May 1958]

ANTI-REA DRIVE HOTS UP

(By Roscoe and W. N. Fleming)

The rural electrical cooperative program has worked day and night as a mighty engine of prosperity for the Nation since Franklin D. Roosevelt, George Norris and others first threw the starter switch in 1936. But now, Eisenhower administration policies threaten it far more than most REA members realize.

Two bills in particular carry the seeds of its possible stagnation or death, as shown at the National Rural Electrical Cooperative Association convention in Dallas, and continuously since at regional and State meetings.

The 4 million farm families served by REA are as a whole $117 million ahead of schedule in repaying money loaned by the Government, and have paid $307 million in interest. This is perhaps the best repayment record of any group that ever borrowed from the Government. Yet the REA's are being threatened like delinquent debtors.

One bill backed by the administration would simply compel them to pay interest on future loans, at whatever fluctuating rate the Government itself has to pay for money. But the farmers say that the Government has actually "made" $50 million over the years, on REA loans, because much of the time money has been loaned to REA's it has cost the Government much less than the 2 percent REA's uniformly pay.

The other bill is far more sweeping. Purporting to create a "revolving fund" for REA's to draw upon, its net effect might be to force many of them into the hands of private money-lenders.

Private loan rates are always higher than Government rates, and in addition the Government would insure the loans to get private financiers interested. It would charge for this service—a charge which the farmers' REA's would of course, pay in addition to the higher private rates of interest—though the fee is not for REA's benefit, but to insure the safety of lenders.

THREAT HANGS OVER REA

But this is not the worst, REA leaders say. The Government could turn over its first liens on REA properties, held to safeguard its loans, to the private lender. This, says Clyde Ellis of National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, could permit private utilities, or banks which finance those utilities and are allied with them, to acquire first mortgages on REA properties. Any faltering or failure in payments of principal or interest, and private utilities could snap up REA's by foreclosure.

Friends of REA are alert in Washington, and due to the press of other legislation and the hurly-burly of the coming campaign, Congress does not seem likely to pass either bill this year. But they remain a continuing threat for the 86th Congress.

On the other hand, the REA cooperatives must continue to grow, and will require enormous drafts of new capital.

HAMIL CITES RISING DEMANDS

Speaking at the recent Colorado REA Association meeting, REA Administrator David Hamil explained:

"We once talked in terms of a modest 40 kilowatt-hours per month per person. The national average today is 280 kilowatt-hours. We terribly underestimated what rural electrification was going to do for the rural areas. There is one cooperative in Washington State that is using 1,446 kilowatt-hours per person per month.

"This steadily increasing demand—away from the concept of electricity to run household gadgets and a few appliances in the farm toward that of an automated farm operation calling on the mighty muscles of electricity for almost every task—means that the 950 cooperatives that still owe the Government are going to need $1 billion per year of new funds within the foreseeable future." (A total of 81 cooperatives have paid out their Government debt, and are wholly self-financed.)

"But where is the money coming from? I do think it wise to look down the road to the day when we may have our own lending agency, but it can't be done today. The time is not yet.

"Utilities generally figure they are not strong and safe unless they own an equity of 50 percent in their own properties—own half of those properties free and clear, in other words.

"The comparative figure for REA cooperatives as a whole is 13 percent. The gross figures: Congress has loaned the REA's $3.6 billion in 20 years. The REA's have repaid $506 million in principal, beside paying $307 million in interest, or a total gross repayment of more than $800 million. The repayment overall is $117 million ahead of schedule."

"As of March 1958," Hamil added, "there was a little more than $100,000 in REA payments due the Government which was more than 1 month in arrears. This is a 99.9985 percent repayment record."

WHAT ABOUT HAMIL?

Farmers can't make Hamil out. He is one of them, he was one of the organizers of one of the biggest REA cooperatives in the Nation, the Highline in Colorado, which covers a territory larger than Connecticut. He has kept quiet about the two adverse bills; his friends say he is plenty vociferous about them in private, but officially has nothing to say.

Also, final authority over REA loans of more than $500,000 has been taken away from him, following a bitter row in Indiana over a generating-plan loan of $40 million (not yet made) in which virtually the whole Indiana official hierarchy lined up with the private utilities against the farmer, and battled the REA loan clear to the White House.

The second bill—the moneylenders' bill—also would reduce the REA administrator to a figurehead, and put all final authority directly in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture.

In an elaborate analysis prepared for the 140,000 members of Illinois REA cooperatives, the whole REA situation was pinpointed.

First, the program is a social one, and so REA cooperatives have to serve every farm in an area, no matter how remote. This is contrary to private utilities' custom of serving only those clumps of customers who can be most cheaply and profitably served.

(Only the oldtimers remember it, but F. D. R.'s administration first offered private utilities long-term, low-cost loans to extend electric service into the countryside. They turned him down, and only then did the administration go ahead to create REA. And then many private utilities, as veteran REA organizers well remember, built "spite-lines" to pick off the best paying farm neighborhoods before the REA's could build. This is still going on, by the way. The private utilities move quickly to seize suburban and housing developments in REA territory, and, under the present administration, REA's are generally denied loans to serve such developments, even when far within the farm territory the REA's are serving.)

In Illinois, although farmsteads are relatively close together, there is only an average of three REA customers per mile of line.

Secondly, many farms formerly served by REA's have been abandoned, or consolidated into larger holdings. In Illinois, there were originally 151,000 farms served by REA. Now the number is down to 140,000. The cost of providing the abandoned services was $7 million. The remaining members have had to assume this capital cost.

REA RATES PUSHED UP

Thirdly, every cost item has gone up. The Illinois REA's, like those in Indiana, are served almost entirely by private utilities. The latter at first charged a wholesale rate of 2 cents per kilowatt-hour, one of the highest in the United States. But successive negotiations, backed by the REA threat of building their own generating plants, has cut it to 8.5 mills. Now, the REA's themselves say, they are threatened with a rate increase of 10 percent. If they could get a loan to build their own plant, which would cost $30 million, the threatened increase in REA interest rates from 2 to 4 percent, could alone cost an extra $600,000 yearly.

Lastly, interest and repayments on debt were supposed to increase year by year as the cooperatives got stronger. Now, the Illinois group says, their net margin over operating expenses runs about $2,200,000 yearly, but within the next few years debt service alone will require $3,700,000 yearly. They need $1,500,000 more revenue just to meet this bigger bill.

Ten cents a day is the cost of the farmer's extra hired hand, Willy Wired-Hand, the electrical worker. And that is the farmer's own wage when he chooses to do heavy work by hand that electricity can do for him, says O. J. Trenary, extension agricultural engineer at Colorado State University.

A strong man can develop about one-tenth horsepower at continuous work. But a 1-horsepower motor can do 10 times the work for 1 kilowatt of electrical energy, which costs about 3 cents an hour.

Nixon's Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN H. MAY, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following fine editorial from the Boston Traveler concerning Vice President NIXON's recent trip to South America:

NIXON'S VICTORY

Our South American friends and critics will be talking for a long time about the courageous way Vice President NIXON handled that Peruvian mob scene last week.

What is more, this will be the kind of a story that does not tarnish with retelling. It will continue to stand as a gleaming example of personal bravery and of loyalty to principles.

NIXON knew when he set out to visit San Marcos University in Lima that he was moving head on into danger. Communist agitators had boasted openly that he'd be greeted with violence if he showed up.

He braved their challenge. He refused to flinch in the face of a cowardly attack. And he hurled back a challenge of his own, daring them to meet him on the field of free speech. This they were afraid to do.

There was a lot at stake in this Lima incident. If NIXON had showed the brand of cowardice that his attackers showed, the prestige of the United States would have plunged like a chunk of lead in a bucket of water.

But the sight of the Vice President angrily showing his fist and daring the opposition leaders to come out and face him was some-

thing that has given South Americans a new respect for us.

Communist agents have been doing their best to turn NIXON's tour into a shambles and to develop bad feeling toward the United States. But when they tried to make NIXON look bad at Lima, their plan backfired disastrously. He emerged looking good—obviously the victor.

Mrs. Nixon is said to have remarked after the mob scene that she was so proud she "could almost bust."

Many another American feels that same way.

And many persons at home and abroad, who formerly disliked NIXON, now at least respect and admire him for his show of personal courage.

He displayed American spirit at its best.

Federal-State Relationships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN H. MAY, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, my work on the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations brings me into close contact with the problems involved in Federal-State relationships.

The Fountain subcommittee of the the House Government Operations Committee, dealing with intergovernmental relations, has conducted exhaustive hearings throughout the country in this field. We have interviewed many of the governors; heard from 42 of them and also from many mayors and municipal officials. In fact, I was proud that one of our hearings took place at the State capitol in Hartford, Conn. To set the record straight, Governor Ribicoff, of Connecticut, was invited to testify not only by mail, but to appear in person in Hartford, Boston, New York, or even Washington. He declined.

There is a very worthy discussion of this subject appearing in an editorial in the May 17 edition of the Hartford Courant. I commend the thought contained therein to my colleagues:

THE STATES COULD REGAIN SOME FINANCIAL POWERS

The local fashion today in financing capital improvements is to discover the right Washington agency ready to help with the cost. The habit erodes the fiscal independence of States and towns. The taxpayer who sends about a fifth of his income to the United States Treasury every year may not worry over the principles involved in getting some of this money back. Even so, the less the Federal Government pays of a community's bills the better. Only Washington can encourage this trend by leaving more money at home, so that States and towns can finance their own way. The Joint Federal-State Action Committee has now made several recommendations on this point.

The committee suggests that the Federal tax on local telephone service be reduced from 10 to 6 percent; that Federal grants for vocational education be cut out; and that the Federal Government discontinue its grants for building waste-treatment plants. President Eisenhower agrees with these ideas.

His countrymen will also agree, once they learn how the tax credits will be switched to the States. Present estimates are that $150 million would be available from the Federal tax cuts. Legislation on these proposals should be watched carefully by the States, to see that the shifting of responsibility creates a financial advantage.

It will be a bright day for decentralized government when the States can pay for their own disasters, finance their own atomic energy developments, and do their own urban planning without help from Washington.

Murder on the Airways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am herewith submitting a letter dated May 21, 1958, from Mrs. Arthur O. Wooldridge, 3260 North Ohio Street, Arlington, Va., registering an emphatic protest against the negligence of our government in not prescribing rules and regulations against military planes and Air Force Jets from endangering the lives of people traveling commercial airplanes. This letter was addressed to the Washington Star and the Hammond (Ind.) Times.

In the last 2 years over 300 lives have been sacrificed due to the reckless negligence of the Department of Defense in allowing unchartered and unscheduled military planes to cross and travel haphazardly on the designated commercial airlanes.

Mrs. Wooldridge states she is traveling by automobile and train in the future until something is done to protect the lives of air passengers.

A LETTER TO THE WASHINGTON STAR AND HAMMOND (IND.) TIMES

MAY 21, 1958.

When may we expect action to be taken to end these massacres in the sky? Was it not sufficient reason when an Air Force jet rammed into a transcontinental airliner over Nevada on April 21, killing 29 persons when the day was clear and perfect flying conditions prevailed? Must we wait for another disaster such as the one in Maryland on Tuesday of this week?

Military aircraft should be forbidden to fly in or across civilian air lanes.

Is it not time for a complete coordination between the various Government agencies controlling military and civilian flying? A single agency with complete jurisdiction over all planes is an imperative need at present.

Jet pilots confess they do not see the civilian aircraft. Why are they permitted to enter the civilian airways? The Capital plane was on course and at a proper altitude on Tuesday.

Instead of inquiries, I implore Congress to do something. We spend billions to reach the moon, let's do something realistic about a happy landing in U. S. A.

MRS. ARTHUR O. WOOLDRIDGE.

ARLINGTON, VA.

Pacific Northwest Wants Competitive Air Service to the Orient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the people of Washington State have been greatly disappointed at the denial of the application of Pan American World Airways to furnish air service to the Orient from the Pacific Northwest. Our people support competitive service on the Great Circle flights by allowing Pan American to pick up passengers and freight in the Seattle-Tacoma area on flights between California and the Orient.

Seattle and other west coast chambers of commerce have hoped President Eisenhower would direct the CAB to start a new proceeding in the light of up-to-date figures so that when Pan American obtains jet aircraft the end of next year Washington State will not have inferior service. Most emphatically, the travel public is entitled to competitive United States-flag air service from Seattle in recognition of its natural mileage advantages of 800 miles as against routing from California.

The following editorials express community opinion:

[From the Tacoma News Tribune of May 15, 1958]

LET IT ALONE

A decade has passed since Pan American World Airways and Northwest Orient Airlines undertook the pioneering effort in establishing the direct air service which links Puget Sound with the Hawaiian Islands. In that interval, the competition between the two carriers has produced traffic which statisticians estimate has grown 500 percent in volume. This is a tribute both to the quality of the service and to the free competition and aggressive salesmanship which has sold the public on the economic importance of this direct air service which is most essential to the development of the Pacific Northwest. Today, traffic over the route has developed to a degree that neither line receives a penny of Government subsidy. Continued competition on the run, unlike the excessive competition which exists on some routes, will not call for support from already overburdened taxpayers.

It was something of a surprise therefore when a prehearing conference between representatives of the two carriers and Civil Aeronautics Board Examiner Ferdinand Moran early this month indicated that another route-case controversy is in the making. At the proceedings, preliminary to a CAB hearing which largely may determine the future of air service between Puget Sound and Hawaii, Pan American took the stand that continued competition on the route is desirable and in the public interest. Northwest, with equal sincerity and conviction, argued that the route would support only one carrier and that this sole operator should be Northwest.

Such a dispute, in a day that calls for enlarging rather than restricting the areas of air transport, scarcely seems to be in the public interest. Healthy, active competition ever has been a stimulant to economic development, a matter of vital concern to the

entire Pacific Northwest. In the past, adherence to this principle has won the sound endorsement of civic groups. Chambers of Commerce (including the united front of those of both Tacoma and Seattle), State and local governmental bodies as well as others interested in the growth and development of international trade and travel through the Seattle-Tacoma aerial gateway. On the basis of proven business which in the light of an increasing clamor for Hawaiian statehood scarcely can do anything but grow, it does not now appear logical that the element of competition should be eliminated by Government decree on this overseas aerial route. The competitive situation here seems to be one of improving health for all concerned with the public need for continuation of existing conditions the matter of paramount importance.

[From the Seattle Times of May 18, 1958]

CONTINUED COMPETITION DESIRABLE

For the past 10 years, Seattle and Portland have enjoyed the benefits of competitive airline srevice to and from Honolulu. Both Northwest-Orient Airlines and Pan American World Airways have operated over that route.

The temporary certification of the two airlines for this service has expired. Its renewal will be the subject of a forthcoming hearing before the Civil Aeronautics Board.

At a preliminary conference with a CAB examiner, Northwest Airlines has urged that Pan American's certificate be revoked, on the ground that the traffic would support only one carrier. Pan American took the position that continued competition on this route is in the public interest.

Pan American presented evidence that the volume of traffic over this air route has increased 500 percent in the 10 years the 2 airlines have been operating in this service. At present neither airline is receiving a cent of Government tax subsidy for this operation.

Under the circumstances, it seems to us that continued competition will, as Pan American contends, be in the public interest. We think that all the business that can be obtained for the Seattle-Tacoma International Airport and all the air service that can be maintained for Pacific Northwest air travelers should be encouraged.

Both these considerations, in our view, call for the issuance of permanent certificates to both air carriers to continue their service between the Pacific Northwest cities and the Hawaiian Islands.

Healthy and active competition is the lifeblood of democratic enterprise. We trust the CAB will not take too seriously a proposal by 1 or 2 airlines, serving a steadily growing route, that its competitor be eliminated by Government directive.

One World, and We Are a Part of It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, a Member of Congress today is very much aware of the fact that it is indeed one world, and that we are, whether we like it or not, a part of it. Nuclear-weapons policies, reciprocal-trade agreements, mutual security, and many other such vital questions come before Congress. The local interests of our respective districts are, of course, the principal responsibility of every Member of the House of Representatives, but these local interests today include, among many other things, the drafting of our young men and the use of our tax money for the defense of our country and for the building of a lasting peace.

These matters are very well discussed in an editorial entitled "No Longer Alone," which appeared in the Albany Democrat-Herald on May 6, 1958, and which, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NO LONGER ALONE

On just 1 day these events were reported from overseas:

The Indonesian Foreign Minister protested that Americans and Nationalist China nationals are helping the rebels on Sumatra and the Celebes, and is threatening to lay the matter before the United Nations.

Generalissimo Francisco Franco, Spain's military dictator, rounded up leaders of opposition groups to prevent demonstrations that might mar his show of jet fighters, trainers, and other weapons he has received from the United States, that took place Sunday at Torrejon Airfield near Madrid, used jointly by Franco and the 16th Air Force of the United States Strategic Air Command.

At what purported to be and what probably was a free election Korean President Syngman Rhee's Liberal Party won an election.

Vice President RICHARD NIXON continued his Latin American tour, conferring with Argentine President Arturo Frondizi, Uruguayan executive, Luis Battle, and other Government officials.

Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru of India allowed himself to be dissuaded from retiring after explaining that he had wanted to seek seclusion in the Himalayan foothills to escape the rising turmoil and ferment that is plaguing the Indian Government.

Greece got a warning from Nikita Khrushchev that it will risk becoming a target for atomic weapons if it permits establishment of guided missile bases on Greek territory by the United States or other western powers.

Each one of these incidents had an important if indirect bearing upon the lives of all Americans.

That a few Americans should choose to fly aid to the Indonesian rebels is not surprising. American soldiers of fortune have always been on the hunt for wars and have usually been able to find them in South America, Africa, the South Pacific, or here and there, for there is seldom a time between big wars that little wars aren't flaring up. The American Government has not sponsored nor assumed responsibility for these volunteer soldiers abroad, but now, it appears, we are being held by the Indonesian Government as not only responsible for our own adventurers but for the Chinese Nationalist daredevils as well. And though Indonesian President Sukarno is avowedly pro-Communist we must sit back and let him suppress the prodemocratic elements of Indonesia whose victory would be a victory for the West and whose defeat is our loss.

Whatever may be his faults, it cannot be said that Syngman Rhee is lukewarm toward the Communists. So the results of Korea's election are down our alley, as it were.

It looks as though Vice President NIXON is laying the groundwork for more and bigger loans to Southern American countries. That will associate us more intimately than ever with Latin America. His suggestion that the United States place greater stress on personal dealings with the southland, in contrast with our absentia policies of the past, is a good one. The need for greater knowledge among our Government officials about Latin American nations south of the Isthmus of Panama has long been apparent.

Franco's show of force in Spain was made possible by the United States, a majority of whose citizenry hold Franco in low esteem. But Spain is so located strategically that it behooves us to keep on good terms with the dictator as long as he is in power, for without his approval we would not have access to the airfield we built for him.

Greece is caught between the United States and Russia. Her decisions could spell trouble or satisfaction for us.

It was no more than a generation ago that Americans would have been no more concerned with a revolution in Indonesia, an airbase in Spain, an election in Korea, guided-missile bases in Greece, Nehru's retirement, and the disturbing circumstances that caused him to change his mind—all these would have been little more noticed in the United States than a dust storm on Mars.

But now we must worry not only about our own domestic affairs but about those of other countries. It was not so long ago that all we had to do was to quote the Monroe Doctrine and then go on about our business. Where is that doctrine now?

The Fund for Adult Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution by AMVETS:

THE FUND FOR ADULT EDUCATION (FAE), AN ADJUNCT OF THE FORD FOUNDATION

Whereas certain forces dedicated to the overthrow of our form of republican government under the Constitution of the United States of America, are disseminating propaganda to agitate and confuse Americans by obscuring the truths of American history, American domestic affairs, and international political affairs; and

Whereas the aim of such propaganda is to implant ideas of a collectivistic world government and to incite action leading thereto through biased information contained in political activity known as adult education discussion groups sponsored by the American Library Association (ALA), various universities and colleges through liberal arts discussions released through university extensions, the American Foundation for Political Education (AFPE), and the Foreign Policy Association (FPA); and

Whereas the discussion group activities sponsored by the above listed organizations are supported by funds received from the Fund for Adult Education whose aggregate funds, amounting to many millions of dollars, are exempted from taxation by privilege extended by citizens of the United States of America; and

Whereas at this time, there is no need nor desirability for politically biased curricula to be implanted in the educational system of the United States of America in the form of prepackaged collectivistic material published by Ford Foundation's FAE, or the latter's subgrantees: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved in view of the disclosures regarding the FAE, That we, the members of Ninth District AMVETS, meeting in a regular and duly authorized session this 18th day of May 1958, in Shenandoah, Iowa, do hereby alert our membership to—

1. Continue followup and study of the ever-changing tactics of the FAE to infiltrate and to propagandize the educational system of the United States of America.

2. Urge the investigating committees of Congress to make thorough investigation and to report to the American public findings concerning FAE activities.

3. Urge that the Internal Revenue officials make thorough investigation of FAE's propaganda activities which, under the Internal Revenue Code, disqualifies FAE for tax exemption, and, finally, to revoke FAE's tax exemption; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution and this alert be brought before the next meeting of the State convention of Iowa, and also brought to the attention of the Iowa Department of AMVETS and the National AMVETS Headquarters in Washington, D. C., for a complete study and analysis of the Fund for Adult Education (FAE) at the earliest possible time; finally, it is hereby

Resolved, That all elements of AMVETS, the American Veterans of World War II and Korea, at the State and local levels, will have no truck with the Fund for Adult Education (FAE) enterprises. If AMVETS posts and departments (State organizations) are offered financial aid or invitation by the Ford Foundation FAE-adjunct, or its subgrantees, in carrying out the FAE programs, it is sincerely hoped that they will decline.

WALTER MAXWELL,
Commander.
ROBERT B. CUNNINGHAM,
Adjutant.

APRIL 1958.

Worthy of Imitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MYRON V. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial column of May 18, from the Independence (Kans.) Reporter, written by the Reverend A. L. Lesco, pastor of a Baptist church in that city:

WORTHY OF IMITATION

(By Rev. A. L. Lesco, pastor, Chestnut Street Southern Baptist Church)

It is always commendable when a man is able to demonstrate Christian grace toward those who would do him harm, especially when his enemies resort to violence in their fanaticism. Certainly this a quality that distinguishes a representative of government as a true statesman, rather than a mere politician. Vice President of the United States RICHARD NIXON has earned the applause of his countrymen, and the respect of honorable people throughout the world, by his restraint and benevolent behavior during the extremely unpleasant situations to which he has been subjected during recent days. His example is worthy of imitation by all of us.

Seldom is it easy to love those who seem adept at making themselves unlovely. And yet this is what is expected of Christian people. When the Creator of us all wanted to tell the creatures of His creation how to live useful and happy lives, He expressed Himself in terms of love. When the enemies of Jesus spit upon Him—when they reviled, persecuted, and finally murdered Him—He responded to their evil and grace and love. Even as they put Him to death, He called out in love for them to the Heavenly Father, asking that they be forgiven. More than a few of the followers of Jesus have been able to follow His example and pray for those who persecuted them. "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge," was the cry of the disciple Stephen as he was being stoned to death.

Surely this is what the Lord was trying to teach us when He said: "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another." (John 13: 34.)

Today in our confusion we seek to solve the problems which obstruct the realization of world peace, and at the same time strive for supremacy in the realm of military might. But the one essential ingredient for securing a satisfying and permanent peace—Christian grace and love for one another—is largely neglected. In such times it is refreshing and encouraging to have the Christian character of one of our Nation's leaders brought to our attention. In the opinion of this writer, Vice President NIXON'S self-disciplined deportment will have a more important impact upon the thinking of a thoughtful world than will the launching of innumerable space satellites.

Labor Management Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the recent actions of the House Subcommittee on Labor Management Relations of the Committee on Education and Labor should make it apparent that the Democrats are more interested in playing politics with the Taft-Hartley law than they are in making any revision in this law. The American people have listened for many, many years while the Democrats groaned about the alleged evils of the Taft-Hartley Act. Let me say at the outset that I know of no piece of legislation that is ever perfect at the time of enactment and certainly revisions are in order from time to time.

It is interesting to read the Democratic platform pledges regarding the Taft-Hartley Act, and I quote the Democratic platform of 1948:

We advocate the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. It was enacted by the Republican 80th Congress over the President's veto. That act was proposed with the promise that it would secure "the legitimate rights of both employees and employers in their relations affecting commerce." It has failed. * * * We advocate such legislation as is desirable to establish a just body of rules to assure free and effective collective bargaining, to determine, in the public interest, the rights of employees and employers, to reduce to a minimum their conflict of interests, and to enable unions to keep their membership free from communistic influences.

The 1952 Democratic platform pledges almost the same as the 1948 advocating repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. The last paragraph of the 1952 provisions of the Democrat platform state this:

In keeping with the progress of the times and based on past experience a new legislative approach toward the entire labor-management problem should be explored.

I know of no way that the pledge of the Democratic platform of 1952 in this regard can be fulfilled unless the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations of the House Committee of Education and Labor is willing to hold hearings on this very vital piece of legislation. The 1956 Democratic platform also contains provisions dealing with the labor-management relations. I quote the last paragraph in the 1956 Democratic platform:

Upon return of our National Government to the Democratic Party a new legislative approach toward the entire labor-management problem will be adopted, based on past experience and the principles of the Wagner National Labor Relations Act and the Norris-LaGuardia anti-injunction law.

In view of these facts it seems certainly inconsistent that the Democratic members of the Subcommittee on Labor Management Relations voted unanimously to withhold any hearings in this field.

In his message to Congress on January 23 President Eisenhower emphasized and reemphasized the need for some changes in our labor laws.

The President said:

program today can ignore the disclosures of corruption, racketeering and abuse of trust and power in the labor-management field. Many of these disclosures have been made in congressional hearings and in investigations by grand juries and local law enforcement agencies. * * * In order to protect the basic rights of the individual worker and to maintain the integrity of trade unionism itself, action on the part of the Government is needed.

The President's recommendations include proposals in the labor-management area to protect the welfare of the individual worker and curb union abuses, include amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act, changes in other laws and enactment of new laws. They range from controls over union funds and activities, including boycotts and organizational picketing, to the elimination of the jurisdictional no man's land between State courts and the National Labor Relations Board.

During this Congress there have been a number of proposals introduced to amend the Taft-Hartley Act in one form or another. Some of these are in line with the recommendations of President Eisenhower. Others have been introduced by our colleagues on the Democratic side, all of whom favor outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, and none deal with correcting the abuses which have been shown to exist in labor-management relations.

Both management and labor have acknowledged that abuses have taken place. Both admit there should be some revisions in the law to correct these abuses.

By its refusal to hold hearings the subcommittee thwarts the correction of these abuses.

It is very difficult for me to understand a situation wherein a Member of this body introduces legislation which is then referred to the subcommittee of

which he is chairman and then refuses to permit hearings on his own and related bills.

That is exactly what happened a few days ago when the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] called to order the first meeting of his Labor Management Relations Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor. This meeting was called to consider the subcommittee's course of action during the remainder of the session. The full membership of the subcommittee was present, being composed of the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND], the gentleman from New York [Mr. TELLER], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN]. It is my understanding that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS] proposed that the subcommittee set up an agenda and hold hearings as soon as possible on the proposals which President Eisenhower has characterized as vital to protect the basic rights of individual workers and to maintain the integrity of trade unionism. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] proposed that the subcommittee begin hearings on March 12 on the four parts of the President's program on which both management and labor had expressed an interest.

When it came to a showdown, the Democratic members of the committee stood man to man against permitting any legislation of this type to come before the committee as proposed.

Last week, during a discussion of this legislation, the distinguished majority leader said:

> They know that if a bill comes out, you fellows in combination with some others are going to try to put through some antilabor legislation.

Obviously the majority leader was attempting to infer that the Republicans would attempt to put through some antilabor legislation when he said "you fellows."

I feel confident I can assure the majority leader we Republicans will not have any part in punitive legislation but are desirous of constructive revisions of the law.

Who did the majority leader have in mind when he said "some others"? This House is composed of only two parties—Democrats and Republicans. Apparently the gentleman has fears as to what some of the Members on his side of the aisle might do.

Does the majority leader and the chairman of the subcommittee fear the Democrats will support what he calls antilabor legislation? Is that why no hearings will be held on amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act?

The Democrats are in the majority in this House and the Democrats are in the majority on the Labor Committee and on its Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations.

I would like to call to your attention to the fact that the four Democratic members of this subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] and his colleagues the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TELLER], all of whom unanimously voted against holding hearings in the field of management relations, are among the 80 Democratic Members of Congress who signed the manifesto under the heading of Proposed Program for the Democrats in the House of Representatives, 85th Congress, which is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 30, 1957.

That manifesto said:

> We favor the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and its replacement by labor-relations legislation that is favorable to labor, to management, and to the public.

Now I ask you how inconsistent can you be and what can be the motives of these Members? Labor itself in many instances has come out in favor of revisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. I know in many of the political campaigns of the past the Taft-Hartley Act has been an issue and yet the Democrats who are in control and who have been in control of the United States Congress for every year except 2 years since its enactment have done nothing. They have taken no steps whatsoever to revise this piece of legislation.

Just a few weeks ago members of the building trades and labor unions were in Washington and many of them visited our offices. They visited me. Several of the provisions that they were interested in had to do with revising certain provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, most of which have the support of this administration and have been proposed by the President of the United States. I asked those that came into my office why they do not go to the committee and request that hearings be held so that the provisions in which they are interested can be made a part of the law.

Apparently these men were aware of the doubletalk engaged in by our colleagues on the Democratic side who out of one corner of their mouths pretend to be the great friend of the laboring man and out of the other vote to thwart consideration of this labor legislation we are discussing.

Certainly it is no secret to the gentlemen on the Democratic side that these labor groups have been calling for action on the Taft-Hartley bill. These very building trades people who visited us were here in the interest of legislation.

This AFL–CIO group wants the Taft-Hartley Act amended. The Democratic members of this subcommittee have blocked any possible attempt to consider any amendments to this act.

I certainly feel that the Democratic Party has a great deal of explaining to do. Certainly they should advise the American people as to the reasons for the actions that have been taken by this subcommittee and also issue a statement as to when we can expect some action in this field which they have themselves stated is worthy and deserving of some action. I believe one thing that we must call to the attention of the American people is the fact that the Democratic Party controls the House of Representatives and controls the Senate of the United States, therefore, it is their responsibility in this field if any action is going to be taken.

We Republicans stand ready to do what we can to assist in sensible and reasonable revisions of this act, but we must and feel compelled to state that the record should be crystal clear, that the Democrats are not interested in revisions of this act, but interested in merely playing politics with it. Certainly the laboring man of this country deserves more than that. Lipservice is not enough.

Nixon Gains Stature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MYRON V. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial from the Independence (Kans.) Reporter of Thursday, May 15, regarding the visit of Vice President and Mrs Nixon to Latin America:

NIXON GAINS STATURE

Perhaps the most amazing thing about Vice President and Mrs. Nixon's good will trip to Latin American countries is the fact they were able to hold their poise as well as they did. Put yourself in their places and be subjected to mob violence including the hurling of stones, insults, overripe fruit and vegetables, and worst of all, being spat upon, and all of our patience would be taxed to the limits.

The Nixons, who returned to Washington this morning, took the angering embarrassing ordeal in commendable stride. They met the crude challenge with dignity. President Eisenhower has praised them for their courage and fortitude. By the Nixons' action the best traditions of individual free men were upheld and advanced in the face of the apparent Communist inspired demonstrations in Lima, Peru, and Caracas, Venezuela.

All should quickly realize what has taken place in Latin America was not aimed at the Nixons personally nor were they solely Communist led. Rather the American Government and Nation was the main target. The Nixons were unfortunate enough to be present to catch the abuse.

There are many complex reasons for the trouble and Latin America's attitude. Undoubtedly the influence of the Communists has increased and they have been quick to take advantage of the other anti-U. S. A. factors involved. No doubt the Communists are still burning over DICK NIXON'S relentless prosecution of Alger Hiss in the Whittaker Chalmers case.

It is also a well-known fact there is a widespread Latin American recession, particularly in Venezuela as a result of restrictions on oil imports to this country. Then, too, it was just last January that Venezuela went through a revolution and threw out their dictator. There is also probably no doubt the poor peasants dislike the Americanos display of wealth and "better than thou" superior attitude. Like other countries, they seem to also resent our foreign aid. Although the amounts going to Latin and South American countries have been

minor compared to European countries, the old adage, "you can't buy friendship" is becoming more and more apparent day by day.

It is disturbing to find ourselves apparently so heartily disliked by those we thought surely were our stanchest friends. It will take much time to correct this deplorable situation and the causes that have brought it about. It could even be, though, that the Communists will find their plot has backfired on them and they have been made the ones to look ridiculous for their barbarious-led attacks on the Nixons.

Whatever the outcome, Vice President NIXON handled himself superbly. In the course of all the trying circumstances he has added to his own stature as a man and a political figure, both in the world and in our country. It is only too bad that he and Mrs. Nixon have had to prove this fact in such a difficult way.

National Radio Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the month of May is National Radio Month, observed to give recognition to radio as a vital instrument of public service. I am very happy to join in the observance of this occasion, to pay my respects to radio as an invaluable means of communication and, also, to give heartfelt thanks to the many dedicated and public-spirited people who make up the radio industry.

Let us take a look at this modern miracle of communication which is an integral part of the lives of each of us and which we have come to take for granted. Service provided by radio is available to us every minute of the day, wherever we are and whatever we are doing, and it is a personal service. Each one may select what he wishes to hear, without payment other than purchase of receiving sets.

The growth of the radio industry is, in some large measure, attributable to freedom from control by our Government, except for the limited regulation necessary to keep order in the use of broadcasting frequencies. It is significant that in nearly all other countries, government directly or indirectly operates and controls broadcasting. In the United States, Congress has refused to adopt any control measures which remove the direct influence of the free voice of the people in selecting programs from a variety of sources. No one can compel us to listen or make us pay a tax to listen. Radio is free to bring us both sides of public questions.

What does radio mean to us all individually? Everyone depends far more than he realizes upon all the services of radio in his daily life. From the time we awake in the morning until we go to sleep at night, radio provides something of value in our daily lives. Time signals keep us on schedule, weather forecasts helps us plan our activities, market reports assist the farmer, and a variety of programs is available at any hour. Only radio is able to bring us instantaneous, on-the-spot reports of news and events from every country.

One of the primary advantages of radio is that we can listen almost everywhere, at home, at work, in the car, at the beach or picnic ground. We can listen while we work and do not have to take our eyes from the highway to enjoy radio while driving.

The several billions of dollars invested in radio sets have not been spent because radio sets are decorative pieces of furniture but because they provide contact with the world through the broadcasting system. Among the needs fulfilled are obtaining of news of the community, which once could only be heard at the general store; news of the world at large, which once was available only through published journals, sometimes long delayed in delivery; music that once was only available at considerable cost and at a few places which only a few could reach; discussion in which at an earlier date one could only participate by going to the meeting house; all these and many others have come to life in our homes through radio.

At this moment more than 1,000 aircraft are in the air over the continental United States, carrying thousands of passengers and many tons of freight, in touch with the earth only through radio. In taxicabs, in industry, on farms, in the oil fields, in military installations, on trains, and aboard ship, radio is performing a service.

The vital role of radio in local, regional, and national disasters or emergencies such as floods, storms, mine disasters, hurricanes, tornadoes, and others is a matter of record. The voice of the radio broadcaster in such times of crisis is more reassuring than a printed bulletin.

From our own experiences, we know weather news help save time, money, property and inconvenience. But weather disaster news also saves lives when it is given the instantaneous treatment which radio can provide. Radio is almost the first thought of the majority of people in time of emergency or uncertainty. Ability to communicate directly from the spot and without delay is a unique and priceless attribute in rescue or evacuation operations when speed is of the essence.

With the wholehearted cooperation of the broadcasting industry, involving a large amount of time, money, manpower, and equipment, a special system to bring immediate emergency information to you has been developed, known as Conelrad. This system of public emergency broadcasting is the surest and fastest way developed of getting word to the public—you and me—under attack conditions in the event our country should be attacked. In addition to providing the alert for the public, the broadcast stations of our country comprise the main alerting system for about one and one-half million other radio transmitting facilities operated in other services such as trans-Atlantic telephone, point-to-point communication, police, fire, forestry, amateur, and so forth. Under this system it will be possible to receive civil defense instructions on standard radio sets during an air raid.

While much of the service of radio broadcasting is through the networks, the local radio station is most important in many ways. The local station extends the border of your community to encompass the entire earth's surface, and in addition reports the local news and events, supports local civic projects and is a vital part of the life of the local community. Both local and national broadcast facilities always recognize their responsibility in times of stress—storms, floods, drought, earthquakes, epidemics—and broadcast warnings that save lives and property and help alleviate damage and suffering that result from such disasters.

The growth in number of broadcast stations from 600 twenty years ago to the present 3,700, and the 150 million radio sets owned by Americans today are indications of the extent to which everyone relies upon radio in his daily life. It is a good thing to take a look at something so important to us all and which tends to be taken for granted because it is so much a part of our everyday life.

The Italian Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, on May 25 Italians will hold a national parliamentary election—the first such election since 1953—to determine the composition of the whole Parliament which in turn determines the possibilities of forming an effective government for the next 5 years. This is the third time since the proclamation of the Republic that the whole Parliament will be renewed.

Past legislative periods have shown the difficulty of establishing a firm coalition of democratic parties in the relatively narrow margin between the two extremist groups to the right and the left.

The democratic parties can point with pride to the record of their rule during the last 10 years. Italy as a whole has achieved more substantial progress than in any other decade in its history. National income has almost doubled and one can see the emergence of a modern and progressive Italy in both the cities and in the countryside.

The continued existence of serious problems at home and abroad has not been blithely ignored; it has been faced realistically and solutions are approached in a mood of gradual but solid action. Meanwhile the Communists today, as in the past, are fighting a hard campaign in their efforts to take votes away from the democratic parties in order to destroy their working coalition.

A democratic coalition is the only effective bulwark against the continued Communist threat in Italy. Such a coalition alone can come up with a realistic and democratic solution of the country's pressing problems. The coalition policy is aimed at safeguarding and developing the social and economic gains of the past 10 years. Italy has benefited by this middle-of-the-road program of gradual progress. For revolutionary and extremist forces to gain control of the Government at this time would result in a tragic end to this progress, as well as destruction of Italy's democratic system.

As we observe this election in Italy, we strongly urge her people to recognize and appreciate the importance of their vote in determining the future of their country. The democratic pro-Western policy has been a successful one for Italy in her foreign relations, as a member of NATO. It is our belief that her people, realizing the value of such alinements with peace-loving nations, will renew their vote of confidence in the leadership that has guided her in this direction. May 25 will then stand out as a warning to Communists that Italy has once again chosen the enlightened, progressive, democratic road toward future peace and prosperity.

Trade Bill Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN H. MAY, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, in further enlightening their readers on the necessity for passage of the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, the editors of the Hartford Times are performing a very worthwhile public service. This measure will come up on the floor of the House next week, and I believe it important that my colleagues are acquainted with one of the strong areas of support for this measure.

The Hartford Times is in close touch with, and expresses what I believe to be the majority opinion of the citizens of Connecticut:

TRADE BILL PROGRESS

The fight in Congress between the high protectionist and the liberal tariff advocates is beginning to form into battlelines. The House Ways and Means Committee tentatively approved a bill which adopts the liberal provision desired by the proponents of a 5-year extension of the present Reciprocal Trade Act. The last extension was for 3 years and will expire on June 30. This is a good beginning but a hard fight looms in the House, after which the issue will go to the Senate.

The measure embodies all President Eisenhower's major recommendations for legislative authority to carry forward a liberal foreign-trade policy. Amendments to appease some tariff protectionists were written into the extension bill with the administration's cooperation.

The concessions are designed to attract sufficient votes in the House for passage of the measure without drastic curbs on the President's tariff-making powers. Whether they would accomplish the purpose remained in doubt. Protectionist forces were uniting behind a proposed substitute by Representative RICHARD M. SIMPSON, Republican of Pennsylvania, that would severely restrict the President's authority.

Under present law, the President has the final word in this escape clause procedure. The Commission investigates complaints and recommends higher tariffs or import quotas if it finds that serious injury to a domestic industry is threatened by competitive imports.

The President, taking into account broader considerations of foreign policy and the national welfare, may accept or reject the Commission's recommendations. In most instances, they have been rejected.

Liberal-trade advocates held that it would be impossible under any conceivable circumstances for a President's opponents in such a case to muster the two-thirds majorities necessary under the extension bill to reverse his decision.

Reciprocal trade law extension received useful discussion in Hartford this week by governmental, industrial, and labor leaders, under the auspices of the League of Women Voters and the Connecticut Council of Churches. This State has much to gain from a liberal foreign-trade policy. Our industries have a vital interest in foreign markets. The competition of imports, while serious, is heavily outweighed by reciprocal trade advantages.

Communists Behind Attacks on Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Vice President of the United States has been subjected to the most outrageous attacks ever perpetrated upon such a high American official in a foreign country. The American people are due an explanation.

I have read Latin American editorial comment, United States editorial explanation, listened to my colleagues in Congress, and attentively bent an ear toward foreign-affairs analysts both within and outside of our Government. The reasons advanced for these savage attacks are as numerous and divergent as the sources of their inspiration. The rationalizations range from mediocre leadership in North America, inattention by the United States to its own hemisphere, faulty economic policies by the United States in Latin America, improper attitudes of the United States toward certain forms of government, to selfish interests of high-placed American officials in their own advancement, American attention to the uncommitted nations of the world, and an evil plot designed by the international Communist conspiracy. I have mentioned but a few of the causes assigned by the multitude of observers who have brought their thoughts to bear upon these tragic incidents.

While I am not disposed to see in any one or combination of these reasons the sole and unmistakable answer, it does appear that by far the most important reason lies in the area of purposeful and concerted Communist agitation. Many would state that such a conclusion is merely an escapism. They would argue that to place blame principally on the Communists is not only an oversimplification, but it is the easiest way to find an answer to what otherwise would be an almost insoluble complexity.

One might be persuaded to assign equal weight to the many reasons advanced were it not for the perverted violence which accompanied the demonstrations against the Vice President. There are few in this body more familiar than I with the slings and arrows of political warfare, whether it be domestic or international. It is only human nature to argue, criticize, disagree, and even condemn one's opponents on the field of friendly strife; but freemen have learned to settle their differences or, at least, air their conflicting views in an atmosphere of mutual respect and regard for the inherent dignity of their fellow human beings. Herein lies the fundamental distinction between free man and his atheistic would-be Communist enslaver. The Communists, and only the Communists, denying the existence of God, rejecting the inherent rights and dignity of the individual, can blamelessly and unashamedly spit in the face of the highest form of creation known to this world—man. Do we not recall that pagans of another day, the soldiers of Rome, spat in the face of Jesus as the highest form of mockery?

We would only be indulging in self-delusion if we were to forget that the peoples of Latin America have been justifiably provoked by the United States in the past, particularly in the days of the unfortunate dollar diplomacy. But, in the last 25 years, and particularly since the days of my distinguished fellow Tennessean, Cordell Hull, the United States has pursued the course of a friend and good neighbor throughout the Americas. Indubitably we have made mistakes, made enemies, and followed policies which we have lived to regret, and which have given rise to resentment.

Construing all of our policies and attitudes, however, in the most unfavorable light could not possibly motivate even the most irate of our fellow Americans to the south to so insult the Vice President and his lovely wife. Free men fight and die, Communists spit, vilify, and desecrate. By their work and deeds you shall know them.

The specter of inhuman communism has been casting an ever-increasing shadow over Latin America. Despite the many warnings of competent observers, including many of my distinguished colleagues, we seem to be aghast that the attacks on the Vice President should have occurred. What is truly disconcerting is that, faced with the unmistakable action of Communist agitators, many intelligent Americans are still searching elsewhere for answers they will never find. Shall we never learn that the prime source of the world's ills is communism itself? Perhaps it is too monstrous and diabolic a conspiracy for free men to comprehend. Perhaps the wall has not been built large enough to hold the bloody handwriting of

Communist deeds in the last 40 years. Even allowing for the forgetfulness of man and the passage of time which might have faded the sins of Stalin, the blood of Korea, Hungary, Syria, and Lebanon is still fresh and legible. The hour is late. Look up, America, lest historians report that the free world died because it could not see.

In any objective appraisal of these recent developments in Latin America, let us never lose sight of the evil machinations of communism and in developing a policy to cure and remedy whatever ills may exist, our prescription must contain a large dosage of Communist killer.

Above all, let us not forget and forsake our known friends. I have heard and still hear some of my distinguished colleagues urge that we sack our friends in order to placate what could only be our enemies. In this perplexing world it is difficult to answer the age-old question: Who is my neighbor? Remember the Good Samaritan. He offered not spit and stones but comfort and a helping hand.

I would like to introduce into the RECORD reports of observers more experienced than I, who have seen clearly the Communist menace in Latin America during the eventful tour of our courageous and beloved Vice President.

The following articles need no amplification:

[From the U. S. News & World Report of May 23, 1958]

I SAW NIXON MOBBED

CARACAS, VENEZUELA.—I saw Vice President RICHARD NIXON mobbed and the United States attacked and insulted by Communist-led gangs in South America. In scenes so tense that several times it appeared that American blood might be spilled, Mr. NIXON was shoved, stoned, and spat upon.

Riotous students ripped up an American flag. I saw police stand idly by while Mr. NIXON and his wife were under attack and in danger of their lives.

Through it all, Vice President NIXON appeared poised and unruffled—seemingly unfrightened by the shouting, pushing, menacing mobs.

Only once did Mr. NIXON show real resentment at the indignities heaped upon him. That was after he had been, to use his own words, "covered from head to foot with spit" in the Communist-spurred outburst on his arrival in Caracas.

It is not pleasant, he said, "to have a man spit directly into the face of my wife."

AFTER A SURPRISE, ACTION

The hate campaign started out mildly. It got ugly when the Communists woke up to the fact that Mr. NIXON's good will tour was having a terrific impact on the peoples of the countries he visited. It reached a climax at Caracas in mob vilification and violence—perhaps the greatest indignity suffered by the United States in recent times.

There was no sign of trouble ahead at the first stop, in Montevideo, Uruguay. The Communists passed out anti-United States pamphlets in the crowd, but no violence was attempted.

I saw no hint of hostility in Buenos Aires—although Argentina has the second largest Communist Party in South America—or in Asunción, Paraguay.

At La Paz, in Bolivia, the Communists circulated leaflets demanding that the United States buy Bolivia's tin. Still, there was no trouble.

Then, suddenly, it happened.

The Communists seemed to sense at last that Mr. NIXON was harvesting a crop of good will. They went into action. The results were immediately apparent at his next stop, in sedate Lima, Peru.

A HUNCH PAYS OFF

The Communist-led students' federation of San Marcos University had hurriedly passed resolutions opposing the Vice President's scheduled visit to the university. It appeared that Mr. NIXON would bypass San Marcos.

Yet, playing a hunch, I walked to the plaza facing the university at 10 a. m., a half hour before the time the visit was scheduled. Two men on ladders were painting on the walls beside the university's main entrance, in 18-inch letters, signs saying: "Get away NIXON, merchant of war; get out NIXON."

When the painting was finished, a cheer went up from the several hundred students and bystanders gathered at the scene.

As I watched, gangs of students emerged from the university carrying placards on poles. The signs read, "NIXON snake," "Get out, NIXON pirate," "Away Yankee imperialist," "Go away, NIXON dog." All had the familiar ring of Communist slogans around the world.

A detachment of 15 policemen appeared. They paused in the street 100 feet from the entrance. Soon Mr. NIXON drove up in an open car, followed by secret service and press cars. He waved from the car. The crowd responded with boos and catcalls.

MISSILES: STONES, BREAD

The Vice President got out of his car. He started to walk to the entrance. The crowd pressed in. The police tried to force a passage. At this, the students began throwing stones, oranges, bits of bread—anything they could find. They shouted, "Get out, NIXON" and "Away, Yankee imperialist." Mr. NIXON and his aides were shoved around. There was scuffling between the mob and police.

The Vice President sized up the situation, saw that serious violence might result if he persisted in trying to enter the university. He returned to his car, drove to Catholic University. There the students received him cordially.

Back at San Marcos University, about 5,000 students were milling around the courtyard, shouting and trying to make speeches. Several hundred young women jammed the balconies that extend from the second-floor level of the building.

FOR DEFENDER: A SOAKING

One young man climbed on the base of a fountain and began a defense of Mr. NIXON and the United States. He was pushed into the fountain. Another youth took his place and launched into a denounciation of "Yankee imperialists."

I followed the San Marcos crowd as they marched from the university to the Plaza San Martin in the city's center to await the Vice President's return to his hotel. The students amused themselves by tearing the United States flag from the wreath Mr. NIXON had placed at the foot of the statue of Gen. José de San Martin, Peru's liberator. All the while they chanted, "Yankee, go home."

A deafening chorus of boos, catcalls and whistles arose from the mob when Mr. NIXON reached the plaza. The demonstrators pushed the police aside and swarmed around the official car. Some shoved Mr. NIXON, spat on him. They tore the shoulder decorations from the uniform of Lt. Col. Vernon Walters, the Vice President's military aide. Others threw small stones and tomatoes that struck and spattered the Nixon party.

United States Secret Service men surrounded Mr. NIXON, hustled him into the hotel. The crowd hung around, booing and whistling. Finally, a group of 80 club-swinging policemen dispersed them.

REDS WITH CHEERLEADERS

The Communists were quiet at Quito, in Ecuador, but busy at Bogotá, in Colombia. They did not have things all their own way.

A crowd of about 2,000 awaited Mr. NIXON when he arrived at his hotel from the Bogotá Airport. It included many Reds, but was predominantly pro-United States.

Cheerleaders led the Communists in rhythmic chants of, "NIXON go, NIXON go." Others in the crowd heckled them and shouted them down. Mounted police kept the demonstrators under control and the Nixon party safe. Noticeable among the Red "students" were men and women 40 years old, or older.

It was in Caracas, the Nixons' last stop, that the Communist attacks on the Vice President reached their climax.

Nearly 1,500 teen-agers, with older leaders, packed the airport terminal building. As the Vice President alighted from his plane, the demonstrators set off a pandemonium of shouting.

One youth grabbed Mrs. Nixon's arm and shouted, "Little Rock, Little Rock."

FROM THE MOB: SPIT

Mr. NIXON omitted his speech of greeting because of the noise. Members of the official party made their way between lines of soldiers toward their cars. Jeers, insults, and a veritable rain of spit showered down on them.

A traffic jam halted the official car briefly at the outskirts of the capital. I watched a group of about 50 poorly dressed adults start from the roadside toward the Nixons' cars. A truckload of soldiers blocked them off.

The motorcade moved on again. Once more it was halted by traffic. By this time, the truckload of soldiers had disappeared.

A group of about 150—carrying typically communistic placards on long sticks—ran out of a side street. They attacked Mr. NIXON's car with the sticks, broke several windows, threw rocks as big as baseballs which dented the sides of the cars. United States and Venezuelan flags were ripped from the vehicles.

Mr. NIXON escaped injury. The Venezuelan Foreign Minister, riding with him, was cut by flying glass. Colonel Walters got a mouthful of glass splinters. All the cars near the head of the caravan were damaged.

NO HELP FROM POLICE

All this time, five motorcycle policemen sat astride their machines in the midst of the melee. Occupants of several police cars in the motorcade took no action. United States Secret Service men leaped from their cars. With the palms of their hands, they pushed back the demonstrators and protected Mr. NIXON until the motorcade could get under way again.

The Vice President went directly to the United States Embassy residence. This little plot of United States territory was well guarded. Mr. NIXON and most of his party stayed there instead of at the military club, where a plush suite had been made ready for him.

The Communists still were not appeased. Later that day a small group threw stones at the United States Chancery and attacked an assistant attaché. That night, mobs ranged through downtown Caracas, breaking store windows, looting shops, and destroying automobiles.

The flimsy security precautions caused the Vice President to cut short his stay in Venezuela. On the way to the airport, his entourage was escorted by a heavy guard of military police carrying submachine guns. From thin crowds along the route I heard occasional cries of "get out," but there were no further scenes of violence.

LEADERSHIP BY REDS

It was obvious that not all members of the mobs in both Lima and Caracas were Com-

munists. Some were youngsters looking for excitement. Others were adults who hate the United States for some reason. Many were simply hoodlums out to stir up a little deviltry.

Vice President NIXON is convinced, however, that the leadership in both instances was communistic. The United States through Mr. NIXON, was gaining great good will. The Reds, obeying high-command orders, were out to stop it at any cost.

The result was one of the greatest indignities the United States has suffered in recent history.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of May 21, 1958]

BOOMERANG ON COMMUNISTS?—RIOTS AGAINST NIXON HELD LIKELY TO STIR ANTI-RED MOVEMENTS

(By David Lawrence)

There is some evidence that the Moscow government is beginning to be disturbed over the consequences of the demonstrations against Vice President NIXON in Latin America. While steadily encouraging anti-Americanism in South America, the Kremlin, it is reliably reported, did not anticipate the kind of climax which now has brought a vigorous countermovement.

For today the Communist projects of the last several years are in danger. There are more than 200,000 active Communists in various Latin American countries, guided by daily Communist newspapers. A number of trade missions have been aiding in the work of political infiltration. The publicity due to Mr. NIXON's experience and the exposure of Communist intrigue has just given the Communists unexpected worries. Their projects will come under fire now inside every country in Latin America.

Already the four-party junta which rules Venezuela, in which the Communist Party is an equal member, is in trouble. Two civilian members of the junta have just resigned in protest against the inaction of the Venezuelan police. As for the strange behavior of the police—directed by a cabinet minister of Communist sympathies—significant comment comes from Earl Mazo of the staff of the New York Herald Tribune, who was an eyewitness to the incidents in which Mr. NIXON's life was threatened. He writes:

"The Caracas killer mob of 300 screeching Communist-led individuals, ranging from teen-agers to aged derelicts, attacked Mr. NIXON's car as his motorcade was stalled in a mysterious traffic tieup. The Venezuelan police either vanished or froze where they stood. The tieup occurred in a midtown area that is notorious for bloodshed in revolutions and riots. * * *

"This reporter witnessed the attack on Mr. NIXON from a photographers' truck immediately in front of the Vice President's car. The viciousness of the affair was compounded by the fact that the Venezuelan police did practically nothing to protect the Vice President and his wife. The cool maneuvers of a half-dozen American Secret Service agents, several of whom were hurt, prevented injury to Mr. NIXON."

President Eisenhower naturally got reports by telephone about the incident. He decided to send marines to a nearby point in the Caribbean to be ready "just in case." Thoughtless critics promptly assailed him for doing so. But supposing Mr. NIXON had been trampled upon and taken prisoner, what would the critics have said? Of course, they would have denounced the President for not having taken proper precautions.

Should Vice President NIXON have canceled the trip to Latin America? Secretary Dulles answers this way:

"These things, you know, are much simpler to judge after the event than before the event. I believe myself, in the light of what we knew before Vice President NIXON went there, it was a quite correct judgment on his part to go. I think if we had all known what was going to happen there and had been able to foresee the events, probably he would not have gone. But, you know, if you don't go to places because of threats you will be locked up at home. I have never gone to any country in the world, hardly, but what I have had threats and there have been demonstrations of one sort or another. It is so with the Vice President, who has also visited a great many countries. If you allow yourself to be deterred by threats of that kind, the result is that the Communists will imprison you at home. I don't accept that at all.

"The miscalculation in the case of the visit to Caracas was primarily a miscalculation as to the adequacy and efficiency of the police force. It virtually melted away at the sight of trouble. That wasn't anticipated. I don't know whether it could have been anticipated or not. But if there had been an adequate handling of that situation by the police, such as occurs in most countries, there would not have been any reason whatever to have concluded that the trip was unwise to have undertaken.

"Now we can see, in the light of after events, that that might perhaps have been foreseen. The police force that had been maintained under Estrada had been virtually liquidated, and we see now that the substitute police that had been created was inadequate and did not know how to cope with the type of organized rowdy mob such as the Communist agitators put on."

On balance, the episode may boomerang in favor of the United States and against communism. The anti-Communists in South America will have an issue now which will grow into a demand that Communist Parties be banned or, if allowed to exist, that they should not be permitted to participate in the government lest the United States be alienated. For, throughout Latin America, they know that the United States can in the long run do more for all the people of this hemisphere than can the opportunistic Communist regime in Moscow.

Chief Thomas Honored Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN H. MAY, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, Fire Chief Henry G. Thomas is an often-honored man, and no one deserves it more than he. I am proud of the fact that the Hartford Times has added to his honors in their editorial column and I would like at this time to submit this editorial for publication in the RECORD:

CHIEF THOMAS HONORED AGAIN

Fire Chief Henry G. Thomas is the first uniformed man ever to head the National Fire Prevention Association. The organization is 62 years old, and draws members and executives from the ranks of leaders in insurance, engineering, and many other fields.

Chief Thomas' record as chief of the Hartford Fire Department for 13 years and as fire marshal for some time before that is one of great devotion to the city he serves. He knows Hartford minutely; that is part of his job. But he contributes a zeal for the city's good that is remarkable and highly to be commended.

When there is a job to be done that involves long hours of conference and attention to detail with little or no prospect of remuneration or recognition, Chief Thomas is likely to come to mind as the man to ask. His work as civil defense chief of the city is only one example.

It would be possible for a man to be that kind of administrator and still be hard to like. Chief Thomas in his personal relations with others is approachable, likable, and popular. His voice is soft, but when he speaks people listen.

Congress Needs Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MYRON V. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial from the Arkansas City (Kans.) Traveler of Thursday, May 15:

CONGRESS NEEDS LEADERSHIP

Were the outbreaks timed and were they Communist inspired?

This double-barreled question keeps cropping up in view of violence in Algeria and Lebanon, while on another continent the Nation's Vice President was made the target of jeers and spit in one South American country and stoned in another.

At this moment Congress is considering a foreign-aid bill. Possibly millions of Americans are ready to stop foreign aid and they ask, "What are we getting for it? Enemies?"

Leaders in South America insist the Communists are behind the insults against Mr. NIXON. It could be that his visit is serving a purpose. It is showing these nations they are in danger of being taken over by the Reds.

Americans will always be dubious, however. There is a strong feeling foreigners do not like us. Money sent to them does not create goodwill, some people believe. In addition, some foreigners resent our reluctance to buy from them goods which are available in our own country. They believe we should not protect our producers.

Uncle Sam's position is made more difficult because this is an election year and politics overshadows sincerity in the most important foreign and domestic issues. This happens when the Nation is witnessing an economic revolution within while a new power attempts to dominate the world.

Our foreign policy has been criticized since there was a change of administration. Behind much of the criticism is politics. It is during times like this that the level head can do much to calm the nerves of the jittery. Recently one of these persons listened to complaints about the foreign program and noted, "We still have peace. Our procedure can be criticized by many but the fact we are not at war should be worth something." How many people prefer a world of uprisings to outright war? Or have we forgotten what war brings? The citizen who treasures peace believes this Nation is fortunate because he remembers Pearl Harbor and Korea.

As important at the moment is domestic policy and followers of the politicians will see a move underway in Congress to revive the New Deal. All sorts of programs are being suggested to ease a recession. The

plans will be financed on credit. The Nation will be plunged into greater debt. A decade or so hence there will be a day of reckoning. Every individual will be forced to pay for the folly. Then the Red menace will be felt here as it is in many foreign lands.

Internally, a difficult problem has arisen since the last war and Congress failed to cope with it. While attempting to keep peace with the world it neglected a domestic duty. That was to keep up with the economy. Control of the economy changed hands so to speak. Agriculture lost this power while industry—namely, steel and automobiles—took it over. It must never be forgotten that this change came while Government controls pretty well governed the destiny of the farmer.

For several years agriculture had rough sledding but the national economy kept improving. No depression was forthcoming. That was the tipoff to the changing times. Now agriculture is looking up but a recession had slowed business. Steel and auto industries are in a bad way. That's proof the economy is no longer dependent on agriculture.

Unless this Nation takes a firm stand and replaces politicians in Congress with sound businessmen and sincere leaders the domestic and foreign programs will eventually bring chaos. This is no time to spend what the people do not have in order to get votes. If foreign friendship can be bought with the guaranty that American money is not building Communist machines there is reason to move ahead. There is no future for the young American if political leaders insist on increasing the debt in order to make more jobs when a recession is not general. What Congress does now could well destroy the rights Americans want tomorrow.

Ignoring Economic Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Peoria (Ill.) Journal-Star of May 9, 1958:

IGNORING ECONOMIC LAWS

It is obvious that the industries hardest hit economically these days are the automotive industry and the tractor industry, with resulting effects on steel and others.

It can hardly be regarded as pure coincidence that these very business enterprises are the ones which have been subjected for years to the cockeyed economic theories and pressures of Walter Reuther.

Mr. Reuther is a very smart man, but his theories and the policies that he has forced on key industries are born not for practical use in the business field but for their political appeal.

He has sought things that sound good instead of things that actually are good and workable.

Ironically, it is the high cost of "security" in a large measure that has given automobiles and tractors a price structure that is presently destroying the real security of the workers. They are discovering the hard way that the only realistic security lies in the continued business success of their companies and that socialistic idea and runaway costs are not helpful to such success.

It is no secret that the heaviest blow to new car sales is the reluctance of the new-car-a-year people to stay on that schedule, or that the heaviest blow to heavy equipment such as caterpillar tractors is the decision of major users to stretch replacement from 2 years to 5—both decisions due to the high cost of equipment and its rapid depreciation in value.

It reminds us that the coal industry has been in its own private "depression" for almost 20 years, ever since John L. Lewis extorted wages and huge "welfare" funds which coal miners may well deserve but which the customers would not support. An industry regarded as so essential that price could not hurt it has been sick ever since—and the miners have had no real security of work in years.

Security cannot be provided by a piece of paper when economic laws are ignored and violated.

Law Day—Address by Hon. James A. Farley, Lamar School of Law, Emory University, Emory University, Ga., May 9, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include the following address given by the Honorable James A. Farley at Emory University on Law Day, May 9, 1958:

It is an honor to be a guest of this distinguished university. Both as a politician, which I have been, and as a businessman, which I am, I have many friendships in Georgia which I value highly. With all respect for the institutions of this State, it is nevertheless not amiss to say that Emory has as proud a place in Georgian life as any other.

Perhaps you will, nevertheless, allow me to speak of national rather than local problems today. It seems to me now that national questions transcend all others in importance. The United States is, I think, considering its whole position both in domestic and international affairs. Like most veteran politicians I am sensitive when change is in the air.

The current recession is bringing up for consideration some of the problems which faced the country as far back as 1932. Tension existing between the United States and the Soviet Union is also causing a continuous examination of foreign policy. The thinking is already beginning which will crystallize in political issues and international decisions within the next 2 or 3 years.

This is as it should be. The whole success of American democracy is rooted in just this process. Facts are first studied in universities and are discussed in organizations great and small. Interpretations are given and debated. Points of view and measures are suggested. Eventually in the American party system some of these are selected as political issues. These issues are decided in the ensuing political campaigns. In a sense, the universities, faculties and students alike, are thus the intellectual general staff of the country. Out of them come the accumulation of data and the stream of ideas which make America politically a progressive country. This is true both in domestic and foreign matters.

Internally the recession has brought up, and I think is establishing, certain attitudes on the part of the American public.

In our youth we thought that periodic depressions were unavoidable misfortunes. They were like bad weather or hurricanes. You endured them, and hoped that they would blow over. But there was nothing to be done about them. But during the past 25 years, as economists have studied and businessmen have worked we have come to think that they can be controlled, that in time perhaps they can be eliminated, and that it is part of the business of Government to adopt policies and take measures for that purpose.

The younger of you here will hardly realise how great a change that is. I like to think that it is, at least partly, a result of my own first national campaign—that of 1932. Today most economists and statesmen and practically all politicians consider economic policy very much a part of their business. They do this in part at least because the American public, deep in its heart, considers it fundamentally wrong for a man-made system to tolerate human misfortune if it can be avoided, unless, of course, it is occasioned by the misconduct or fault of the people who suffer. But in our modern economic system the people who suffer in case of recession are very often people who had no responsibility for what happened. As a result, the United States is everywhere discussing antirecession measures which can be taken, either by private business or by Government authorities or by both of them working together. You have to be as old as I am to remember that, a generation ago, it was seriously urged that the Government of the United States had no business concerning itself with these matters. No one is taking that position today, and no one will.

The United States has developed a system of production and distribution which at present is the strongest and most fertile in the world. This is partly due to a high factor of organization in both industry and labor. On an average we have steadily increased the productivity of labor, and its real wages as well. To do it we have steadily increased the standard of efficiency of national industry. Our problem just now is to assure that this improvement shall be continuous. It is not enough to look merely at 10-year averages, satisfying as these are in retrospect. We want the improvement to be continuous, and not to be interrupted and in distress every few years.

Entirely nonpartisan economists tell us this requires two conditions. One of them is maintenance of national production at an uninterrupted and increasing level. The other is making sure that the spendable income reaching individual consumers shall also remain uninterrupted. This means full employment, or failing it, full provision for the involuntary unemployed. That is why, in Washington today, proposals are being made to increase the length of time for which unemployment insurance payments are made and to cut taxes, putting additional spendable income into the hands of the public at a time when it is being cut by unemployment. That is why programs of public works and other similar measures are being discussed.

Meanwhile, private businessmen are taking counsel together to see whether more cannot be done to iron out the peaks and valleys in our economic system. Already this has produced results. Great companies, even in the face of a poor year, are endeavoring not to cut their expenditures for capital construction and to improve the distribution of the goods they have for sale. All of this discussion and counsel seems to me necessary and wise.

If we are to work effectively on these matters, it becomes necessary, I think, to make one change in a historic division of American politics. This is the idea that there is a party of "capital" against a party of "labor." In the old days when the Government went

to work on economic problems the political assumption was that it must be hostile to business and that when business goes to work on problems it must oppose government. Probably there was reason for this attitude in earlier times. But I wonder whether times have not changed.

The fact is that America has chosen, rightly, as it seems to me, to use private business as the method by which it produces. The work done by Socialist bureaus in many parts of the world is done here by private companies, big and little. They are our service of supply. Government, on the other hand, supplies the ground rules and many of the facilities under which these companies work. You cannot, I am clear, have government perpetually in opposition to business or business perpetually in opposition to government. Neither can do the work of the other and both ought to work together. Obviously there is a difference between the staff of the corporation and the staff of a government department, but not as much as you would think. The days when business automatically resisted every social advance, I believe, are over. For one thing, modern business means mass production and mass production needs a mass market. You cannot have a mass market unless you have a prosperous and well-paid population.

It happens that the United States has done better at distributing prosperity than any other country in the world, not excepting Socialist countries. Back in the days of the New Deal we reckoned that the day would come when every American family would have the equivalent of an income of $5,000 a year. We have not quite got there yet, but we are well on the way. As we have moved toward that, American production has moved up and American business has prospered. So it seems to me that we are reaching a point where the interests of government and the interest of business run very close together. Our politics ought to reflect that fact.

I make no pretense of being an economist. But there are two conclusions that even a businessman can safely draw.

The first is that no one will buy what he thinks he cannot pay for now or in a reasonable time. If labor wants jobs and business wants customers, the final decision rests with you and me and all of us who consume the product of the United States. We will buy only if we have jobs and paychecks. For that reason, whenever and wherever it is possible to keep men employed this must be done both as humane policy and as business commonsense. Governments, Federal and State, must assist this process in every way possible. We know some ways to do that. Probably there are more ways than we have yet discovered and it is our business to find them out.

The second is that spending can be done through savings, as well as through consumer buying. This is something which has not yet been said in this discussion and it needs saying. In bad years people do save their money. They may need it later. But that does not mean that the money is not spent. It goes into a savings account or perhaps into an insurance company. It does not stop there; the bank or the insurance company must put it to work. It does this by lending money to build houses or plants or public utilities. Some of it goes to cities and towns for schools and roads. It is the business of the banks and the insurance company to pump savings into useful work. When this is done a builder buys building materials or a contractor buys cement, and both of them hire labor, as do the manufacturers of building materials and of cement. Employees of these enterprises spend their wages. The whole economy moves forward.

I think in combination private business and government can work together to see that neither savings, which are capital, nor individuals, who are workmen, shall be idle.

This is particularly true of America now. We know, almost to dead certainty, that the needs and activities of our country 4 or 5 years from now will be far greater than they are today. We know that we shall need, for example, at least 7 million more houses by 1963. Each of these will need the whole kit and background that goes with a modern house; a road to its door, electric and natural gas conduits to its cellar, lights, facilities, and appliances inside. This means powerplant increases, schools, shops, and services to match. It ought not to be past human ingenuity to arrange that needs we can presently calculate shall be provided for by building now when we have men and money available.

We may, it is true, need to make credit arrangements bridging the present gap. In an earlier struggle with depression, as I have reason to remember, our experiments showed that the American public honestly pays for whatever it buys as soon as it can. It is for economists and financial experts to work out how credit can be used; but our experience shows that while Americans sometimes need time to pay for their houses and other equipment if they are given the time they do pay when they can.

This is why I think the present recession can be handled and why I think we can take another forward step in learning how future recessions can be modified to the point of disappearance.

Whether I am right or wrong about that I am perfectly clear that the American public wants this problem licked, not only for now but if possible for the future as well. I think it can be done and done without putting the country into a Socialist straitjacket either.

International affairs present an added reason for doing this job. Business requires me to travel abroad and I see many men and many businesses in other countries. One fact shows up with great regularity. The United States is no longer merely a country by itself. It is a part of an economic system which interacts with most of the countries of the free world. We are dependent on them and they depend on us. If the 20th century has settled anything it is that not even a country as great as the United States can live alone. What happens here affects the lives of men and women in Europe, in South America, in parts of Asia, just as what they do affects our lives as well.

This statement has more serious implications than many of us realize. Three South American countries, for instance, eat or go hungry, depending on the market price for copper in the United States. Four more Latin American countries depend on coffee. What we do with cotton can make or break several other countries. All of these peoples are saying to us, in one form or another, "Can you not stabilize things sufficiently so that we know from one year to the next about where we are?" It seems to me that they have a point.

They are also saying something else, and not unnaturally. They are saying, "if the United States cannot keep things in balance we must get together and do it ourselves." Six European governments have just joined a common economic pool. Our South American friends and allies are discussing the same thing; a Mexican President was elected last week on a platform which included a common market with the rest of Latin America.

This is not anti-Americanism. These are groups of nations trying to do for themselves what American farmers and American manufacturers have always tried to do within our own country. American policy has thus far refused to deal with these situations except in 1 or 2 cases such as sugar, where we do stabilize, and wheat, where we have in the past made such agreements. I wonder whether the time has not come for a new look at our foreign economic policy.

We dislike recessions in the United States and rightly so; but we are strong enough to handle them here. Smaller nations, especially when they are dependent on the United States, cannot. A small recession for us is catastrophe for them. It seems to me we have to recognize that, in the 20th century world, economic life goes beyond anyone's national borders, including our own. This means we must take common counsel with other countries to work together in matters of economics as well as in matters of defense. If this is wisely done I think it will steadily lower the necessity for foreign aid which at best can be only temporary.

This is not merely economics. It is also national defense. If the United States is to be secure in her defense we have to have allies and friends in a great many parts of the world. For that matter, many other countries in the world depend for their own military security on the strength of the United States. We cannot say to an ally, "of course you will help us in matters of defense, but of course we will fight you in matters vital to your economic life."

There is no clear method by which nations work together in economics. Our European friends are just beginning to try out methods new in the world's history. These European nations, for instance, have a Coal and Steel Community. They are now beginning to study other arrangements. Our South American friends are considering similar measures for the Western Hemisphere. It seems to me that the Government of the United States cannot safely stand aside.

We are not ready to offer a solution to these questions. But we must be ready at least to state them and to move toward their answer, American fashion, by debate and eventual decision. The United States will have to have relations with the new European common market. She will have to recognize the fact that if she wants friends in Latin America arrangements have to be made for orderly and continuous markets in those products such as copper, coffee, and oil on which Latin Americans largely depend. There are at least a dozen similar problems pressing in other parts of the world. On their solution depends not only the economic welfare but the military safety of the United States.

All these problems are, of course, overshadowed by the limitless unsolved problem of war and peace. On that score I am optimistic. I have not much faith in summit conferences because I do not recall any conferences of that kind which really settled questions. I rather doubt if the Summit conference now under discussion can do very much. I have had too much experience in affairs to try to tell the men who at present have the responsibility what they ought to do about holding such a conference. They know their situation better than anyone else. Quite possibly it is more dangerous not to hold such a conference. I cannot tell. It is possible to say, however, that if such a conference is held no one ought to expect too much from it. The Soviet Union, if it is not totally mad, does not want war any more than we do. In the long run, the present contest will be decided by the strength, the equity and the humanity of the two systems which are now opposing each other. It will be finally settled not by bombs but by persuasion.

Persuasion, however, will be closely allied to our capacity first to make our American system work well and, second, by our ability to make it work with the economic systems of other countries. This, in brief, will be the content of political discussions in the United States through the next 2 years.

So I close as I began. Universities, such as Emory, must study the problems, find the

facts and offer possible interpretations. In the great sense, they furnish the material and the thinking on which through its political processes America must base its decisions.

In this work Emory has already made notable contributions. Let me, as guest, as a businessman, as a politician, or perhaps simply as a member of the American public, pay my tribute to what you have done and offer my hope that you will keep up the good work.

Three Hundred and Twenty-fifth Anniversary of Wethersfield, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN H. MAY, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most historic towns in the United States, my hometown of Wethersfield, Conn., is celebrating its 325th anniversary.

I have lived in Wethersfield almost 34 years and consider it a great honor to note this important milestone in the town's history.

It is particularly appropriate that we reflect on the great traditions of this town and of the colonial days, especially since consideration of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii is uppermost in the minds of the people today.

The accompanying editorial by the Hartford Times expresses the feeling of the people in Connecticut on this occasion:

WETHERSFIELD'S 325TH MILESTONE

Wethersfield, settled almost a century and a half before the founding of the Republic, is this week marking the 325th anniversary of its existence. Rich in tradition, the town has prospered with the growth of the Nation but happily it has not lost its charm or neglected its historic landmarks.

Life has not always been completely tranquil and unruffled along the banks of "The Long Tidal River." Residents of this old town experienced the horror of an Indian massacre, it saw its maritime trade dwindle with changing times, and, as did its sister towns in Connecticut, sent its sons to all the wars at home as well as to the battlefields beyond the seas.

Although it was only a tiny village, its geographic location made it an acceptable site for the famous conference between General Washington and Count Rochambeau. It was in Wethersfield that the plans were made for the siege of Yorktown and the final triumph of the American cause.

One of the most gratifying things about Wethersfield is that in the span of more than three centuries the townspeople have had the good sense and sound foresight to retain much of the character of the town that has made it such a charming community. It has not been easy because the pressure to cast out mementos of a rich past for the glitter of modernization is great.

But Wethersfiled has saved its trees, it has preserved the essential qualities of its center green and it has resisted the temptation to destroy many of its fine old houses. It is to be hoped that future generations in the town will not succumb to the blandishments of so-called, but sometimes hollow progress.

There is a golden opportunity in this town to preserve the landmarks that are so closely identified with the New England tradition. With the removal of the State prison from the center of the town, problems will arise with respect to the eventual disposition of those structures. The situation will present a real challenge to the town fathers to keep Wethersfield the fine old community it is today.

Wethersfield, 1 of the 3 river towns, is symbolic of the solid virtues that played such a major role in early colonial times as well as in the formative years of the Republic. It made its substantial contribution to the public good, and it will continue to do so as we move forward into a new age, different from the past in everything but human aspirations and ambitions.

Growth of Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record of May 13, 1958, on the progress which has been made over the years by the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce:

Wilkes-Barre Board of Trade, forerunner of our present Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce, was founded March 24, 1884, some 74 years ago. Fewer than 15 members were present.

This evening at Wilkes College gymnasium almost 1,000 members of our chamber, their wives, and guests will gather to observe its founding, and, like the original charter members, they are composed of individuals interested in the general prosperity of Wilkes-Barre.

All of them will be interested in the remarks made by the principal speaker, United States Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, a man who rides high on the waves of national popularity. Our city is privileged and proud to welcome one so distinguished.

Yet, underneath interest in the principal speaker is the inherent desire of the members to learn what has been accomplished in the year just passed. Those present tonight will listen avidly to reports made by Edmund H. Poggi, Jr., chamber president, and Samuel M. Wolfe, Jr., chairman of the steering committee of the chamber, Greater Wilkes-Barre Industrial Fund, and the committee of 100.

In 1884, we are told the former Board of Trade listened to complaints by businessmen about nonbusiness subscribers to telephone service who tied up lines for 15 minutes. Today, a different generation complains about traffic congestion and insufficient parking areas.

Times most assuredly have changed—and, we hope, for the better; yet new problems forever confront us as a community. With a strong and united chamber, we can face up to these problems and in most instances find a solution. Certainly, the chamber needs support from business and professional men as it never needed it before. Only with such support can we as a community keep pace with a progress that becomes us.

President Carlos P. Garcia's State Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the President of the Philippines, the Honorable Carlos P. Garcia, is soon to embark upon a visit to the United States where he will be greeted by our President and engage in discussions with our Secretary of State and others of our distinguished representatives. President Garcia's administration is friendly to the United States.

Earlier this year, the Congress has been requested by the President to continue the mutual security program and to provide assistance to meet certain needs of newly independent and economically impaired countries of the world. In his state of the Union message delivered at the opening of the present session of Congress, the President pointed out that if we are to reap the multiple benefits of other countries becoming strong bulwarks against Communist encroachment, of reaching a point where mutually profitable trade can expand between them and us, and of entering a state of mutual understanding and confidence, our economic aid efforts should be made more effective.

The House concurred in that view by overwhelmingly approving the mutual security authorization bill of 1958 a few days ago.

High on the list of countries needing and deserving our aid and cooperation is our proven friend and ally, the Republic of the Philippines.

The economic plight of the Philippines has been and continues to be an obstacle in the path of the growth of this relatively new nation, which came into being in a time of trouble and has struggled to progress in the face of it ever since. The country's international payments position continues to weaken, and dollar reserves have declined until they are at a dangerous figure. There has also been a fall in export earnings and a disproportionately high level of imports. Recently, a shortage of rice, keeping pressure on retail prices, has caused added suffering to the little man.

The Government of the Republic of the Philippines has apparently tried to impose controls wherever necessary, and has been endeavoring to effect drastic economies in current operations. In no particular, however, does it appear that strongly entrenched democratic ideals have been sacrificed. Further, the Government of the Republic of the Philippines, under President Carlos P. Garcia and Vice President Diosdado Macapagal, continues the policy of close cooperation and friendship with the United States.

The particular forms in which our economic assistance to the Philippines should be cast must necessarily be left to experts. As suggested in the state of the Union message, there will probably

be a greater use of repayable loans. Industrial and agricultural assistance must be vitalized and expanded. I recall in connection with one of the Philippines' principal pay crops, sugar, President Eisenhower said, when he approved the extension of the Sugar Act in 1956:

It was not considered feasible to recommend an increase in the Philippine quota at this time. I believe, therefore, that when new amendments are being prepared at the conclusion of the present act, consideration should be given to allowing the Philippines to share in increased consumption.

Since the days of the war, when Filipinos fought at our side, and the dark days thereafter in their struggle against Communist aggression, the halls of Congress have rung with praises of the Philippines and pledges of unending friendship and cooperation. I hope our memories will never grow dim, or our footsteps lag, in the performances of our promises.

Mr. Speaker, the Republic of the Philippines may take heart from these remarks of one who will never fail to give full recognition to its distinguished place in our history.

Cardinal Stritch Never Spared His Right Arm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to the editor of the Tablet, written by Mr. John C. Sciranka, editor of American Friends of Slovak Freedom, of Passaic, N. J.:

CARDINAL STRITCH NEVER SPARED HIS RIGHT ARM

DEAR SIR: We were all most sorry for Cardinal Stritch when the sad news came that his right arm had to be amputated.

I picture in my mind three occasions, which recall most pleasant memories, when Cardinal Stritch would not spare his right arm. The first occasion was, when he as a young bishop of Toledo, Ohio, readily responded to say Mass for the Slovak parish in need of a priest. I mentioned this in an article dealing with Famous Americans Who Mastered Languages, which was also reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD before the Cardinal's departure for Rome.

Another occasion was when Cardinal Stritch preached during the centennial birthday celebration of Rev. Stephen Furdek, known as Father of American Slovaks, on Labor Day, 1955, in Cleveland, Ohio. Over 20 archbishops and bishops attended the anniversary in the public auditorium. Cardinal Stritch came to the banquet and spoke again, imparting his blessings.

The third occasion was the 38th national convention of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America, held in Chicago, Ill., in the spring of 1956. Here Cardinal Stritch celebrated Pontifical Mass in the Holy Name Cathedral and also preached the sermon. Although there were more than 100 monsignori and priests present, His Eminence did not spare his right hand, but distributed Holy Communion to all who came to the altar rail, and there were many who received the Holy Eucharist from the Cardinal's right hand.

Cardinal Stritch sensed that many present at the convention came from far and wanted to carry with them a blessed remembrance that they received Holy Communion from his hand, therefore, he did not spare himself. Those many have, indeed, the most pleasant remembrance and, no doubt, are praying for the Cardinal's well being.

Although Cardinal Stritch preached to the crowded cathedral on the importance of good education, in the evening he came to the Blackstone Hotel to be the principal speaker. This is the best evidence that Cardinal Stritch did not spare himself and especially he did not spare his right arm, which had to be amputated.

I am also reminded of a story about a Slovak Franciscan Brother, who died over a year ago in the Gary, Ind., hospital and who had great admiration for Cardinal Stritch. This Franciscian had to have his leg amputated. Shortly after this an amputation of another leg followed. Then one of his friends wrote him that he should cheer up, for the angels thought he was too heavy to be carried to heaven, therefore, they reasoned that one of his legs should be amputated. But he still was too heavy, so off went another leg. I visited the West around that time and wrote up the story. I understand that it reached many American people, even the bishops and archibishops. George Sokolsky liked the story and wrote me about it. So, very likely millions of friends and admirers of Cardinal Stritch, who were blessed with his now amputated right arm, feel that the good Lord wanted his hand to take a rest, for he never spared it.

JOHN C. SCIRANKA,
Editor of American Friends of Slovak Freedom.
PASSAIC, N. J.

Columbus Day for National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN H. MAY, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with a bill which I am introducing today to make Columbus Day a national holiday, I should like to emphasize that it is perfectly logical and just that we should give recognition to the man who discovered America and who paved the way for the settlement of the Western Hemisphere. Through his vision, his courage and his Christian spirit, he set an example for all generations to emulate. We, who are proud of the pioneering spirit of the earliest Americans can show in this way our appreciation to the first pioneer without whom we may not have had the privilege of living in a land of freedom and opportunity.

Many States now recognize Columbus Day as a holiday and in Connecticut, many offices and businesses close on October 12 in honor of that great man. It is fitting, I believe, that we, as a nation, in selecting our next national holiday should give first preference to Christopher Columbus. I am sure that most Americans will welcome congressional action to this end.

Baseball Anonymous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express a few remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in behalf of a worthy undertaking by Baseball Anonymous, an organization to which I belong. I am inserting the letter I have received from this fine group which speaks for itself:

BASEBALL ANONYMOUS,
Chicago, Ill., May 19, 1958.

DEAR MR. BYRNE: Last Monday evening, May 7, 1958, our board of directors held a meeting of the board. At this time a very serious and worthy project was planned and enacted into a resolution to go full speed ahead.

Our old friend "Big" Ed Walsh, a former star pitcher for the Chicago White Sox from 1904 to 1917, is gravely ill and bedridden. To help defray medical and hospital expenses and to save his life we have to act and be generous ourselves.

It has been resolved to have Chicago's own Ed Walsh Day on Sunday, June 22, 1958. Tickets and donations will be handled by "Cracker" Ray Schalk at Tony Piet Pontiac, 6603 South Western Avenue. Your help is essential to make this affair a huge success.

We have contacted Mayor Richard J. Daley, Charley Comiskey, and many other dignitaries to assist us in this respect. Television, radio and newspaper sportswriters, announcers and sportscasters will be giving us their full support.

Even sports firms and department stores will do their part to show our city's respect for one of Baseball Hall of Fame's most outstanding players—one of yesteryear's greats.

If you're not certain what you can do to help, besides making a donation, please contact any one of our special committee members who will be happy to accept your contribuiton according to the dictate of your heart and conscience. Remember, it's what we all do as a team that counts. Please do your share.

Sincerely yours,

RED FABER,
General Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, as a young boy I saw Ed Walsh pitch many games. He is still considered one of the world's greatest pitchers. When I was old enough, I joined the Chicago White Sox in spring training and was coached by "Big" Ed Walsh. In those days it was not uncommon for a great pitcher like Ed Walsh to pitch 50 games. From 1904 through 1916, Edward Arthur Walsh, Sr., born May 19, 1882 in Plains, Pa., pitched with Chicago in the American League. In 1917 he was with the Boston Braves, National League.

Here is his record:

Year	Club	Games he appeared	Won	Lost
1904	Chicago	18	6	3
1905	do	29	8	5
1906	do	42	17	13
1907	do	57	24	18
1908	do	66	40	15
1909	do	32	15	11
1910	do	52	18	20
1911	do	62	27	18
1912	do	61	14	8
1913	do	13	8	3
1914	do	11	2	3
1915	do	5	3	0
1916	do	2	0	1
1917	do	4	0	1

Looking at Both Sides of Coin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial which appeared on May 7, 1958, in the Daily News Record, of Harrisonburg, Va. I believe it is pertinent to our forthcoming consideration in the House of the legislation providing for an extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act:

When Congress begins debate on proposed changes to our reciprocal trade program, Virginians will do well to follow it closely. What Congress does could have a considerable effect on pocketbooks in Virginia.

The debate will concern proposed stiffer tariff duties on certain items to make it easier for American manufacturers to compete with goods imported from other countries.

American manufacturers in certain lines, including textiles, are faced with tough foreign competition and their problem deserves sympathetic consideration. But there is another side of the coin, as usual. The United States enjoys a favorable trade balance with most of the countries we do business with. They buy more goods from us than we buy from them. Jacking up our tariffs invites retaliation, which would hurt our sales abroad.

Now let's look at the problem as it affects us here in Virginia. Manufacturers and producers in Virginia export millions of dollars worth of products every year. What are these products? Rayon yarn from Front Royal, Fredericksburg, and Roanoke. Cotton textiles from Danville. Apples from the Winchester area. Tobacco products from several places in the State. Coal from our southwest. Cellulose and petroleum products from Hopewell. Industrial chemicals from West Norfolk, and so on.

Virginia's exports to only one country, Venezuela, totaled $6 million in value last year. This was a whopping increase of 54 percent over 1956, according to a survey recently completed by Econometric Specialists, Inc., of New York. The report was released by Creole Petroleum Corp., a United States company operating in Venezuela.

Japan, perhaps, is the best example of the foreign trade problem. More furore has been raised over the importing of inexpensive Japanese textiles than any other single product. Japanese textile manufacturers, with their low wage scales can undersell comparable American-made products on the United States market despite tariff duties and large price markups by American importers, wholesalers and retailers.

Japan has, also, a flourishing optical industry, turning out large quantities of cameras and binoculars which undersell American brands.

This competition must be balanced against the hard fact that Japan is the largest foreign buyer of American products with the exception of Canada, Japan's imports from the United States total nearly three times the value of Japanese exports to this country.

Relatively few American industries are hurt seriously by foreign competition in our domestic market. Congress can go only so far in protecting these industries. To go farther would mean jeopardizing the highly favorable foreign trade balance which the vast majority of American industries enjoy.

Thirty-five Fruitful Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of May 17, 1958, on the occasion of the 35th anniversary of the ordination of the Right Reverend Monsignor Wenceslaus A. Losieniecki to the priesthood. Monsignor Losieniecki is the pastor of the Maternity of the Blessed Virgin Mary Church in Wilkes-Barre:

THIRTY-FIVE FRUITFUL YEARS

A mass of thanksgiving in the Maternity of the Blessed Virgin Mary Church, city, on Sunday morning and a testimonial dinner at Irem Temple on Sunday evening will provide a fitting observance of the 35th anniversary of the ordination of the Right Reverend Monsignor Wenceslaus A. Losieniecki to the priesthood of the Roman Catholic Church.

A native of Blossburg, which furnished a score of priests to the diocese, including the late Rev. J. E. Gryczka, of Kingston, Monsignor Losieniecki has had a fruitful career, although he is now only in his prime and the harvest years are ahead in the normal course of events.

The high regard in which he is held by his ecclesiastical superiors is indicated by the honors he has received, including the rank of Domestic Prelate from the Pope, and the responsibilities he has been asked to assume. He not only has one of the most important parishes in the diocese, but he is a member of the board of consultors. Among other diocesan posts he has held are prosynodal judge and member of the board of examiners of junior clergy and seminarians.

He is also a director of St. Stanislaus Institute, treasurer of the Diocesan Council of the Catholic League, clerical representative in the National Council of the Polish American Congress, member of the board of governors of the Catholic University Alumni Association, charter member of the Reccobono Seminary of Roman Law, director of the Rev. Joseph Dabrowski Foundation at Orchard Lake Seminary, chaplain of the Polish Veterans, life member of the Polish Roman Catholic Museum and Archives Association, member of the Inter-Catholic Press Agency Association, and charter member of the Friends of Poland.

The community knows him also for his service on the boards of the Wyoming Valley Playground and Recreation Association and the American Red Cross.

His parishioners think of him chiefly as an outstanding spiritual leader and administrator who has carried on zealously in the footsteps of his predecessors with results that leave little to be desired. The impressive record speaks eloquently for itself and makes it understandable why an appreciative congregation desires to pay tribute to him on this milestone.

The Importance of States Rights in Preserving Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the greatest domestic problem confronting the United States today is that concerned with States rights and the usurpation by one branch of the Federal Government of the powers properly belonging to the other branches.

Recently I received a paper prepared by Bland Roper, a senior at Laurens High School in Laurens, S. C., on this subject. It is a well-written paper, and it clearly shows the fine grasp this young man has on the subject of States rights and constitutional government.

I am glad to see that our young people—some of them at least—understand the seriousness of the constitutional crisis. These young people are the citizens of tomorrow, on whose shoulders the continuation of our system of government will rest.

I ask unanimous consent that the paper, entitled "The Importance of States Rights in Preserving Americanism," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IMPORTANCE OF STATES RIGHTS IN PRESERVING AMERICANISM

(By Bland Roper)

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." (U. S. Constitution, 10th amendment.)

From the unhealed wounds of the American Revolution, liberty sprang. The colonies, fearing for their safe existence, united in a compact to protect their common freedom. Before joining, each State hesitated, doubted, and turned questioningly to her leaders. In the North, Hancock and Hamilton, and in the South, Pinckney and Madison, were quick to assure their States that only those enumerated powers in the Constitution belonged to the central government. Still the States were dissatisfied. Their murmurs rose to demands and, with the addition of the Bill of Rights to the Constitution, States rights became the fundamental law of the land.

Regarding their victory as decisive, the States dropped their guard. Instantly,

power conscious men broke the tight bonds of the Federal Government and invaded the undefended territory. The solitary resistance of the separate States failed. Finally, convinced that the Union no longer cared about constitutional rights, 11 desperate States withdrew and formed the Confederate States of America. Denied the right to secede, the South fought, bled, and fell.

For the next 60 years a conservative Government through its foreign conflicts produced a wave of national feeling, further sinking the battle-torn doctrine of States rights. The road was open for the coming assault on individual liberty.

In the vicious depression of 1929–33, a new liberal era started. Roosevelt's New Deal, Truman's Fair Deal, and Eisenhower's program brought a tightened control of business, the birth of a welfare state, and a complete alteration in the makeup of the Supreme Court. No longer did the Highest Court consider past principles applicable to the present. It wanted something new. As a result unbelievable decisions with only psychological bases were reached. States rights was at its darkest hour.

Following 1954, a deluge of radical decisions descended. The educational system of a fourth of the Nation was upset. State labor and antisedition laws were made invalid. Attacks were even made against the governing of private institutions. An enthusiastic court went wild.

Instead of reprimanding the judiciary, the other two branches of the Government actively supported it. An injuction measure, which would have denied thousands the right of trial by jury, was narrowly defeated in Congress. Bent on enforcing the Court's decrees, the Chief Executive defied an explicit clause in the Constitution and, without a request, sent troops into a sovereign State.

With bayonets in the backs of her citizens, with court interpretations vaguely based on the Constitution, and with the Government stepping into the daily lives of her citizens, America faces a crisis. Shall she continue her present policy and magnify the threat of socialism and the destruction of democracy or return to the doctrine of States rights, the foundation of our Americanism? The situation stands. It is left to us, the up-coming generation, to chart the course.

Milestone on the Coosa-Alabama River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, a historic milestone was marked recently when a blast of dynamite shook loose the earth on the upper reaches of the Coosa River near Centre, Ala.

This was the ground-breaking ceremony for the first of 5 dams—4 new and 1 existing dam to be improved—which will be raised on the mighty Coosa River.

It was with much personal pleasure that I was able to take part in the ceremonies, because overall development of the Coosa-Alabama River system has been sort of a pet project of mine for some time. My interest has been intense since coming to Congress, especially since seven of the Fourth Alabama District's counties are bounded by this riverway.

Another development affecting the Coosa Valley is that the world's largest paper machine has gone into production at the Coosa River Newsprint Co. mill near Childersburg, Ala. The new machine will add 140,000 tons yearly to the firm's newsprint capacity, and it culminates a $35 million expansion program for the 8-year-old plant.

Commenting on these two developments in a recent editorial was the Sunday Home News of Talladega, Ala., the Sunday edition of The Talladega Daily Home.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit this editorial:

THE MIGHTY COOSA

News that Coosa River Newsprint Co. at Coosa Pines in Talladega County put into production last week the world's largest paper machine came 2 days after news of the groundbreaking for the first of 5 hydroelectric dams to be built by the Alabama Power Co. on the Coosa River.

These two important news stories are closely related for several reasons, particularly as far as Talladega County is concerned.

Recent surveys show that many industries are looking for waterside sites for their new plants. Great quantities of water and power are required in certain modern manufacturing processes. Some industries require water transportation because of its low cost.

A map prepared for the Alabama State Planning and Industrial Development Board shows 67 major industries which have selected Alabama waterways for sites, according to an article in the Montgomery Advertiser.

Fifty-seven of these industries chose streams where barge transportation was available.

The Coosa River Newsprint Co. at Coosa Pines is frequently cited as an example of heavy industry locating on river banks.

One of the greatest paper plants in existence, Coosa River Newsprint, with completion of installation of the large new paper machine, thus culminated a $35 million expansion program.

The machine adds 14,000 tons yearly to the mill's capacity. In a single day the 43-inch-wide machine can make a strip of paper the width of a standard-size newspaper and 14,000 miles long—more than half way around the earth.

This expansion will increase employment in the Childersburg area approximately 600, the company announced.

At the ground breaking ceremonies at the site of the Weiss Dam, first of the series of hydroelectric dams to be built on the Coosa River, Thomas W. Martin, chairman of the board of the Alabama Power Co. said this: "Remember that the building of the dams and powerhouses is just a part of the way. The responsibility rests on the Representatives and Senators to provide the money for building locks at these dams so that commerce may come to the Coosa-Alabama. We are dedicated to the accomplishment of the complete story."

One of these Representatives, ALBERT RAINS of the fifth district, described the Coosa-Alabama waterway as "the second greatest undeveloped waterway in America," the development of which has been delayed too long, thus retarding the growth of the basin.

RAINS reminded the audience at the ground breaking ceremony that many years ago boats plied the Coosa and Alabama Rivers, and added that "in a few short years they will ply the rivers again, bringing new industry and new jobs, and causing income to be moved up considerably."

The Alabama Power Co. is spending $60 million this year to build generating plants, to build or enlarge substations, extend lines and make improvements. During the next 10 years the company is planning to spend many times that amount, company officials announced.

Included in this vast outlay will be the Kelly Creek Dam a few miles west of Talladega in Talladega County and the stream plant at Wilsonville in neighboring Shelby County.

It is of the utmost importance that citizens of the Coosa and Alabama River Valleys get behind the Alabama delegation in Congress and promote the building of locks on the waterway.

As Mr. Martin says, the building of dams and powerhouses is just a part of the way. Congress must provide the money to build the locks which will assure transportation from Rome, Ga., to Mobile and the Gulf of Mexico.

Great quantities of water and electric power will attract industries, but accomplishment of the complete story depends upon water transportation, which means the locks are a must if the dream of almost a century is to be fulfilled.

Mutual Security Act of 1958

SPEECH

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1958

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12181) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, having served on the Foreign Affairs Committee for 12 years, and having been associated during all that period with two of the members, the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], who are both retiring this year, I am painfully aware of the great holes which their departure will leave in our committee, 1 on the majority side, 1 on the minority side, that no one can fill.

It is too bad that Mr. GORDON, with his wonderful spirit, his deep loyalty and attention to duty has been compelled by ill health to give up this heavy burden. Our affection and good wishes go with him.

As to JOHN VORYS, I do not know anybody in the Foreign Affairs Committee, or in the Congress, or in the United States who has a greater knowledge of our foreign relations, and parficularly the role of the mutual assistance program, than does this man. There just is no one else who has his experience and knowledge—and especially when we need some help on events in the past. He has an elephant's memory. Often when we are wrestling with some current problem he will come up with, "Back in lend-lease we had a comparable situation," or whatever other program it may have been in the last 20 years since he has been in Congress. He not only remembers the occasion, but he also re-

calls all the details, and they are generally very pertinent to our particular situation. One cannot but admire and envy his diligence, his industry, and the imaginative suggestions he contributes. His capacity to retain figures and facts and to marshall them convincingly are unsurpassed. His leaving will be an irreparable loss to our committee.

Another retiring Member whom we will miss greatly is Mr. LECOMPTE, of Iowa. He has been on our committee a shorter time but his faithful attendance and loyal support of constructive measures have made him a most valuable member.

The only redeeming feature of these losses is that the acting chairman this year, and our new chairman next session—if worst should come to worst and his party be kept in control at the next election—my friend and fellow physician, Dr. MORGAN, of Pennsylvania, has already demonstrated to us in the committee, and I think to everybody in the House, his extraordinary ability, his keen grasp of essentials, his fairness, his good judgment, and his capacity to give effective leadership.

Mr. Chairman, it is hard to know just what things it is most important to discuss in a debate of this sort. Almost every item has already been touched upon. The problems we face today are just the same as we faced in previous years only more aggravated and perhaps more advanced.

The first fact is that the Communist conspiracy against human freedom still exists. Its target, of course, is still the United States of America. If it can pull other countries away from the United States, if it can weaken us either militarily or economically; in short, if it can isolate, weaken, and destroy the United States, it will have control of the planet. This is a hard and continuing fact. I wish it were not so, but we cannot deny or duck it.

There is a second fact. Since we live on the same planet with that conspiracy and since we do not care to be subjugated by it, we have to resist it. That conflict is the cold war. Some people talk as if the cold war were something that a President or a Secretary of State under this or a previous administration dreamed up as a nice foreign policy. No, it is the price of our survival. Nobody in the free world likes the cold war but we cannot escape it if we would be free.

There is a third hard fact: We cannot call this conflict off except on the Communists' terms—and their terms are surrender. Not necessarily all at once—they are quite willing to accept our surrender step by step, conference by conference. Just now they are agitating for a conference at the summit, supposedly to relax tensions; but, of course, it must be on their terms which specify, among other things, no discussion of the single biggest cause of the tensions; namely, the enslavement of 900 million human beings, politically and economically. If we were to agree to a summit conference on such terms, it would be a mockery and a well-nigh fatal defeat for the free world.

A fourth hard fact is that we cannot continue the cold war indefinitely. We are not that patient a people; and besides, it costs too much. We know that if we do not spend more and more this year and the next for our own defenses and for those of our allies, we court insecurity—and disaster. But we also know that if we do continue to spend these terrific amounts for defense, we are inviting inflation, insolvency—and disaster. Either way, disaster. No wonder Mr. Khrushchev when in his cups drools in anticipation over what he has already announced as the impending victory over us by the Communists.

Well, if the threat still exists, and we cannot escape the cold war, and we cannot call it off except by surrender, and we cannot continue it indefinitely, then the only course left is to try to win the cold war.

We have to confront them with such unity and sustained firmness and strength—military strength, economic strength, and moral strength—that they dare not start a hot war now, because they could not win it. And we have to hold on and on and on until the disintegrating forces that are plainly at work behind the Iron Curtain so weaken them at home that they cannot start a hot war.

At this point some new facts enter the picture which were not recognized so clearly in previous years and which require some changes in our thinking. The first is that we have never really tried to win the cold war; we have just tried to prevent a hot war. Why have we failed to try our best to win the cold war? I think it is largely because we Americans, in our usual self-confidence in our own energy and ability, just took for granted that if we could prevent a military struggle, we would, of course, win any nonmilitary struggle; we would of course win an economic struggle; we would, of course win any scientific struggle or educational struggle. But we are not so sure today. We have an economic downturn here that has shaken our allies. In contrast, the Communists have made some undeniable economic gains and they have achieved some sensational victories in the fields of science and education that have jarred us. These can be of great benefit to us if we learn the lesson from them, if we see that this is not a contest of which side can outsit the other; but of which side can outwit the other. It is not a contest of which side can outwait the other; but of which will outwork the other—outthink, outsacrifice, and demonstrate the tightest discipline.

Now, although the Communists have made these gains, of which we are painfully aware, the United States still has one superasset. It is described in the middle paragraph on page 25 of the committee report, which to me is the most important paragraph in the whole report. The United States still has access to a string of bases—Army bases, naval bases, air bases—all around the world. Russia does not have any such bases. And, most important, there is no way she can get such a string of bases so long as our mutual security system is strong and effective. The one ace we have—and we must never forget it—the one superiority the Soviet Union and Red China cannot match with their sputniks, manpower or anything else, is our string of forward bases. We have these only because of this mutual security program.

Probably there is considerable agreement with what I have said thus far. The disagreement comes on how best to deal with the changed problem; how best to win the cold war before we ourselves are broken in the process.

Some still put faith in making new agreements with regimes that make a virtue of bad faith. Whenever the Communists offer new proposals, they grasp at them as a drowning man at a straw.

Some would say put faith only in our own power. They argue that these other countries are weak and perhaps undependable. They would let the rest of the world collapse and try to go it alone.

But most of our people, I am sure, believe that our best hope is to continue this mutual-security program, recognizing fully all its shortcomings, its difficulties, and its weaknesses, and working harder and more intelligently than we have to correct those weaknesses.

Perhaps our differences of views as to this program arise from differences in emphasis. Some concentrate on the remarkable achievements of this program, and they are listed at the bottom of page 3 and the top of page 4. What has been accomplished in these 10 years is beyond, I think, anything we dreamed would be possible when we started it 10 years ago. The prospects seemed dark indeed. And, the fact that we have been able to succeed in so many ways is the surest promise that we can succeed in the future, if we work hard to improve, correct, modify, and push ahead.

Others concentrate more on the failures. We have heard a good many talk about them during the debate thus far. There have been plenty of failures, plenty of mistakes in judgment. Often we have tried to do too much too fast; we have spread ourselves too thin. Often we have had less than the most competent personnel. It is difficult to get high-grade persons to bury themselves in these out-of-the-way places. How many of us would be willing to quit our jobs here at home and go out to work at lower salaries in these backward, uncomfortable areas, with bad climate, bad sanitation, endless frustrations, and disappointing inability to achieve spectacular results?

It is hard to get the very best top-flight personnel to go. Sometimes we have sent people who were technically proficient but who were too insensitive to the fact that this program is most of all a matter of dealing with persons. We build dams and dynamos and fertilizer plants, not just for their intrinsic value, but because of what building them will do, we hope, to the morale, the sense of confidence, the will to resist, the unity of peoples around the world who are still free and who want to stay free.

The real test is not whether there have been mistakes, but what are we doing about the mistakes? Are our efforts the very best that can be made under the very unideal circumstances?

Let me take some of the criticisms that have been made by various Members during the debate and give what I think are the right answers to them. Maybe I can at least put the issues in better focus or perspective.

It has been charged that each year the Committee on Foreign Affairs says that this bill will be the last. Mr. Chairman, under the Marshall plan for Europe we did have a 4-year program and there was reason to believe that it would end then. It could have, if only Europe had not been threatened. But the Reds started a war in Korea. We can hardly be made responsible for that. Checked in Europe by the Marshall plan, they moved east into Asia, and later south into the Middle East and Africa. They made it perfectly clear that the Communist conspiracy is a world problem, a world threat. We did not like that but we could not escape it. I have not heard anybody from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, since Korea, say "Just give us 1 more year, and that will be the last." For myself, I never made such a statement. I have said in the past, and I say today, that we can stop this program only when we have succeeded—and that will be when the Communist problem has been solved, which means when it is ended.

We have had a program of aid to the American Indians for 175 years. When is it going to stop? Well, it is not going to stop until we solve the problem of helping the American Indians to adjust to present-day society, so they can handle themselves and their problems more satisfactorily in today's world.

We have a program, larger each year than this program, to aid American agriculture. What will be the last year for that? I do not know. It will be only when the problems of agriculture are solved.

It seems rather pointless to spend much time talking about whether this is the last year for mutual security or how many more years it will have to go on. Please God, it will not be too long; but it has got to be until we win, unless we prefer to surrender, and, of course, we do not.

Another statement made is that we do not need to appropriate more funds because of the billions of dollars in the pipeline. There are several things to say about that. I wish you would look at the section on pages 12, 13, and 14 of our committee report, in which we deal with that at some length, more adequately perhaps than in any previous report.

The first thing to note is that the pipeline in the foreign-aid program is not unique. All other agencies of Government with purchasing programs have a pipeline. It consists of unexpended balances for goods and services contracted for but not paid for because not yet delivered. The agency with the largest pipeline is the Department of Defense. The biggest pipeline or carryover we ever had in mutual security was $10 billion in the fiscal year 1953. Because of the Korean war, we had to expand mutual security that year for obvious reasons. That same year, the pipeline for the Department of Defense was $62 billion for the same reasons.

At the end of this fiscal year of 1958, it is estimated that the pipeline for mutual security will be $5.1 billion. For the Department of Defense it will be $32.1 billion. With the necessity of ordering missiles and new superweapons, the Defense Department carryover, or pipeline, is bound to increase again. I think we can hold it down for mutual security.

The pipeline for the Department of Agriculture at the end of this year will be $4.5 billion. All the agencies of the Government combined, excepting only mutual security, have a total carryover of $64 billion.

Now why do not Members argue that we do not need to appropriate new funds this year for any of these other agencies, such as the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Defense, and just use their pipelines instead? Of course, that would not make sense. The funds in a pipeline are not free. They are obligated. They are at work. They are waiting to be spent, to be paid out just as soon as the goods and services contracted for are delivered.

The second thing to note is that the reduction from a high of $10 billion carryover to a low this year of about $5 billion has largely been made by reducing the military pipeline. We reduced it by $800 million in this last year. That is discussed on page 16 of the committee report. We are going to get it down by the end of next year to about $3 billion, and we were told frankly—I cannot dispute it, I think it is correct—that they cannot operate this kind of a program with a much smaller pipeline than that. If they tried to, they would not have the maneuverability and the continuity to be efficient and economical. No money is wasted by being in the pipeline. It has to be there to be spent when the expensive items that take a long time to manufacture are delivered.

Then there is the argument against the economic aid portion of the bill that funds have not been authorized for specific projects in the same way that we require when we pass authorization bills for navigation and flood-control projects. This is perfectly true. But there were two good reasons for it. One was the shortage of time; heretofore these authorizations and appropriations have been on a year-to-year basis. When our engineers make a study of proposed projects in my district or yours, they are given certain initial grants for planning, for surveys. They study the project very carefully, evaluate it from all angles, and establish benefit-to-cost ratios. Most of the factors—political, economic, psychological—are fairly discernible. Even so, it generally takes a year or more. But when working in other countries with all sorts of unfamiliar and unknown factors, it takes a still longer time. Yet under present procedures, the project has to be studied, evaluated, negotiations completed with the other government, and funds obligated—all within less than a year, or else the funds revert to the Treasury.

A second good reason is that in dealing with other governments, there are special political difficulties that we do not have in domestic projects. When we negotiate with other governments regarding projects there, as we must before we can make firm plans, or even make a study, it inevitably raises hopes in those countries.

You will readily realize what it would do to those governments—and many of them are new, some only 10 years old, and very shaky—and to their peoples' confidence in those governments and in us, if we were to raise their hopes and then not be able to go through with the projects, because the time had expired or we had changed our minds, assuming, of course, that the projects proved sound.

We all know the disappointment that follows when the engineers make a favorable report on projects in our districts, and then the Congress waits years to provide funds—or perhaps never provides them. The disappointment, and the political risks to our foreign relations, are much greater when dealing with projects in other lands. Their governments hardly dare to stick their necks out to make the firm commitments we require of them for projects to produce power or fertilizer or build roads to help their economy, unless they have pretty reasonable assurance that our part of the project is going to materialize also. To raise their hopes and then to dash them—again, in the absence of some overwhelming reason—would weaken the other governments, whereas the major objective of the program is to strengthen those governments.

The Development Loan Fund is an effort to reduce this difficulty by permitting longer range planning. The Fund does not have to meet the fiscal year deadline in obligating its funds. Each year it will have to come to the Congress with its budget, like all other Government corporations. The Appropriations Committee and the Congress will examine its budget and if it appears to be getting off the beam, we can reduce its funds. We can even veto individual projects. But the Fund should go a long way toward avoiding the special risks and difficulties inherent in the year-to-year pattern of the past, and thus improve our prospects of achieving the objectives that all of us want.

It is interesting to note that some of those who object most to the system of voting authorizations for projects abroad that are sometimes not as fully studied in advance as projects at home, are the same persons who object also to the Development Loan Fund, which is the best means we have yet devised for curing the difficulty of which they complain. What means do they propose for dealing with it?

There is a new section in the bill this year—the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] spoke about it—section 517, which will require the agency operating the mutual security program to delay

obligating funds for projects which require substantial technical surveys and planning and which require legislative action by the recipient country, until the plans are completed, a firm cost estimate made, and the agency is reasonably sure that the recipient country will complete the necessary legislative action within 1 year. This section is a further attempt to take care of the legitimate objection that has been raised regarding past procedures. We want to be sure that both parties—the other governments and our own—are prepared to go ahead, before either gets in too deep on a given project.

The Communist criticisms of the mutual security program are the charges of waste. Some of them are true. But they are only part of the picture. Frequent mention is made of a cement plant in Korea. Undoubtedly, as we look back on it, some mistakes in judgment were made and the total cost of the project was much higher than anticipated. But look at the Korean program as a whole. Not too many people had much hope for Korea as late as 2 years ago, but today the good results of years of discouraging effort are becoming apparent. The currency has been stabilized for 16 months, although some thought it never could be stabilized. Korea is far nearer self-supporting than seemed possible. The local opposition to our programs, which was bitter, has largely disappeared because the results are now visible to all. In fact, Korea is becoming a showcase of what can be done, even in a divided country under constant threat of war, by cooperation between a country and ourselves. The contrast is dramatic between free Korea and Communist Korea—and even Communist China with its hunger and unrest.

It is never more than 10 percent of the program that is complained of—generally less than 3 percent. Should we, therefore, condemn or knock out the 90-plus percent which is producing remarkably good results?

I was going to report similarly about the gains for the free world in Laos, despite the incredible difficulties there and the relatively high cost of keeping the country free and independent, as we have been able to do. But time does not permit.

Another criticism is of our aid to the neutrals. It is said we should not help any who will not stand up and be counted. But why will they not stand up? We must think of the situation that they face. Generally, it is not because they are pro-Communist. It is because they are afraid. Afraid, first, of the Communists, both the Soviet Union and Communist China. They are closer to those countries than we—and they are less able to defend themselves. Second, they are afraid of the United States—in a different sense: they are not sure of our steadfastness. They hear Americans advocating, in and out of the Congress, that we stop our aid program. They hear other Americans urging us to make a deal with the Kremlin, even at the price of accepting its conquests of other peoples. They do not forget Yalta. They fear they may be next. If they were to stand up and be counted on our side, declaring themselves openly against the Communist side, and then the Congress unfortunately were to do what some are advocating that we do, they would, indeed, be out on a limb, having invited the disastrous reprisals they would face. They are sure of the Communists; but they are not quite sure of us.

It is said the neutrals will not be of help to us in winning a war. That is correct. But our main purpose is not to win a war; it is to prevent a war. And the neutrals are of very great help to us in preventing a war just by preserving their independence. If they do not grant us bases, at least by maintaining their neutrality they deny bases on their soil to the enemy. What they want most of all is to maintain their independence. They do not want to be under European control, or under American control, or under Communist control. The very fact that they are determined to hold on to their newly won independence is exceedingly useful to us. We ought to do our level best, in my opinion, to try to help them keep their independence.

It is said that we have not won friends by this program. But its primary purpose is not to win friends; it is to give other nations increased will and capacity to defend their independence. Its objective is to establish a mutually beneficial partnership, in order better to maintain their independence and ours. They cannot maintain their independence without us as a partner; we can maintain our independence more easily and cheaply and surely if we have them as partners. We hope they will also like us as friends. But that is not the primary objective of this program.

It is said charity begins at home. Of course charity begins at home. But who can contend that this is charity? It is not philanthropy for others; it is survival for the United States. We need them quite as truly as they need us. The justification of the program is not because it does good to others, although it does do that when well handled; its justification is that it does good to and for us.

It is said that we are spending billions of dollars abroad. No; 78 percent of the dollars are spent right here in the first instance. And all the dollars have to be spent in the United States in the end. Why do people all over the world want American dollars? Because of the things those dollars will buy in the United States. Over 700,000 Americans have jobs today, growing and making the things or providing the services these dollars buy.

It is said this program, in fact, our whole budget is too big for peacetime. Of course, it is. But who can seriously contend this is peacetime in any real sense?

It is said that if we were to cut down this program drastically, we could have that much more money for public works, housing, hospitals, schools, social security, here at home. We could take better care of our own people. But could we? The fact is that to cut down this program would weaken our allies and require us to spend far more additional money for our Military Establishment than the amount saved. We would have less to take care of our own people, not more.

I had hoped to speak also of several improvements this year's bill makes in the program. I can only mention them: First, the overall audit that has developed as a result of the finding of the Hardy subcommittee and the General Accounting Office studies; second, the separation under different titles of military and economic aid, although we recognize that almost all military aid serves to protect economic freedom, and almost all economic aid serves a military purpose, and certainly all aid under this program, both economic and military, is political; third, incorporation of the development loan fund to make it conform more to our established pattern for Government lending agencies; and, fourth, ICA's inauguration of longer and more comprehensive training and orientation for its personnel before being sent abroad. These are all forward steps.

Mr. Chairman, there have been many mistakes in these 10 years. But overall the mutual-security program has been brilliantly successful; it has kept the free world free. Let us carry it on—only better.

The forces of freedom are stirring mightily—especially behind the Iron Curtain. They will weaken, divide, pin down, and ultimately pull down the Communist tyrannies—if only we do not build those tyrannies up, and if we steadfastly and skillfully assist all those who resist our common enemies by striving to maintain their freedom and independence.

This is the way to victory and peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The Gallup Poll on United States Prestige

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Gallup poll reports this morning that United States prestige has dropped disastrously throughout the world. This report preceded the fiasco of the Nixon tour in South America, the gross insults to America in Lebanon, and the dangerous crisis of friendly parliamentary government in France.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article, showing how severely our prestige has been damaged, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES PRESTIGE DOWN IN 11 LANDS

PRINCETON, N. J., May 21.—Recent outbursts of anti-Americanism occurred against a backdrop of falling United States prestige in major cities of the Western and neutral bloc nations.

Surveys by the World Gallup Poll on the eve of the trouble in South America, Africa, and the Near East show this pattern of opinion around the world:

In virtually all of the 11 world opinion centers in the international poll, a significant number of persons said their respect for the United States had decreased recently.

In several of the world centers, however—notably New Delhi—this lessening respect is offset somewhat by large proportions who say their opinion of the United States has gone up recently.

Some of the most vehement criticism of the United States was recorded in Paris where, just before the outbreak of the current trouble, the anti-United States sentiment outnumbered the pro-United States sentiment by 11 to 1.

The chief reason for the downturn in sentiment in the French capital was what was felt to be the favorable attitude of the American Government toward the Algerian Nationalists.

Generally speaking, persons in the various cities who said their opinion of the United States had gone down recently attributed their change in view to some phase of our handling of international affairs—such as our approach to summit conferences or reaction to nuclear disarmament.

Very little criticism was directed at our economic situation and its possible effects on other countries.

The United States was praised, on the other hand, for its foreign aid policy.

In all of the 11 world opinion centers, there is a considerable number—ranging from 8 out of 10 in Stockholm to 1 in 5 in Athens—who say their opinion of the United States has not changed recently.

Interviewers for the affiliated world Gallup polls asked this question of typical citizens in 11 major cities of the world—eight of them in NATO countries:

"Has your opinion of the United States gone up or down lately?"

The views in each center:

	Percent			
	Down	Up	Same	No opinion
Oslo	38	11	37	14
Paris	33	3	55	9
London	33	7	41	19
Helsinki	32	9	39	20
Milan-Rome	30	22	45	3
Athens	29	11	21	39
New Delhi	25	28	22	25
West Berlin	22	18	45	15
Amsterdam	20	11	56	13
Copenhagen	17	7	32	44
Stockholm	8	2	79	11

The consensus in the eight NATO centers, based on an average of the results, is as follows:

Opinion of United States

	Percent
Gone up	11
Gone down	28
The same	41
No opinion	20

The Texas Rangers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the world's greatest law-enforcement agencies is the Texas Rangers. This small body of able men, only 51 in number, is known to the far corners of the world for their resourcefulness, their devotion to duty, and their skill and determination in maintaining law and order.

Throughout the years Texans have been proud of the Texas Rangers. That pride is based not only on their untiring efforts to maintain law and order during the frontier years, but also on the fact that the Texas Rangers have kept up with every modern innovation in fighting crime.

Recently the Dallas Morning News published an excellent story, written by Jimmy Banks, a reporter with the Austin Bureau of the News, which sheds some light on the present-day operations of the Texas Rangers. The article states that although the Rangers now use the most up-to-date machines in their unrelenting war against crime, the essential character of the Texas Rangers, the character which has made them such an effective agency of the law and has brought them worldwide renown, has not changed. The Texas Rangers remain as dedicated to the public weal and as resourceful and unrelenting in their pursuit of lawbreakers as they were when they patrolled the Texas frontier of yesteryear.

Mr. President, because I feel that it would prove of interest to all, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article entitled "Rangers Maneuver Into Tight Spots," written by Jimmy Banks, and published in the Dallas Morning News of May 19, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RANGERS MANEUVER INTO TIGHT SPOTS

(By Jimmy Banks)

AUSTIN, TEX.—Texas Rangers are now using airplanes in exploits as daring as those that made their organization world-famous many years ago.

But they still believe in terse, old-fashioned daily reports that rival an oldtime Ranger's classic: "We had a gun fight and they lost."

Texas has only 51 Rangers—but the department of public safety's four airplanes keep them within 2 hours of even the most remote points in the State.

Max Westerman, Jr., a pilot-investigator, has landed on highways and mountain tops while chasing—and capturing—criminals.

The exciting details, however, are omitted from his daily reports. For example:

"Made an investigation of arson in Huntsville this date. Picked up subject between Cleveland and Dayton and took him to Huntsville. Secured confession from him for setting fire to Plaza Cafe."

Westerman had flown to Huntsville when local authorities there reported they suspected arson. Westerman investigated and noted that all of the merchandise—even cigarettes—had been removed before the fire.

Westerman learned that the cafe owner had a ranch in southeast Texas and took to the air again, flying along the highway leading to the ranch.

When he spotted the fugitive's car from the air, he radioed for help on the ground. The arson suspect spotted the plane and began going up and down the highway, trying to figure out some way to escape. Every time he turned, the DPS plane turned. It stuck with him for an hour, until Westerman spotted a sheriff's car coming up behind the fugitive.

To close the trap, Westerman landed on the highway in front of the cafe owner's car and taxied up to make the capture.

Another report by Pilot George Burney shows how the airplanes are combined with the old Ranger standbys—horses and six shooters.

"Piloted P-3 with (Ranger) Truemon Stone and 3 dogs Austin to Sweetwater to Austin. Left Austin 5:30 a. m., arrived Sweetwater 7:10 a. m. Followed dogs on horseback 15 miles trailing 3 escaped prisoners. Apprehended subjects after dogs ran them up a tree. Left Sweetwater 6:15 p. m., arrived Austin 7:45 p. m. Miles traveled in State car, 6. Miles traveled in State airplane, 560."

The department of public safety has two single-engine and two twin-engine planes. One of the latter was donated to the department recently by Col. D. Harold Byrd, of Dallas.

The airborne operations of the Rangers are not only highly efficient but economical. They save a tremendous amount of time and money in the war against crime.

Several times, they have been used to spot jail escapees making their way across rugged country. In 1948, a child lost in the northeast part of Young County, near Farmer, was spotted from the air and rescued.

The airplanes have also proven extremely valuable in directing traffic at such events as the Texas A. and M.-Texas football game.

The planes are used extensively in connection with floods, frequently providing the stricken area's only means of communication with the outside world. During the 1954 Del Rio flood, a DPS plane served as an aerial observation post.

Rescuers were directed to hundreds of marooned people.

The planes are important in day-to-day, routine operations. Chemists from the department's topnotch crime lab are flown to various parts of the State to testify in trials. One chemist recently left Austin early in the morning, testified in Amarillo, then in Lubbock, and was back in the office late that afternoon.

Col. Homer Garrison, Jr., director of the department, uses the planes to maintain close contact with his regional commanders and to help supervise many investigations. They enable him to go almost anywhere in the State without being away from his desk more than a few hours.

The airplanes help Garrison in nearly everything he does—except with the time-honored problem of getting detailed reports from the Rangers.

Garrison likes to tell of the early-day adjutant general, then in charge of the Rangers, who finally devised a brief report form asking only for the date, and disposition.

The form lasted only until a Ranger reported the date and name of an offender, listing the offense as "cattle theft" and for "disposition" wrote down: "Mean as hell—had to shoot him."

Growth of International Advertising Strengthens Free World's Economies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday Vice President NIXON, in addressing the National Press Club, rightly pointed up the desire of the American people to help

strengthen private enterprise in Latin America. Our basic desire is to help improve standards of living there and elsewhere in the world. In so doing, we will help ourselves, as well.

With America beginning to rise out of its recession, we see more clearly than ever the importance of widening the market for United States goods and services abroad.

I might say, parenthetically, that I have just had lunch with a man who has been all over America. He said there is no real recession except in spots such as Detroit, where the automobile industry is centered. But he said:

I represent large groups of labor, and things are in fine shape. All that is necessary is to stop advertising something which is not true; then we would quickly get out of the mess into which we have put ourselves.

TEN BILLION DOLLAR INDUSTRY AT HOME

One of the vital instruments in this process is an industry which has served this Nation well on the home front. I refer to the advertising industry, a $10 billion a year industry in the United States and a growing industry throughout the world.

WORLD INTEREST IN NEW IDEAS, GOODS

Fortunately, literacy is increasing throughout the globe. More people are reading newspapers, magazines, and other publications. More people are watching commercial television and are listening to their radios. They are people interested in new ideas, as well as in new comforts and conveniences. The various mediums of advertising are increasing and opening up new channels of endeavor. Yes, the future of worldwide advertising seems bright indeed.

Meanwhile, however, the Soviet Premier has declared an economic war on the United States. We will meet his challenge, and win. We will see to it that the free world nations continue to have goods to offer to one another on an ever-increasing basis. But that will not be possible unless consumers know what is available, unless demand is stimulated by sound advertising of sound brand-name products and services.

MEDIUMS WILL FLOURISH AS WELL

As advertising increases abroad, mediums will flourish abroad, as they do in the United States. There will be better, stronger newspapers, periodicals, radio, and TV in many nations, as more advertising revenue comes in. With the growth of advertising, there will grow another American concept—another industry—public relations, as well.

WISCONSIN IS AD MINDED

Here at home, my own State has long been an advertising-minded State; not only because of the importance of its own production of goods and services, but because it is a center of the graphic arts. Therefore, it has provided natural technical support for the advertising industry.

Advertising agencies in my State and printing plants in my State have long excelled, each in their respective fields.

FOUR ARTICLES FROM ADVERTISING AGE

On the world front, I was interested to read in two successive issues of the magazine Advertising Age articles depicting the tremendous growth of advertising throughout the world. I refer especially to several articles published in the May 12 and May 19 issues.

The first article lists the 100 leading United States advertisers abroad which in 1957 invested more than $8½ million in 36 international circulated publications, alone. These corporations would not invest their stockholders' funds, in effect, unless that investment paid off in terms of increased sales.

The second article lists eight leading world advertisers outside the United States and Canada.

The third article describes an international advertising conference which was held last month in Tokyo under the sponsorship of the Far Eastern division of the International Advertising Association.

The fourth article briefly cites advertising in a land which represents possibly the greatest single economic recovery since World War II, Western Germany, a bulwark today of competitive free enterprise.

I cite these articles because I think that they will illustrate the growth in this field.

FEDERAL LAWS NOT EFFECTIVE WITHOUT PRIVATE GROWTH

At this very time we members of the Committee on Foreign Relations are marking up the 1958 mutual security bill. Shortly, the Committee on Finance will review the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements bill.

But neither the mutual security bill nor the reciprocal trade bill can fully achieve their objectives unless private trade advances, and largely on its own initiative. That is true of both industrial countries and underdeveloped countries, as in Latin America.

Worldwide advertising can play, and is playing, a vital role in this constructive process of economic growth. Thereby, consumer living standards will rise.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles which I have cited be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES ADVERTISERS INVESTED $8,481,371 IN INTERNATIONAL PUBLICATIONS IN 1957—PAN-AMERICAN AIRWAYS, DOUGLAS AIRCRAFT BIGGEST USERS OF OVERSEAS BOOKS

NEW YORK, May 6.—One hundred United States advertisers invested a total of $8,481,371 in 36 internationally circulated publications during 1957.

Advertiser investments in international mediums are reported here, for the first time anywhere, as a result of a survey made by Advertising Age.

Heading the list, with an expenditure of $373,400, is Pan-American Airways (including expenditures by its affiliate, Panagra).

In second place, with a total expenditure of $345,563, is Douglas Aircraft, supplier to many international carriers. Champion Spark Plug, in third place, was the only other advertiser to spend more than $300,000.

Seven other companies—Caterpillar Tractor, Ford Motor, Allis-Chalmers, Remington Rand, General Electric, Kodak, and Burroughs—spent more than $200,000.

The 100th leading advertiser, with an expenditure of $19,298, is American Brake Shoe.

The top 10 advertisers accounted for more than 30 percent of the total expenditures by the 100 leaders.

Industrial advertisers, not surprisingly, bulk large in this list, since many of the international publications are business magazines, and even consumer-type books such as Life International, which reach an upper-income audience abroad, compete for heavy goods advertising.

Also, this list does not cover expenditures made locally by overseas subsidiaries of American companies. Many consumer products manufacturers have considerable advertising investments abroad, but they are made locally, in local mediums. Procter & Gamble, for example, ranks 33d on the accompanying list, with an expenditure of $84,158, but P. & G. subsidiaries abroad spend well over $10 million annually.

ONE HUNDRED LEADING UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL ADVERTISERS IN 36 INTERNATIONALLY CIRCULATED PUBLICATIONS

1. Pan-American Airways (incl. Panagra).
2. Douglas Aircraft.
3. Champion Spark Plugs.
4. Ford Motor.
5. Caterpillar Tractor.
6. Allis-Chalmers.
7. General Electric.
8. Remington Rand.
9. Kodak.
10. Burroughs.
11. General Motors.
12. Monsanto.
13. Goodyear.
14. Chrysler.
15. Standard Oil (New Jersey).
16. Union Carbide.
17. Firestone.
18. Coca-Cola.
19. Le Tourneau-Westinghouse.
20. International Harvester.
21. Minnesota Mining.
22. Pepsi-Cola.
23. Willys Overland.
24. Outboard Marine.
25. Timken.
26. Caltex.
27. Standard Brands.
28. TWA.
29. Borg-Warner.
30. Socony Mobile.
31. Sterling Drug.
32. Procter & Gamble.
33. Boeing.
34. Dow Chemical.
35. Eversharp.
36. International Business Machines.
37. American Radiator & Standard Sanitary.
38. J. B. Williams.
39. B. F. Goodrich.
40. Chase Manhattan Bank.
41. Electric Autolite.
42. Royal McBee.
43. Chesebrough-Pond's.
44. General Aniline & Film.
45. Radio Corporation of America.
46. Clark Equipment.
47. Texas Co.
48. United Fruit.
49. Rockwell Manufacturing Co.
50. Mack Truck.
51. S. C. Johnson & Son.
52. National Cash Register.
53. General Dynamics (Convair).
54. Northam-Warren.
55. Dresser Industries.
56. American Cyanamid.
57. Schenley.
58. American Home Products.
59. Revlon.
60. Bank of America.
61. Bethlehem Steel.
62. Zenith.
63. White Motors.
64. Parke, Davis.
65. Carrier.
66. Westinghouse.

ONE HUNDRED LEADING UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL ADVERTISERS IN 36 INTERNATIONALLY CIRCULATED PUBLICATIONS—continued

67. Olin Mathieson.
68. Mennen.
69. Gillette.
70. Eimco.
71. Wagner Electric.
72. Port of New Orleans.
73. Sylvania.
74. Standard Oil (California).
75. Bendix Aviation.
76. Parker Pen.
77. Tidewater Oil.
78. General Foods.
79. Combustion Engineering.
80. Max Factor.
81. Miles Labs.
82. Hupp Corp.
83. Besser Co.
84. Cummins Engine.
85. United States Lines.
86. Underwood.
87. Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton.
88. Perfect Circle.
89. Johnson & Johnson.
90. Campbell Soup.
91. Yale & Towne.
92. Stewart-Warner.
93. Colorado Fuel & Iron.
94. Koehring.
95. Bristol-Myers.
96. Hyster.
97. Admiral.
98. Van Norman Industries.
99. J. I. Case.
100. American Brake Shoe.

EIGHT LEADING WORLD ADVERTISERS INVEST $10 MILLION PLUS OUTSIDE UNITED STATES-CANADA—UNILEVER, COLGATE, PHILIPS, SHELL TOP THE LIST OF LEADERS

NEW YORK, May 7.—The eight leading world advertisers, outside of the United States and Canada, are (in this order): Unilever, Colgate-Palmolive, Philips, Royal Dutch Shell, Procter & Gamble, Standard Oil (New Jersey), Nestle, and Imperial Tobacco.

Each of these companies spends more than $10 million outside of the United States and Canada. All of them—except Colgate and Philips—have sales in excess of $1 billion annually.

Topping the list by a wide margin is the Anglo-Dutch combine, Unilever, which broke precedent last month by revealing its worldwide advertising expenditures (AA, May 5). Unilever spends an estimated $125 million in markets outside of the United States and Canada.

In second place, with an estimated expenditure of $50 million in 1957, is the American company, Colgate-Palmolive, one of the Unilever's main competitors.

FAR EAST ADMEN COMPARE NOTES: PRINT MEDIA LEAD IN INDIA, MALAYA; RADIO IN THAILAND

TOKYO, May 13.—The first Asian advertising conference was held here last month under the sponsorship of the Far East division of the International Advertising Association.

The meeting attracted 10 delegates from Asian countries other than Japan. They met with some 100 Japanese admen. The conference was held in conjunction with the sixth annual meeting of the Advertising Federation of Japan.

One of the immediate results of the conference was the formation of a committee charged with the responsibility of drafting a charter for the establishment of the Asian International Advertising Association. On the committee is Hideo Yoshida, president of Dentsu Advertising and the IAA's vp for the Far East.

Toyonobu Domen, president of the Ajinomoto Seasoning Manufacturing Co. and president of the Japaneses chapter of the IAA, told the conferencec that "advertising plays a vital role in the economic development of the free world and is no longer a matter of mere domestic concern."

* * * * *

Jagan Nath Jaini, chairman of the Bombay agency, National Advertising Service Private Ltd., presented the conference with this thumbnail portrait of advertisfng in India.

* * * * *

There are now some 3,500 Indian advertisers.

One hundred and fifty national advertisers each spend more than 100,000 rupees ($20,000) annually.

Total advertising expenditures advanced from $4,500,000 in 1951 to "well over $20 million" in 195".

Mr. Jaini said the press is by far the biggest medium in India, accounting for nearly 45 million rupees of advertising. "In all," he said, "there are 6,570 newspapers and periodicals, of which 476 are dailies and 1,903 weeklies."

* * * * *

The next important medium in India is film advertising through the nation's 3,500 movie houses. Advertisers may also use Radio Ceylon, which covers Indian, Burma, and Pakistan.

Mr. Jaini said there are now 109 advertising agencies in India, of which 50 are recognized by the Indian and Eastern Newspaper Society.

* * * * *

The Indian agency man said the largest advertiser in the country is the Government, which spends nearly $2 million in all media, through a panel of 9 agencies.

Miss Elma Kelly, managing director of Cathay, Ltd., Hong Kong agency, reported that newspapers are the leading medium in Hong Kong. There are several English-language papers and 10 Chinese papers.

In Thailand, on the other hand, the leading medium is radio, according to a report by Chatrasobhon Sarasti, manager of the Chatra Press, Bangkok. He reported that Bangkok has 12 radio stations and 2 television channels.

* * * * *

John Weller, manager of Cathay's office in Bangkok, reported that the leading medium in Malaya is the newspaper. There are 2 English dailies, 4 Chinese newspapers, 1 Malayan, and 1 Indian.

* * * * *

"I believe," he told the conference, "it is very possible to improve this market by advertising. For example, many fishermen in the area are buying Johnson-powered fishing boats recently because of the single fact that Johnson Motors has been consistently advertising in the area."

ADVERTISING, SOZIALE MARKTWIRTSCHAFT KEEP WEST GERMAN ECONOMIC BOOM BOOMING

FRANKFURT, May 7.—The amazing economic recovery of West Germany from the ruins of World War II has aroused the envy and admiration of countries throughout the world. In this recovery, generated under the doctrine of Soziale Marktwirtschaft, or socially responsible free enterprise, advertising has played a big part.

West Germany's minister of economics, Ludwig Erhard, is generally credited as the man behind the German comeback. But the man behind Dr. Erhard was the later Walter Eucken, the economist and adviser whose work molded the dynamics of postwar German economic philosophy.

One of Mr. Eucken's main theories was that modern technology proliferates ever greater, wider and keener competition. An extension of this was his theory that the greater, wider and keener the competition, the more stable the national economy.

Germany has therefore tried to stimulate the conditions leading to competition. And in a competitive economy, advertising plays a leading role.

Dr. Erhard himself has stressed the importance of advertising to the new West German economy, going on record as saying:

"The essential purpose of advertising is to make people understand clearly that the sole purpose of all magic of economics is only to serve their good, to bring them happiness and to give them freedom."

The German people, too, have apparently recognized this. In a recent survey by the DIVO-Institute for Market Research in Frankfurt, more than two-thirds of those questioned said they believed advertising was important in the sale of products.

It is estimated that something like 2,927,400,000 deutschemarks ($714 million) was spent on all forms of advertising and sales promotion in West Germany in 1957. This compares with an estimated expenditure in 1954 of 1,869,600,000 deutschemarks ($456 million), an expenditure increase of 56 percent in 4 years. This is further testimony to the importance of advertising in the economy.

Coosa Development Was John R. Hornady's Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, for many years of his adult life, the late John R. Hornady worked for the fulfillment of a glorious dream. He envisioned the complete development of the Coosa-Alabama River from Rome, Ga., to Mobile, Ala. He worked for this development with all his energy. But this crusading newspaperman and public official died a decade before his dream began to come true.

On April 26, 1958, ground was broken for the first in a series of dams on the Coosa River. With this event, the people of Alabama and west Georgia realized the beginning of John Hornady's dream.

Writing in the Birmingham Post-Herald following the ground breaking, the noted columnist John Temple Graves called the late Mr. Hornady "a moving spirit of the moving Coosa River development," and he added:

The Coosa was dear to his heart, and what is happening now is in fine part a product of his dream and work.

Many people today share John R. Hornady's dream and many are carrying on his work. I think it is fitting that one of those interested in this development is Cecil Hornady, the son of this man of vision, the editor of the Talladega Daily Home, in Talladega, Ala., in the Fourth Congressional District.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a portion of an article which appeared in the Rome (Ga.) News-Tribune on April 27, 1958:

In 1930 a man who had just written a book on the history of power development on

the Coosa-Alabama rivers entitled "Soldiers of Progress and Industry," became editor of the Rome News-Tribune. He was John R. Hornady.

For 18 years, until his death in 1948, he spearheaded the efforts of interested citizens from Rome to Mobile toward the goal that now is just over the horizon.

Through strong and constant editorials both in the Rome News-Tribune and the Gadsden Times, which were affiliated until 1943, he advocated the opening of the Coosa-Alabama Rivers, envisioning the vast benefits to all the adjacent territory throughout the 145 mile distance. He went to Washington on many occasions to present the proposal before congressional bodies, and traveled the rivers many times with engineers to study the needs.

It has been many years since those efforts were made, but they are helping to bear fruit now because they had their lasting effect.

In connection with the overall river picture, Mr. Hornady is described as the one man who gave the most time and energy to the final approval by Congress of the erection of Allatoona Dam and the levees in Rome, resulting in a flood-free city, which in previous years was ravaged by high waters at frequent intervals. These projects are estimated to have saved the city at least a million dollars a year in flood damage since their completion 8 years ago.

This was the first major work done on the waterways since the 1920s, when the Alabama Power Co. built dams along the lower river reaches in Alabama.

Mr. Hornady served as president of the Coosa-Alabama River Improvement Association from 1940 until his death, succeeding the first president, Capt. William Patrick Lay, the father of hydroelectric power development in the South and the founder of the Alabama Power Co.

McGee Bend Dam Serves the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, since 1940 the farm population of east Texas has steadily declined, and the maps recently exhibited on the floor of the Senate during the consideration of the area redevelopment bill showed east Texas to be one of the areas of lowest per capita and per unit income in the United States. McGee Bend Dam, in its full multiple purpose building, will furnish jobs for thousands, bring in new industries, and will raise the general level of prosperity and income for east Texas.

People are more important than trees. East Texas is growing more trees and less people than 20 years ago. McGee Bend Dam puts the emphasis on people, jobs, and income. Families who have lived in east Texas for over a hundred years are being forced out of their homeland and their habitat by lack of a means of making a livelihood.

McGee Bend Dam will furnish water and power for farming and industry, will create many new jobs and will make it possible for east Texans to earn a living and dwell in the land their forefathers settled.

The Beaumont (Tex.) Journal, on May 19, 1958, published an excellent editorial entitled "People Outrank Trees and Water Rates Above Wood." The editorial forcefully and clearly highlights the main issues in the battle to bring new lifeblood, new power, and needed water resources to east Texas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Beaumont (Tex.) Journal of May 19, 1958]

PEOPLE OUTRANK TREES AND WATER RATES ABOVE WOOD

Some conservationists disagree as to the value of big dams and little dams to impound water—one of our great natural resources—but most of them are in complete agreement on one other thing:

Our greatest natural resource is people—ourselves, our children and our generations of descendants to come.

This is true because all other natural resources are no more than rewarding tools at the disposal of people. Wisely used, they feed, clothe, shelter, transport, protect and generally enrich the lives of the people. To assume otherwise, to make people secondary in importance to the natural resources around them, would be to put the cart before the horse and ultimately upset the whole scheme of creation.

So Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH is thinking and talking like a dedicated conservationist when he says people are more important than trees. In this instance he refers to 2 natural resources—water and wood—and correctly infers that of the 2 water is immeasurably more important to people than wood. He refers also to McGee Bend Dam and the necessity of inundating a large area of timber land to make room for water.

Senator YARBOROUGH has both feet on the ground of commonsense when, in pointing out that east Texas is growing more trees and fewer people than it was 20 years ago, he says the mighty multipurpose dam puts emphasis on people, jobs and income. It will also, as he explains, raise the general level of prosperity and income for east Texas and make it possible for more east Texans to earn livings and live in the land many of their forefathers settled.

It will do more. Multipurpose McGee Bend Dam will, when completed, conserve water that is now robbing east Texas soil of valuable minerals and rushing them down to the Gulf of Mexico. Its blessings will extend to the industry-loaded and agriculturally rich section of southeast Texas and thus raise production and the standard of living for hundreds of thousands of other people. Additionally, it will help to solve the State's overall water shortage problem and thereby benefit all Texas.

Senator YARBOROUGH is as right as rain. Water is more important to more people than trees. People are more dependent on water than on wood. Therefore, the water to be impounded at McGee Bend Dam means more to the people than trees which can be grown almost anywhere in east and southeast Texas.

An Economic Danger: Clear and Present

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1958

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the remarks of Mr. Robert T. Stevens, president of the J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., North Andover, Mass., before the annual meeting of the Montana Society of Engineers, Butte, Mont., on April 26, 1958:

AN ECONOMIC DANGER: CLEAR AND PRESENT

(Remarks by Robert T. Stevens, president, J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., before annual meeting of the Montana Society of Engineers, April 26, 1958, Butte, Mont.)

Mr. Chairman, Governor Aronson, members of the Montana Society of Engineers, guests of the society, and your ladies, first of all I would like to express my appreciation to the distinguished Governor of Montana for the honor he has accorded me in introducing me to this annual dinner of the Montana Society of Engineers. I count Hugo Aronson among my closest friends, value his friendship very highly, and appreciate what he has just said to you.

I would also like to be among the first to congratulate the Montana Society of Professional Engineers on its forthcoming 71st anniversary, in July, and for its importance to the welfare of the professional engineers of this State. It appears that, since you joined forces with the national society in February of last year, the Montana society has been in the forefront nationally in the acquisition of new members. A special note of recognition is due the "baby brother" of this important group and I refer, of course, to the Helena chapter which was "born" last August.

My information is that the Montana Society of Professional Engineers is one of the oldest, most highly respected, and one of the best organized of all the State groups belonging to the national society. I also understand that, through the efforts and aggressive leadership of President Olund and the membership of the society, you are extending your activities and expanding your sphere of usefulness. I congratulate you on the vigor and success of your programs. It is indeed a pleasure to be with you this evening.

Montana is most generous in the way it welcomes the Stevens family and makes us feel at home. When Mrs. Stevens and I visit our ranch at Two Dot, our good neighbors never fail to come by and greet us. They have a wonderful way of indicating that they like to have us in Montana—even on a part-time basis. We hope to spend more time in Montana in the future.

There are many things that have attracted us to this Treasure State. The inspiration of the frontier, the vastness of Montana, the beauty of its rivers, ranges and lakes, the friendliness of its people and the absolute certainty of its tremendous future. All these things appeal to us. And perhaps there is another factor that has unconsciously had an effect upon us. That factor goes back 105 years.

In 1853, the Congress of the United States created the Territory of Washington. That Territory embraced, at that time, much of

the western part of Montana. As a matter of fact, the spot at which we are now gathered was included within the boundary of that Territory. Stevensville, about 80 miles nothwest of here, is also within the then Territory of Washington. And that town was named for my grandfather's cousin, General Isaac I. Stevens, who was appointed in 1853 by President Pierce as the first governor of the Territory of Washington. I am extremely proud of this early connection with our great Northwest.

General Stevens graduated from West Point in 1839. He stood number one in his class and was an engineer. He had a noteworthy record in the Mexican War and became governor of this Territory at the age of 36. He headed an expedition that made the first survey for a railroad route across Montana. I am proud of that soldier-engineer-diplomat ancestor and, perhaps, I was thinking of this engineer member of the Stevens family when I accepted your cordial invitation to be with you tonight.

Since I am not an engineer, it ill behooves me to discuss with you the latest methods of mining copper, or lead, or zinc from our Montana soil. I feel even less than equal to the task of predicting the future advances in this field. However, I do feel that my deep and ceaseless interest in the education of our youth, having in mind that some of these youths will be the engineers of tomorrow, permits me to comment briefly on the educational problem that faces America today.

In preparing for my appearance here, I asked two of my friends in the field of education and two of my friends in government about the engineering needs of our country. These men are Deane Malott, president of Cornell University; Fred Hovde, president of Purdue University; the Honorable Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, and James R. Killian, Jr., special assistant to the President for science and technology. They have all been good enough to write me regarding their views.

Without exception, these outstanding men in government and education are convinced that our need for educating engineers of quality is far greater today than at any other time in the history of our country. We should recognize potential scientists and engineers early in our secondary schools. By encouraging their imaginations and by nurturing their ambitions, we need actually have no fear of the future supply of men with creative minds.

Quality even more than quantity is the crying need. In order to obtain more engineers of quality, we should grant incentives to outstanding graduate engineers to encourage them to remain on the faculties of our schools in order to teach the future engineers of America. In this way, we can insure a continuous flow of qualified engineers who possess the creative and imaginative minds needed in our complex society. I was shocked to learn recently that, in New York City alone, there is a present need for almost 900 mathematics teachers to staff the junior and senior high schools. By comparing this deficiency in just one city, in just one subject, with the situation all over America, it is small wonder that the tasks we face in meeting our basic needs for qualitative factors in education are nothing short of monumental.

In addition, we should be much more careful than we have been in the past to make certain that our men of learning are not hidden under the proverbial bushel basket, where their real potential may never be utilized to the utmost. This requires topnotch personnel policies by the employer and it may be necessary for business and government administrators to revamp these policies now, wherever the need exists. There is no room today for wastage of engineering talent.

The position and importance of today's engineer was summed up by Dr. Killian in his letter to me when he said, and I quote:

"One hardly needs to emphasize the fact that engineers steadily assume greater professional responsibilities in our society. We have had a great volume of national discussion on the importance of science and on the need for training more and better scientists. This discussion has tended to overlook the important fact that we need first-rate engineers as much as we need first-rate scientists, and that if we are to have a flourishing, advancing technology we must recognize that the engineer is an essential partner in the tripartite team of scientist, engineer, and manager.

"I suggest that the engineering profession itself has a very great responsibility to make clear the important role of the engineer, and the need for engineering and engineering education to keep abreast of the accelerating scientific advance and discovery we witness today. Both from the standpoint of my experience as an educator in the field of science and technology and my brief period of public service, I am increasingly impressed with the importance of the engineering profession speaking with a more unified voice in our national councils, and with the professional status of the engineer being enhanced."

Incidentally, Dr. Killian has asked me to extend to you, the members of the Montana Society of Engineers, his very warm regards and best wishes.

The dramatic changes in our attitude with respect to higher education since the advent of the sputnik and its American counterpart, best described by the French as the Ikenik, can do nothing but good. These divining rods into the future advances of science and technology have focused the attention and concern of the American people on the importance of education and particularly higher educational pursuits. I am sure the youth of America are ready to respond to the need if only we will point the way. We can surely do something about this at the family and community level.

I surely do not know all of the answers with respect to our educational needs. However, I do know that we as a people have never liked to be second best in any competitive arena. The pioneers who settled these magnificent Western States never relinquished their competitive spirit and I have every reason to believe that that competitive drive continues today. The competition today is not over the survival of the wagon train, but over the survival of our Nation.

While we are on the subject of competition, I would like to turn now to another matter which is of great importance to the continuance of a strong and vital America. It is a subject which involves unreasonable competition. It could impair the dynamic, American economy which we all agree is so essential to the security of our country.

I refer to something that could not only tear down much that you here in this room have erected but much that you dream of bettering. This subject has been described by the use of catch phrases like "trade, not aid" and, in mathematical terms it sounds like 2 plus 2 equal 4, but, in actual operation it is more like 2 minus 2, which equals nothing. I am speaking of the proposed legislation before Congress right now, known as the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. It is up for renewal for another 5 years and the plan would authorize substantial additional tariff cutting powers. Many of the top level men of our Government have spoken for the program. These are friends of mine. I differ honestly with them on this measure but that does not lessen my regard for them as public servants or as personal friends. Their voices and pens are, however, diligently at work to keep this amazing world trade anachronism intact. Free trade proponents from commerce and industry are fighting side by side with my friends in government to extend this ill-advised legislation.

An enormous number of well-intentioned and fine people really believe that these so-called reciprocal trade agreements are actually reciprocal. Nothing could be further from the truth. This legislation was enacted originally in 1934 as an emergency measure to aid the country during depression times and was frankly called "an emergency measure for emergency conditions." It has been renewed 10 times for varying periods and the emergency never ends, in spite of the fact that since Pearl Harbor, in 1941, our country has experienced greater economic growth than ever known by any nation since time began. Instead of being an emergency measure, today its friends now call it an "antireeession" measure. They move with the times and always have an opportunistic reason for renewal.

This emergency measure has kept growing like a blight; wider, more complex, and more dangerous, at the expense of many American workers and many American businesses. While textiles and other soft goods were hit hard at first, today, the whirlwind of cheap imports is affecting many kinds of goods and machinery. Our people divide sharply on this subject and the Congress itself breaks up into large blocs of those who are for and those who are against, or those who lean toward or those who lean against. Many of our people have tranquilized their own convictions by repeating a little singsong that deserves some comment. The singsong goes something like this: "Free trade means no conflict between nations and that means no wars and that in the end means that our sons will not go forth to battle." Who among us has the courage to take issue with such sentimental reasoning? It is a strong America that will deter war, not an America with holes in its military and economic armor.

The shocking fact is that many American markets and American jobs are just as easy for foreigners to take as stealing a baby's candy. Let's consider these salient points:

1. Wages paid to workers abroad, making all kinds of goods that we buy, range from 35 cents or 40 cents an hour down to about 8 cents per hour. By comparison I'm sure it is unnecessary for me to cite the hourly rates of the average worker in the United States.

2. In 1934, when the tariff-cutting spree began, the average tariff levels protecting our industries were 46.7 percent—now they are 11.7 percent. The so-called protection is three-quarters gone. And there will be more of the same if the act is renewed as proposed.

This has been mercilessly destructive to the basic foundations of American jobs. You, as engineers, know full well that no amount of technological improvement in processing can compensate for those wage differentials, in the light of what you know about present-day equipment here and abroad. As a matter of fact, many foreign countries have very modern, new equipment that was partly paid for by you and by me, as American taxpayers. How can we as a nation give money, know-how, and lowered tariffs to our friends abroad and not have trouble at home? We can't eat our cake and have it too.

Now what about the reciprocity in our trade agreements? Well, in the first place, as these successive trade agreements were made with various countries, all the benefits were passed around to all the other trade-agreement countries. As you know, this is called the most-favored-nation clause. It is not surprising that the country with the lowest wages and the required skills gets the busi-

ness. Obviously, again, because our wages are 5 to 10 times greater than those of other countries, we didn't get the business; we got the "bizness."

The whole thing reduces itself to very understandable elements if we take a look at the facts and forget the much-touted slogans. For most items, wages are the deciding factor in measuring what country will make which product, depending upon where the necessary skills and materials can be made available. For example, England controlled the wool-goods export market for centuries. In recent years the Italians, with lower wages and excellent skills, have chased the British woolen goods off many trade routes. And now the Japanese are invading the wool-goods export market in a big way. Japanese goods made of wool are seriously affecting the already stricken woolen manufacturing industry of the United States. This is bad for the wool-growing industry in which Montana is so vitally interested, as well as being bad for the American worker.

With our generous showering of goods, services, and money upon so many lands, in addition to having cut our average tariff rates by three-quarters and with foreign wages so far below ours, what did our foreign friends do? How did they reciprocate? The facts show that the 89 trading nations, other than the United States, have developed no less than 36 different, ingenious practices, restrictive to international trade and investment. As examples:

Sixty-two countries require import licenses to get goods into the countries and skullduggery is rampant in this area.

Forty-six require export licenses, sometimes tied up with stringent currency controls.

Twenty-six have restrictions on outgoing capital movements.

Twenty-eight have restrictions on incoming capital movements.

Thirty-three have exchange licenses.

Twenty-three have multiple exchange rates.

Nine have import quotas, but the import licenses operating in 62 countries are, in effect, just the same as quotas.

The problem is the same whether it be in Rhode Island, Ohio, Georgia, or Montana. Only the names of the products involved are different. The blight is on a vast variety of items; textiles, machinery, machine and hand tools, chemicals, metals, cameras, appliances, and countless others. The great State of Montana is probably first in the Nation in zinc, third in copper, and fifth in lead production in the United States. As you know, the price structure is not only disheartening but is ruinous to many American mining companies. It is tough on many Montanans who depend so greatly upon these metals for their livelihood. We get the same end result whenever low-cost imports shut down plants and mines and people are put out of jobs.

Probably one of the least understood phases of the market place, and certainly the phase misunderstood by most of the proponents of free trade, is the psychological effect of the sale of a small quantity of really cheap and unrestricted imported goods on the basic price level of the rest of the domestic supply. The result is dramatic, immediate, and destructive. The price of all the rest of the goods, no matter how high the wages, rent, heat, light, taxes, and other items of cost that went into them, will grind inexorably downward with the sureness of the pull of gravity.

Unrestricted imports encourage the disintegration of price levels based upon American costs. There may be a temporary advantage to consumers but, if uncontrolled, it will wreak havoc on employment in America. The result is decreased purchasing power, hardship, relief, and a lower standard of living. American jobs must be preserved for American workers.

What advantage is there to the American worker and his family if we permit the further liberalization of these foreign-trade laws? The gains that have been made in the fields of minimum wages, overtime pay, social security, industrial safety, health, and welfare could be seriously affected. Any manufacturer can now escape American labor legislation and most American taxes simply by locating his plant abroad. The laws governing interstate commerce should not discriminate against goods produced in the United States.

Why should 2 identical garments, 1 manufactured in the United States and the other manufactured in Japan, run into different rules at our State borders? If, as is true, we have legislated costs on the United States product, is it fair or reasonable that foreign goods should move in interstate commerce entirely exempt from the rules that apply to American manufacturers?

In my judgment, the American people are too fair minded to approve this type of unfair competition if they understood it. The point is that our laws should take into account the high costs of American manufacture when evaluating the entry of foreign goods into our country. Tariffs, quotas, or a combination of both are necessary if we are to preserve our American standard of living. And let us not forget that American industry has twice been the arsenal of democracy in world wars. Is it wise, in the nuclear age, to decimate, under the halo of reciprocal trade, industries which were essential to allied victories in World War I and II?

Ladies and gentlemen, it is fantastic to many American businessmen to speak of this idea of international trade as reciprocity. Almost alone, we have done all the giving and yielding and losing. It was all the American Government's idea in the first place, 24 years ago, and we sold it all over the world. The act took the tariff control out of the hands of Congress and gave it to the executive branch. The control of American international trade should go back into the hands of Congress, where it belongs. This is the point at which local conditions register promptly and accurately.

Two bills are now in the House Ways and Means Committee and will shortly be acted upon. One is the Dorn bill, H. R. 11250, and the other is the Simpson bill, H. R. 11462.

Both bills return the determination of when American industry, and thus, our country is injured to the Congress, through the medium of the Tariff Commission, by whatever name it may be called. Under these bills economists in the State Department could no longer use global politics, sputniks, or other convenient reasons to overrule the true facts when our industries and mines are actually hurt, as is now the case.

I urge all of you connected in one way or another with American free enterprise to give serious thought to this vital and current subject and to advise your Congressmen and Senators how you feel. There isn't too much time. I have opposed the encroachment upon American jobs of these misleading trade agreements since their inception and I shall continue to do so until some form of equitable relief, based upon the American standard of living, is available.

The danger is clear and present. No one can deny that we must stop being complacent about our technical educational system. By the same token, we cannot be complacent over the fact that our country has actually become the battlefield for cheaply made imported manufactured goods. The American standard of living is under attack from overseas. Many countries who are attacking us in this way are our friends. They rely on our economic strength and our aid. Personally I believe most of them would understand our problem if our representatives at the international bargaining table would present our situation effectively and fearlessly. Let us join together to remind our government of the necessity of defending our hard won high standards of living.

I thank you.

Another Victory for Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, Vice President NIXON's dignified and calm handling of the delicate situation created by the violent demonstrations during his recent South American trip brought much credit to himself and to our Nation. We all owe the Vice President a solid vote of thanks for the wonderful job he did.

I am submitting for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial from the May 10, 1958 Los Angeles Times, entitled "Another Victory for NIXON," which comments on Vice President NIXON's fine accomplishments:

ANOTHER VICTORY FOR NIXON

Americans cannot be blamed for reacting initially with indignation and anger to the disgraceful outbreak in Peru Thursday. The idea of the Vice President of the United States being subjected to a barrage of insults, verbal and physical, is repugnant in every aspect and even more so when it is considered that this was an official visit made in the interests of establishing better understanding with our Latin-American friends, of whom Peru has long been one.

WE GUARD VISITORS

The Peruvian government was not to blame for what took place at San Marcos University but that it feels some responsibility can be noted in the apology promptly delivered by the Peruvian Embassy in Washington. Correct as that action was, it still does not erase the incident. Foreign dignitaries to our shores are protected to the fullest extent possible from embarrassments or humiliations; it seems that this courtesy was overlooked in Peru.

Aside from that there are a good many other things to consider. Vice President NIXON's good will trip to Latin America has produced some convincing evidence of ill-will and that is a matter of serious concern to all of us. The question has already been askd why such a trip was undertaken in the first place when the State Department must have been aware that anti-American feeling has been growing.

That question can be answered with another: Granted, but was that not all the more reason to send our Vice President abroad to explain and interpret American viewpoints and policies in the interests of better understanding?

APPARENT SUCCESS

It is, perhaps, easy to writeoff the Peruvian demonstration as conceived and guided by Communists and to blame them for other unpleasant happenings in Paraguay, Uruguay, and Argentina. Unquestionably Communists have had an enthusiastic and leading part in promoting and spreading anti-American feeling everywhere they can in South America. But the seriousness of the

situation is that they seem to be enjoying some success; that they appear to be winning over large groups of South Americans in their campaign of hate and lies.

All this calls for some examination of our own policies and our own attitudes toward the South American people. We have been accused specifically in some cases of supporting dictatorships as tyrannical as the one which exists in Russia. We have been charged with promulgating economic policies injurious to Latin-American countries (the United States Tariff Commission has proposed higher tariffs on lead and zinc, major exports of Peru, Mexico, and Bolivia). We have been criticized on the basis that the foreign and we have extended has gone to the top and very little has trickled down in the form of material aid to vast numbers of people who need it.

Here is fertile ground for sowing the Communist seed. Our own business recession had had economic repercussions in South America and that has not helped matters. In Bolivia, Vice President NIXON was showered with pamphlets advising him to go home and proclaiming, "Death to the high cost of living imposed by the Yankees."

REDS TAKE ADVANTAGE

Peru has a growing unemployment problem; the same situation exists in other Latin-American countries. Where the people are not informed, the Communists are quick to step in and provide all the perverted information possible. Anti-Americanism is a commodity that has been too easily sold in too many countries and in some South American countries this propaganda falls on ready ears.

Meanwhile Vice President NIXON deserves our gratitude and admiration for the dignity, calmness, and physical courage which he has consistently shown in every circumstance and provocation. President Eisenhower, himself, has noted this; in his message sent to the Vice President at Quito, Ecuador, yesterday, the President said that NIXON's handling of the Peruvian episode had won him "new respect and admiration in our country."

And so it has. A man of lesser stature could have already worsened a delicate situation; NIXON instead blamed neither the government nor the vast majority of students at San Marcos University. Instead he quietly expressed regret that "a violent and vocal minority denied freedom of expression, without which no great institution of learning can deserve the name great."

The Vice President could have avoided a visit to the university; he had been told there was likely to be Communist-inspired trouble. He went anyway and faced the insults and outrages of the few with equanimity and a quiet defiance. Out of all this came no Communist triumph. As the Vice President, himself, said later, the Communists have suffered "a great defeat, as time will tell."

HAS BARED DANGERS

It may well be. The violence at San Marcos University can serve to promote a better understanding between the people of Peru and ourselves; Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat of Montana, has said that "the net result could be a strengthening of the already firm ties of friendship between our two countries and between this country and Latin America as a whole."

If this comes about—and it is in our best interests that it should—then Vice President NIXON will have no small share of the credit. He has shown to the world and to his countrymen that the Communist menace exists not only in the East but that it is taking on broad and formidable proportions much closer to home.

Perhaps our Government will now look longer and more closely to the south. The danger exists there, too.

Senator Russell and Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, is ably defended in the following editorial from the Greenville, S. C., News. Of course, Mr. Speaker, those of us who have carefully studied the testimoney of Cordell Hull before the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee in 1934, know that he favored only mutually advantageous foreign trade with emphasis on exporting farm and industrial surpluses. At no time did Cordell Hull advocate imports that would injure or threaten serious injury to basic American industries:

OPENING FOR AN OVERDUE DEBATE

The eight former associates of the late Cordell Hull, who took it upon themselves to attack Georgia Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL'S views on international trade have opened up a debate that is as overdue as it is important.

The eight claimed Senator RUSSELL, in a speech before the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, had misinterpreted the late Secretary of State's concept of reciprocal trade agreements.

They quoted the Georgian as saying the original idea behind the trade agreements was that the United States would export those goods we could produce in large quantity and import raw materials and goods not produced in great quantity in this country.

"This," they said, "is essentially so barren and inherently so self-contradictory that it could never have been accepted by Cordell Hull."

Unfortunately, the eight former Hull associates did not quote further from Senator RUSSELL'S speech, or at least not in the press association's story we saw, and we do not know what else he might have said.

It is true, and we are sure Senator RUSSELL would recognize the fact, that Secretary Hull knew that some displacement would result from really free, international trade. After all, most nations engage to some degree in production of almost all goods and competition between countries is inevitable.

But Mr. Hull, and the other freetraders, conceived of this competition as being relatively limited in importance, at first anyway, and its effects on our economy capable of being offset by other factors.

At one time, this may have been a valid view. It is not today.

Certainly the classical freetraders never contemplated today's pattern of international production, nor did they foresee today's highly complicated pattern of international trade. They could not have, for both are the result of the cold war and of the free world's desperate, even frantic, efforts to shore up its economy and hold back the industrial development of Communist nations.

They could not have foreseen that manufacturers in the United States would face competition with low-wage nations made overnight into first class industrial powers by the gift of our latest and best production methods and machinery.

They could not have foreseen that the traditional scheme of international trade would be so distorted that, by Government policy, those nations whose economies we are building along lines identical with our own are forbidden to trade with anyone except us and our friends.

These factors are fundamental to the present international trade situation. To ignore them is to misinterpret Mr. Hull's views beyond all recognition.

It is to be hoped that Senator RUSSELL will reply to his attackers and bring on a full-dress debate in the Senate on the problem of free trade today.

It is sorely needed.

The Progress of the Italian Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, on May 25, more than 30 million Italians will cast ballots for the election of members of the house and senate. Once again, as in every election since the establishment of the Italian Republic, the basic issue will be the struggle of democracy against communism.

Ever since the Communists were ousted from the Cabinet in 1947, the democratic parties have had a working coalition in Italy. It has been through the democratic process that the Italian Republic has risen from the misery and humiliation of defeat to a respected member of the world community of nations.

Since the birth of the Italian Republic, the American people have been vitally concerned with its welfare. One of the objectives of our postwar foreign policy has been to strengthen the free world against the spread of communism. Italy was a strategic area in this aim. The rebuilding of this economically shattered country was a task of highest priority, for a weak Italy would be a breeding ground for communism. We sent aid to bolster her sagging economy. Although we did provide assistance, chief credit for her recovery, however, goes to the determination and toil of the Italian people.

This recovery was no small task. The war had disrupted Italian economy; 4 million homes were destroyed; inflation was rampant and unemployment figures were high. Although the situation seemed hopeless, the Italian people with resolve and energy, slowly made their infant Republic economically and politically secure.

This progress made by the Italians since the war has been truly remarkable. The standard of living has risen considerably for all classes of people. Industrial production has doubled. Agricultural development is up over 20 percent and savings have increased over 70 percent. The economy has flourished in all fields with American aid as a support. This progress was shown in recent statistics issued by the Organization of European Economic Cooperation—OEEC—which included Italy among the

countries that have made the greatest progress since World War II.

This economic progress was accomplished in the face of constant Communist resistance. The Italian Communist Party, through a series of strikes and violence, attempted to halt economic recovery and to destroy confidence in the new democratic government that had been established. Fortunately, these tactics were in vain and the forces of democracy held the line against communism. The majority of the Italian people worked diligently to put Italy back on her feet.

Communism, however, is still a threat. But the Italian Government is ever vigilant and has adopted steps to restrict its activities. These measures included: Strengthening the Italian police so they can deal effectively with challenges of the Communist Party; screening personnel holding positions of responsibility in the government; and decreasing the hold that Communist-dominated unions have over organized labor. These policies are indicative of the desire of most of the Italians to support a democratic form of government.

Although occupied by these problems of economic and political stability, the government has not hesitated to pass legislation to strengthen its defense position. When Italy became a member of NATO, additional military responsibility fell upon Italian shoulders. Massive domestic problems imposed limitations on her capacity to build the necessary defense establishment. Consequently, the United States, through the mutual defense assistance program, granted aid to Italy to enable her to meet her NATO commitments and to rebuild her military strength. As a result the reorganized Italian armed forces have become an efficient, well-trained, and effective part of the defense structure of the North Atlantic community.

As the Italian people go to the polls, the Italian economy is stable, communism has been held in check and Italy is an important member of the Western alliance. All this has been accomplished through the democratic process. Most of the Italian people will be aware of this as they cast their ballots. I am confident that the election returns will show that the Italians will continue to support the form of government that has made the Italian Republic stable and strong.

Welcome, Dick Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following item from the Birmingham News of May 16, 1958:

WELCOME, DICK NIXON

DICK NIXON came home yesterday.

Without wanting to seem melodramatic, we think we can say that the Vice President on his tour of eight Latin American countries had truly risked at least injury. Further—and this we think needs some real emphasis—he had had to undergo an experience any normal man finds as difficult as anything to withstand. He had seen his wife publicly offended and been unable to do anything about it.

NIXON simply had said it was "unpleasant" when his wife was deliberately spat upon.

It was an understatement, we know. Imagine what a personal ordeal that must have been.

In Washington he was welcomed by a great throng of people. Among them were Latin American diplomats from the countries he had visited, where he and the United States had been insulted.

Mr. Eisenhower, on hand to greet him, said that the events would result in improved relations. Strange as that may seem, we have every confidence that will turn out to be the case.

Mr. NIXON and his career have been subject of much discussion in the past. But it can be said, we trust with no gainsaying, that in his most recent service to the country he handled himself superbly. He and his wife deserve the congratulations and the gratitude of the entire Nation. We offer ours.

Let's Keep Our Shirts On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of May 16, 1958:

LET'S KEEP OUR SHIRTS ON

Despite natural anger at developments in Venezuela; despite the perfectly natural feeling that the millions we have spent abroad have brought us few friends, Americans must not be stampeded into a desire for isolation in the present world.

Nothing would suit the Communists better than to have us withdraw behind our borders and thumb our noses at the rest of the world. We do have friends, though this may appear doubtful at times, and we need them. For, though we are the strongest power of the free world, we cannot stand alone.

We find it hard to believe that those who spat on Vice President NIXON and his wife could have held any personal animosity toward these two friendly people. We believe they did, it because they were ordered to do so by their Communist leaders. In short—that it was a Communist-inspired, Communist-directed maneuver from beginning to end.

To be sure, the United States reduction of import quotas on some things has produced bitterness in Latin America, and higher tariffs on lead and zinc have not helped the general feeling regarding us. But these are not spitting, rock-throwing resentments. They are the quiet kind that smoulder slowly, until whipped into a flame.

This time, we would imagine, the Reds have overplayed their hand.

Meanwhile, Mr. NIXON, a man of demonstrated physical and moral courage, has added greatly to his stature, as evidenced by the warm reception he received when he and Mrs. Nixon returned to Washington yesterday. And President Eisenhower did the proper thing when he sent token units of American military power into the area where Venezuela could have called for aid had it been needed.

The old American expression: "Keep your shirt on," applies in the present situation. The Reds only hurt themselves. But we will be well advised to give serious though to why supposed friends are sometimes something less than cordial.

First New York Corp., the First National City Bank of New York, and International Banking Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony given by me before the Board of the Federal Reserve System, Wednesday, May 21, 1958, in the matter of the applications of First New York Corp., the First National City Bank of New York, and International Banking Corp. for prior approval of action to become bank holding companies under section 3 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956:

I. INTRODUCTION

This is the first proceeding before the Federal Reserve Board under section 3 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.[1] Thus, the decision rendered in this case will have the greatest significance in future interpretation and administration of this vital, new legislation. Equally important, the plan presented to the Board is one which could have the most far-reaching consequences on the future banking structure not only of New York State but of the entire Nation.

What is involved here is an application under section 3 of the Bank Holding Company Act, seeking, in essence, Federal Reserve Board approval for the First New York Corp. (a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware), to become a bank holding company which would acquire 100 percent stock control of (1) the First National City Bank of New York, (2) its trust affiliate, the City Bank Farmers Trust Co., a New York State charted bank owned by the same shareholders, and (3) the County Trust Company of White Plains, N. Y., also a State bank. The proposal, in addition, contemplates the chartering of three new national banks into which would be consolidated the First National City Bank, the City Bank Farmers Trust, and the County Trust Co. It may be noted that the proposed bank holding company would be the largest in the country with deposits about two and half times more than those held by the next largest holding group.

Basic purpose of the plan, it is clear, is to circumvent New York State statutory

Footnotes at end of speech.

limitations preventing banks in New York City from establishing branches outside the boundaries of the city.[3] These limitations, which are applicable to national banks under the Banking Acts of 1927 and 1933,[3] were designed to safeguard against banking monopoly in the State by protecting independent banks in areas beyond New York City from encroachment by the giant banking institutions in that city. Here, through the simple expedient of forming a holding company, the same management which is restricted in its operation under a bank charter, seeks to acquire a unit bank, operate it in the same manner a branch would be operated, and flout the expressed will of the legislative body of New York State regarding the establishment of branches. Indeed, the applicants themselves admit that circumvention of statutory district lines is the underlying reason for the proposal. In their application they state that "the boundaries of New York City have come to represent an increasingly arbitrary and unnatural division of a trade area, and a correspondingly arbitrary and unnatural limitation upon the extension of service of New York banks." [4]

To forestall the threat to the State banking structure implied in this plan, the New York Legislature adopted, on January 29, 1957, legislation effective until May 1, 1957, to prohibit any holding company from acquiring any bank located outside of the district prescribed for branch banks. On April 22, 1957 the effective date of this legislation was extended to May 1, 1958; on April 16, 1958, the State ban on holding company expansion beyond branch district lines was extended to May 1, 1959. In these circumstances, as I shall discuss later in my statement, New York State law precludes the transaction and makes the present proceeding moot at least until May 1, 1959.

I turn at this point to consideration of the nature of the banking institutions involved in the present proceeding.

The First National City Bank of New York is the second largest commercial bank in New York City and State and the third largest in the Nation. Created in March 1955, as a result of a merger of the National City Bank and the First National Bank of New York which was approved by the Comptroller of the Currency, the First National City bank and its affiliate, City Bank Farmers Trust Co., have aggregate assets of approximately $7.1 billion which comprise about 19.5 percent of the total commercial banking assets in the city.[5] In comparison, Chase-Manhattan Bank, the largest bank in New York City from the standpoint of assets, has about 21.2 percent of total assets of all commercial banks in the city. Next in size to First National City Bank are the Manufacturers Trust Co. and the Guaranty Trust Co., with each having assets of about 9 percent of total commercial banking assets in New York. In contrast, 44 of New York City's 60 banks have in the aggregate 10 percent of the total commercial banking assets of New York City. In brief, total assets of the First National City Bank are twice as large as 44 banks in New York City and exceed the combined assets of the third and fourth ranking banks in the city.[6]

The County Trust Co. of White Plains, N. Y., the other major bank involved in the application, is by far the largest bank in Westchester County, having total assets of approximately $378 million which comprise 48 percent of all banking assets in Westchester County. Its nearest competitor, by way of comparison, has assets approximating $140 million which represent 18.1 percent of the commercial bank assets of Westchester County. Beyond that it may be noted that the County Trust Co. has 39 branch offices, or about 47 percent of all commercial bank offices in Westchester County.

Footnotes at end of speech.

II. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDED DECISIONS OF THE HEARING EXAMINER

It is clear, of course, that the Board, in accordance with applicable Supreme Court precedents, should give great weight to the reports and recommended decisions of the hearing examiner assigned to this case. But even apart from that, the examiner's decisions in this matter were so carefully and objectively prepared as to be entitled to the most careful consideration.

The examiner on October 3, 1957, after exhaustive and painstaking consideration of all the legal issues presented, concluded that New York State law, for the period of its duration, effectively prevent approval of the proposed transaction. To quote from his decision (p. 13):

"In my judgment conformity to the intent of Congress, orderly administration of the legislation, and achievement of the statutory objectives, requires a plural rather than a singular construction of section 7, that is, one preserving State power within State jurisdiction to prohibit or contain bank holding companies composed of National as well as those composed of State banks.

"It is my further opinion that the New York statute, article III–B, is an exercise of State jurisdiction authorized by the Federal law, and that for the period of its duration it effectively prevents the effectuation of the program approval of which is sought herein. In addition, I have also concluded that the proposed consolidation of County Trust Co. with County Trust National Bank would be in contravention of New York law, and therefore not permissible under the Federal consolidation statutes, 12 United States Code 34a. For these reasons I believe that the applications may not presently be granted.

"Those conclusions being dispositive of the case, I do not find it necessary to consider, and do not pass upon other issues, such as whether the proposed program as a whole would be in the public interest."

For reasons which I will discuss in a few moments, I think that the examiner is clearly right and that the existence of the New York State statute is dispositive of the issues in this case.

Nevertheless, on December 10, 1957, the Board remanded the matter to the hearing examiner to obtain his views and recommendations with respect to the merits of the subject application. On February 20, 1958, the examiner, in another cogent and careful decision, concluded as follows (p. 27):

"The program, by combining the dominant banking system in Westchester County with one of the largest banking systems in the Nation, establishes in Westchester County a financial organization of such relative size as perhaps to give it decisive advantage over competitors; may result in an undue concentration of banking assets and control; may induce unnecessary dislocation in the existing banking structure of the county—and thus unsound banking; may unduly and substantially lessen competition between city and county banks; and may result in undue reduction of the number of independent banks in the county with consequent reduction in the number of competing banking organizations.

"In addition, in the existing circumstances, approval may tend to prejudice State regulation unduly and to impair legislative policies governing State banks.

"On balance, the prospective and possible benefits of the program do not outweigh its prospective and possible disadvantages. It is concluded that the program is not required for the needs and welfare of the community and area, and further, that the effect of the proposed acquisition may be to expand the size or extent of the holding company system involved beyond limits consistent with adequate and sound banking, the public interest, and the preservation of competition in the field of banking. Under these circumstances the applicants have not sustained the burden of establishing that the public interest will be furthered by granting approval of the applications."

Again, and for reasons I will set forth, I think the examiner's findings in respect of the merits of the proposed transaction are clearly correct.

III. NEW YORK STATE LAW BARS APPROVAL OF THE TRANSACTION

I turn to the impact of New York State law upon the transaction for which approval here is sought. The major question in this respect is whether the Bank Holding Company Act has preempted the field or whether there is an area for permissible State action. Without stopping to discuss in detail the examiner's conclusions on this point, I submit that the provisions of the Bank Holding Company Act, coupled with its legislative history, make it crystal clear that there has been reserved to the States wide latitude to adopt appropriate bank-holding legislation. Thus, section 7 specifies that "the enactment by the Congress of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 shall not be construed as preventing any State from exercising such powers and jurisdiction which it now has or may hereafter have with respect to banks, bank holding companies, and subsidiaries thereof."

The legislative history illuminates the meaning and intent of this section. For example, the report of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee makes this comment:

"Another provision of this bill expressly preserves to the States a right to be more restrictive regarding the formation or operation of bank holding companies within their respective borders than the Federal authorities can be or are under this bill. Under such a grant of authority, each State may, within the limits of its proper jurisdictional authority, be more severe on bank holding companies as a class than (1) this bill empowers the Federal authorities to be, or (2) such Federal authorities actually are in their administration of the provisions of this bill. In the opinion of the committee this provision adequately safeguards States rights as to bank holding companies."[7]

Beyond that, Senator ROBERTSON, sponsor of the legislation in the Senate and chairman of the Banking and Currency Subcommittee which considered the measure, pointed out in Senate debate that "each State may * * * enact legislation to regulate bank holding companies."[8] As an example of the type of legislation States were empowered to enact Senator ROBERTSON inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a bank holding bill recently passed by the Georgia Legislature,[9] preventing any bank holding company incorporated under State law or doing business in the State from acquiring 15 percent or more of the voting stock of each of two or more banks. Illinois, it may be added, has enacted similar legislation.[10]

In this setting, it is evident that the New York State legislation prohibiting a bank holding company from acquiring any bank located across the district prescribed for branch banks is a valid and appropriate exercise of State power and entirely consistent with the letter and intendment of the Bank Holding Company Act. The conclusion is therefore inescapable that the Board must give full faith and effect to the State enactment and deny approval to the pending application on the basis that it is barred by State law.

IV. STATUTES INVOLVED IN SUBSTANTIVE PHASE OF THIS PROCEEDING

These considerations apart, what of the merits of the pending application? First

Footnotes at end of speech.

let me direct attention to the several statutory provisions directly involved. Section 3 (c) of the Bank Holding Company Act specifies:

"In determining whether or not to approve any acquisition or merger or consolidation under this section, the Board shall take into consideration the following factors: (1) The financial history and condition of the company or companies and the banks concerned; (2) their prospects; (3) the character of their management; (4) the convenience, needs, and welfare of the communities and the area concerned; and (5) whether or not the effect of such acquisition or merger or consolidation would be to expand the size or extent of the bank holding company system involved beyond limits consistent with adequate and sound banking, the public interest, and the preservation of competition in the field of banking."

Explaining the purpose of this provision, the Senate report on the bank holding bill pointed out that:

"It is upon the basis of these factors that the Federal Reserve Board is to measure whether each application should be granted or denied in the public interest. It will be noted that these factors extend beyond the nature of those primary in importance to bank supervisory authorities in the exercise of their supervisory powers. In most instances, safety of the depositor's funds and adequate banking service to the public in the area where the bank operates are uppermost in the consideration of such bank supervisory authorities. The factors required to be taken into consideration by the Federal Reserve Board under this bill also require contemplation of the prevention of undue concentration of control in the banking field to the detriment of public interest and the encouragement of competition in banking. It is the lack of any effective requirement of this nature in present Federal laws which has led your committee to the conviction that legislation such as that contained in this bill is needed. Under its provisions, the expansion of bank holding companies in the banking field would not be prohibited, but would be regulated in the public interest." [11]

Equally important to the present proceeding is section 11 of the Bank Holding Company Act which provides that:

"Nothing herein contained shall be interpreted or construed as approving any act, action, or conduct which is or has been or may be in violation of existing law, nor shall anything herein contained constitute a defense to any action, suit, or proceeding pending or hereafter instituted on account of any prohibited antitrust or monopolistic act, action, or conduct."

So that there can be no doubt about the meaning of this section, I quote again from the Senate report:

"This bill provides that none of its provisions are to be construed as approving any act, action or conduct in violation of existlaw. It also provides that nothing in the bill shall constitute a defense to any action, suit, or proceeding pending or later instituted on account of any prohibited antitrust or monopolistic act, action, or conduct. In the opinion of your committee, approvals granted and action permitted under the provisions of this bill are not to supersede the provisions of other Federal laws, particularly those designed to control monopoly or break up trusts. For example, the Clayton Act has been judicially determined to apply to banks. Under the provisions of this bill, any action taken by the Federal Reserve Board in accordance with its terms is not to interfere in any manner with the performance by the Board of such functions as may be assigned to it under the Clayton Act." [12]

Footnotes at end of speech.

Against this background, it is clear that the Celler-Kefauver amendment to section 7 of the Clayton Act adopted in 1950, is fully applicable to the present transaction. That amendment provides in part as follows:

"No corporation engaged in commerce shall acquire, directly or indirectly, the whole or any part of the stock of other share capital and no corporation subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission shall acquire the whole or part of the assets of another corporation engaged also in commerce, where in any line of commerce in any section of the country, the effect of such acquisition may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly." [13]

Jurisdiction to enforce new section 7 insofar as it applies to banks, banking associations and trust companies, is vested concurrently in the Federal Reserve Board [14] and in the Attorney General.[15]

Thus, a major issue is whether or not the effect of the First National City Bank plan may be substantially to lessen competition or to create a monopoly in any section of the country, within the meaning of the Celler-Kefauver amendment. Making this clear, Mr. C. Canby Balderston, vice chairman of the Board wrote me on January 18, 1957, in part as follows:

"Section 11 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 provides that nothing therein shall be interpreted as approving any action which may be in violation of existing law, nor is anything herein to constitute a defense to any action or proceeding on account of any prohibited antitrust action or conduct. Also, as you indicate, under the Celler-Kefauver amendment to section 7 of the Clayton Act the test is whether the effect of the acquisition may be substantially to lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly in any section of the country.

"Section 3 (c) of the Bank Holding Company Act requires the Board, in passing upon each application by a bank holding company for approval of its acquisition of bank stock, to consider certain specific factors, including whether or not the effect of the proposed acquisition would be to expand the size or extent of the holding company system beyond limits consistent with the public interest and the preservation of competition in the field of banking. The concept involved in this factor is a broad one, and in the Board's opinion adequate consideration of the facts in this regard necessarily involves consideration of the standards mentioned in section 7 of the Clayton Act—that is, whether in any line of commerce in any section of the country the effect of such acquisition might be substantially to lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly.

"In the circumstances, it has not been considered necessary to refer specifically in the order for hearing to the standards of the Clayton Act or to give specific instructions to the hearing examiner on the subject. You may be assured that the Board in its consideration of this matter will take into account all pertinent factors, including whether the proposed transactions might involve a violation of section 7 of the Clayton Act or other statutes."

V. THE CONGRESSIONAL INTENT UNDERLYING THE CELLER-KEFAUVER AMENDMENT TO SECTION 7

In light of these considerations, full understading of the purpose of the Celler-Kefauver amendment is essential for proper disposition of the pending application. Basically, this act strengthened provisions of existing antitrust legislation in order to limit future increases in the level of economic concentration resulting from corporate mergers and acquisitions. For one thing, the coverage of old section 7 was extended to cover nonbank corporation mergers accomplished by asset as well as stock acquisitions. Bank mergers accomplished by asset acquisitions remained unaffected by this new legislation. That, however, has no relevance to this proceeding, since the proposal before the Board involves a bank merger accomplished by a stock acquisition—a transaction fully covered by the Celler-Kefauver amendment.[16]

Beyond that, the Celler-Kefauver amendment established a new standard of illegality. It eliminated the old section 7 test which required that the effect of an acquisition may be to substantially lessen competition between the acquiring and acquired corporation in any section or community. In lieu of the effect on competition between the acquiring and acquired firms, the amendment adopted a less restrictive test which predicated illegality on whether the effect of the acquisition "may be substantially to lessen competition * * * in any section of the country". One reason for the change was to make it clear that mergers which enabled small competitors to compete more effectively with giant corporations were in the public interest.[17] This change was not, however, intended to legalize mergers between competitors which were illegal under old section 7.

A second and equally important reason for the change was to enlarge the coverage of section 7 "to make it clear that the bill applies to all types of mergers and acquisitions, vertical and conglomerate as well as horizontal, which have the specified effects of substantially lessening competition * * * or tending to create a monopoly." [18]

The House report added that:

"Acquisitions of stock or assets have a cumulative effect, and control of the market sufficient to constitute a violation of the Sherman Act may be achieved not in a single acquisition but as the result of a series of acquisitions.

"The bill is intended to permit intervention in such a cumulative process when the effect of an acquisition may be a significant reduction in the vigor of competition, even though this effect may not be so far reaching as to amount to a combination in restraint of trade, create a monopoly, or constitute an attempt to monopolize. Such an effect may arise in various ways, such as elimination in whole or in material part of the competitive activity of an enterprise which has been a substantial factor in competition, increase in the relative size of the enterprise making the acquisition to such a point that its advantage over its competitors threatens to be decisive, undue reduction in the number of competing enterprises, or establishment of relationships between buyers and sellers which deprive their rivals of a fair opportunity to compete. * * * It would be unnecessary for the Government to speculate as to what is in the back of the minds of those who promote a merger; or to prove that the acquiring firm had engaged in actions which are considered to be unethical or predatory; or to show that as a result of a merger the acquiring firm had already obtained such a degree of control that it possessed the power to destroy or exclude competitors or fix prices.

"The test of substantial lessening of competition or tending to create a monopoly is not intended to be applicable only where the specified effect may appear on a nationwide or industry-wide scale. The purpose of the bill is to protect competition in each line of commerce in each section of the country." [19]

The Senate report commented that:

"The type of problem to which this bill is addressed was described by the Federal Trade Commission in these words:

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

"'Under the Sherman Act, an acquisition is unlawful if it creates a monopoly or constitutes an attempt to monopolize. Imminent monopoly may appear when one large concern acquires another, but it is unlikely to be perceived in a small acquisition by a large enterprise. As a large concern grows through a series of such small acquisitions, its accretions of power are individually so minute as to make it difficult to use the Sherman Act test against them * * *.

"'Where several large enterprises are extending their power by successive small acquisitions, the cumulative effect of their purchases may be to convert an industry from one of intense competition among many enterprises to one in which 3 or 4 large concerns produce the entire supply. This latter pattern (which economists call oligopoly) is likely to be characterized by avoidance of price competition and by respect on the part of each concern for the vested interest of its rival * * *. (The Merger Movement, A Summary Report, pp. 6–7.)' "[20]

The legislative intent is also clear that the prohibitions of new section 7 are intended to be far more stringent than those of the Sherman Act; that it is enough to show that the future competitive effect may be adverse even though the actual anticompetitive results cannot be demonstrated. Indeed, section 7 of the Clayton Act was originally adopted to supplement the Sherman Act's prohibitions against mergers and to ban those where the effect may be to substantially lessen competition. Section 7's test of illegality, therefore, was based upon probable future anticompetitive consequences unlike the Sherman Act which requires proof that injury to competition has already resulted. Thus mergers were proscribed under section 7 that were well beyond the reach of the Sherman Act.

However, section 7 soon became a dead letter so far as preventing mergers was concerned due primarily to the fact that the courts held that the Sherman Act's rule of reason (requiring extensive inquiry into economic factors to show actual effects) was applicable.[21] This obliterated for all practical purposes the distinction between section 7 and the Sherman Act and thwarted the congressional intent that monopolistic tendencies resulting from corporate mergers were to be nipped in the bud.

In this setting, a major purpose of the Celler-Kefauver Act, as the Senate Report pointed out, was "to make it clear that the (act) is not intended to revert to the Sherman Act test" but "to cope with monopolistic tendencies in their incipiency and well before they have attained such effects as would justify a Sherman Act proceeding * * *. (The) various additions and deletions—some strengthening and other weakening the bill—are not conflicting in purpose or effect. They merely are different steps toward the same objective, namely, that of framing a bill which, though dropping portions of the so-called Clayton Act test that have no economic significance, reaches far beyond the Sherman Act. * * * The concept of reasonable probability * * * is a necessary element in any statute which seeks to arrest restraints of trade in their incipiency and before they develop into full-fledged restraints violative of the Sherman Act. A requirement of certainty and actuality of injury to competition is incompatible with any effort to supplement the Sherman Act by reaching incipient restraints."[22]

Footnotes at end of speech.

VI. THE PROPOSED TRANSACTION IS CONTRARY TO THE CELLER-KEFAUVER ACT. IT IS ALSO CONTRARY TO PROVISIONS OF THE BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT BARRING BOARD APPROVAL WHERE THE EFFECT WOULD BE TO EXPAND THE SIZE AND EXTENT OF THE BANK HOLDING COMPANY SYSTEM INVOLVED BEYOND LIMITS CONSISTENT WITH ADEQUATE AND SOUND BANKING, THE PUBLIC INTEREST, AND THE PRESERVATION OF COMPETITION IN THE FIELD OF BANKING

a. Competitive effects on Westchester County

On the basis of the record and the findings of the Examiner, reasonable probability exists of an increase in the combination's market power in Westchester County to such a point that, in the words of the House Judiciary Committee Report, "Its advantage over its competitors threatens to be decisive."

Relevant in this connection is concentration of commercial bank assets in Westchester County as demonstrated by the following table:

Concentration of commercial bank assets, Westchester County, June 30, 1956

[Dollars in millions]

	Total assets	Percent of total
County Trust Co.	$355	48.0
National Bank of Westchester	138	18.6
2 largest banks	493	66.6
First National Bank of Yonkers	56	7.6
3 largest banks	549	74.2
First Westchester National Bank	45	6.1
4 largest banks	594	80.3
8 remaining banks	146	19.7
Total, all banks	740	100.0

The degree of banking concentration in Westchester County is such, with County Trust Co. controlling about one-half of all banking resources, and with the National Bank of Westchester as much as two-thirds, that there is considerable doubt as to whether smaller competing banks in the county will have long-range opportunity to do business profitably, whether they will have unfettered opportunity for growth and expansion, whether new banks will be able to enter into business without undue handicap, and whether new capital will find such new banks an attractive investment.

The short of the matter is that present concentration in Westchester County is serious enough; to combine the resources of the dominant banking institution in Westchester County with the gigantic resources of the First National City Bank of New York may well compound that situation to an enormous extent. If smaller banks in Westchester now labor under a competitive disadvantage with the County Trust Co., that disadvantage would pale into insignificance by adoption of the pending proposal. It now takes considerable courage for small-business men to pool their resources and charter a new commercial bank in Westchester County. The obstacles to new charters, now especially serious because of concentration of banking assets, could well become infinitely greater once County Trust Co. had behind it the weight of the First National City Bank resources. Integration such as proposed, that "links together competitive areas with others in which competition is already seriously defective, accomplishes by financial consolidation something very much like what is accomplished by the tie in prohibited by section 3 of the Clayton Act; it permits the use of market power in one area to create competitive advantages unrelated to efficiency in others."[23]

It follows that the acquisition would introduce in Westchester County an institution of such power that the banking community would be transformed into one overwhelmingly dominated by a single company, with a reasonable probability of price leadership and a general absence of price rivalry. Smaller banks in Westchester County could not be expected to be unaware of the financial power with which they would be confronted by virtue of this consolidation. In these circumstances, their means of competition would be hardly comparable to those available to the First National City-County Trust combination. To suppose that entry by First National City Bank in Westchester County might have no adverse competitive effect on the other 11 banks in that area is like supposing that chickens can dance with an elephant and come out unharmed.

Moreover, the inference can be drawn that the pattern of acquisition behavior that has characterized the operation of the County Trust Co. and the First National City Bank in the past would continue in the future, so that ultimately much, if not all, remaining effective competition in Westchester County would be destroyed via the same route. This is in accordance with the principle that probable future effects of a consolidation cannot be looked upon in isolation, but only in the framework of the merger history of the various parties to the transaction.

As far as the First National City Bank is concerned, it has taken an active part in a recent series of large mergers that reduced the number of more sizable banks in New York City—those with assets of about $500 million—from 16 to 12. By its merger with the First National Bank, the National City Bank increased its assets by $713 milion, or over 12 percent.

The following tables show the result of those mergers on banking concentration:

Concentration ratios, New York City, five largest banks, October 1954 and September 1956

Before the recent wave of mergers initiated with the Chemical Corn merger of October 15, 1954, concentration ratios in New York City for the five largest banks stood as follows:

[Dollars in billions]

Institution	Resources	Percent of total
National City	$5.43	16.5
Chase	5.36	16.3
Total		32.8
Guaranty Trust	3.10	9.4
Manufacturers Trust	2.96	9.0
Bankers Trust	2.16	6.5
Top 5	19.01	57.7
New York City total	32.95	

In September 1956 the ratios stood as follows:

[Dollars in billions]

Institution	Resources	Percent of total
Chase	$7.24	22.0
First National City	6.35	19.0
Total		41.0

Footnotes at end of speech.

[Dollars in billions]

Institution	Resources	Percent of total
Manufacturers Trust	$3.0	8.9
Chemical Corn	2.9	8.7
Guaranty Trust	2.77	8.3
Top 5	22.26	66.9
New York City total	33.42	

The County Trust Co. of White Plains completed 13 mergers in the postwar period. In fact, its activity rose to such a pitch that during 1955 its acquisitions numbered 7 institutions. When it attempted to cross the Hudson, however, to acquire the Ramapo Trust Co. of Spring Valley, the superintendent of banks vetoed this merger. A primary purpose was to keep the merger ambitions of County Trust from spreading into Rockland County.

The following tables show the merger history of First National City Bank and County Trust Co.:

Merger history, First National City

[Dollars in millions]

Name of institution	Year absorbed	Resources
International Banking Corp	1915	$41
National City Co. (City Company of New York)	1916	
Commercial Exchange National Bank, New York	1921	11
Second National Bank, New York	1921	30
Peoples Trust Co., Brooklyn	1926	76
Farmers Loan & Trust Co., New York	1929	205
Long Island National Bank, Long Island City	1931	4
Bank of America N. A	1931	500
First National Bank, New York	1955	713
Total		1,580

Sources: Rand McNally; Polk's Bankers Encyclopedia; Moody's Bank and Finance Manual.

Merger history, County Trust

[Dollars in millions]

Name of institution	Year absorbed	Resources
First National Bank, White Plains	1920	2
Caleb Heathcote Trust Co., Scarsdale	1936	4
Hartsdale National Bank	1940	3
Mount Pleasant Bank & Trust Co	1940	3
First National Bank, Hastings-on-Hudson	1941	3
First National Bank, Pleasantville	1943	2
Ossining Trust Co	1946	4
Fleetwood Bank of Mount Vernon	1946	11
Washington Irving Trust Co., Portchester	1947	29
Citizens Bank of White Plains	1950	18
First National Bank, Croton-on-Hudson	1952	3
Mount Vernon Trust Co	1955	24
Northern Westchester Bank, Katonah	1955	5
First National Bank, Ardsley	1955	3
Central National Bank, Yonkers	1955	30
Dobbs Ferry Bank	1955	4
Peekskill National Bank & Trust Co	1955	7
Irvington National Bank & Trust Co	1955	4
First National Bank of Elmsford	1955	4
Total		163

Sources: Rand McNally; Polk's Bankers Encyclopedia; Moody's Bank and Finance Manual.

In the context of the merger history of these two institutions, the present holding company plan appears as but another step toward larger size, greater dominance in the market area, and a possibly destructive dominance in Westchester County. Thus, there is presented the very type of situation to which the Celler-Kefauver bill was addressed. As the Senate report on that bill stated:

"Imminent monopoly may appear when one large concern acquires another, but it is unlikely to be perceived in a small acquisition by a large enterprise. As a large concern grows through a series of such small acquisitions, its accretions of power are individually so minute as to make it difficult to use the Sherman Act test against them * * *.

"Where several large enterprises are extending their power by successive small acquisitions, the cumulative effect of their purchases may be to convert an industry from one of intense competition among many enterprises to one in which 3 or 4 large concerns produce the entire supply. This latter pattern (which economists call oligopoly) is likely to be characterized by avoidance of price competition and by respect on the part of each concern for the vested interest of its rival." [34]

Senator ROBERTSON, cosponsor of the bank-holding bill, was aware of the danger to competition from a transaction such as this. Presenting the bill on the Senate floor, he stated:

"Recently there has been much discussion, in and out of Congress, of bank mergers. I believe there is substantially greater danger of abuse through the bank holding company device than through the process of bank mergers. Imagine what a New York City bank with deposits of $7 billion could do in the way of competition with other banks if it also controlled a vast industrial empire worth $1 billion, and had unlimited ability to establish banks throughout New York State and in any other State.

"It is inconceivable to me that any Member of this distinguished body would say that the time has not come to put a curb on such possible expansion. The pending bill not only would divorce the bank holding companies from their industrial empires, but also would put any future expansion under the control of the Federal Reserve Board, which would have the advice and assistance of the Comptroller of the Currency and State bank regulation agencies—the agencies which are charged with responsibility for maintaining the strength and the integrity of our monetary system." [35]

Similarly Governor Robertson, member of the Federal Reserve Board in a speech on October 22 of last year to the Independent Bankers Association, pointed to the problem at issue in the following terms:

"We are required to pass upon applications by holding companies for permission to acquire additional bank stocks. In doing so, we must be guided by certain standards which Congress has prescribed in the law itself. These standards relate to financial conditions; future prospects; character of management; needs of the community; and restriction of holding company growth within limits consistent with sound banking, the public interest, and the preservation of competition. These are not rule-of-thumb standards. In applying them, the Board must carefully consider all the circumstances of each case that comes before it, weighing one factor against another; and—needless to say—no factor will always weigh the same and no two cases will ever be exactly alike.

"Whether you fully appreciate it or not, there are some differences between a great metropolitan area—for example, New York City—and my home town, Broken Bow, Nebr. One can imagine a multi-million-dollar holding company acquiring a bank in New York City without unduly upsetting competition there. But if such a corporation acquired 1 of the 3 small banks in Broken Bow, the other 2 might fear that their life expectancy had been shortened. Even a Solomon might have to ponder a while in applying the statute in such different situations."

Apart from this, there is a further dimension—a possible chain reaction. The success of the applicant in establishing this holding company would not only spur it to further efforts elsewhere in the State of New York. It is common knowledge that other large city banks, such as Chase Manhattan, Bankers Trust, Chemical Corn, and Manufacturers would have to establish similar bank holding companies to keep abreast. Once First National City had gained approval, it would be useless, and in fact inequitable, to disapprove the rest. These considerations make it plain that this one decision involves not 1 but 4 or 5 bank holding companies.[36]

It is certain, however, that there are not enough of these regional branch banks to go around or satisfy every city bank. The expectation would be for a general scramble to buy up the independent banks in Rockland, Westchester, Nassau, and Suffolk Counties. In the end, local competition in these areas would be trampled and replaced by the Big Five of New York City. As far as the sizable commuter traffic between New York City and the suburbs is concerned, competition between the suburban banks and the city banks at the retail and small-business level would be annihilated, as will be pointed out below.

b. Competitive effects on metropolitan New York City

Among the most important competitive forces in banking in metropolitan New York, particularly to people in the suburban areas, are the sizable regional branch banks that have sprung up in the rapidly growing counties surrounding the five boroughs. These suburban institutions have actually grown in three ways: through the influx of population, through new branches, and through mergers with existing smaller banks. Some of these banks, in fact, have acquired control of so large a portion of the banking resources of their counties as almost to raise questions of undue concentration. An important mitigating fact, however, is that commuter traffic, the automobile, and banking by mail bring these institutions into close competition with the banks in New York City. To an important degree, residents of the suburbs have a free choice as borrowers or depositors between their local institutions and city banks.

For example, First National City controls approximately one-third of both the number and dollar amounts of thrift deposits of commercial banks in New York City. The County Trust's 120,000 thrift accounts constitute roughly one-fifth of the 600,000 such accounts now at First National City. Moreover, the number of individuals with demand accounts at County Trust is approximately 119,000. Further, the number of persons with direct consumer loans is above 15,000.

Most of these individuals will be directly affected by the acquisition of County Trust by the First National City Bank. Most of them (or a member of their family) undoubtedly commute to the city. Thus, they have a choice as to where they may deposit their savings, where they may place their funds for use in regular or special checking accounts, and where they may obtain loans for personal needs. This acquisition would eliminate for these many thousands of individuals a substantial portion of their freedom of choice as to whether they prefer to bank near their homes or near their place of work.

As the examiner pointed out in his February 20, 1958, recommended decision (pp. 24–25):

"Execution of the program will also tend to eliminate competition between Westchester County banks and city banks. About 6 percent of the fiduciary accounts—in dollars a substantial figure—of Farmers originates in Westchester County. That competition may be expected to be eliminated by the proposed program, as well as poten-

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

tial competition which County Trust could be expected to provide by continued improvement of its trust services. The reduction of competition would, however, be greater than that. As of July 1956 more than half as many employed Westchester residents were employed outside the county, mainly in New York City, as were employed within the county. At the same time at least 10 percent of the locally employed persons were nonresidents of the county.

"It is thus seen that a majority of the county labor force possibly has regular access to banking facilities both in New York City and in Westchester County. To such persons, as well as to large-scale industrial and business establishments, the two areas offer alternative sources of banking service. Under such circumstances the banking systems of the two communities are in competition. The applicants estimate that the percentage of FNCB domestic depositors originating in Westchester is less than 1 percent; the deposits of County Trust originating in New York City less than 3 percent. One percent of FNCB's domestic deposits would be over $20 million; more than 5 percent of County Trust's total deposits. Three percent of County Trust's deposits would be approximately $10 million. These are in substantial amounts. Statistics in evidence indicating greater percentage of overlap in an FNCH branch nearest Westchester appear too fragmentary to be meaningful.

"Since a substantial number of persons employed in Westchester County have access to either the city or the county banks, and thus have a choice between them, I am of the opinion that there is effective competition between the city and county banks for the business of such individuals. The entry of First New York Corp. into Westchester County will tend to eliminate the choice which such persons now have, or may in the future have, between the banking services of FNCB and Farmers on the one hand, and the services of County Trust Co. on the other. In addition, the program will probably eliminate FNCH as an actual or potential correspondent for any of the other Westchester banks. These deprivations of choice result in a substantial lessening of competition, and in some respects a reduction in available banking service."

In connection with this facet of the problem, the ratios advanced by First National City are highly misleading. For example, exhibit F, page 5, cites that the "percentage of domestic business * * * originating in Westchester, based on amount of deposits * * *, is estimated to be less than 1 percent." Similarly it is stated, on page 7, that "the group to be formed by these proposals will have deposits and resources less than 6 percent larger than those of the First National City Bank of New York."

Apart from other considerations, the difficulty with these ratios lies in the fact that the First National City Bank is both a money-market bank as well as a retail institution. The County Trust Co., by contrast, does mostly a retail business.

To show how preposterous this comparison is, New York City banks could acquire the assets of all commercial banks in upstate New York and increase their size by only 23 percent. An analogy might be an acquisition by the Ford Motor Co., which manufactures charcoal, of various charcoal-producing competitors and justifying the acquisitions by putting into the ratios the entire operations of the Ford empire.

First National City produces no data breaking down their banking activities into wholesale and retail components, and showing the effects on size, concentration, etc., on such a detailed basis. An attempt has been made here to estimate, for example, the direct consumer lending business of First National City. It would appear that this bank's share is almost one-half of the New York City total. In these circumstances, it is clear that the First National City Bank's present dominance in this field cannot, consistent with antitrust principles, safely be increased further through holding company activities.

c. Relationship between population and deposits in New York City

One of the major points made by First National City is that since New York City population increase has been lagging behind the growth of the suburbs, it is necessary for a bank which desires to maintain its growth to go into these suburban areas. In the words of the First New York Corp. application:

"The First National City Bank of New York management also believes that due prudence and proper exercise of its responsibilities to First National City Bank shareholders make it desirable to protect First National City Bank against the consequences of business and population shifts from the city to Westchester County, which may create a relatively rapid growth of banking opportunities in the county, while at the same time limiting the growth potential within the five boroughs." [27]

This argument takes the rather simple view that a close relationship exists between population and bank deposits. In contrast with most communities, the New York City banks are not dependent upon this single factor. Because of their countrywide money market and corporate activities, their correspondent banking and their position in international finance, any such claim is fallacious.

On the contrary, when one takes the long view of the period since 1900, population in New York City has grown from less than 3½ million in 1900 to over 8 million today. Thus, the present population is 2½ times that at the turn of the century. By contrast, over the same period the deposits of the downtown commercial banks in the city increased from $1.7 billion to $29.4 billion. After adjusting for changes in the price level, their deposits are over 5 times the level in 1900 as shown in the following table:

Footnotes at end of speech.

Population growth and commercial bank deposits, New York City, 1900–1955

	Population	Index	Total deposits [1]	Index	Total deposits deflated [2]	Index
	Million		*Billion*		*Billion*	
June 30, 1900	3.44	100	$1.64	100	$4.46	100
June 30, 1955	8.05	234	$27.79	1684	$22.93	511

[1] Data for 1900 include all commercial banks in Manhattan. In 1955, only central reserve city member banks (banks with offices below Canal St.).

[2] 1955 figures deflated by implicit price deflator for gross national product; for 1900, the Bureau of Labor Statistics Wholesale Price Index used.

d. Ease of raising capital

One of the points made in the First National City application is that through the holding company device it is easier to raise capital and that County Trust will therefore benefit in this regard. Thus, in the First New York Corp. application (exhibit F, p. 3), the following statement is made:

"The association would likewise facilitate the raising of additional capital for the County Trust Co. to support its present position and future growth. Because of the great expansion in its deposits, its need for additional capital funds has been continuous; they have been provided in part by the sale of subordinated debentures. It is clear that its future capital requirements will be equally great if it is to meet adequately the needs of the communities which it serves. If the proposal is approved, the problem of raising this additional capital would fall upon the holding company which, through the broader market which may be expected for its own stock, would be able to accomplish this task more readily."

However, an examination of the premium existing for County Trust stock indicates that it is actually in an extremely favorable position as regards the raising of additional capital. During 1956, as shown by the table that follows, its market value was about two times its book value per share. By contrast First National City Bank stock was selling at only slightly higher than its book value. Thus the market has already taken into account the future growth and earnings potential of County Trust and this is reflected in the market value of its shares. It can therefore be inferred that County Trust would have no difficulty in raising the capital needed to margin its future deposit growth, and does not need a holding company organization to accomplish this.

Comparative book and market values, First National City Bank and County Trust Co., 1956

	1956
First National City Bank:	
Book value per share	$60.22
Range: Market price per share 60¼ to 73¼.	
County Trust Co.:	
Book value per share	14.18
Range: Market price per share 25¼ to 33½.	

VII. THE APPLICANT FAILS TO MEET ANY OF THE OTHER FACTORS OF SECTION 3 (C) OF THE BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT

From the background of the act, it is clear that a bank-holding company application, to win approval, has to meet squarely every single test prescribed by section 3 (c). Failing in that, the application must be disapproved.

It must be observed that the Bank Holding Company Act is a restrictive measure, not one designed to place the stamp of approval upon indiscriminate creation of new bank-holding companies. This is demonstrated by the history of the legislation as well as by the provisions of the act itself.

Bank-holding companies first caught the public's attention in the late 1920's when their organizational activity reached a peak. Many such ventures were mainly speculative in nature, with the result that the stock market crash caused much distress. By 1930, the Congress became so concerned over bank-holding companies that it held extensive hearings culminating in specific regulatory provisions in the Banking Act of

1933.[28] Such regulation proved inadequate, however, not only because of loopholes in the act itself, by which bank-holding companies might evade the reach of the Federal Reserve System, but also because of the failure of the act to deal with one of the principal problems involved—concentration. In a special message to Congress on April 29, 1938, President Roosevelt made these comments:

"It is hardly necessary to point out that the great economic power that might be wielded by a group which may succeed in acquiring domination over banking resources in any considerable area of the country. That power becomes particularly dangerous when it is exercised from a distance, and notably so when effective control is maintained without the responsibilities of complete ownership.

"We have seen the multiplied evils which have arisen from the holding-company system in the case of public utilities, where a small minority ownership has been able to dominate a far-flung system.

"We do not want those evils repeated in the banking field, and we should take steps now to see that they are not.

"It is not a sufficient assurance against the future to say that no great evil has yet resulted from holding company operations in this field. The possibilities of great harm are inherent in the situation

"I recommend that the Congress enact at this session legislation that will effectively control the operation of bank holding companies." [29]

Bills subsequently introduced in the Congress failed to make headway so that the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System felt moved to renew a plea for legislation in its Annual Report for 1943. This report stated in part as follows:

"There is now no effective control over the expansion of bank holding companies either in banking or in any other field in which they may choose to expand. Moreover, the device lends itself readily to the amassing of vast resources obtained largely from the public which can be controlled and used by a few people and which give to them, when they choose to use them, an unfair and overwhelming advantage in acquiring additional properties and in carrying out an unlimited program of expansion. In the exceptional case, these resources have been used to acquire independent banks by measures which leave the local management and minority shareholders little with which to defend themselves except their own strenuous protests. Likewise, these resources have been used to support the market for their own stocks and thus to facilitate the acquisition of independent banks by the exchange of stocks, as well as to create trading profits for favored participants.

"The Board believes, therefore, that it is necessary in the public interest and in keeping with sound banking principles that the activities of bank holding companies be restricted solely to the banking business and that their activities be regulated, as are the activities of the banks themselves.

"Such legislation should be so designed as to prevent any such company from using the corporate device to circumvent and evade sound banking principles, regulatory statutes, and declared legislative policy."

In 1944 the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation added its voice to the call for legislation. It stated in its annual report for that year:

"The business of lending money is well suited to private initiative and is best performed under competitive conditions. Monopoly in banking is a threat to American traditions, both because it limits the opportunities to engage in the business of banking, and because it provides an opportunity for favoritism in the extension of credit which may foster monopolies in other industries. The growing tendencies toward monopoly in the banking business are serious, and prompt action should be taken to curb them.

"A partial monopoly which develops when one bank obtains a disproportionate percentage of the total banking resources of an area may have a serious effect on the economic life of the district.

"Holding companies not only tend to become monopolistic, but increase the problem of supervision."

In the meantime, and continuing through the early postwar years, the large bank holding companies continued to expand without hindrance. Finally, in 1948, a point was reached when the Federal Reserve Board decided to grasp the initiative under powers conferred by the Clayton Act. Without repeating here the voluminous proceedings against the Transamerica Corp. in any detail, the following section of the Board's brief seems relevant in stating the bank holding company problem in general terms.

"The Clayton Act is a prophylactic statute, designed to arrest monopoly 'in its incipiency and before consummation,' as Congress itself said when it passed the law. Section 7 was specifically aimed at holding companies which buy up the stocks of companies in actual or potential competition and bring those companies under common ownership and control. The holding company which follows this practice was denounced by Congress as 'an abomination.' Here we have a case where just such a situation as Congress specifically visualized has come to pass. Transamerica and its predecessors have for over 40 years been acquiring the stocks of small, medium and large sized commercial banks in an ever expanding area on the west coast. To date, they have acquired almost 700 separate banking offices in 5 States. As fast as these banks were acquired, they were merged into or became branches of one or another of the rapidly growing branch banks in the controlled group of banks to a point where they now comprise 40 percent of all commercial banking offices in the 5-State area, having 39 percent of all commercial bank deposits and 50 percent of all commercial bank loans in those States. Furthermore, the evidence clearly indicates that, unless restrained, Transamerica intends to acquire more banks and thus to increase further its growing monopoly power in that area. The net 'effect' of these acquisitions, we contend, 'may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly' of commercial banking offices, deposits and loans in the 5-State area, contrary to the provisions of section 7. The nub of our contention springs from the conviction that the only proper legal test for determining the 'effect' of such a continuous series of acquisitions is to consider their cumulative effect upon existing and potential competition in commercial banking in the area." [30]

Perhaps nothing sparked renewed agitation for effective restrictions against bank holding companies more than the Board's inability to stop the acquisitions of the Transamerica Corp., due to the apparent impotence of section 7 of the Clayton Act as interpreted in that case by the Circuit Court of Appeals.[31] Finally, by 1955, the Congress had accumulated sufficient testimony, and Members of both Houses had become sufficiently familiar with the issues to bring bills within sight of enactment. The mainline of argument, familiar from many long-drawn-out proceedings, did not falter from its main objective—greater restriction. Thus Chairman Martin, of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, testified at hearings before the House Banking and Currency Committee as follows:

"These provisions of existing law regulate the activities of a bank holding company only if it happens to control a member bank and only if it desires to vote the stock of that bank. In effect, therefore, regulation is largely voluntary on the part of the holding company. Even if a voting permit is obtained, the regulation to which a holding company is subject is aimed mostly at protecting the soundness of the member banks in the group.

"These provisions, therefore, do not deal at all with two apparent problems in the banking holding company field. In the first place, there is nothing in present law which restricts the ability of a bank holding company to add to the number of its controlled banks. Consequently, there can well be situations in which a large part of the commercial banking facilities in a large area of the country may be concentrated under the management and control of a single corporation." [32]

When the House Committee on Banking and Currency issued its report to accompany its proposed bill, H. R. 6227, the problem was stated again in this form:

"Evidence developed during the hearings has convinced your committee that bank holding companies are not in accord with the very precepts upon which our banking system rests. The United States, early in its history, it should be recalled, adopted a democratic ideal of banking. Other countries, for the most part, have preferred to rely on a few large banks controlled by a banking elite. There has developed in this country, on the other hand, a conception of the independent unit bank as an institution having its ownership and origin in the local community and deriving its business chiefly from the community's industrial and commercial activities and from the farming population within its vicinity or trade area. Its activities are usually fully integrated with the local economic and social organization. The bank holding company device threatens to destroy this democratic grassroots institution.

"Your committee believes that the destruction of the American unit banking system resulting in the further concentration of credit facilities, would have revolutionary effects upon our free-enterprise system. Ultimately, monopolistic control of credit could entirely remold our fundamental political and social institutions.

"The time for action is now. We dare wait no longer, for already we are rapidly following the example of England whose many banks became the Big Five. She finally passed a law against further concentration. The Bank of England has been nationalized. France has nationalized its few banks. The same will inevitably come to pass here unless we forestall it by legislation.

"There is no question about what the reaction of the American people would be to such a condition. A nation that would not allow a monopoly over tobacco certainly will not condone one over the lifeblood of its economy, money, and credit. Through their Representatives in Congress and the State legislatures they have at various periods erected legal barriers against centralization of credit. Some of these have fallen, some have corroded. It is urgently necessary that we stop the remaining laws from being evaded. H. R. 6227 would do this. Its adoption by the Congress is necessary if we are to preserve our free-enterprise banking system, the economic counterpart of our political system. Each is essential to the other." [33]

From the foregoing it is abundantly clear that the act is restrictive and that by no means was it intended to provide ambitious

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

bank holding companies a hunting license to wage war on the country's independent unit and regional banks.

In addition to its history, provisions of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 make it clear that it would be a perversion of congressional intent to depict this act as a harmless ordinance designed to legitimatize or even foster and encourage bank holding companies. The following points are significant:

1. Acquisition of bank stock or assets: Specific procedures are set forth whereby the board of governors cannot render a decision without first consulting the appropriate State authority or the Comptroller of the Currency. Specific provisions of the act, previously discussed, establish that the Congress was deeply concerned about the harmful effects of these acquisitions on competition and the public interest.

2. Banning acquisitions across State lines: Acquisition of a bank located in a State other than where the holding company's principal operations are conducted is expressly forbidden, unless specifically authorized by State law.

3. Divestment of nonbanking organizations: The act, recognizing the great potential abuses inherent in combining banking with nonbanking enterprises, requires divestment within a specified time period.

4. Registration of existing holding companies: The act requires registration with the board of governors of all information regarding the financial condition and operations, management and intercompany relationship of all existing bank holding companies and their subsidiaries. This closed a previously existing loophole in the Banking Act of 1933.

5. General powers given to board of governors: The board of governors is empowered to issue any regulations or orders, to require reports under oath and to examine holding companies and their affiliates whenever necessary to accomplish the purposes of the act.

6. Forbidding intercompany borrowing: The act recognizes the possibility of abuses through financial manipulations within the holding company setup. It therefore forbids a subsidiary bank from investing in the securities of the parent company, from making loans collateralled by such securities, or from extending credit to any subsidiary of the holding company.

7. Responsibility of holding company officers: The act specifies that officers, directors, or employees of a holding company are subject to the same severe penalties for falsification of records as would be the personnel of member banks.

Factor 1: The Financial History and Condition of the Banks Concerned

As the applicant amply demonstrates, the financial history and condition of the two banks involved are sound. Apart from the merger histories of these two institutions, which have been previously described, there is little to be added to the facts presented by First National City Bank. Since both institutions are in a strong and profitable condition, the public interest does not require in the least that their proposed alliance through the holding company device be approved.

Factor 2: Prospects of the Two Banks

From all appearances, the prospects of the First National City Bank and County Trust Company of White Plains are excellent. Again, the applicant has shown that its own growth and earnings—as well as those of its proposed subsidiary—are good. Both institutions may be expected to benefit from the continued growth of population and income in New York State, with a resultant gain in the volume of business done by these two banks. The prospects of these institutions, therefore, are bright and offer no ground whatever why this application should be approved.

Factor 3: Character of Management

Both First National City Bank and County Trust Co. are generally considered adequately managed banks, headed by experienced officers and guided by active boards of directors. Indeed, the successful operation of both banks as separate entities raises a question whether the imposition of yet another layer of management might not result in diseconomies, in a blunting of initiative, and in the creation of a superbureaucracy that might stifle the creative talents of top personnel. Indications that undue size produce such effects—as evidenced by time-consuming and inefficient lending procedures—were given to the New York State Legislative Committee to Revise the Banking Law during its hearings.

In sum, not only does present character of management fail to supply grounds why this application should be approved, but a presumption that management might suffer calls for disapproval.

Factor 4: Convenience, Needs and Welfare of the Communities

The convenience, needs and welfare of the communities in the areas in which First National City Bank and County Trust Co. operates appear presently well served by banking institutions, including the applicant and its intended subsidiary. Both these institutions offer a full and apparently adequate range of services to their customers even though their specialties differ. By volume of business, First National City Bank is not so much a retail as far more importantly a wholesale bank which serves the national and international markets. The County Trust Company of White Plains, by contrast, puts its major emphasis on retail banking.

It is recognized that certain services, such as facilities for international transactions, are more available at the First National City Bank than at the County Trust Co. But any such lack cannot be construed to prove an inconvenience to the residents of Westchester under the meaning of this act. There is no reason why such new services could not be aded equally well—if a large enough demand existed in Westchester—without the proposed combination.

Second, residents of Westchester are now within easy commuting distance of banks in New York City, including the First National City Bank, apart from the fact that they have access to any of the more specialized services of city banks through the unique correspondent banking system. No compelling reason exists, therefore, why the convenience of residents of the area involved would demand the proposed holding company plan. In the absence of such a positive showing, disapproval would have to follow.

As for arguments in the application purporting to show resultant benefits of the merger, let me make these observations. There is no showing as to how and in what particulars the proposed merger would afford increased facilities to the borrowers and savers of Westchester County.

There is no showing that borrowers were unable to get credit or as being unable to obtain it in whatever amounts needed for growth and development.

There is no showing that business enterprise was being stunted in diversification or growth for lack of adequate banking facilities.

There is no showing that the bank facilities of Westchester County, and specifically of the County Trust Co., have refused or been unable to grow as needed. On the contrary the actual growth is shown to be extraordinarily rapid, fully as rapid as the rate of suburbanization of population and business.

Nor is there a showing as to how the proposed merger would bring about more economic and efficient operation. On the contrary it is stated that "no change in management is contemplated." The application speaks of "continuity of able management" presumably facilitated by access to personnel and training program of the First National City Bank without any evidence that a management survey had been made by the County Trust Co. resulting in a finding that after more than 40 years of rapid growth it was experiencing such additional difficulty in recruiting management personnel as to necessitate recourse to supposedly extra supplies of such talent in the First National City Bank. The application nowhere indicates why and wherein the free enterprise method failed of bidding for personnel from not only the graduates of dozens of banking and business schools but from the ranks of all the managerial personnel in all the banks of the country.

Nor is there any proof given that "because of the great growth in deposits * * * the relationship of its [County Trust Co.] capital funds to its deposits is not so strong as that of the First National Bank." The ratio is different—as one might expect in a rapidly growing bank. But the application itself calls County Trust Co.'s financial condition sound.

In short, one looks in vain for facts to show how the proposed merger will add strength, service, adequacy, diversification or growth to the banking facilities that are forcefully demonstrated to be completely adequate in Westchester County.

On the contrary as the examiner found on February 20, 1958 (pp. 12, 14, 15, and 16):

"Initially, it will be observed that no new bank or banking office will be created by the acquisition, either in New York City or Westchester County.

"The growth and increased industrialization of Westchester County in recent years has brought a need for various specialized services, such as foreign banking and foreign financing, small loans, and residential mortgage and consumer loans. These services are presently available in adequate degree and form. There is no present want or need for further banking services in Westchester County in the sense that such service is unavailable, either directly with a county bank, or through the bank's corerspondent relationship with one of the larger New York City banks. In the matter of large loans for industrial enterprises, and perhaps in the field of foreign banking services, referral of some portion of such business to a correspondent bank may at times be necessary either because of loan limits of the county banks, or because of other limitations. Certain other services, now available in varying degrees, could be improved by the adoption of specialized techniques.

"County Trust and the other county banks seem to have kept pace with the essential needs of Westchester. Their growth in the past decade is evidence of responsiveness to and anticipation of community needs. The 1956 annual report of County Trust discloses the establishment of a foreign department in that year, the inauguration of a training school for tellers, and the development or improvement of banking services and administrative programs. Contrary to some suggestion in the record, County Trust offers a complete range of trust services.

"To sum up the considerations bearing upon the fourth statutory factor: It appears that the proposed program may contribute to the convenience of the Westchester community and area; but it is not shown by clear evidence to be necessary for the needs and welfare thereof. It will make no contribution to the convenience, needs, and welfare of the New York City community and area. In addition, considerations involved in factor 5 tend to diminish or cancel the weight of the convenience factor in Westchester. As in the case of Northwest Bancorporation: though the proposed acquisition may serve a useful purpose in the county, existing needs are not of a high order of intensity and the convenience and welfare of the community and area are not

heavily dependent upon its consummation. Indeed, the needs and welfare of the area may be adversely affected."

---

[1] Public Law 511 (84th Cong., 2d sess.).

[2] Sec. 105, New York Banking Law.

[3] 12 U. S. C. sec. 36.

[4] See Application First New York Corporation before Federal Reserve Board (November 5, 1956), Exhibit D, p. 4.

[5] First National City Bank operates 75 domestic branch offices in New York City and 70 foreign branches located in 24 foreign countries.

[6] See Statement, Superintendent of Banks of State of New York, pt. III, hearings, House Antitrust Subcommittee on Current Antitrust Problems, (84th Cong., 1st sess.) pp. 1993–96.

[7] S. Rept. No. 1095 (84th Cong., 1st sess.), p. 11. See also Senate hearings, p. 48; House hearings, p. 98.

[8] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 23, 1956, p. 6043.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Mississippi outlaws bank holding companies while Vermont bars any corporation whose primary business is the holding of stock in other corporations. Wisconsin law provides that any corporation controling a majority of stock in a State bank is to be deemed engaged in the business of banking and subject to supervision of the State Banking Department.

[11] S. Rept. No. 1095 (84th Cong., 1st sess.), p. 10.

[12] Id., p. 19.

[13] 15 U. S. C. sec. 18. Sec. 7, as amended, exempts mergers approved by a number of Federal regulatory agencies such as the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Communications Commission, etc. However, it does not exempt mergers, such as the one proposed here, approved by the Federal Reserve Board. Hence, from a technical standpoint Board approval would not insulate from antitrust prosecution an acquisition under the Bank Holding Company Act.

[14] 15 U. S. C. sec. 21.

[15] 15 U. S. C. sec. 25.

[16] There is no question that present sec. 7 covers a holding company's acquisition of stock in another corporation. Indeed, the primary reason for originally enacting sec. 7 was to deal with such transactions. This is demonstrated by the following language of a House Committee on the Judiciary Report, dated May 6, 1914, which recommended passage of the Clayton Act (H. Rept. No. 627, 63d Cong., 2d sess.):

"Sec. 8 (now sec. 7 of the Clayton Act) deals with what is commonly known as the holding company, which is a common favorite method of promoting monopoly. Holding company is a term generally understood to mean a company that holds the stock of other companies. It has usually issued its own shares in exchange for these stocks and is a means of holding under one control the competing companies whose stocks are thus acquired. As thus defined a holding company is an abomination, and in our judgment is a mere incorporated form for the old fashioned trust.

[17] H. Rept. No. 1191 (81st Cong., 1st sess.), pp. 6–8.

[18] Id., p. 8. In view of this new test of illegality, no longer apposite is *Transamerica* v. *Board of Governors of Federal Reserve Board* (206 F. (2d) 163 (CA 3, 1953)); certiorari denied (346 U. S. 901 (1953)). In that case Transamerica had acquired control of 48 banks with 645 offices in 5 Western States. The Board found—and its finding was not challenged in the court—that the area of competition was largely the local community. The Board made no effort to prove the existence of competition between any of the acquired banks in any local community, and, in fact, rejected evidence on that issue. Furthermore, of the 48 acquired banks, 38 were located in communities where there were no other acquired banks. The court held that since there was no competition between acquiring and acquired corporations to begin with, the Board's finding of a sec. 7 violation must be rejected.

[19] Id., p. 8.

[20] S. Rept. No. 1775, 81st Cong., 2d sess., p. 5.

[21] See *International Shoe Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (280 U. S. 291 (1930)); *United States* v. *Republic Steel Corp.* (11 F Supp. 177 (N. D. Ohio, 1935)). Old sec. 7 made illegal stock acquisitions where the effect may be to substantially lessen competition between "the corporation whose stock is * * * acquired and the corporation making the acquisition." A literal reading of this provision could prohibit virtually all stock acquistions of competing concerns even those which had but minimal economic significance. In all probability the courts reverted to the Sherman Act test of looking at actual and immediate effects so as to avoid the literal sweep of this provision.

[22] Id., pp. 4–6.

[23] Joel B. Dirlam and Alfred E. Kahn, Fair Competition: The Law and Economics of Antitrust Policy, Cornell University Press, 1954, p. 1943.

[24] Supra, p. 17.

[25] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 23, 1956, p. 6046.

[26] Note that in recent years mergers in New York City showed the chain effect. In one 6-month period, the 5 largest banks raised their share from 58 percent to 67 percent of New York City's total.

[27] Exhibit D, p. 4.

[28] 12 U. S. C. sec. 1 et seq.

[29] S. Doc. 173 (75th Cong., 3d sess.)

[30] Reply brief of counsel for the Board of Governors, November 9, 1951, in the Transamerica proceedings.

[31] Cited supra note 15, p. 9.

[32] Hearings before House Committee on Banking and Currency on H. R. 2764 to provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies (84th Cong., 1st sess.), pp. 13–14.

[33] H. Rept. No. 609 (84th Cong., 1st sess.), pp. 1–2.

Smokescreen Resolutions by Governors' Conference Fail To Fool the American People

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, as is evidenced by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 8078, under title Battle To End Federal Paternalism a Challenge to the States as Well as the Federal Government, I tried to point out the responsibility of the governors of this Nation to give leadership to the President's proposal to assist the States in regaining some of their lost authority. This would include return of some taxing powers. The recommendations of the Joint Federal-State Action Committee which had been previously reported favorably by 10 of the governors who served on that committee along with 7 administration representatives should be adopted.

For all practical purposes, the faint-hearted effort to comply with this challenge by adoption of the report in principle, with many reservations, and the simultaneous call for further action by the Federal Government in fields of public works and other programs apparently gave stronger support by the governors for continued Federal intervention and usurpation of State responsibilities than support for stronger States rights. In my opinion, the governors thus showed that they are out of tune with the true beliefs and convictions of the people of this country.

For example, a resolution offered by Governor Abraham Ribicoff, of Connecticut, called on congressional leaders to get together and draw up a program covering such areas as unemployment insurance benefits, tax policies, and public works—and accused the administration of government by stalemate in dealing with the so-called recession.

A majority of the governors jumped on the bandwagon in an effort to throw up a smokescreen to cover their own inaction in many instances in their own States and to place the blame on Washington. A program asking for unlimited Federal spending plus tax cutting—under the apparent assumption that deficit Federal spending is perfectly all right. Apparently they believe that the only solution is to spend our way out of the economic situation, and that there is no responsibility resting on the States themselves in finding solutions to our problems. I can imagine the hue and cry that those same governors would raise if a similar program were proposed in their respective States.

In any event, the debate on and preceding the resolution clearly shows a desire to abdicate all responsibility to Washington from the States on this problem. The apparent political purpose being to becloud their own inaction with this smokescreen resolution, and demonstrating an amazing lack of knowledge of what is going on in Washington, what steps have been taken already; how programs presently authorized and in existence can be utilized and how we may properly combat the problems.

For instance, Governor Ribicoff suggested that Democrats and Republicans sit down and work out a program in the fields of tax cuts, public works, and unemployment compensation. Apparently he is unaware that the two parties have been in constant touch with the White House and have held numerous conferences on these very problems. He has not heard that the parties have a gentleman's agreement as to when action should be taken on tax cuts depending on further economic developments. He does not understand as do the parties understand each other fully on unemployment compensation and that the President has voiced his approval of the bill that has already passed the House but is awaiting Senate action (of course under the control of the same party to which the Governor belongs). Nor does he recognize that in public works, Congress has already accelerated, to the tune of $1.5 billion, the highway construction program; has stepped up authorizations

for other programs; is giving favorable consideration, after Presidential recommendation, to $125 million more in public works projects for fiscal 1959—and as for the much maligned Public Works Omnibus bill, the President has recommended that Congress enact a sound bill consistent with his veto message—and that the Bureau of the Budget and congressional leaders are in conference on working out differences of opinion.

The heckling of the politically ambitious governors, including Ribicoff, Meyner, Williams, and Harriman, just to mention a few, calling for further Federal action, completely failed to give any credit whatsoever to the administration—or Congress for that matter—for taking numerous steps to meet the problem. To refresh their all-too-short memories, I include a list of the steps taken under the leadership of President Eisenhower in this matter—and I will challenge any of the governors who gave such carping criticism of the President—to match this record of constructive and effective action and recommendations. The list, not inclusive of every action taken of course, follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

1. Defense contracts accelerated to $13.4 billion in first half of 1958 as against $7.9 billion in last half of 1957. Calendar year totals: 1958—$23.6 billion; 1957—$17.8 billion.

2. Spending increased in Federal highway programs by $800 million over last fiscal year and plans call for additional increase of $600 million in fiscal 1959.

3. Acceleration of authorized civil works by $200 million in current fiscal year.

4. Federal Reserve discount rate reduced from 3½ to 3 percent on November 14.

5. Reserve requirement of Federal Reserve banks reduced one-half of 1 percent on February 20, thereby freeing additional $3 billion for lending.

6. Release of $107 million for additional purchase of military Capehart housing loans by Federal National Mortgage Association.

7. Additional $50 million in capital grant funds for urban renewal projects issued.

8. FNMA received additional $20 million for purchase of FHA insured loans for cooperative housing.

9. FHA-insured mortgage downpayments reduced.

10. Release of additional $200 million for use in FNMA's special assistance mortgage buying program.

11. About 60 Federal buildings programed for lease-purchase construction, requiring $105 million financing. If ordered by Congress for financing by direct appropriations $177 million would be appropriated.

12. Federal Reserve discount rate cut from 3 to 2¾ percent on January 21.

13. Rule requiring cash payment of FHA closing costs eliminated, in effect a further reduction of downpayment requirement.

14. More funds attracted to VA-insured mortgages by permitting increase in maximum yields allowed on VA loans traded in secondary markets.

15. Defense Department directed to funnel contracts to distressed labor areas and to small business generally. In February, $102 million in Federal contracts set aside for small business, twice the amount in February 1957.

16. Federal Home Loan Bank Board arranged longer term financing with Home Loan Banks.

17. Army schedules award of 100 million in motor vehicle contracts in areas hit by automobile unemployment.

18. Speed-up ordered in $1 billion worth of urban renewal loans and grants handled by Housing and Home Finance Agency.

19. Federal Reserve discount rate dropped from 2¾ to 2¼ percent on March 6.

20. Acceleration ordered in placement of $740 million in Rural Electrification Administration loans for electric facilities and telephones.

21. Federal Reserve again reduces reserve requirement by one-half of 1 percent on March 18, freeing another $3 billion for lending.

22. President orders speedup in $300 million in HHFA loans for college housing.

23. Urban renewal program speeded to 100 new projects in fiscal 1958 and 120 additional in fiscal 1959, compared to 56 started in fiscal 1957.

24. Military departments accelerate construction programed before June 30 to total of more than $2 billion and expect to arrange financing for $500 million in Capehart housing loans. All Federal agencies directed to plan immediately for as many fiscal 1958 supply and equipment orders as possible.

25. Interior Department steps up general construction program by $25 million.

26. Acceleration ordered on $140 million in HHFA public housing loans.

27. General Services Administration given extra $8 million for general repair and improvement work.

28. REA given additional $12.5 million for loans.

29. Speedup ordered on $75 million in HHFA loans for public facilities.

LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

30. Permit Federal Government to assist States in 50 percent extension of unemployment benefits.

31. General supplemental appropriations of $1.2 billion, mostly for defense, requested.

32. Congress asked to authorize $2 billion, 3-year program of postoffice modernization and construction.

33. Area assistance program recommended for Federal aid to sections of the country experiencing persistent unemployment.

34. Additional $200 million requested for accelerated urban-renewal program in year beginning July 1.

35. Army engineers' fiscal 1959 budget for civil works boosted by $125 million.

36. Congress asked to remove limit on life of Small Business Administration.

37. A $2 billion increase in lending authority of Export-Import Bank requested. Bank to finance $625 million in shipments abroad in first half of 1958, with larger program due in last half of this year.

38. Congress requested to authorize $840 million speedup in general Government purchasing by June.

39. Congress asked to suspend expenditure limitations in Highway Act, so that additional $2.3 billion can be allocated for highway aid in calendar years 1958–61.

40. Reclamation Bureau's 1959 budget increased by $46 million to maintain faster construction pace.

41. Congress asked to increase size of FHA loan insurance and to increase FHA total loan authorization by $3 billion per year for next 5 fiscal years.

42. Tax relief for small business proposed.

43. Acceleration of VA home-loan program proposed through elimination of interest-rate limitation.

44. Congress asked for additional $15 million for Agriculture Department watershed program in fiscal 1959.

45. Supplemental appropriation of $46 million for Federal hospital aid proposed.

46. Congress asked for $2 million supplemental appropriation for FHA to use in speeding processing of loan applications.

47. District of Columbia authorized to propose $100 million public-works program, to be financed with Treasury borrowings.

48. Elimination asked of interest-rate limitation on FHA-insured loans for rental projects, cooperative housing and Capehart military housing.

49. Interior Department budget amended to permit early start on small reclamation projects.

50. Additional lending authority proposed for Small Business Administration.

As to the demand for further public works programs, I point out, as I did before in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—but apparently to little avail—that many of the States have not used even 50 percent of the money made available under the regular—let alone the accelerated—National Highway Act. I enclose the latest report on State road construction, dated April 30, 1958, in substantiation of this statement.

TABLE 1—STATUS OF THE PROGRAM

Table 1 shows the status of the Federal-aid program for the Interstate System on the date indicated, and includes all actions taken since passage of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 on June 29, 1956. It should be understood that data in this table represent the program status at a point of time. Progress of work from month to month results in moves across the table: For example, a project that had been advertised for bids during the month will now be in the construction contracts columns but at the end of last month it was in the programed only columns.

An explanation of the table column heads follows:

Unprogramed balance: Federal-aid highway funds authorized by the Congress are apportioned among the States according to formulas prescribed by law. Each State's share now available but not yet committed to projects in any way is shown as unprogramed balance.

Programed only: Funds committed for specific projects in a program which defines the location, general nature, and estimated cost of each project.

Preliminary engineering and right-of-way authorized (July 1, 1956, to date): Funds previously programed and now committed for use or already spent for preliminary engineering (surveys, plans, etc.) and/or acquisition of right-of-way, needed for construction projects.

Construction contracts authorized (July 1, 1956, to date): Funds previously programed and now committed for construction work; includes contracts advertised but not yet awarded, contracts awarded but not yet underway, contracts underway, and contracts completed.

Total programed: The total of all commitments, including all columns to the left in the table except unprogramed balance.

THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

TABLE 1.—*Status of the program as of Apr. 30, 1958*

[Thousands of dollars]

State	Unprogramed balance [1]	Programed only			Authorized July 1, 1956, to date					Total programed		
					Preliminary engineering and right-of-way		Construction contracts					
		Total cost	Federal funds	Miles	Total cost	Federal funds	Total cost	Federal funds	Miles	Total cost	Federal funds	Miles
Alabama	$24,081	$46,782	$41,548	116.7	$19,016	$17,104	$20,474	$18,427	87.1	$86,272	$77,079	203.8
Arizona	10,016	19,307	18,089	91.3	10,573	9,973	19,898	18,598	123.1	49,778	46,660	214.4
Arkansas	6,470	33,335	29,999	47.3	24,226	21,169	19,956	16,841	46.2	77,517	68,009	93.5
California	24,669	4,391	3,992	5.1	351,172	94,785	173,642	157,490	163.6	529,205	256,267	168.7
Colorado	25,238	6,445	5,885	28.4	10,640	9,644	32,583	28,458	143.6	49,668	43,987	172.0
Connecticut	21,796	1,837	1,654	1.0	9,137	8,213	22,329	18,380	15.5	33,303	28,247	16.5
Delaware	22,121	6,939	6,245	1.2	5,145	3,453	1,110	999	1.0	13,194	10,697	2.2
Florida	7,177	38,900	35,010	29.5	23,630	21,220	25,765	22,081	21.4	88,295	78,311	50.9
Georgia	6,961	66,638	58,924	84.2	37,888	33,863	23,246	19,454	51.4	127,772	112,241	135.6
Idaho	27,310	11,933	11,014	48.6	4,720	4,344	11,482	9,672	34.9	28,135	25,030	83.5
Illinois	21,246	42,815	38,088	44.9	65,134	58,253	135,912	113,469	62.2	243,861	209,810	107.1
Indiana	48,255	45,686	40,298	61.1	25,583	22,132	15,628	13,450	18.4	86,897	75,880	79.5
Iowa	31,071	27,792	24,754	58.0	13,115	11,353	46,123	39,144	186.7	87,030	75,251	244.7
Kansas	25,480	18,170	16,353	75.3	17,909	16,096	34,105	90,695	146.4	70,234	63,144	221.7
Kentucky	37,683	26,015	23,413	33.9	33,372	28,149	6,635	5,971	14.8	66,022	57,533	48.7
Louisiana	14,010	23,868	21,481	30.1	23,828	20,912	30,593	26,757	25.5	78,289	69,150	55.6
Maine	16,667	8,401	7,320	7.9	4,424	3,964	15,174	12,974	12.8	27,999	24,258	20.7
Maryland	5,278	5,581	4,286	2.2	14,791	12,859	41,691	37,463	32.3	62,063	54,608	34.5
Massachusetts	21,504	32,088	28,796	6.5	20,357	18,142	43,455	38,104	17.4	95,900	85,042	24.9
Michigan	20,442	59,434	53,490	75.3	43,502	38,814	74,615	65,086	86.7	177,551	157,390	162.0
Minnesota	45,346	8,504	7,764	12.0	47,069	41,744	21,458	18,370	40.5	77,031	67,878	52.5
Mississippi	7,707	30,168	27,016	86.8	11,370	9,222	40,880	36,098	110.2	82,418	72,336	197.0
Missouri	23,003	15,003	13,552	5.4	43,523	36,218	66,241	59,690	88.7	124,767	109,460	94.1
Montana	52,901	3,607	2,667	12.6	14,881	13,430	6,912	6,224	59.8	24,800	22,321	72.4
Nebraska	49,276	3,101	2,876	2.3	20,203	18,023	6,846	5,184	11.2	30,150	26,083	13.5
Nevada	25,697	5,700	5,415	13.9	15,292	14,470	7,918	7,404	20.4	28,910	27,289	34.3
New Hampshire	17,355	250	225		3,669	3,153	14,563	11,950	18.8	18,482	15,328	18.8
New Jersey	56,999	2,106	1,896		29,145	24,044	34,864	30,934	20.0	66,115	56,874	20.0
New Mexico	4,428	8,405	7,781	15.9	8,161	7,556	42,917	39,853	153.1	59,483	55,190	201.0
New York	68,578	27,725	24,952	22.7	94,015	82,875	220,013	174,080	74.2	341,753	281,907	96.9
North Carolina	38,698	41,003	36,846	146.9	15,322	13,388	46,883	40,304	284.1	103,208	90,338	497.0
North Dakota	17,353	14,315	12,773	83.5	5,793	5,128	23,786	21,561	142.2	43,894	39,462	225.7
Ohio	8,628	1,741	1,567		61,409	55,155	167,593	146,657	144.5	230,743	203,379	144.5
Oklahoma	6,371	39,404	35,344	117.3	12,529	11,254	44,049	37,892	158.0	95,982	84,490	275.3
Oregon	22,990	2,310	2,118	6.0	9,088	8,356	35,717	32,713	154.7	47,115	43,187	160.7
Pennsylvania	71,124	49,177	44,080	35.3	41,514	37,306	136,313	117,939	116.3	227,004	199,275	151.6
Rhode Island	6,374	286	257		8,302	7,299	18,868	16,981	17.8	27,456	24,537	17.8
South Carolina	14,515	30,152	27,160	61.2	6,333	5,533	25,248	21,618	117.9	61,733	54,311	179.1
South Dakota	3,993	41,739	38,056	82.9	4,850	4,422	14,804	12,561	48.9	61,393	55,039	131.8
Tennessee	16,889	47,301	42,571	36.9	40,854	33,479	20,872	18,450	33.0	109,027	94,500	69.9
Texas	36,935	93,685	84,316	179.7	25,041	22,534	155,802	139,007	486.7	274,528	245,857	666.4
Utah	6,230	23,713	22,508	53.2	11,996	11,383	7,982	7,542	20.5	43,691	41,433	73.7
Vermont	2,515	19,550	17,595	10.3	9,025	7,859	6,351	4,827	7.8	34,926	30,281	18.1
Virginia	8,424	41,648	37,464	31.9	26,988	23,904	36,812	32,300	52.0	105,448	93,668	83.9
Washington	19,719	11,609	10,595	17.4	21,948	19,901	35,550	31,218	122.4	69,107	61,714	139.8
West Virginia	28,131	30,245	26,470	34.1	9,142	7,236	170	153	[2]	39,557	33,859	34.1
Wisconsin	66,754	14,463	11,411	24.6	22,749	19,732	23,411	20,044	72.4	60,623	51,187	97.0
Wyoming	7,253	12,589	11,715	39.3	4,305	3,979	31,086	28,590	126.9	47,980	44,284	166.2
District of Columbia	4,049	13,015	11,765	1.2	9,675	8,604	9,203	8,264	.5	31,893	28,633	1.7
Total	1,155,700	1,158,271	1,039,344	1,981.8	1,392,403	1,011,629	2,097,528	1,821,921	4,026.5	4,648,202	3,872,894	6,008.3

[1] Includes additional funds authorized by Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958, for fiscal year 1959, apportioned Apr. 16, 1958.

[2] Less than 0.05 of a mile.

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads.

This clearly indicates the lack of real antirecession leadership on the part of the Governors themselves. They absolutely refuse to fully use an existing program provided by the Federal Government—while asking for new programs.

As a matter of fact, it is amazing that some of the Governors do not even seem to be fully familiar with the programs offered by the National Highway Act. This was evidenced by the Governor from Connecticut when he appeared before our Public Works Committee during hearings on the Bush-May-Buckley proposals for reimbursement of toll facilities and other roads built to Federal standards. He gave as his reason for not getting the National Highway program fully underway in Connecticut that the State had trouble matching the 90 percent Federal money. This was apparently in complete ignorance of section 6 in the program which definitely provides funds to the States for the purpose of assistance in matching funds. Further, according to Assistant Secretary Rothschild of the Department of Commerce, no State requesting such aid has ever been turned down. It certainly would appear the good people of Connecticut were denied full benefits of the program already in existance. The State administration, most apparently failed to acquaint itself with available Federal authority. Now the titular head of that government is now trying to place the blame for the lag of that program in his State on the Federal Government. This is a pure attempt to further condemn the Republican administration for inaction in combating the so-called recession. I doubt if the American people will be fooled by such smokescreen tactics by the sponsor of the resolution at the governors' conference nor will they be hoodwinked by its adoption. Thus, those who have the primary responsibility of administering this program on the State level, who are now pleading for huge new Federal public-works programs, are themselves not spending the money available today on the largest of all Federal public-works programs, the highway program, even after some 23 months in which to get the program off the ground and fully underway to immediately serve to check any recession.

I call special attention to some of the States whose governors are most critical of Federal inaction. These facts prove beyond a doubt even greater State inaction, and in considering some of them it is noted for instance:

Connecticut has only $26.5 million of interstate funds under contract of $50.043 million available.

New Jersey has only $54.9 million of Interstate funds under contract of $83.939 million available.

New York has only $174.088 million of interstate funds under contract of $257 million available.

Michigan has only $103.8 million of interstate funds under contract of $177 million available.

Florida has only $43.2 million of Interstate funds under contract of $85 million available.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Address by Hon. William M. Colmer, of Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I count it a great privilege to serve in the Congress with the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman of the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives, and the Honorable WILLIAM M. COLMER, Member of the House of Representatives from Mississippi. They are both great Americans and I am proud to call them my friends.

On May 10, 1958, the Democrats of the Eighth Congressional District of Virginia assembled at Fredericksburg, Va., and again nominated Congressman SMITH as the Democratic nominee for the 86th Congress. The Honorable WILLIAM M. COLMER, of Mississippi, was the speaker of the occasion. He made a memorable address—one that I wish every American could read and digest. The address is as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER, OF MISSISSIPPI, AT JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER, SPONSORED BY THE EIGHTH DISTRICT DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE OF VIRGINIA, FREDERICKSBURG, VA., MAY 10, 1958

Mr. Chairman, Governor Battle, Congressman Smith, my fellow Jefferson-Jacksonian Democrats, it is with considerable humility and trepidation that I appear before you this evening. However, I hasten to assure you that I am not unmindful of the honor which you have bestowed upon me by inviting me to be with you on this auspicious occasion.

Since my early childhood when I first began to read the history of this country, I have been tremendously impressed with the contribution which the people of the Commonwealth of Virginia have made to the founding and preservation of this Republic. That respect and admiration has grown within me as my thinking and ability to appraise the situation has matured throughout the years. And, so this evening, as always when I cross the line into the great State of Virginia, I feel that I am on hallowed ground. Certainly no people of any State have, in my judgment, equalled much less excelled this substantial citizenry of Virginia in their contribution to the cause of national security and good government.

Mr. Chairman, I would be untrue to the thoughts that well within me if I did not on this occasion, as well as on every other occasion when the opportunity presents itself, pay homage to him whom you have again today signally honored by renominating him for his seat in Congress, HOWARD W. SMITH. HOWARD SMITH is my distinguished chairman of the powerful Rules Committee of the American Congress, my warm personal friend, my counselor and the true leader in that body of House Members who believe in constitutional government as we have known it. Modest almost to a fault, never seeking the limelight, day in and day out he wields a powerful influence for the preservation of those principles of government for which your imortal Washington and Jefferson, your Madison, your Monroe, your unexcelled Robert E. Lee and the long line of other illustrious Virginians devoted their lives. Possessed of a brilliant and logical mind, a man of indomitable courage, he tirelessly wages the fight against the foes of good government both in committee and on the floor of the House. But, it is in the conferences on strategy, in formulating the lines of defense against the opponents of constitutional government that he renders the greatest service. Like unto the great master of military strategy, Gen. Robert E. Lee, outnumbered in force, his brilliant mind conceives and wins many a successful battle.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my high privilege to serve as a Member of the House of Representatives for the past quarter of a century. In no similar period in the history of the Republic, I dare say, have there been more grievous assaults made on the Constitution and the Bill of Rights which we cherish. For certainly in no similar period have we strayed further from the sound philosphy and the admonition of those great Virginians, Washington, and Jefferson, and men of like mind. A brief comparison of the fundamental principles of the philosophies of the Government's founders and their handiwork—the Constitution itself—with the modern philosphy that now prevails will, I fear, confirm this sad commentary.

Washington urged that we "cherish public credit." He said, "One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible." Today that public credit has been extended to almost $276 billion. This represents an increase of some $250 billion in the past 24 years.

Again, in his farewell address, President Washington admonished: "Avoid likewise the accumulation of debt not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in times of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear."

Yet today, enjoying the greatest national income and burdened with the highest taxes in the peacetime history of the country, we hover on the precipice of deficit spending. Prudence suggests that under such conditions we should be retiring a part of our gargantuan debt and fortifying our fiscal position for the proverbial rainy day. On the contrary, we are now faced, under the guise of a recession with deficit spending for the next fiscal year of from five to $15 billion. It is often argued that because two-thirds of our expenditure are either to pay for previous wars or to prepare for possible future ones, we cannot retrench; but that we must increase our defense program without limitation for fear of a sneak Pearl Harbor attack. For more than a decade this humble voice has been heard repeatedly in the halls of Congress to the effect that the masters of the Kremlin want neither war nor peace. They are following the blueprint of their idol, Lenin, himself, who wrote in the early stages of the Bolshevik Revolution that the way to conquer the United States was to make it spend itself into bankruptcy. If this be a correct analysis of the sinister Russian objective, they certainly have no more useful allies than the special interests and minority groups who year after year descend upon Washington seeking larger and larger favors from the public till.

Mr. Chairman, I fear the Russian menace less than the danger of collapse of the fiscal structure. I am more apprehensive of inflation than I am of Communist infiltration. For if our economic strength is destroyed, hungary people might well become easy prey to the siren song emanating from the Kremlin.

Along with the peril of unbridled spending and exorbitant taxation, I am sure that you, like I, are justly alarmed with the ever-increasing tendency toward consolidation of power in the Federal Government at the expense of the States and the freedom of our citizens.

Jefferson, who contributed so much to the cornerstone of our freedom, warned: "It is not by the consolidation or concentration of powers that good government is affected. Were not this great country already divided into States, that division must be made, that each might do for itself what concerns itself directly, and what it can do much better than distant authority."

It was to prevent this consolidation of power that the 10th amendment was adopted providing that, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." For more than a century that mandate was scrupulously honored. On the few occasions when Congress, with an excess of zeal, invaded the domain of the States, the Supreme Court firmly pulled it back. Thus, when Congress attempted by the Civil Rights Act of 1875 to exercise the police power of the States by requiring the operators of inns, theaters and other places of public amusement to serve white and colored people alike, the Supreme Court held the measure void. It told Congress that neither the 13th nor 14th amendments conferred any authority for this interference with the conduct of private individuals.

How changed the situation today. Apparently the States no longer have any rights which the Federal Government is bound to respect. Congress, I am sorry to admit, is partially responsible for this development. It has passed laws, expressed in vague general terms, empowering Federal agencies to regulate vast areas of our economy. Immediately these agencies set up all the trappings of bureaucracy. They issue directives, regulations, and interpretations, which as time goes on, bear less and less resemblance to the act passed by Congress.

But the evil wrought by the executive and the legislative branches has been minor in comparison with the transgressions in the past two decades of the nine black-robed gentlemen of the Supreme Court. You won't find anything about preemption in the Constitution, but the Supreme Court, with ever-increasing frequency, is applying that doctrine to whittle down the jurisdiction of the State courts. Of course, in doing this the tribunal always professes to be carrying out the intent of Congress; the effect is the further centralization of power in the Federal Government. Among the most flagrant examples of this practice in recent months have been the Steve Nelson and Slochower cases. In the Nelson case, the Supreme Court held, under this doctrine of preemption, that Pennsylvania's antisedition law was void. And in the Slochower case, the Court denied the right of the city of New York to discharge a teacher who had invoked the fifth amendment in a congressional committee investigation concerning his past membership in the Communist Party. If this doctrine is permitted to go unchallenged, our State courts will become but empty shells.

Remedial legislation sponsored by your own Congressman has been languishing in committees of Congress for the past 3 years.

"There is no danger I apprehend so much," Jefferson wrote, "as the consolidation of our Government by the noiseless and, therefore, alarming instrumentality of the Supreme Court."

One can conceive of no more flagrant example of the digression from the doctrine enunciated by Washington and Jefferson than the recent school segregation decision of the Supreme Court, on the one hand, and the passage of the so-called civil rights bill, on the other. In the school case the Court admittedly substituted its own political and social theories for legal precedent. The enactment of the civil rights bill under the guise of protecting the liberties of certain minority groups will result in the further

encroachment upon the liberties of all our citizens.

We are now told that centralization is liberalism. Jefferson called it "toryism in disguise." By whatever name called, it can only end in totalitarianism.

The basic principles of human freedom are as invariable as the solar system. They are the same in the jet and nuclear age as they were in the horseback and ramrod and musket days.

And now, Mr. Chairman, we are gathered here this evening to do honor to two truly great Democrats and the contribution made by them to the Democratic Party. Sometimes I wonder, as lip service is rendered unto these great stalwarts of our party, what their own reaction would be if they were permitted to step out of the pages of history on to the current terrestrial scene and view in person the assaults that are being made upon the fundamental principles and philosophy of the party to which they contributed so fully. Yes; I wonder how they would react to the present posture of their beloved Southland within the Democratic Party. What would the reaction of the "Sage of Monticello" be to the advocacy of our Democratic leaders along with the Republican high command, of the use of bayonets for forced integration of our public school system in his beloved Virginia? Would not Old Hickory himself rebel at the continuous whittling away at the foundation of the freedom of the individual by the modern pseudo-liberals in charge of the machinery of both parties?

Surely our beloved Southland finds itself today in a most unenviable position within the party. Notwithstanding the fact that our section and particularly the great Commonwealth of Virgina has contributed so much to the creation and the preservation of the party in both the lean as well as the prosperous years, we are now just taken for granted. Is it possible for instance today for a member of our party from the South to obtain the nomination for President? Can a man of the stature of HARRY BYRD, for instance, receive this recognition?

Whether we like it or not, we must face the facts of life. We have permitted ourselves to be taken for granted so long that we are completely ignored. This is true even though in the last two presidential elections the candidate of our party received the electoral votes of only one State outside of the Solid South. Organized pressure groups under the guise of false liberalism have taken over the machinery of the party. Is it not true that the NAACP, the ADA, and other misnamed liberal minority groups are more powerful in the councils of our party than the so-called Solid South?

To my mind, there is but one answer. The South is the strongest potential minority group in the country. And while I do not like the idea of government by minority groups, I am reluctantly driven to the conclusion that there is but one answer to the problem thus posed. The South must become a militant, aggressive, and crusading organized group dedicated to the preservation of those sound constitutional provisions of government for which so much blood, treasure, and labor have been expended. Then, and only then, will the once strong voice of the South be heard in the smoke-filled rooms of our party's conventions and in the legislative arena.

These, Mr. Chairman, are strong words. But, if the great Democratic Party and the Republic, itself, are to be saved we must fight fire with fire. We in the other States of the South are looking to the statesmen of Virginia. If you will lead, we will follow.

To those of us who believe in the principles of Washington and Jefferson, enshrined in the Constitution, the present posture of affairs would indeed appear discouraging. The distress signals are all about us.

But, surely, we, the beneficiaries of the labor and sacrifice of those who founded the Republic, have the courage, the will, and the patriotism to see to it that this Republic, embodying the most perfect form of human liberty ever conceived by the minds of men, shall not perish from the earth.

Walter Reuther as Manager and Politician

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, recent statements by Reuther indicate that he has not changed his political philosophy very much from the day when, from Russia, he wrote back to the comrades in Detroit to "fight for a Soviet America."

Reuther is a very shrewd, unscrupulous individual, whose record as director of organized violence, which is consistent since 1936, shows that he believes that the end justifies the means, however unlawful or reprehensible the latter may be.

He has long insisted that he should share in management. Unfortunately for the rest of us, some industrial leaders have gone along with him in certain aspects of his program, especially on the one where they agree it was advisable to pay whatever wage Reuther might demand, then add the increase in price and pass it along to the purchasers.

We have had a recent illustration—and it is still with us—which demonstrates that consumers, that is, buyers, can be pushed just too far. Their recent refusal to purchase at the price fixed by the motor industry and by Reuther demonstrates the fallacy of Reuther's economic thinking.

From Nation's Business of May 1958 comes an article entitled "Look Behind Unions' Profit-Sharing Demand." The article reads as follows:

LOOK BEHIND UNION'S PROFIT-SHARING DEMAND

Walter Reuther's controversial demand that business share profits with employees and customers raises some important questions:

Will the United Automobile Workers accept the principles of employee profit sharing which have proved necessary to a successful plan?

Do the UAW president and his advisers really want a profit-sharing plan?

The record indicates a "no" answer to both questions, and prompts this third one:

What does Mr. Reuther really want?

Others:

What effect would the Reuther plan have on investors? On taxes? What would it cost stockholders? The Government?

If it had been in effect in General Motors during 1956, the plan would have cost the Government a net loss of $295 million in income taxes.

GM income after taxes would have been cut $290 million and earnings reduced from $3.02 actually earned to $1.97 per share.

The 656,000 stockholders, who greatly outnumber the employees, would have taken a cut in dividends. GM would not have been able to pay, out of earnings of $1.97, the $2 dividend it paid in 1956.

Employees—GM had 371,000 on an hourly basis in the United States—would have shared $300 million. The same amount would have been shared by purchasers of the 3,508,000 cars and trucks produced in the United States.

One of the strong fears of automobile management is that if earnings can be affected year to year by profit-sharing programs imposed on management it will become more difficult to get necessary financing, which would be a blow to expansion prospects. Investors would look for other businesses in which to invest their savings where earnings would not be diluted through employee profit sharing.

Moreover, financing a business has always been a responsibility of management, and should remain so, one Detroit executive points out. Once collective bargaining is permitted to enter into the question of profit sharing, he says, there is an immediate conflict with the financial responsibility of management.

Another asserts that through his profit-sharing plan Mr. Reuther plans to appropriate a portion of the share belonging to those who risk their money in the business.

There is a big difference between employee profit sharing as practiced under more than 20,000 existing plans, and the management-stockholders-employees-customers split-up idea the UAW is testing in current negotiations with major automobile manufacturers.

These differences, combined with the expressed objectives of the UAW and its leadership, have stirred up serious concern over the future of our business system, established collective bargaining principles, and profitsharing itself.

This concern stems not only from automobile management, which is the first to face the UAW's drive on this new issue, but also from other business leaders, experts on employee profit-sharing, companies having or planning to install profit-sharing arrangements, and even from other union officials and members, including some in UAW.

Here are some of the problems they see:

In the opinion of business leaders, Mr. Reuther and other labor leaders want a greater voice in business decisions. This is something they have been getting gradually through increasing bargaining power as they move toward the ultimate objective of joint labor-management-government control of business.

This fear seems to be well founded in the light of the UAW's past and other unions' continuing attacks on profit-sharing plans; labor's opposition to the basic principles of employee profit-sharing, and Mr. Reuther's conviction that he can overcome labor's inherent objections to profit-sharing by giving labor a veto power in most management decisions. This would include determination of profits and their distribution.

Look at the record:

The UAW summed up its view—which has not changed—in this headline over an article in the April 1949 issue of Ammunition, monthly publication of the union's research department:

"What's Wrong With Profit Sharing Plans?"

"They Undermine Purchasing Power When You Need Purchasing Power Most; They Make Workers Pay For Company Mistakes; and They Don't Work."

Today Mr. Reuther is pleading for increased purchasing power as the solution to our economic ills, yet he wants profit-sharing which his union has said would undermine purchasing power when it is needed most.

The answer to this inconsistency seems to be: Mr. Reuther does not want the standard profit-sharing plan, but one that he can control. He must feel confident, too, that the UAW is strong enough to assure that the workers won't pay for company mistakes.

George Meany, AFL–CIO president, reflected some of this thinking. Asked to comment on the Reuther proposal, he qualified standard labor suspicion of profit-sharing with the view that the UAW could protect itself against its evils.

The evil most frequently mentioned by labor is that profit-sharing is an incentive to work harder so as to lower costs and increase profits through hgher productivity, which will increase profits and workers' earnings.

A member of the UAW research department told an AFL–CIO conference last year that elimination of incentives has always been a major goal of UAW. The union opposes incentive arrangements, he said, because they lead workers to concentrate on making more money instead of how to make their jobs easier.

Mr. Reuther made clear at the special UAW convention last January that the membership need have no fear of any work speedup.

In reply to a delegate's qualms on this point, the UAW chief reminded the convention that the union has always fought for decent production standards; that this is the one issue on which the unon may strike at any time despite the overall no-strike provision in the automobile labor contracts, and that the UAW was not going to degenerate into a soft union.

"We will still go on fighting," he said, adding that the plan the UAW is seeking is as different from employer-introduced profit-sharing plans as night is from day.

One of management's strongest fears is that on the theory that, under profit-sharing, a company is doing business with the employees' money, the UAW will claim a right to review every company activity and the company will have to keep its books available for constant inspection by union auditors.

The union's demands already include a union voice, through a joint study committee, in decisions involving plant relocation, and decentralization, technological changes, hours of work, output and related matters.

The Reuther proposal, in the opinion of Ernest R. Breech, chairman of the board of Ford Motor Co., "would invite increasing demands for union veto power over day to day management decisions."

"Budgets for advertising, research and engineering, new-model tooling; capital expansion plans; make-or-buy decisions—all would be viewed by the union as affecting profits," he says.

A delegate to the UAW convention confirmed Mr. Breech's fears in these words:

"The profit-sharing plan would extend the field of collective bargaining and cut down the field of management prerogatives. If we get it even in a watered down form, management can never again say to us that the amount of profit they make is none of our business. They will have to sit down and bargain with us about it."

Another delegate, opposed to profit-sharing, seemed disturbed that the workers might be expected to help the company make a profit.

"The present profit-sharing plan, as presented, seems to carry with it an inherent weakness," he said. "It seems to carry the strong suggestion that, if we are to share profits, we must take a responsibility for seeing that there be profits."

Advocates of employee profit sharing have two special concerns over the Reuther proposal.

One is that Mr. Reuther's disregard for true profit-sharing principles and the controversy with the automobile industry will give employee profit sharing a bad name if the differences between the accepted plan and what the UAW wants are not clearly understood.

The second is that growing union interest in employee profit sharing will discourage employer interest and halt the tremendous postwar spread of such plans. Reasons: An employer will be reluctant to install a plan, or might even discontinue an existing plan, because he may lose control of the plan in case a union wishes to include it in bargaining.

Even an employer with no union might legally be barred from abandoning a profit-sharing plan when a union moves in. Such a step might be construed as an unfair labor practice.

Of 400 companies which are members of the council of profit-sharing industries, only one-third deal with unions, and only a handful make the profit-sharing plan a part of the labor contract.

Even in the latter cases, according to Joseph B. Meier, the council's administrative vice president, the union usually exercises only a token interest in its operation; for example, a voice in how the part of profits available for sharing will be divided among the employees.

Cash profit-sharing plans, which is what Mr. Reuther wants, have a high mortality rate. A recent study of 114 cash plans shows almost one-third have been discontinued since 1946. With regard to deferred plans, usually providing retirement benefits, less than one-tenth have been abandoned.

The reason given most often for discontinuance is union opposition. Objection to cash plans: Union leaders prefer to see all of the money go regularly into pay envelopes. Objection to deferred plans: Union leaders want members to have a fixed pension instead of retirement income geared to profits.

A majority of profit-sharing plans are of the deferred type, providing for retirement, group insurance, sick benefits, layoff pay, and the like, rather than immediate cash payments. Automobile industry sources point out that these types of benefits are assured under UAW contracts without regard for profits.

What Mr. Reuther is up to hardly jibes with the basic principles and objectives of employee profit sharing. Here is what some of the experts say:

J. J. Jehring, director of the profit-sharing research foundation, makes two points:

An employee profit-sharing plan must function in an atmosphere of cooperation, not antagonism, between employees and management.

It must be profit producing, not profit consuming; it must increase profits, not reduce them.

Yet Mr. Reuther, while asking for a share in profits, attacks profits as an evil. The UAW convention resolved to fight any management attempts to cut costs by stepping up the production rate.

Jay V. Strong, a pension consultant, adds that instead of trying to produce more profits, Mr. Reuther wants a share of existing profits. A profit-sharing plan should not cost anything. Mr. Strong says, because it is supposed to produce more than enough extra profits to pay for itself.

Under the Reuther plan, the union would decide each year in each company how the workers' share of profits would be distributed. It might be a cash bonus or be used to increase pensions, holiday pay or vacation pay; implement a shorter workweek, or for some other purpose.

UAW's General Motors council has already decided that, if it gets the profit-sharing plan from GM, at least part of the employees' share will be used to eliminate what workers now pay toward the cost of hospital and medical insurance.

Howard E. Nyhart Co., consulting actuaries, says, in its letter on employee benefits, that management must be in favor of a profit-sharing plan if it is to succeed. Profit sharing is not a means of resolving discord between management and employees; mutual trust and confidence necessary for profit sharing to work cannot be bargained. Profit sharing never has been used deliberately to expand purchasing power.

Rawson L. Wood, chairman of the board of the council of profit-sharing industries, warns that "a faulty profit-sharing plan could easily destroy a company's soundness and sources of capital."

One of the delegates to the UAW convention, opposing the profit-sharing proposal, cited and was disturbed about this newspaper statement by Mr. Wood: "Such plans make every employee a capitalist. Where carefully planned and operated, they act to increase productivity without adding to the cost of the products."

"Now," the delegate told the assembled delegates, "I am sure that there is no delegate here who would have any objection to every worker in the UAW becoming a capitalist, but I do think that there may be a few delegates here that may be a little bit worried about the price we may have to pay to become a capitalist if it means what this man has indicated here, that we are going to have to have, in a sense, another speedup."

Mr. Reuther reassured him the union would continue to fight speedups as hard as ever.

Thus far, other segments of organized labor have been slow to support the Reuther profit-sharing idea. In fact, expressions of opposition have come from other union leaders as well as from within the UAW.

The MESA Educator, publication of the Mechanics Educational Society of America, an AFL–CIO affiliate headquartered in Detroit, as is UAW, said that the wicked and deceptive profit-sharing plan is worse than other piecework or payment-by-results systerms because it has no guaranties.

A MESA member raised a question whether, after the union becomes part and party of management, it would lose its identity and initiative as a labor organization.

Labor relations experts are aware of that element in any new labor-management relationship under profit sharing. They fear, in fact, that a union such as the UAW may feel it has to be even more militant, in even more areas of management responsibility, in trying to discredit management in the eyes of the employees and prove that it is still a tough union.

They point out, further, that the very existence of a union is a hindrance to increasing productivity and increasing profits because of the restrictions collective bargaining imposes on management.

Seniority rules which restrict management in making the most effective use of the work force by restricting transfers, promotions, layoffs, and the like are an example.

What's Mr. Reuther up to?

After talking for 2½ years about a shorter workweek with no loss in pay—and getting his 1957 convention to go on record for it—Mr. Reuther suddenly sprang his plan for a division of business profits above 10 percent of net capital before taxes—one-fourth among all employees who do not share in executive bonuses; one-fourth among consumers in a year-end rebate to car purchasers, and one-half among stockholders and executives.

The stockholders would be taking a pay cut because basically profits are wages paid to them for the use of their money as well as a necessary source of capital for company expansion to create more jobs.

The proposal met with such intense opposition from UAW members and leaders, who want to stick to the original objective

of a shorter workweek, that Mr. Reuther had to qualify his position and agree that the shorter workweek issue would still be on the bargaining table.

Behind it all is Mr. Reuther's sense for public relations as a tool in helping him reach his objectives, the ultimate being comanagement of business. He feels he always has to come up with a big, new idea or plan that is not only startling but will also capture and hold public appeal. (See Business Looks at Walter Reuther, October 1957.)

His demand for wage increases without price increases and a look at the books during the 113-day strike against General Motors in 1945-46, Mr. Reuther admitted later, was to put the company over a barrel in public opinion.

Early this year, Mr. Reuther could see that he was in trouble, both with the public and many of his members, in pressing for a shorter workweek when workers were complaining about layoffs and short weeks and the public was concerned about the sputniks and catching up with Russia.

But he could not drop the shorter workweek without a sensational substitute which would still serve his purposes. Thus, the profit-sharing proposal with something for everybody: savings to consumers and profit-sharing for bosses and other nonunion employees in UAW-organized plants as well as for the UAW members.

UAW convention delegates gave testimony as to the purpose and effectiveness of the Reuther strategy.

One rose to relate how, the morning after the profit-sharing idea was announced, his boss telephoned him to ask how much he, the boss, would share.

Another told how his doctor asked him how much he, the doctor, might get in a rebate on a car purchase.

More significantly, two delegates revealed how the UAW asks for something that will help get the public on its side, then takes advantage of the public support as a pressure in getting what it really wants.

One said that whether the UAW wins or loses a strike this summer will depend in large part on whether public opinion is with the union or with the company.

"Do the delegates here think that people outside of the industry will be more sympathetic to a demand for a cut in prices or a cut in production?" he asked rhetorically.

The other said the union was "going to need something, whether you want to call it a gimmick, some catchy phrase, or anything you can use to get public opinion behind you. * * *

"In this proposal to get the consumer a rebate, if we can get pressure on them [the companies] through the television and newspapers to such an extent that they have got to do something, then we have a chance."

Martin Garber, a member of the UAW executive board, has been quoted as telling local UAW leaders in New Jersey that the union's bid for a profit-sharing plan was a good public relations move. He said, "It puts the public on our side."

National Honor, Dignity Demanded Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Nashville Banner of May 14, 1958:

NATIONAL HONOR, DIGNITY DEMANDED ACTION

Peace and security are not served by supine surrender to insufferable riot and insult—and President Eisenhower did not choose to stand by while these ensued in the Caribbean area, imperilling as a breakout relations in the whole Southern Hemisphere.

United States troops dispatched yesterday intrude on no sovereignty. They are there, where the flag flies, on an errand of safeguard—to protect national honor and dignity. It was time to erect that standard of decency and principle for all the world to see—a proclamation of the fact that the United States will not be pushed around either by Communist conspirators or their ragtag riffraff employed to humiliate, slander and kill.

It makes no difference whether the American who was, or is, the target of murderous mischief is named NIXON or Jones or Joe Doakes—where an American citizen goes, his flag follows, and protection must go with that. Vice President NIXON was on official mission, representing the United States, and the infamy of this assault was heaped not on just the man but on the Nation.

It is time to tell all and sundry that the United States does not intend to lose this war with communism, by default or otherwise. If there was necessity to meet it with arms in Korea or to fortify against it as is being done elsewhere, there is equal necessity to meet it realistically wherever in this hemisphere it rears its ugly head—with violence or thumbing its nose at the United States. This is an area, assuredly, of primary obligation.

The oddity of arguments to the contrary, and of those mouthing protests in terms of "imperialism," is that these same critics are the ones voicing the loudest "Amens" to the sending of the 101st Division to Little Rock. They objected not at all to that; they lament the decision to guard national and hemispheric interests put in peril by blazing infamy outside the United States. Their hypocracy speaks for itself—symptomatic of softness toward the real enemy.

President Eisenhower was right in yesterday's order—a stewardship measuring to duty, responsible to that obligation in the truest concept of national honor and dignity.

It was an action lending weight to the determination, shared by the right-thinking among these Latin American neighbors, to guard security here at home. It builds respect, in terms the whole world can understand. It was time to enunciate a principle, backed with arms.

UNITED STATES PROUD OF THE NIXONS

RICHARD M. NIXON has honored, under the most difficult circumstances, the role of ambassador of good will; and decency throughout the Americas applauds official conduct reflecting credit on the land he represents.

He bore himself with courage, restraint, and dignity commanding admiration.

No less did his lady, Pat Nixon, exemplify these qualities; hers the womanly grace and sincere friendliness that earned a Nation's regard during two presidential campaigns at home.

America couuld have had no finer envoys, and the hooligan scum who sought by outrage to inflame hate at such points as Lima and Caracas can get no satisfaction save that of wallowing in their own filth.

Their ideological target was not the Nixons; their object of hate was the United States—and the basic cause of that venom was the communism that inspired it. They would not have been above inflicting bodily harm, as manifested by showers of rocks and kindred violence, to create an international incident. It doesn't take much of that to incite a mob.

Vice President NIXON has increased his own stature and enhanced the respect of America despite this outrageous series of demonstrations.

Thinking people in these nations to the south must resent such brazen escapades, calculated to harrass and humiliate them, and to stigmatize an area basically friendly to the United States.

It is the nature of infamous characters to act with infamy, and of criminal, seditious conspirators to incendiarize and riot. There has been at the points named a sufficient dose to acquaint the populace with the facts—and, surely, to get and keep the guard up.

These lands can be expected to feel deeply and apologetically this exhibition—and with that, deep admiration for the Vice President and his lady for calm gentility and honor fortified by the dignity of the office they graced.

They did not default on their duty, and—as demonstrated in the dispatch of troops—America has not defaulted on its own obligation to guard the principles of international decency they have ably represented.

Italian National Elections on May 25, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, May 25 will be election day for more than 30 million voters in Italy. They will go to the polls and cast their ballots in the national elections for a new Parliament. It seems difficult to realize that it was but 12 years ago, in 1946, that Italy voted to end the monarchy of the House of Savoy and become a democracy. Italy has experienced a new life since then and has made great strides in domestic democracy and in European and free-world cooperation. As one writer has put it:

The country has doubtless achieved more substantial progress than in any other decade in its history.

As an American I take this opportunity to congratulate the Italian people on their magnificent accomplishments and urge them to carry on. I do this with both joy and humility in my heart. I am happy because Italy has done so much for herself since the end of the war to rebuild herself as a leading and responsible partner in European cooperation. I am happy because the Italian people have been able to see through the sham and false hopes of communism and have made democratic society a reality. But my joy is mixed with feelings of humility for I know how hard the Italian people have worked against tremendous odds to build those democratic institutions which we in America so often take for granted in our own land. We have forgotten that democracy is indeed a precious treasure.

At the end of World War II, Italy was a broken and defeated nation. Much of the economy had been destroyed in the war. The people had not known democracy for more than 20 years, since Mussolini and his Fascists

marched to power in 1922. Like a phenix, the new Italy has arisen from the ashes of the old.

Today Italy is a land of remarkable political stability. Since the Communists were thrown out of the government in 1947 the center democratic parties have consistently moved forward in building the economic, political and social bases for Italian democracy. The government has made giant strides in land reform and in alleviating the plight of those in the lower economic groups. Free national and local elections are held in an atmosphere of freedom of speech and press.

But what of communism? Palmiro Togliatti and the other hard-core Communists pose as Italian patriots, but in fact they have consistently placed the interests of the Soviet Union first. They opposed Italian participation in the Marshall plan that contributed so much to Italian economic recovery after World War II. They have denounced NATO in violent terms as imposing an American stranglehold on Italy. They will not admit the truth that NATO is a free alliance of nations to deter and if necessary, meet Soviet aggression against the Atlantic community. They have even gone so far as to oppose Italian membership in the European coal and steel community, the new common market, and Euratom that are designed to improve European economic cooperation and increase the opportunities for members to trade with each other.

Today the Community Party is following the Soviet line again by concentrating its efforts on the struggle against guided missile bases in Italy and at the same time demanding the establishment of a zone around the Adriatic Sea from which atomic weapons would be barred. The Italian people have seen through this foolishness. Why should Italy forego weapons which the Soivets already posses? It seems clear that if the Communists are successful it would mean the end to NATO, and to Italian independence. An Italian Communist official put the case well when he addressed a party meeting in December 1956 with these words:

A real Communist must not have doubts or crises of conscience. His temper is measured by his loyalty to the Soviet Union.

The Communist Party remains a seious threat to the hard won liberties of the Italian people even though the Communist strength seems to be on the decline in Italy today. Last year party boss Togliatti himself admitted that the party had lost more than 10 percent of its members in the preceding 12 months. Even so, reliable estimates place the party membership figures at about 1½ million.

The great battle in this year's national elections will be between the Communists on the one side and the democratic parties on the other side. Most observers are confident that communism cannot win. The question still remains, however, whether the democratic parties that can unite in a working coalition will receive a large enough majority to form a stable government to continue the present course of the new Italy. It is our sincere hope that this will happen.

Army Forms Unit for Limited Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, public announcement this week disclosing details of the organization of the Army's mobile, highly trained strategic combat force designed to deal effectively and quickly with aggression in the form of limited war represents an important and timely public service. This is reassuring news to all people and I commend the Army for making this announcement at this particular time.

I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the New York Times article of May 21 by Jack Raymond, which sets forth the details concerning the Strategic Army Corps. The article follows:

ARMY FORMS UNIT FOR LIMITED WARS—150,000 SPECIAL TROOPS IN CORPS WILL BE OPERATIONAL AT A MOMENT'S NOTICE

(By Jack Raymond)

WASHINGTON, May 20.—The Army formally announced today the organization of a force of more than 150,000 paratroopers and infantrymen to deal with limited war situations anywhere in the world.

The announcement was specially timed against the background of the latest United States military movements in the Caribbean, the Mediterranean, and Europe. Each of the services has been involved in military alerts in the Middle East and Latin America.

It was the Army force, known as the Strategic Army Corps or STRAC, which supplied the 500 paratroopers who were flown to Puerto Rico when Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON was attacked by rioters in Venezuela.

READY ON SHORT NOTICE

The Army's strategic unit has heretofore been an official secret, although its existence has been indicated. It consists of 2 airborne and 2 infantry divisions, the Army revealed.

"The Strategic Army Corps is that element of the Army which is maintained in the continental United States to meet or reinforce any initial emergency requirements throughout the world," the official statement said.

Its mission is to be operationally ready on a moment's notice, the Army added, and called attention to the slogan based on the letters STRAC: "skilled, tough, ready around the clock."

Army officials said that the Strategic Corps did not have its headquarters or commander, but that it included the headquarters of the XVIII Airborne Corps at Fort Bragg, N. C., and that the commander there, Maj. Gen. Robert F. Sink, was senior officer of the strategic force.

It includes the 82d Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, the 101st Airborne Division at Fort Campbell, Ky.; 1st and 4th Infantry Divisions, Fort Lewis, Wash.; 1st Infantry Division, Fort Riley, Kans., and supporting units.

It was the 101st Airborne, which is regarded as the Army outfit in the greatest state of readiness, that sent units to deal with the Caribbean alert, as well as the desegregation situation in Little Rock, Ark.

LIMITED WARS CITED

The Army emphasized that its strategic force was specially tailored to deal with limited wars and to move promptly to potential trouble spots anywhere in the world.

But it also added that its effectiveness and speed of movement are dependent upon the availability of adequate air and sea lift.

This was a reference to the Army's repeated complaints that the Air Force and the Navy may not have sufficient planes and ships to transport Army units, while the Army itself is barred from having its own transport.

At Fort Bragg, where General Sink briefed newsmen while the Pentagon made the official announcement, the paratroop officer described his men as hitchhikers.

The Memory of Hon. Maurice J. Tobin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. PHILBIN. Today in the great, historic city of Boston close to the scenes where he achieved most notable, memorable distinction in public affairs, in the midst of the homes of the people who repeatedly honored him by election to the highest offices in their gift, a majestic, beautiful statue is unveiled to the memory and accomplishments of the late and much lamented, Hon. Maurice J. Tobin.

Governor Tobin enjoyed a remarkable public career. His great talents and zeal were early recognized by the people. While still a young man he was elevated to several high offices in succession—mayor of Boston, Governor of Massachusetts, and Secretary of Labor in the administration of President Harry S. Truman.

One only had to meet Maurice Tobin to know something of the reasons for his outstanding success in the public service. A handsome young man of warm, appealing and dynamic personality, he readily won the attention and personal regard of thousands and thousands of people. Possessed of unusual magnetism, early in life, he gained many genuine admirers and loyal supporters.

Maurice Tobin worked his way up from the ranks. He earned every honor and distinction that ever came to him by virtue of marked ability, unflinching determination and hard, unremitting work. He had no headstart. He labored diligently and sacrified greatly to secure his education and he never gave up the fight until he answered the divine summons.

To an exceptional degree, Maurice Tobin was loved, respected, and trusted by the people. He was a man of great charm and graciousness—considerate, friendly, and helpful—gentle and cultured in his speech, warmhearted, sympathetic, and cordial in his manner and reaction. Few men, if any, in my range of acquaintance ever possessed the qualities of personal warmth and graciousness and wholehearted willingness to assist others that I observed in Maurice Tobin. He was beloved by all who knew him for these qualities and for his loyalty to his friends and his convictions.

I cannot begin in these brief remarks to cover fully the many facets of the character, personality, compassionate

nature, humane impulses, and inspiring career of this great American, Maurice Tobin. But I must allude to his devotion to the working people from whose ranks he so conspicuously rose as one of the most distinguished leaders of our generation. No one ever could exceed Maurice Tobin in his love of the common people, his firm resolve to better their lot, and his tremendous contributions to the welfare and betterment of all those who toil. In every office he ever held with such marked distinction, in every fiber of his being, in his thought, mind, and heart, sincerely, ably, and dauntlessly, Maurice Tobin dedicated himself with resolution and achievement to the cause of the rank and file of the American people.

One of the most brilliant orators and distinguished personalities of our day, known, lauded, and honored for his devotion to his Creator, to his city, State, and country, Maurice Tobin's place in the history of our times is secure. His fame and memory will endure throughout many generations to come as vivid testimony of able, constructive public service, and a noble heart devoted to the people.

I join today in the fitting tribute to the memory of a dear, valued friend, an illustrious public servant, and a great American—Hon. Maurice J. Tobin.

Robert Frost Appointed by Librarian of Congress To Be 1958–59 Consultant in Poetry in English

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call further attention to one of the more pleasant and gratifying events of recent days, namely, the appointment of four-time Pulitzer prize winner, Robert Frost, to be 1958–59 consultant in poetry in English. His appointment by Librarian of Congress L. Quincy Mumford was announced yesterday and under unanimous consent I include the Library's press release on this impressive literary event:

ROBERT FROST APPOINTED BY LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS TO BE 1958–59 CONSULTANT IN POETRY IN ENGLISH

Librarian of Congress L. Quincy Mumford announced today the appointment of one of America's best-loved and best-known poets, Robert Frost, to be consultant in poetry in English to the Library of Congress in 1958–59.

Mr. Frost will assume his post at the Library of Congress early in October 1958. His appointment is for a single term, and during its course he will give at least two public lectures in the Coolidge Auditorium of the Library of Congress.

The position of consultant in poetry in English was established in the Library of Congress in 1936 through a gift of funds from the late Archer M. Huntington. The consultant gives advice on improving the Library's collections of literature, recommends the purchase of new materials, assists in acquiring important manuscripts and books through authors and collectors, advises on bibliographic and reference work in his field, confers with scholars and poets using the Library's collections and facilities, and provides editorial supervision of the Library's program of recording 20th century poets in readings of their own works.

To these duties Robert Frost brings the distinguished experience of a long and vivid life in the field of letters. No contemporary American poet has received more honors. Four times his work has won the Pulitzer prize in poetry—in 1924, 1931, 1937, and 1943. In 1922 his poetry brought him the Helen Haire Levinson prize and in 1931 the Russell Loines Memorial Fund prize. Among his medals are the Mark Twain medal (1937), the gold medal of the National Institute of Arts and Letters (1938), the silver medal of the Poetry Society of America (1941), and the Theodore Roosevelt medal (1954). In 1950 the United States Senate, in a resolution on the occasion of Mr. Frost's 75th birthday, extended him felicitations of this Nation which he has served so well.

No stranger to the Library of Congress, Mr. Frost's last visit was on October 24, 1955, when he gave a public reading of his poetry before an audience that overflowed the Coolidge Auditorium. His reading marked the opening in the Library of Congress of a major exhibition devoted to the life and work of the poet. In it the Library displayed more than 100 photographs, original manuscripts, and rare editions, accompanied by a phonograph from which visitors could hear Mr. Frost reading his poetry in the recording made by the Library for its Twentieth Century Poetry in English series of records. Since then this popular exhibition has traveled widely in other cities.

Born in San Francisco on March 26, 1874, Robert Frost was educated at Dartmouth and Harvard and holds a long list of degrees from a variety of distinguished institutions. He has been a teacher of English and psychology at a number of colleges and universities and is Simpson lecturer in literature at Amherst College. He will continue his association with that institution and will give lectures there in the coming year as he has in the past.

Among the celebrated poet's books are A Boy's Will (1913), first published in England, where Mr. Frost lived in 1912–15; North of Boston (1914); Mountain Interval (1916); New Hampshire (1923); West-Running Brook (1928); the prose play, A Way Out (1929); The Lovely Shall Be Choosers (1929), a poem; Collected Poems (1930, 1939, 1949); The Lone Striker (1933), a poem; A Further Range (1936); From Snow to Snow (1936); A Witness Tree (1942); Steeple Bush (1947); A Masque of Reason (1945); A Masque of Mercy (1947); and Come In (1943), edited by Louis Untermeyer.

Mr. Frost's next volume of poetry, And All We Call American, will be published early in 1959 by Henry Holt & Co., United States publishers of all Mr. Frost's poetry.

Vincent J. Petrillo, Packing for Overseas Shipment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following story which appeared in the Journal of Commerce. Mr. Vincent J. Petrillo, general manager of the Jerome F. Gould Corp., is a resident of my congressional district and an authority on export packing. In view of the forthcoming debate on foreign trade, it is my belief that every Member of Congress will find his comments on the importance of proper export packing most enlightening:

AS BUSINESS LEADERS SEE IT, EXPERT PACKING FOR OVERSEAS SHIPMENTS IS ESSENTIAL

(By Vincent J. Petrillo, general manager, Jerome F. Gould Corp.)

Before World War II, packing for export in this country was a slovenly affair with steamship companies accepting practically anything a shipper offered.

During the war, when the Government became alarmed over the fantastic proportion of goods that was arriving overseas damaged and unusable, it set up stringent packing specifications. After the war, the marine insurance companies forced steamship companies to adopt these specifications to some extent and export packing as an industry was underway.

This industry accounts in part for our competitive position in world trade today. If we are to survive as a Nation, if we are to retain our foreign customers, if we are to expand our world markets, we must pay more attention to our export packing.

It is useless to try to deliver a product overseas in the same type of container in which it is shipped domestically. The domestic container is not designed to withstand the hazards of an ocean voyage. Neither is the product protected against corrosion, pilferage and the risks of handling.

Why American manufacturers spend millions of dollars developing the best product in the world only to pay little or no attention to its packing is something I have never been able to understand.

If we are to compete in foreign markets, if we are to expand sales, we have got to deliver our goods in salable and working condition. This seems so elementary that it seems almost ridiculous to have to say it. Yet so many manufacturers in this country act as if they never heard of the term "packaging engineering."

This same ostrich-like approach to packaging applies to sales promotions and sales campaigns abroad although I think this is an attitude that is beginning to change. One of these days, shippers are going to realize the tremendous advantages of packing at the port. Why its full impact hasn't hit them as yet. I don't understand but I think it is beginning to.

Why should a manufacturer pay the cost of shipping his freight halfway across the country in heavy export containers when he can have his goods packed at the port and save inland freight?

When are industrialists going to realize that the export packer can pack cheaper than the manufacturer himself because of the economies realized by volume packing? Why don't they see that expert packing means cheaper insurance costs and satisfied customers; that their customers do not want to be compensated by insurance, but want the merchandise they ordered in good working condition.

Every day, sales executives abroad warn their home offices that their products are not arriving in operating condition. But the message has not sunk in as yet with top management. How long will it take American manufacturers to realize that if they deliver their goods safely, their own reputations will be enhanced and their foreign sales will increase.

If manufacturers would only inspect waterfront facilities, both here and abroad, they would understand the type of handling their products undergo and hence the kind of packaging their products require.

Voting Restrictions: A Report From the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have previously published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reports on voting restrictions in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and Louisiana, which were presented to a conference of the southern conference educational fund held in Washington on April 27. A brief summary of the findings of those reports follows:

Of the four States, Alabama and the rural areas of Georgia present the most insurmountable barriers to registration and voting, to the Negro citizen who is qualified to vote.

In 1956, Negroes represented 30 percent of Alabama's population of voting age, while only 6 percent were actually registered. It is not hard to see why. The registration application in that State contains 21 questions. In many cases, one inaccuracy or failure to answer one part of one question disqualifies the petition. Some registration boards require that a Negro secure a voucher from a white voter in order to register—always difficult and sometimes impossible. Of the registered Negro voters, many fail to exert their franchise through fear of losing their jobs or being denied credit, because they have failed to pay the poll tax, or because they are effectively discouraged by whites.

The largest concentration of Negro voters in Georgia is in the cities. In the rural areas, violence, intimidation, and economic reprisals have been used to prevent registrations. New, more stringent rules for voting qualifications have recently been adopted by the State legislature, with the intent of curtailing Negro registrations. However, these provisions are strict enough to prove such an obstacle to white registration that the law is likely to be repealed as a similar law was 8 years ago. Then, Negro reregistration was much larger than white, proportionately.

In Florida and Louisiana the situation is somewhat better, although in 5 northern Florida counties only 110 Negroes out of 16,533 eligible are registered. There actual intimidation has prevented registrations, and elsewhere in the State, Negroes are effectively barred from holding office.

The greatest problem in Louisiana is the "purge" of registration rolls, a device to challenge imperfect registrations. That progress is being made, however, is illustrated by the fact that in 1952, 23 out of 64 parishes had no Negro registrants, while now there are just 4 such parishes.

Today, under leave to extend my remarks, I include similar reports from Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia:

VOTING RESTRICTIONS IN MISSISSIPPI

(By Aaron E. Henry, executive secretary, Regional Council of Negro Leadership, and Albert L. Powell, president, Mississippi Progressive Voters League)

The Negro registers and votes freely in only 6 of the 82 counties of Mississippi. These counties are Harrison, Hinds, Washington, Warren, Lauderdale, and Coahoma.

In 43 counties there is a situation where every now and then a favored Negro is able to register.

In the remaining 33 counties there is gross intimidation that creates a fear complex to such an extent that the Negroes in these counties are in most instances afraid to try to register. These counties include Calhoun, De Soto, Carroll, Panola, Tallahatchie, Humphreys, Issaquena, Sharkey, Clay, Lowndes, Monroe, Lee, Alcorn, Choctaw, Noxubee, Attala, Yazoo, Montgomery, Bolivar, Tunica, Sunflower, Webster, Holmes, Tate, Jefferson, Walthall, Clarke, George, Lamar, Pearl River, Wayne, Chickasaw, and Forest.

The Negroes of the State have appealed to the sheriffs and circuit clerks of each of these counties to cooperate in a movement to permit Negroes to register and vote. Still the report from the counties involved came back like this: From Holmes County, "No." Negroes are still denied the right to vote and register. From Issaquena County, "No relief," please keep working. From Sunflower County, "Things are the same," what next? From Humphreys County came the only report where Negroes actually fear physical violence if they attempt to register and vote.

The Negroes in other areas are more afraid of economic reprisals and pressures such as loss of employment and loss of credit. Some are just afraid to make the white people mad.

The Negroes are determined to pursue this issue until every qualified Negro in the State of Mississippi is free to register and vote.

In March of 1955, the legislature of Mississippi passed a bill that, at the time, its proponents openly admitted was for the sole purpose of retarding the vote of Negroes. This bill made it necessary for the prospective voter to interpret any section of the Mississippi or United States Constitutions to the satisfaction of the circuit clerk.

The circuit clerk himself may have never gone to school a day in his life, as there are no literacy requirements for circuit clerks. If a candidate for clerk can get the votes, he is in. And, as in most elections in Mississippi, the candidate that can yell "Nigger, Nigger" the loudest will be elected.

The application to vote in Mississippi makes it necessary for one to be more highly trained to qualify as a voter than to qualify as a schoolteacher. For in each of these counties where Negroes are barred from registering there are hundreds of Negroes teaching Negro children.

Here are specific instances of intimidation from three counties:

HUMPHREYS COUNTY

Mr. A approached the registrar in Humphreys County and requested permission to register. The person in charge informed him that the registration problem had caused bloodshed once in Humphreys County (obviously referring to the death of the Reverend George Lee and the wounding of Mr. Gus Courts) and advised him not to try.

BOLIVAR COUNTY

On the afternoon of March 12, 1958, just 6½ weeks ago, 2 special agents of the FBI made a 3-hour investigation of the refusal of authorities to allow Mr. A and others of Mound Bayou to register and vote. After the investigation the FBI cautioned Mr. A not to discuss the conversation with anyone. One A. D. Saxton, a white local merchant and a member of the citizens council, demanded that Mr. A repeat the conversation between him and the special agents or there would be another Till case. Affidavits are in our files.

SUNFLOWER COUNTY

Negroes presented themselves to become registered voters. The registrar refused to register them by this ruse: "We'll have to wait until the State legislature adjourns; then we'll see about it."

VOTING RESTRICTIONS IN NORTH CAROLINA

(By Miss Willson Whitman, author and editor)

It is estimated that only 26 percent of the eligible Negro voters go to the polls in North Carolina. Senator ERWIN of North Carolina, told the Senate Subcommittee on Civil Rights that there was no restriction on the registration and voting of Negroes in his State. But he thought there was some apathy, and he admitted there might be a little trouble with local registrars.

To combat apathy and get out the vote is the purpose of a new organization called the North Carolina Ministers' Committee for Full Citizenship, which wants to see 100,000 more voters registered this spring. With the same objective, the NAACP is calling for 250,000 more Negro voters in North Carolina by 1960.

To achieve these goals it is not proposed to make any special racial appeal by putting Negro candidates into the field, although of recent years we have managed to elect Negro members of city councils and so on. To tie in the registration drive with the election of candidates in a given election is of course to risk, by loss of the election, a feeling of discouragement about voting in the future. The idea is to establish the habit of voting in every election, and to do that the NAACP will depend on door-to-door appeals to the individual voters.

Of course the matter of apathy in registration is closely connected with the difficulty of registration wherever such difficulty exists. But there is little or no trouble registering Negro voters in the larger cities and in those parts of the State where white elements in control feel little or no fear of Negro majorities. I have even heard it suggested that there is more discouragement of white mill workers who might wish to register in some industrial districts.

In the northeastern part of the State, notably in Northampton and Halifax Counties, literacy tests, so-called, have been used to disqualify Negro voters and it is hoped that cases now pending will show that these tests are contrary to the Bill of Rights of the Federal Constitution.

Until recently there was no appeal under State law from the decision of election district registrars. This year the law was changed to provide for such appeal, first from the registrar to the board of elections and then to the State courts. There is, however, some question as to whether this newly enacted provision for review was intended to be an actual reform or merely a deterrent to Federal court action to declare the law unconstitutional.

In Northampton County, for example, one of the cases pending would permit registration of Mrs. Louise Lassiter, denied registration by application of the test in the little town of Seaboard. This case has now become 2 cases—1 an appeal to the board of elections and the State courts under the new law, and the other a plea in Federal Court designed to show that the law is unconstitutional. The Federal case cannot be decided until the State courts dispose of the case pending there.

If anyone feels that the literacy test is fair, it must of course be argued that it is fair only if it is applied to all voters, white

and Negro alike. In practice of course this is not the case. I had lived and voted in North Carolina for 7 years before I ever heard of a literacy test, and I sincerely hope that no registrar will ever expect me to interpret the North Carolina constitution in all its provisions. This constitution, like most State constitutions, is more than twice as long as the United States Constitution, and a great deal more complicated. Moreover, in registration the requirement is not merely to understand the constitution but to give it the individual interpretation preferred by the registrar. The State election law does not examine registrars on the constitution.

In the Seaboard case, it was suggested that the registrar fairly and faithfully tried to administer the spirit of the law as she saw it. Her understanding and belief was that white people, in the nature of things, were entitled to vote. Due to unfortunate loss of a war in the last century, she thought, Negroes are also entitled to vote but only if they can successfully surmount the obstacles put in their way; and it is the duty of a registrar to provide the obstacles.

The conscientious registrar may of course have a little help now and then. The same registrar in the little town of Seaboard had earlier disqualified an Air Force sergeant, Alexander Faison, whose right to vote was about to be submitted to Federal adjudication, just as Mrs. Lassiter's has been. But in that case local authorities discovered that the district line ran in a way to put the sergeant in another district, even though the registrar had already registered his brother who lived in the same house.

Another case involving the literacy test, the Ivey case, is also being brought in nearby Halifax County. The great trouble is not winning such cases on appeal. It is the need for litigation and appeal, the expenditure of time and money required to invoke the whole machinery of the law.

REGISTRATION IN SOUTH CAROLINA

(By Mrs. Modjeska M. Simkins, vice president, southern conference educational fund; former secretary, South Carolina conference, NAACP)

A rather thorough check of possible difficulties surrounding voter registration in South Carolina failed to turn up reports of obvious restrictions, except in Williamsburg County, of which Kingstree is the county seat.

A prominent business man, Mr. J. F. Dimery, a product of Howard University, reported as long ago as last December 5 that he had been turned down in Williamsburg County on the literacy test. He was told, when inquiring as to the reason, that he might qualify on the property-tax provisions if he so desired.

This he refused to do, hoping that some organization or agency would desire to work with him as a client in a test case, since his treatment has been the practice with the board of registrars in that county. In fact, the teachers in Greelyville Negro School in Williamsburg County are reported to have been turned down in a body.

An effort was made last Monday, April 21, to reach the county senator and the male member of the three-member registration board. Failing this, I talked with the State attorney general, Mr. T. C. Callison, who said he had heard of no trouble with registration anywhere in the State. I told him of the persistent reports of violations and restrictions in Williamsburg County. He said that clear instructions had been given to all registrars as to the provisions of the election laws, and he saw no reason why the Williamsburg situation should have arisen.

I said, "You mean there's no logical reason." He replied, "There is no legal reason." And then I said, "I grant there is neither logical nor legal reason, but there can be a devilish, prejudicial reason that is the making of some member or members of that board."

Mr. Callison said all registrars were familiar with the law and had been advised to request further information from his office if they desired. He took the names and telephone numbers of the officials we had tried to contact in Williamsburg County, and said he would get to work on the matter immediately. He told me, "I will tell them that I have had these complaints and urge them to right the matter. After that, I do not know what can be done." My reply was, "I know what can be done. We can have a big lawsuit down there."

Officials at the secretary of state's office also said they were puzzled by the reports from Williamsburg County. They also pointed out that Attorney General Callison had called in all registrars and given them what was thought to be a thorough coaching, and that they had expected no trouble.

All of these officials were told that I felt pained to have to give in Washington this report on Williamsburg County, which constitutes the single blot on record so far as I have been able to find. They also appeared to be sorry about it.

I have talked with others of both races by telephone and personally concerning sections of the State that have been historic trouble spots—for example, Abbeville County. This was the site of the most atrocious lynching in the history of South Carolina; it is also the place where a minister was severely whipped for trying to vote just after the primaries were opened to Negroes. The reply from the Abbeville informant was, "I don't think we are going to have any trouble like we had from the old crowd."

I have also talked with officials of groups that are promoting statewide registration programs. They have heard of no trouble. Lethargy and disinterest seem to be the underlying causes of limited registration in some sections. It must be admitted that in some of these sections the situation could be a carry-over of the fear of reprisal that was the cause in earlier years.

At least 2 white persons—1 a lawyer and the other a candidate for the State legislature—on being asked why there seems to be no trouble, said, "These people have been sued so much that they are afraid of being carried to court."

It will be remembered that the NAACP spent about $15,000 in this State to open the primaries. The white primaries were eliminated by decisions in the *Elmore* v. *Baskin and Brown* v. *Baskin* cases.

After the ruling in the former case, when some registrars swore they would refuse to register negroes, the then Federal Judge J. Waties Waring said he would fill the jails with recalcitrant registrars if the law was not carried out by them.

As State secretary of NAACP during this period, I sent information on the law to all NAACP branches, telling them about securing affidavits, etc. We also sent copies to all registration boards so that they would know we were ready to move into the courts again if necessary. This has had a long-lasting effect, I am sure.

VOTING RESTRICTIONS IN VIRGINIA

(By W. Hale Thompson, attorney)

Voting restrictions in Virginia are designed to keep the electorate small and controllable. Legal procedures for qualification do not tell the whole story.

You have all heard how Negroes are kept from registering and voting by manipulation of the poll tax and the use of questionnaires about the Constitution and the statutes.

Less well known are the harsh economic reprisals against Negroes who dare to encourage others to qualify to vote, or who seek to run for public office in Virginia.

In a county in southside Virginia, Mr. J had been leader in the fight for public school equalization and later for integrated schools. He had spent most of his 60-odd years working among his people, trying to get them to qualify for voting.

He was so busy with his schoolwork and the voting problems in his county that he never had time to acquire a farm of his own. He rented one from some white people who had gone North and he worked it for more than 20 years.

Shortly after the school desegregation decision in 1954, his landlord ordered him to move. Mr. J was finally able to rent another farm. He stayed on that one for 2 years, and then the same thing happened. He finally had to leave the county because no one would rent him a farm. He is held up as an example of what happens to Negroes who get too big for their britches.

Nevertheless, he is still carrying on the fight to get Negroes qualified to vote in his home county, which is more than 60 percent Negro.

In another county in southside Virginia, Mr. W was a prominent preacher and farmer. He owned a 150-acre farm and rented another of equal size. It had been his custom to borrow money locally each year for operating expenses and to repay the money after the crops were sold.

Mr. W had been active in the NAACP and in the County Voters' League for many years. Before 1954, the people who ran the county didn't pay too much attention to Mr. W. They considered him just another colored preacher. Then Mr. W decided he was going to run for 1 of the 3 seats on the county board of supervisors, the governing body of the county.

The day after he announced his candidacy, he was asked to pay his creditors over $8,000. Credit that had been extended to him was secured by demand notes. It had been orally understood that payment would be made after crops were sold and new notes given to secure the unpaid balance.

In this as in other Virginia counties, credit is extended to Negroes on demand notes. When one steps out of line, he is threatened with economic suicide.

Efforts were made to obtain money for Mr. W to pay his creditors. He was told by them that if he withdrew from the race they would go easy on him. This man saw everything that he and his family had worked for many years taken away from him.

It took several weeks to arrange to pay off his creditors. In the meantime this poor man had aged 20 years. He withdrew from the race for supervisor, his spirit broken.

These are just two examples of how Negroes are kept from exercising their rights as citizens. Of approximately 750,000 Negroes in Virginia, slightly more than 80,000 are qualified to vote. However, a greater percentage of them generally vote than do the white who are qualified.

Virginia, like most Southern States, has a very small percentage of her population taking part in political activity. About 34 percent of the adult population went to the polls in 1956. However, 64 to 66 percent of the qualified Negroes voted.

One reason given for the voted apathy is the so-called short ballot. In Virginia, only three officers are elected by the State as a whole—the governor, lieutenant governor, and attorney general. All other executive officers are appointed. In other words, the people of Virginia have permitted machine politicians to relieve them of the right to choose those who govern them.

So you see that perhaps the greatest restrictions against voting in Virginia are not legal at all, but rather sociological and psychological.

Negroes and poor whites haev been pitted against each other for centuries. Negroes have become used to seeing everything that represents authority clothed in a white face, and the poor white has been conditioned to being told what to do by his betters.

The pattern of segregation has inflicted upon the masses of Negroes a feeling of despair. If one of his group seeks public office he is either forced to withdraw because of fear of economic strangulation, or the air is filled with race hate and the qualifications of the candidate are forgotten if his skin is not white.

Speedy Air Traffic Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in view of my remarks yesterday on the subject of air safety, I was gratified by the introduction of the bill for that general purpose by our distinguished and able friend, the gentleman from Arkansas, [Mr. HARRIS], and also by the prompt and diligent attention given this important subject matter by our distinguished and able colleagues, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], and others.

All these measures taken by appropriate leaders and committees of the House demonstrate the continued awareness and alertness of the House, its committees, and its membership to the great needs in this field so tragically illustrated by recent most lamentable air accidents.

Friends of our great aviation industry and many of the general public have been genuinely concerned for some time past now by the relatively large number of air accidents that cannot be adequately explained, by sudden crashes, and by collisions in the air that cost many lives and caused much damage.

Many communities throughout the country have been visited by these sudden death-dealing accidents plummeted down from the skies with furious speed to bring death and destruction. The growth of civil aviation in itself and the increased number of private planes present serious traffic control problems in the air. The activities of military planes along the air routes in close proximity to settled communities, the unannounced and unscheduled character of their approach, the dazzling speed at which they travel and failure frequently to conform with rules governing civil aviation make this problem much more difficult.

Since the principal part of the problem seems to be reconciling military with civilian flights and since the situation has apparently been getting worse rather than better in recent days, we cannot afford to delay the establishment of basic laws, rules, and regulations controlling these matters. Air congestion is growing apace; air traffic control is one of the Nation's compelling problems at the moment.

With the advent of new civilian jet planes, the problem becomes intensified and the Congress must act to lay down proper, effective controls with all possible speed. I commend our colleagues who are giving these important matters such careful, able, and expeditious consideration, and I hope that nothing will deter them from the goal of pressing forward with a sound, considered program that will bring order into the somewhat chaotic and worsening situation, which is causing so much uneasiness and concern throughout the Nation.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., 6278 29th St. *Miss.*
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.*, 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.*, 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.*, University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.*, 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.*, 800 Crescent Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.*, 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.*, 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.*, Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.*, 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.*, 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Beamer, John V., *Ind.*, 110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.*, 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.*, 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.*, 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.*, 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio*, 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.*, Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*, 4301 Mass. Ave.
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.*, The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.*, 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.*, 3606 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*, Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.*, Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind.*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.*, 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*
Byrne, Emmet F., *Ill.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.*, 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.*, The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.*, 1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo.*
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.*, 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.*, 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*, The Jefferson
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.*, 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Coudert, Frederic R., Jr., *N. Y.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.*, 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn.*
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.*
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.*, 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.*, 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William A., *Utah*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dellay, Vincent J., *N. J.*
Dennison, David S., Jr., *Ohio.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Devereux, James P. S., *Md.*
Dies, Martin, *Tex.*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*, 2828 Conn. Ave.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.*, 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.*, The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa.*, 3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed., *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Engle, Clair, *Calif.*, 3840 Lorcom Lane, Arlington, Va.
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.*, 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.*, 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.*, Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.*, The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.*, 3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.*, 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.*, 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.*, The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.*, Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.*, 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.*, 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Myron V., *Kans.*, 3801 Rodman St.
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.*, Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill.*
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.*, 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky.*, 2401 Calvert St.
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Hale, Robert, *Maine*, 2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.*, 4926 Upton St.
Harden, Cecil M. (Mrs.), *Ind.*, The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.*, 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr.*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind.*, 110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Haskell, Harry G., Jr., *Del.*
Hays, Brooks, *Ark.*, 314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*, 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.*, 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Heselton, John W., *Mass.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hill, William S., *Colo.*, 110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*, 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.*, 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holmes, Hal, *Wash.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
James, Benjamin F., *Pa.*, 200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*, The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*, 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*, 3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.*, 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.*, 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Kean, Robert W., *N. J.*, 2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.*, Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y.*, 1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.*, The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*, The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.*, 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.*, 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Knutson, Coya (Mrs.), *Minn.*
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak.*, 112 Schotts Court NE.

Appendix

The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the Appendix of the RECORD, for the examination of the Members, two articles on the farm problem which appeared in the May 21, 1958, issue of the Christian Science Monitor. I include these articles without comment because I am in no way committed to all of the opinions expressed therein:

THE FARM EDITOR SAYS

Most Americans agree that since we all depend on farmers to produce the food and fiber we need, we must somehow keep enough farmers in business to meet this need.

This general recognition of the farmer's essential status has fostered wide belief in two theses which possibly merit acceptance but which, considering present economic pressures on the citizenry, seem to call for fresh scrutiny and evaluation. Much of the political campaigning on farm issues now building toward November congressional elections centers around these two theses.

The first is: "Farmers are entitled to their fair share of profits in the Nation's economy."

The second: "Because the family farm represents certain moral values which have contributed to America's greatness, it must, at whatever cost, be preserved in its traditional entity."

At the risk of sounding brutal, honesty demands a second recognition before the theses can be evaluated, the recognition that America is struggling not only with a surplus of certain basic crops, but also with what some economists define as a surplus of farmers. The technological fact today is, that fewer farmers than ever before can produce what Americans need, and still have enough left over to supply some world needs.

This recognition, involving drastic changes in the agricultural structure, is hard to face, especially for farmers who, because of lack of capital or know-how, have been unable to keep up with the all-out mechanization that has taken over American farmlands with incredible speed. They need help. But what will help them most?

Considering the first thesis: Just exactly what is agriculture's fair share of the Nation's profits? (Think of the imponderables involved—such points as: Should everyone's share be the same? Or should personal effort and success be taken into account? Who is to decide such fundamental questions?)

If 500 farmers—or perhaps 100—can today turn out as much as 1,000 could produce 30 years ago, should Government subsidize the thousand just to perpetuate the way of life they are used to?

This leads into the second thesis, concerning the family farm which today is generally defined as a farm where the family makes all management decisions and does most of the work. With all the mechanical help now available, some family farms have become big operations bearing little resemblance to yesterday's few acres worked by a man and a mule and a plow. Many others have remained too small to prosper, and their plight does indeed cry out for aid.

But many people are now asking: To what extent should all citizens be taxed to keep unsuccessful farmers on the land simply because that is where they happen to be and because Americans feel sentimental about a romanticized but somewhat-out-of-date picture of the family farm as grandpa knew it?

We have yet to hear anyone question what would happen to the moral values usually associated with the institution known as the family farm if that institution could be preserved only by the Federal dole.

Would it be better for the farmer and the whole Nation if Government should confine its role to providing disaster insurance and to offering something like industry's unemployment insurance for a designated period to help struggling farmers find jobs in industry or adjust their operations to more profitable methods?

It is not the purpose of this column to try to answer these big questions, nor to support or refute the theses. It is meant only to urge study of these crucial issues, which will to some extent be decided when Americans go to the polls next fall, and vote into office men who do ardently support, or refute, these now familiar premises.

HELEN HENLEY.

FOOD CHAINS TRY HAND AT SUPPLYING OWN MEAT

(By Roscoe Fleming)

DENVER.—Vertical integration has come to the cow country and is creating massive changes in the whole system of livestock marketing. The net effect has been to bring about so drastic a decline in the business done by the Nation's stockyards—the 66 big terminal livestock markets—that they are worried about prospects.

This process has been hurried along by the policy of many of the big food chains to become packers within the meaning of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1920 so that they can escape from the antitrust rule of the Federal Trade Commission into the arms of the Department of Agriculture, which has jurisdiction of packers under the 1920 act but has never done much about regulating them.

In the Congress this is reflected in the bill by Senators ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah, and JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, which would transfer jurisdiction of meatpacking as a business to the Federal Trade Commission. After some days of inconclusive debate in the Senate, this bill was referred back to its Judiciary and Agriculture Committees, which rereported it with provisions that would leave with the Department of Agriculture regulation of animal trading right up to the packinghouse but would transfer packer jurisdiction to the FTC. This bill now has been passed by the Senate.

The FTC has for years issued antitrust complaints against many of the big food companies and chains, only to have the latter successfully plead that they are packers because they prepare their own meats.

One supermarket chain was denied this classification because its meat preparation was only incidental; whereupon it went out and bought a hundred shares of common stock of one of the big packing companies, and came back pleading that this exempted it from FTC regulation since the law said that any interest in a packing company qualified for regulation by the Department of Agriculture.

BIG CHAINS REPRESENTED

Among the huge retail chains and companies listed by the Department of Agriculture as of 1957 as packers subject to its jurisdiction are seven of the biggest supermarket chains: Atlantic & Pacific, Safeway, American Stores, Food Fair Stores, National Tea, Giant Foods, First National Stores; and such big processors as Procter & Gamble, Campbell Soups, Carnation, General Foods, Quaker Oats, Beatrice Foods.

Now note how this massive drive of general food processors and retailers into the packing business has affected the situation back in the cow country:

It has led such processors and retailers either to establish packing plants and feed lots of their own, buying the animal off the range and taking care of it right through to the cellophaned package on the meat counter, or to use their bargaining powers to buy fat animals direct from the huge feed lots which have sprung up throughout the West and which are, in effect, live-meat factories.

These latter may handle many thousands yearly of cattle, sheep, or hogs, bought from farmers, fattened, and sold. One such operation in Colorado, though by no means the Nation's largest, feeds more than $1 million worth of cattle at a time. And one of the big supermarkets has a Colorado feed lot which is almost as large. Animals from this lot go to the company's own packinghouse. And for the final step two packinghouses owned by supermarket chains now handle one-quarter of all the cattle packed in Colorado.

The effect of this setup through which animals flow around the established livestock markets need not be imagined. A recent study by the Department of Agriculture shows that of livestock headed direct for packing plants only 70 percent of cattle now pass through terminal markets, contrasted to more than 90 percent in 1925. The corresponding figure for sheep and lambs is a little more than 50 percent now, contrasted with 85 percent; of hogs, 40 percent now, against 75 percent. And the decline has been relatively steep since 1950 as the advantages of becoming packing plants have increased.

MARKETS FEEL DECLINE

The effect on one terminal market: In 1953 about 600,000 cattle were sold in Denver destined to nearby packing plants, of which the plants bought direct only 19,000, or less than 4 percent. In 1957 the comparable figures were 632,000 and 160,000, or 25 percent.

In 1953, 578,000 sheep were bought in Denver for packing plants. Of these, 90 percent or 515,000 were handled by the Denver Union Stockyards Co. In 1955 the comparable figures were 894,000 and 544,000—350,000 sheep were bought direct by the ultimate handlers.

It is the thesis of Senator O'MAHONEY that this creates pervasive pressure to drive prices down at the ranch or farm. These big food chains, he says, are able by vertical integration to put meat on their counters at prices several cents a pound less than their competitors who still patronize the older channels—that is, who buy from the traditional pack-

ers, who in turn buy through the terminal markets.

These competitors then demand lower meat prices that will allow them to compete, setting up a chain reaction that puts pressure on prices all the way back to the animals on the range.

Terminal market operators hardly know what to do. They are talking in terms of canceling or bypassing the traditional commission house system by which such houses buy and sell between the ranch and the terminal market, using the facilities of the latter. They think of instituting their own corps of salesmen, to go out and try to turn the tide of animals back to them.

Remarks of Hon. Herbert C. Bonner, of North Carolina, Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, at the Keel Laying of the Nuclear ship "Savannah," New York Shipbuilding Corp., Camden, N. J., Maritime Day, May 22, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VINCENT J. DELLAY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 23, 1958

Mr. DELLAY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday along with other members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee I attended ceremonies at the laying of the keel of the nuclearship *Savannah*, the world's first nuclear-powered merchant ship, in the New York Shipbuilding Corp. yard at Camden, N. J. Our distinguished chairman, HERBERT C. BONNER, delivered the main address at this historic occasion and I am submitting it for insertion at this point in the RECORD.

When I first came to Congress I requested to be placed on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee because of its particular relationship to the activities of the district I serve—which is to a great degree a waterfront district. During the period of time that I have served on this committee the members of the committee under the chairmanship of HERBERT BONNER have been outstanding in their dedication to the work program of the committee and particularly in their desire to bring forth legislation to maintain and develop a strong, modern American merchant marine adequate for our national needs.

The address made by Chairman BONNER yesterday is indicative not only of the ability, foresight, and patriotism of our chairman but also is the spirit that has imbued the entire committee.

The people of this country must be kept growingly conscious of our merchant marine as our fourth arm of defense. Its position must be enhanced so that ships flying the American flag shall be the forerunners in the field of nuclear-powered vessels that will sail the seas in the days to come:

Mr. Teale, Chairman Strauss, Mr. Guill, our most gracious sponsor, Mrs. Richard M. Nixon, friends of the American Merchant Marine, ladies, and gentlemen, on this historic Maritime Day, 1958, we shall lay the keel of the nuclear ship *Savannah*—the world's first nuclear-powered merchant ship.

Within the next few minutes, the United States of America will have resolutely stepped across the threshold of time into the nuclear age on the sea lanes of the world.

In our action here today, we are demonstrating our sincerity and our belief that men of good will can forge tools of peace from the forces of destruction.

One hundred thirty-nine years ago today, the steamship *Savannah* set sail from her home port, Savannah, Ga., to become the first steamship to cross the Atlantic Ocean. It was a proud day for the enterprise and ingenuity of this youthful Nation which had gained its independence and freedom scarcely more than a generation before. The steamship *Savannah*, with her coal-burning, 90-horsepower steam engine, her three masts with full set of sails, was a bold and imaginative symbol of the creativeness of the new Republic. Although far in advance of her time, she was the transitional step that foretold the end of the centuries-old age of sail on the high seas.

Despite the great interest and excitement this revolutionary ship stirred during her triumphal tour of the major ports of Europe, she was deemed a failure by her sponsors. Her fuel supply had been sufficient to run her engine only for a total of 80 hours during the entire 29-day crossing. She was too costly to operate.

It is a paradoxical bit of history that the unprecedented trans-Atlantic voyage of the steamship *Savannah* in 1819 should have turned out to be the forerunner of the era of American supremacy on the seas in the days of the Clipper ships. And American naval architects thereafter concentrated their efforts to perfecting the safer and—at that time—more efficient Clippers. "Steamships," they said, "can never compete with sail as long as the wind remains free."

At that fateful time, blind to the portents of the industrial revolution, decisions were made that, after brief years of glory, were to leave us a third-rate maritime power for a half century. Competing nations quickly saw the significance of the Steamship *Savannah*, while we turned our back on the future.

As Americans, we can be proud of our maritime heritage which is rooted in our earliest history on this continent. This heritage is nobly exemplified in peace and in war; in the exploits of our great navies; and in the bold ventures of the far-ranging Yankee Clippers that carried the American flag through all the seven seas in peaceful commerce. We can be proud of the genius of our naval architects and marine engineers, and the skills and production miracles of our shipbuilders. Living proof of our legacy from the past is embodied in the magnificent Steamship *United States* and the other beautiful, efficient, and safe ships of the American merchant marine now sailing the seas or under construction.

The memorable event in which we participate today marks a step in the progress of modern transportation as significant now as the development of the steamship was more than a hundred years ago. Let us be sure that the lesson of the old *Savannah*—for which this new ship will be named—will be well remembered and studiously observed. May the vision and imagination that goes into the creation of this new *Savannah* lead us ever forward, gaining from this experience and surmounting all obstacles, to keep the American flag foremost on the sea.

We are pioneering here, and we must maintain our lead. Some have advanced the idea of hastily building a reactor copied from an existing design and inserting it in the hull of an old merchant ship to be used as a floating exhibit hall. This makeshift vessel would have been taken to various parts of the world to show nuclear devices and motion pictures demonstrating peaceful uses of atomic energy. Whatever may be the merits of that particular proposal, it would have done nothing to advance our merchant marine.

Other developments in the field of atomic energy showed us that it was timely and appropriate to build a new vessel specially designed in both hull and machinery to secure the maximum advantage from this new source of power of such bright promise. Thus it was, in the spring of 1955, that bills were introduced in the House of Representatives to authorize the construction of a practical merchant ship powered by an advanced type of reactor especially designed for the purpose.

Step by step this project has advanced through the processes of legislation and industry. It has developed out of the idea stage into a full-fledged working element of our merchant fleet.

I am pleased to hear that many of the operators of our present ships are vying with each other for the opportunity to familiarize themselves with the shape of things to come by operating this proud new ship designed to meet the challenge of the future. Make no mistake, what we are initiating here today is no experiment. It is not a toy. It is the forerunner of many more that will assure the continued preeminence of our country in the field of naval design. Of course, it goes without saying that nuclear science is still in its infancy, and we have much to learn.

By the construction of this vessel we will gain the experience we need to move ever forward in keeping with our national policy to maintain and develop a strong, modern American merchant marine, adequate for our national needs—a merchant marine that will be our ambassador of good will throughout the world.

I am proud that I and the House Merchant Marine Committee have been able to play a great part in this outstanding enterprise which surely marks a revolutionary advance in our great transportation system. But, most of all, I offer my sincerest congratulations to this outstanding shipyard, to the Babcock & Wilcox Co. who are building the nuclear reactor, to George G. Sharp, the distinguished naval architect, to Admiral Strauss and Clarence Morse and their able and dedicated assistants in the Atomic Energy Commission and Federal Maritime Administration, and to my colleagues in the Congress whose leadership guided the enabling legislation to enactment.

May all of us who are here today count ourselves especially privileged to take part in this historic occasion, when we will see a piece of steel be transfigured into a symbol of America's destiny.

A Great Contribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 23, 1958

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the following editorial which appeared in the May 22, issue of the San Diego Union, San Diego, Calif.:

A GREAT CONTRIBUTION

Vice President NIXON has richly earned the commendation of both his Nation and Latin

America for being the instrument to bring irritants to hemispheric friendship out in the open where something can be done about them.

Mr. NIXON's trying experiences on his 18-day tour have resulted in a reappraisal of the relationship between the Americas. They offer dramatic proof of the inroads communism has made in Latin America. The stones and the jeers hurled at the Vice President by mobs did no permanent damage to the great hemispheric friendship, but they did call attention to economic problems which chafe the relationship.

Mr. NIXON has put the Latin-American picture in true focus. He said that while Communists were the ringleaders of the violence to which he was subjected, Red agitators were in many cases only the lever for projecting the feelings of innocent persons misled by United States policies.

Latin America is pinched by world commodity prices. Many of its governments are unstable, and because of that instability are unable to cope with the needs of their people.

There is a feeling in many quarters of the globe that the United States has all the answers to the economic and political problems of others. When these answers are in conflict with what is expected, there is often resentment. Peruvian metal, Venezuelan oil, Uruguayan wool and Argentine beef seek more favored trade treatment from the United States which also owes allegiance to its own industries.

The reappraisal asked by Mr. NIXON extends to American trade policies and internal remedies that can be taken by the Latin nations. We need to know more about each other, be more sympathetic to each other's problems and responsibilities. Mr. NIXON has contributed greatly toward bringing this about.

Vice President Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD H. POFF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 23, 1958

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the May 14, 1958, issue of the Richmond Times Dispatch:

MR. NIXON'S GROWING REPUTATION

Card-carrying Communists, or Communist sympathizers in Caracas, of whom there are plenty, apparently were responsible for the gross discourtesies there yesterday to Vice President and Mrs. Richard Nixon. There is no reason to believe that this sort of youthful hoodlumism is typical of Venezuelans or other South Americans. It can also be said that the Nixons again behaved well under pressure.

The United States is not exactly popular in most Latin American countries these days, for it is felt, among other things, that we've been lavishing too many of our grants and loans on other parts of the world. But even temperamental and excitable Latins would hardly throw rocks and tin cans at, or spit upon, a visiting dignitary and his wife, unless such demonstrations had been carefully planned by Communists, or other professional agitators. The rioters were mostly teen-agers.

It will be recalled that widespread disorders broke out in Caracas last January, and that Dictator Perez Jiminez was finally ousted from office. The regime which succeeded him isn't keeping order any too well.

President Eisenhower's praise of Vice President NIXON for his calm and courageous behavior in Lima last week was justified. He deserves similar commendation for his refusal yesterday to let the youthful Venezuelan hooligans rattle him.

It should be noted, furthermore, that one of the impressive facts of recent political history in this country is the manner in which Mr. NIXON has risen in public esteem. The quotation from Max Freedman in the Manchester Guardian, cited in today's column by Roscoe Drummond, is only one of many such striking shifts of attitude.

Visiting editors from Europe at the recent convention of the International Press Institute in Washington said they were impressed with the manner in which RICHARD NIXON is no longer regarded by "liberals" in the United States as the epitome of everything they detest. Time was when it was almost impossible to find a "liberal" on either side of the Atlantic who would say a good word for the Vice President. That is still true of some leading Democrats in Washington, but even they seem to be softening up.

The fact is that Mr. NIXON has risen steadily in the estimation of many who have followed him at close range in recent years. Much of this dislike was based on misconceptions and a tendency to apply more stringent standards of judgment to him than were applied to others in public life.

RICHARD NIXON has made mistakes, like everybody else. We strongly disagree, furthermore, with his views on the race question. Yet he has many more admirable characteristics than he is sometimes given credit for, including quite exceptional ability.

Mr. NIXON's conduct on his South American tour has added to his growing reputation.

Ambassador Langley Wins High Praise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PERKINS BASS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 23, 1958

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, newspaper article entitled "Langley Wins High Praise," by Lawrence Fernsworth which appeared in the May 1 Concord (N. H.) Daily Monitor. We in New Hampshire are indeed proud of the good job and fine reputation Ambassador Langley is making for himself in this very important post:

LANGLEY WINS HIGH PRAISE—PAKISTAN NEWSMEN LAUD MONITOR PUBLISHER FOR ACTIONS

(By Lawrence Fernsworth)

WASHINGTON, May 1.—The editors of Pakistan's three foreign-most newspapers, and a Pakistan press correspondent who were in Washington this past week in the course of a United States tour of information, bestowed warm praise on United States Ambassador to Pakistan, James M. Langley.

"He's one of us," was the encomium bestowed on Langley by Mir. Khalil ur Raham, publisher and editor of the Daily Jang.

Altaf Husan, editor of Dawn, a paper much quoted in press dispatches, told this correspondent that "Mr. Langley is doing a remarkable job in understanding the problems of the country and creating good will for the United States. We see each other quite frequently. He has a newsman's curiosity to learn what lies beneath the surface of things, a trait which we as newsmen understand and appreciate. He gets around the country to see for himself and doesn't take his facts second hand."

SIMILAR SENTIMENT

Mansur Ali Khan, editor of the Daily Zamindar at Lahore, West Pakistan, echoed similar sentiments. "Although I live a thousand miles away from Karachi it is necessary for me to go there several times a year, and a chat with Mr. Langley about mutual Pakistan-United States problems is always a must," he said. "It is pleasant to find him an informal host—what you Americans call a good fellow. Pakistan has some very complex problems and an inquiring and understanding mind on the part of the ambassadors who are sent to us is of highest importance if they are to help us in solving them. Mr. Langley is far from disappointing us in this respect."

With the group is also Zamir Siddiqui, Associated Press correspondent in Karachi. Sharing the views of his colleagues he said, "On my particular job it is necessary to call on Mr. Langley quite often—it is a big help to find him cooperative and understanding of newspaper problems. I feel that I am able to send to your people, and to other countries a better picture of United States-Pakistan relations and their impact on our relations with other countries as a result of the cordial contacts between Langley and the press."

In a general conversation with his correspondent, the visitors remarked that these pleasant relations extend to other persons, whether government officials, political or community leaders or the people of everyday life. They were particularly interested to hear that Langley wrote frequent reports from Pakistan for the Concord Monitor, and wondered how he found time to do so.

They stated that Pakistan is totally anti-Communist, and pro-Western, a policy in which they received strong encouragement as the result of Langley's presentation to his Government of the problems that tied in with this policy.

ALL MOSLEMS

All four of the editors are Moslems. They hoped that Christians would come to understand better the friendly feeling Moslems have for Christians.

As one of them put it: "A black myth has been created that Moslems are the mortal enemies of Christians. The reverse is true. Like the Christians' holy book, our own holy book stems from the ancient Jewish scriptures. The holy men of early Christianity are also holy to us.

"Let it be recalled that when the Moslems first entered Spain they often worshiped in the same temple—the Moslems on Fridays and the Christians on Sundays. The later expulsion of the Moslems was purely political, an unfortunate policy of later rulers who, to justify their actions created the dark legend that Christians and Moslems could not live together. Actually they had been living together for 800 years."

Legislation To Protect Union Members

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 23, 1958

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include an editorial from

the Herald-News, Passaic, N. J., of May 20, 1958, entitled "Legislation To Protect Union Members":

LEGISLATION TO PROTECT UNION MEMBERS

Democratic leaders of the United States Senate have promised that a bill to protect union members from larcenous union heads and from racketeers will be introduced by June 10.

It is odd that they should have to offer this reassurance. There is general agreement, as a result of the disclosures by the committee headed by Senator MCCLELLAN, that the protection of Federal law is needed. Those who watched on their television sets the parade of witnesses before the committee would agree that the need for protection is urgent. In the words of Senator IVES, the Government cannot allow "anyone to play fast and loose with the money union members pay to their unions. We cannot stand idly by when racketeers * * * take over unions."

The average citizen would probably go further, and agree with Senator MUNDT that additional legislation is required, such as providing for "a dependable secret ballot * * * in the election of union officers and in the authorization of strikes." Election techniques that deprive the voter of the protection of anonymity help to keep totalitarian governments in power, we well know. In unions, the lack of secrecy helps dictatorial corrupt leaders to stay in power.

Despite the widespread belief that corrective legislation is necessary, a note of doubt about its prospects in this session is apparent in the Washington dispatches. One reason is that there is disagreement about how far the legislation should go. At one end of the argument are those who want to confine the legislating to a few items, such as protecting union funds from crooks and putting up barriers against racketeers. At the other end are those who want to do a thorough job by legislating in many other fields, such as limiting union participation in public elections and restricting picketing.

It would be unfortunate if disagreement about how little or how much was to keep the Congress from enacting any legislation at all. A modest start at correcting abuses is better than none at all. If the Congress fails to act, it will be strengthening the hand of the selfish union leaders who are trying to persuade their members that proposed legislation is part of a plot to destroy unions. The Congress should not put ammunition into their hands.

A Bill To Amend Title II of the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 23, 1958

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have placed before this body a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits payable thereunder.

This bill will help assure more adequate income for our older citizens and provide them with a sounder base for financial security.

Certainly, one of the important tasks which we face in this session of the Congress is the search for a solution to ease the current financial pressures on persons who receive social-security benefits. Because of the extreme importance of the subject matter of this bill to every citizen of the United States, I sincerely urge that each Member of this body carefully study the provisions of this legislation.

Once they have had the opportunity to study this matter, Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the appropriate committee will find it possible to hold immediate hearings so that my bill may be considered thoroughly and passed without undue delay.

Our retired citizens need this legislation, and I am convinced that it will do the all-important job as soundly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, briefly the bill does this. It allows those persons who have earned the benefits of social security to receive at least $4,200 a year. Simply, the bill provides that a recipient of social security will not lose a single month's benefit check if his income from outside earnings plus his social security checks total not more than $4,200.

My bill is a new approach to a serious problem. It is a new approach because its provisions allow an equality of opportunity for each classification of social security recipient to receive a decent basic income. It is a new approach because the ceiling is placed on total income instead of outside earnings.

Today a couple who receives benefits of $102.80 a month and who earns the maximum sum allowed without loss of benefit checks has an annual income of $2,433.60. A couple who received $162.80 a month in benefits and who earns the same maximum sum, $1,200, has an annual total income of $3,153.60. Under my proposal, both couples could have total incomes of $4,200.

Here, Mr. Speaker, is a plan that gives opportunity for better incomes without an increase in benefits and without an increase in social security contributions from employees, employers, and the Government.

I have received thousands of letters from my district, not only from persons on social security, but also from community leaders, businessmen, housewives, and the professions, to name a few. All are interested in the problem of adequate income for the older generation. All hope for some solution, because all are affected.

The value of the dollar goes down and the costs of existence goes up, but life continues. The squeeze is particularly hard for the men and women of retirement age. Today, if they are able and want to work, they cannot, because they are afraid they will lose the small benefits they have.

The legislation I have proposed can change this. It provides a way for higher earnings and a more realistic basic income. It gives the elderly person the opportunity, in dignity, to pursue part-time employment without the fear of losing income because of tables in an act made law when our economic situation was different from what it is today.

The immediate effect of this bill would be the easing of financial problems for our senior citizens. It would let them earn more, thereby raising their standard of living. They would spend more, and it does not take an economist to see the possible effect upon business.

Mr. Speaker, the American public is looking to the Congress on this matter of social security. My letters prove the public's interest. We have a responsibility to older people, the public, and ourselves. I sincerely hope this body carefully will study this bill as I have suggested, and will give it full approval.

Myth of German Experts Debunked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important subjects of discussion in this country is the comparative state of the art of missile development and use in this country and in the U. S. S. R. One aspect of this discussion is the question of the size of the contribution of captured German scientists to the Russian development. This question has become the subject of partisan politics with the charge being made that this country under a Democratic President permitted the Russians to capture and make substantial use of German scientists and material. A series of two articles by Willie Ley in the Los Angeles Times commencing on May 18, 1958, is an adequate refutation of these charges. Mr. Ley is a rocket expert who was directly connected with the German program and the substance of his observations which follow is that the Russians derived very little benefit from either German rocket research during the war or from German scientists subsequent thereto:

[From the Los Angeles Times of May 18, 1958]

MYTH OF GERMAN EXPERTS DEBUNKED—LEY SAYS MOST ROCKET SCIENTISTS CAME TO UNITED STATES INSTEAD OF BEING CAUGHT BY REDS

(By Willy Ley)

At the end of World War II, or so legend says, the Red army captured all the German rocket experts and put them to work, which explains the Russian sputniks and a lot of other things. To many Americans this is a much-cherished legend which presumably makes them feel better because it was, at least, not the Russians who produced these spectacular things but German scientists working for them. And Germany is known to produce scientists.

Actually, most German rocket scientists never saw the Red army except in the movies and maybe on television. Most were brought, or came on their own volition, to the United States. And of those who were brought to Russia, none was there when sputnik appeared in the sky. They had all been sent home years before.

But let's begin at the beginning.

RESEARCH CENTERS

Near the end of World War II there were several rocket-research centers in Germany. A small one of the German navy was located near Danzig. It had mainly the purpose of developing a naval torpedo with rocket pro-

pulsion. I don't know whether this work was successful—in fact I doubt it—but I do know that the man in charge, Rolf Engel, was not captured by the Russians. For years he worked in Egypt, of all places, and he is now back in West Germany.

A second research group was industrial and was run by BMW (Bavarian Motor Works) in West Germany, the Red army never got that far to the west. One of its leading men, Heinz Gartmann, was brought to the United States for some months and has been in West Germany ever since.

There were, no doubt, several smaller groups in aircraft plants and powder factories but the most important of all was, of course, the research group of the German army in Peenemunde. Its head was General Dornberger (now with Bell Aircraft), its scientific head was Dr. Wernher von Braun, whose whereabouts are well known.

The whole research and planning staff of the German army's institute surrendered as a unit to the American Third Army.

But the Russians did capture a number of production engineers. They were taken to Russia and the story then emanated from Germany that the Russians had captured very many important German rocket experts. In all fairness it must be said that this story may, in part, be due to a mistake in translation. The Russians did capture a number of jet engine experts. Russia and Germany have words which mean both, jet and rocket. The German word in question is Strahlantrieb; the Russian words are Reaktinaya Dvishenniya. The man who wrote the original news story may have heard it in Russian, or, more likely, in German and then did not know which way to translate.

MOST IMPORTANT NAME

Of the Germans who were captured by the Russians, the most important seems to have been Helmut Groettrup. He and others were brought, with their families, to an island in a river. There they were domiciled in separate small houses. Their children were sent to a little school established for them and the men were put to work.

Were they sent to a Russian rocket proving ground to instruct, advise of assist?

No, they had their own place of work.

Were they occasionally flown to be interrogated by Russian scientists, military men or government officials?

No, if an important Russian wanted to see them he came to see them.

Were they informed about what the Russians were doing or what they accomplished?

Of course not, although there seems to have been a "grapevine" as there is everywhere in the world.

Were they threatened or mistreated in any way?

No, although at times their working hours were not what a well-run union would approve.

What happened to them?

In the end, which means around 1953 or 1954, they were shipped back to East Germany. Then they must have leaked through the Iron Curtain because at least some of them are now in West Germany, lecturing about their experiences.

[From the Los Angeles Times of May 19, 1958]

RUSS USED REICH V–2 ROCKET DATA—GERMAN EXPERTS WERE CONFINED BY REDS TO SOLVING SPECIFIC PROBLEMS—ALL ON PAPER

(By Willie Ley)

When the German rocket experts first went to work in Russia they had to dictate their past experiences, telling in detail how and why all the parts for the V–2 rocket had been made, what changes had been made and why, and so forth and so on.

At a later date the German Collective, as the Russians called them, were given specific problems to solve—all on paper. They might be requested to calculate a fuel pump for a rocket burning 600 pounds of fuel per second. Or they might be asked to design a rocket motor with a thrust of 100 tons. Such jobs it must be said, are jobs any rocket engineer can do. The real trouble is not in calculating or drawing up such devices; it starts when they have been built and are on the test stand. This the Russians did themselves, not letting the Germans see how they made out. It is even very uncertain whether the Russians ever built anything that had been designed by the German Collective. In all probability the Russians made the Germans solve problems which they, the Russians, had already worked out. That way they would get a cross check for the same result, arrived at by two different methods.

At one point the Germans were asked to design a rocket for a range of 1,800 miles, capable of carrying a warhead weighing 3 tons.

The Germans worked this out very painstakingly because the problem was new to them, too. The rocket was called Project R–14, but it was also known as Design G–4. Interestingly enough, the Germans wanted to build it finless, like the Vanguard, but they drew the finless design in about 1950. The whole rocket was to be of conical shape, although the German report (by Helmut Groettrup) does not say why. Off hand, one can think of two reasons. It would be very easy to manufacture. And it might increase stability during take off to some small degree.

MAKE THINGS SIMPLE

In general, the German Collective tried to make everything extremely simple. Every welding seam, every screw or bolt was thoroughly checked with the end in view to eliminate its existence, if at all possible. They also tried to make everything work hydraulically instead of electrically. They completely avoided even the idea of so-called exotic fuels. The fuels they used in their calculations were kerosene or watered alcohol with liquid oxygen. When it came to rocket motors the German Collective did have a test stand at their disposal. But they never fired anything they had drawn.

Two more principles of the German Collective were to build all guidance equipment into the tail end for easier inspection and to start the fuel pump with compressed gas.

MAIN GOAL TOLD

The main goal of the German Collective, Groettrup reports, was to make the deadweight of a rocket as small as possible and the pay load as large as possible. This, of course, has been the main goal of all rocket engineers, but the German Collective carried it to some extremes. They went on the principle that a part which has been left out cannot cause trouble by malfunctioning. But it is also true that a part that has been left out may cause trouble because it should be there.

GERMANS NEVER TOLD

In any event the Russians never built the rocket which was called Project R–14. Maybe they felt that the extreme simplicity which the Germans advocated had been somewhat too extreme.

Naturally the Russians never told the Germans whether they would use any of their designs. The Germans do know that the Russians studied them but they seem to feel that is all that happened.

The Germans had been brought to Russia in 1945 and 1946. By 1950 there were rumors that they would be sent home. Then they heard additional rumors that things had gone wrong on the proving grounds. Nevertheless, they were kept for another 3 years. Then the Russians decided that they could not learn anything from their captives any more and brought them back to their native land.

Puerto Rico Does Itself Proud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 23, 1958

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to a most interesting and significant article by Constantine Brown, in the Saturday, May 17, issue of the Washington, D. C., Evening Star. Truthfully, one of the reasons why I have asked unanimous consent to have this article entitled "Puerto Rico Does Itself Proud" reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an extension of my remarks, is that it is complimentary to my people and their Government, but more than that, I feel that there is a message which we can take from Mr. Constantine Brown and from the other members of the press who have reported and commented on Vice President NIXON's goodwill trip to Latin America and some of the incidents which occurred. The reasons and motivations for the organized demonstrations have been and are being discussed in general. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is investigating this matter at the present time. I am sure that some of the agencies of the Government must also have investigations underway. I shall not offer comment on this aspect of the matter.

The message which I see, however, from reports of the incidents, is that while the world has always had struggles, solutions are always found for the most puzzling problems, and very valid suggestions are being currently made with regard to the recent episodes.

We should not be too discouraged and too heavy-hearted over such episodes. Our Vice President proved equal to the situations when confronted with them, and upon his return he indicated that, regrettable as they were, he did not believe them as bad as they appeared to us from this long distance. They seemed to be the irrational behavior of irresponsible, isolated mobs, inspired and encouraged by the enemies of our form of government. But more than that, they revealed a problem, which we now will study and find the solution for. The problem is what shall each of us do to strengthen the hemispheric solidarity which is so important to the free world; what shall we do so that everyone understands the importance of maintaining that solidarity.

We share with the Spanish-American countries the same Western Hemisphere, and our boundaries from the rest of the world are the same oceans. If we are to protect our way of life, if these continents are to remain the great hope of mankind, we must do it together and against the same enemy. Our economies complement one another. The South American countries need what we have to sell, and we need what they produce. It is the most natural kind of a partnership. And it is a spirit of partnership that needs be our inspiration. Being

good neighbors does not imply merely a warm and free greeting, but includes, in addition, perceptive understanding, mutual interdependence, and common action. South America needs the United States, and the United States needs South America. There is considerable to be accomplished in comprehending one another's mutual problems and in assisting one another with these problems. It should not be too much of a job once all of us start working on the task.

Now we have been alerted to a problem as we were similarly alerted by the first sputnik. The first news of Sputnik I inspired us to activity as perhaps nothing else might have done. Will the unpleasant experience of the Vice President similarly awaken and inspire us to an activity which will make both our partners and ourselves stronger? Already there are indications that it will.

I say this as a citizen of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, a free people living under the United States flag and vested with United States citizenship. If a little island like Puerto Rico, with the help and encouragement of the great United States, can in such a short span of time improve its economy and its institutions and inspire its people to the point where they, in turn, inspire other peoples of the world—and all of this without any natural resources whatsoever—then what of the South American countries with the great wealth of their resources and the potential might of their populations, if similar common attitudes were adopted? Mr. Constantine Brown hints of this in his article which he concludes by saying:

"We like to think that all Latin American nations, however backward, can emulate the Puerto Rican example with encouragement."

The article follows:

PUERTO RICO DOES ITSELF PROUD—PEOPLE OF SELF-IMPROVED NATION GAVE NIXONS SINCERE WELCOME

(By Constantine Brown)

Once again the little island of Puerto Rico has played a part in the news of world affairs that gives Americans everywhere a feeling of pride and satisfaction.

When Vice President NIXON visited Lima, Peru; Bogotá, Colombia, and Caracas, Venezuela, he was jeered, insulted, pelted with garbage and offal, spat upon and threatened with physical violence by organized mobs. It is probably true that these hoodlums were not representative of the peoples of these Latin American Republics. The evidence is strong enough that they were ignorant, emotional mobs whose fears and superstitions were preyed upon by the Communists and perhaps by other interested minority groups anxious to embarrass the United States.

The Vice President and his courageous wife, after adding luster and dignity to their own reputations and the reputation of the United States, flew to San Juan, Puerto Rico, for the last night of their Latin American tour. There they were welcomed by the able Gov. Luis Munoz Marin and his aids. But most important of all, they were greeted with warmth and enthusiasm by Puerto Ricans all along the streets of the island capital.

Now, Puerto Ricans are just about the same kind of Latin Americans as Venezuelans or Peruvians or Colombians. The island, long a colony of Spain, then a possession and later a Territory of the United States, is now a self-governing Commonwealth, proud of its association with the United States. But there have been days when bitter anti-Yanqui sentiment was open in Puerto Rico, and only a few years ago a few nationalist fanatics attempted the assassination of President Truman, of Governor Munoz, and actually did shoot up the House of Representatives.

There was none of this fanaticism evident when the Nixons arrived at San Juan, for the reason that there is almost none of it left. The Puerto Ricans who clamored to shake the Vice President's hand were proud to be Americans. They shouted "Viva les Estados Unidos" with sincerity and gusto.

Why the immense difference between the Puerto Ricans and their Latin brothers to the south? There has been as much poverty, as much hardship, as long a tradition of oppression in Puerto Rico as anywhere else in the Western Hemisphere. There could be, on that basis alone, plenty of reasons for hostility in San Juan as well as in Caracas—perhaps more so, since the Venezuelan capital is the center of a wealthy oil industry and of other natural resources, lacking in Puerto Rico, on which to build a higher standard of living for the people.

There is an answer, and it is the same answer as that which has brought statesmen and dignitaries from all over the world to see the astounding accomplishments in Puerto Rico over a brief span of years. The Puerto Ricans, with encouragement but not direct dollar aid from the United States, have created a show window for democracy and economic freedom. They have done it on almost nothing. The island has no coal, no oil, no minerals of importance. Its economy had been for years a poverty-stricken one based on sugar. Today Puerto Rico is prospering, with a host of new industries, new highways, new housing. The death rate has plunged; disease is retreating, people are finding hope and confidence.

Foreign aid of the United States since the end of World War II has climbed into many billions of dollars. Much of it—not enough, Latin Americans say—has gone to our sister Republics to the south. Yet there is nothing in all the world to equal the great accomplishments evident in Puerto Rico—and these gains have been made by the Puerto Ricans themselves in what they quite accurately have called Operation Bootstrap.

The welcome afforded to Mr. and Mrs. Nixon in San Juan ought to remind Americans generally that the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is a prized part of the American heritage. The Puerto Ricans are proud of their American citizenship, and rightly so. We in the mainland United States are proud of the Puerto Ricans, especially for the display they make to us and to all the world of the fruits of their own determination and industry.

We like to think that all Latin American nations, however backward, can emulate the Puerto Rican example, with encouragement.

Labor Legislation Should Be Passed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 23, 1958

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding newspapers in my district is the Daily Home News of New Brunswick, N. J. This paper has proven objective in its reporting, and it has always campaigned in the broad public interest. Its editorials merit respect.

A recent Home News editorial on the subject of labor legislation seems to me to be particularly well balanced and to the point. Under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include this editorial appearing on May 19, 1958, entitled "Labor Legislation Should Be Passed."

The editorial follows:

LABOR LEGISLATION SHOULD BE PASSED

It would be a great loss to the country, and a blot upon the Congress, if no labor legislation at all were to emerge from Washington this year. In the present condition of confusion and hesitation, that danger certainly exists.

Congress is besieged with labor bills which range all the way from the mildest of measures to punitive proposals whose clear purpose is to damage legitimate organized labor.

Obviously there can be no place on our statute books for destructive legislation. But neither will any sound objective be served by the passage of weak, watered-down bills having the appearance but not the real substance of regulation.

The 1957 congressional inquiry into labor's affairs revealed an acute need for proper disclosure and policing of the finances of unions and their officials. It also showed that stiff controls are required to keep unions out of the hands of gangsters and racketeers.

Out of the welter of legislation now in the hopper, out of the testimony being taken by the Senate subcommittee, must come some program which meets those needs.

At first it seemed that labor was unwilling to concede there was a need. Fortunately for his stature as labor's head and a leading public figure, AFL–CIO President George Meany has now seen fit to approve a list of bills which would accomplish regulation of union financial affairs.

He and others still resist, however, any effort to assure democracy and freedom from criminality in union management. They take the view that this is labor's business.

The difficulty is that labor unions today are heavily invested with the public interest. Gangsters in control cannot only cripple the economy at a stroke, but exact vast tribute from an often unsuspecting public. Caution in regulation is wise. But this is no place for the gentle hand.

Marine Safety Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 23, 1958

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on record as supporting the position of the State of Michigan as set out in the following resolution:

Whereas Gov. G. Mennen Williams has created a commission to study water safety in order to encourage even more people to use Michigan's waters and to prevent deaths and accidents when they do; and

Whereas Governor Williams has specifically charged the commission with the responsibility of reviewing Michigan's relations with other States and with the Federal Government on water-safety matters to the end that there can be a greater uniformity of effort and application of water laws and regulations; and

Whereas the commission includes representation from over 35 public agencies, private organizations, and individuals; and

Whereas the commission has reviewed applicable State and Federal laws affecting pleasure boating; and

Whereas the commission has carefully observed the efforts of the Council of State Governments, in cooperation with the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives, to develop legislation to further boating safety and the uniformity of boating laws, which efforts culminated in the introduction of H. R. 11078 in the Congress; and

Whereas the commission, after study and reflection, is convinced that H. R. 11078 would further boating safety, provide for identification of motorboats, assure reciprocity between the States, eliminate existing confusion over jurisdiction between Federal responsibility in favor of State action, and stimulate statewide enforcement of marine-safety regulations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Michigan Water Safety Study Commission heartily endorses H. R. 11078 and urges its prompt passage by the Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the commission's executive secretary transmit a copy of this resolution to each member of the Michigan congressional delegation.

Dual Support Goals Are Called Threat to Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for consideration of the Members an article from the May 11, 1958, edition of the Fresno (Calif.) Bee newspaper. The arictle reports on the observations of Dr. Hedges, of the University of California, with respect to the problem of cotton. I particularly invite the Members' attention to the fact that Dr. Hedges emphasizes that there are two classes of cotton producers and that any sound program for cotton must recognize this fact and establish different programs for each of them if the interest of the noncommercial cotton growers is to be considered at all rather than our present emphasis of orienting support programs toward the least efficient producer.

The article reads as follows:

DUAL SUPPORT GOALS ARE CALLED THREAT TO COTTON

BAKERSFIELD, KERN COUNTY.—A recommendation that the Federal Government separate the problem of substandard incomes from that of commercial agriculture as one of several necessary steps to save the cotton industry from disastrous effects to present and past policy, was made today in a survey by the Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics.

Dr. Trimble R. Hedges, of the University of California, department of agricultural economics at Davis, made a strong plea for support of measures suggested in the survey. He spoke before the San Joaquin Valley Council of the California State Chamber of Commerce.

MIXED OBJECTIVES

"Basic failures of past and present Federal cotton programs stem from mixed objectives and refusal to face economic facts," the survey maintained.

"Two major problem areas exist in agriculture, one concerning low-income noncommercial rural people and the other involving commercial farmers who produce 80 percent of the farm products that go to market on about one-fourth of the farms. One program will not deal effectively with both groups."

CORRECTION NOT ENOUGH

After citing the ills which have developed from past efforts, the foundation concluded, "Correcting the mistakes will not get back the lost markets," and suggested economic criteria for a Federal cotton program should include:

1. Employ farm resources in most effective use.
2. Encourage improved efficiency and lower costs.
3. Choose policies assuring minimum interference with domestic and foreign market prices.
4. Leave maximum freedom in decision-making to individual growers.
5. Minimize cost to the public from either payments out of the Treasury or supporting prices above competitive levels.
6. Limit price and income support policy for agriculture to disaster prevention.

COTTON OVERPRICED

The foundation notes that modern methods permit profits for growers at lower prices than present support levels. It charges supports have overpriced cotton and other products, and thus:

1. Kept farms in production which otherwise would have gone out.
2. Prevented efficient farms from expanding production to make the most economic use of their resources.
3. Priced United States cotton out of the foreign market while holding an umbrella over foreign growers and thus stimulating their production.
4. Encouraged synthetic production, with resultant loss of cotton markets both at home and abroad.

Commendatory Letters Supporting the Work and Activity of the Small Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 23, 1958

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from letters received by the Small Business Administration expressing appreciation by owners and operators of small-business concerns for services performed by that agency.

In thanking the agency for financial assistance when other avenues were closed to him, the owner of a men's wear retail store in Bakersfield, Calif., wrote that it is wonderful that the small-business man has someone to turn to for help. The loan enabled the merchant to move to a bigger and better location where his sales volume increased and the loan is being paid off with regularity.

A La Crosse, Wis., garment manufacturer wrote in February of this year thanking the Small Business Administration's Philadelphia regional office for aid in securing a bond bailment of a contract with a Government purchasing agency. The Wisconsin company's president drew attention to the special circumstances surrounding the bailment which the Small Business Administration was able to help overcome, with the result that procedural changes were allowed and the garment company obtained its contract.

Meanwhile, in Richmond, Va., a furniture company, low bidder on a $175,000 order to supply furniture for Sewatt Air Force Base, Tenn., was being excluded pending settlement of the question of whether his company was big enough to handle the order.

With the expiration date close at hand, the company president appealed to the Small Business Administration and the Small Business Administration really got on the ball. The agency arranged examination of the company's facilities and issued, a certificate of competence for the General Services Administration. Without the Small Business Administration's intervention, the company president said, it might have lost the contract. He expressed his appreciation for this much-needed agency, and urged its continuance in a letter to his representative.

The thorough planning which goes into loan assistance was appreciated by a San Francisco department store seeking a loan from a San Jose bank for construction of a new store. Assisting in arranging the requested $41,500 loan, the agency was praised by the borrower for its help in thinking through this whole expansion program. A resulting lower construction bid than had been anticipated allowed the company to pay off a first mortgage of $16,500 and to plan for earlier repayment of the loan.

The services of the Small Business Administration are available also to small firms in all Territories of the United States. Its work drew recognition from Honolulu where, according to a merchant there, its pamphlets and brochures are accepted as gospel. Particularly is this true, the merchant wrote the agency, of Small Business Administration's Small Marketers Aids. Removed geographically as they are from the mainland, they have perhaps a greater appreciation of the valuable information contained in these brochures, the Hawaiian merchant wrote.

A manufacturer in Nebraska wrote crediting the work of the Kansas City, Mo., regional director and his staff for their assistance in obtaining a $60,000 loan which helped his firm manufacture a new product. The sales volume of the new product required his employing additional personnel "and we are constantly adding more," he said. The resultant sales volume enabled the company to meet prior obligations, the manufacturer said, "and since you have contributed so much to make our progress possible we want to express our deep appreciation."

The Small Business Administration loan-assistance program embraces numerous kinds of businesses, such as the food distributor who sought a loan to erect a new cold storage plant. He voiced his appreciation to the Regional Director at the Boston Small Business Administration Office, for aid in building his Cambridge plant and added that "we

know that without the spadework which you did for us" the success of the loan application would have been very much in doubt.

More unusual is the letter received from a construction company executive who failed to obtain a contract, although he had obtained a bond for the contract through the Small Business Administration. "The fact that I missed the job by $30,000 is not too important," he wrote. "The real significance is that you fellows fired me up to the extent that I returned to the bonding company with a comprehensive financial statement." He is now squared away on bidding for new contracts, he wrote.

Often the acknowledgment of assistance rendered by the Agency comes from sources other than the applicant. A Delaware attorney wrote to the Small Business Administration on behalf of an applicant for loan assistance and told the Philadelphia Regional Office that the applicant's problems had been satisfactorily worked out and that the borrower was particularly appreciative of the courteous treatment extended to him.

Informed by the Small Business Administration of the plans to assist a small business located in his area, an important South Carolina civic leader wrote the branch manager in Charlotte, N. C., that he was delighted to learn of the small corporation's eligibility for a loan. He said the SBA assistance to the company "makes it possible for more than 400 people to earn a livelihood. The agricultural income in the community is small," he wrote, "and the industry provides one of the major sources of income in this section."

The Philadelphia Regional Office was told by a residential real estate developer seeking a loan that "the intelligent explanations given were the best I have ever received from any Government office and equal to any I have ever had in private industry." He added that it was "refreshing to know that in some branches of our Government we have such great efficiency."

A Durango, Colo., office supply company, enclosing a check for payment on a modernization loan arranged by the Small Business Administration wrote that "we could not have made this advantageous move without your wonderful help. Again, thanks a million."

A simliar note was received from a California industrial minerals company official whose organization was quickly repaying $4,000 which had been disbursed on a $15,500 loan. Requesting cancellation of the undisbursed portion, he wrote that business had expanded beyond the volume for the previous year. Thanking the Small Business Administration for its advice and guidance, he said that it had been of "genuine constructive assistance to us and you may be sure it has been greatly appreciated."

Advice and assistance other than financial is frequently supplied by the Agency, exemplified by the services proffered to an Oakland, Calif., meat packer seeking reinstatement of inspection services so that he could again supply meats to the Army. The Small Business Administration was instrumental in reinstating inspection services for the packer, who wrote the Agency that "the cooperation and help we received from your office of the Small Business Administration were beyond our greatest hopes. I am convinced that the SBA is doing a wonderful job in behalf of the small-business man."

In Texas, a Dallas manufacturer wrote that his organization is "in a much better position to secure and successfully handle various Government contracts" because of Small Business Administration assistance.

"Our bank," wrote an Oklahoma construction official, "on learning you were willing to make us the loan, decided to go ahead and loan it all themselves."

Other banks have recognized the part the Small Business Administration plays in bolstering the small-business man. The San Francisco regional director received a communication from a banker in that city who said that "the excellent manner in which you and members of your office have worked with our bank has been mentioned to me several times and has just been called to my attention again."

In Jackson, Mich., another banker commented on SBA handling of a loan to a company employing 40 persons which was facing dissolution. According to the banker, the company's "situation was critical" and "the organization would have had to discontinue business, as all other financial avenues were closed, if you had not given constructive financial assistance." The loan enabled the company to obtain a new contract and the chances appear "very favorable for the continuance and profitable operation of this important local industry," the banker wrote.

A small firm in Sacramento wrote to the agency after successfully bidding on an Air Force repair, overhaul, and maintenance contract with the Small Business Administration's help. "The contract represents quite an extensive step in the growth of our small company and we feel that the help received from your office was a definite contributing factor in our being awarded this contract. The Small Business Administration should be complimented on the caliber of people who represent the agency. It is our sincere wish that the Small Business Administration continue its function."

Awareness of the functions of the Small Business Administration has contributed not only to small businesses but to lending agencies helping to finance such businesses. A Council Bluffs, Iowa, bank wrote that not only was it "impressed with the speed with which all matters pertaining to this loan were handled" but that "having had such a favorable experience we will have less hesitancy in being a part of subsequent participations."

These letters comprise only a few of the communications commenting favorably upon the assistance to small businesses by this agency. Nevertheless, they offer indications that not only does the need exist for such assistance but that it is growing as the part played by the Small Business Administration receives greater recognition.

Purely aside from disaster loans, lending assistance to companies whose collateral assets lies outside the requirements of local lending agencies and participation in loans with local lending agencies, the Small Business Administration performs other functions without which many companies might be restricted in their activities because of the complex welter of details involved.

These include planning and advice for businesses considering expansion; assistance in procurement of set-aside segments of Government contracts; assistance to lending agencies unfamiliar with the procedures in participation loans to small business, and publication and distribution—upon request—of pamphlets and brochures containing marketing advice, information on new products developed by other companies, management tips, information on international trade possibilities for small business and numerous other aids to assist small businesses in solving their problems, to grow and provide jobs and profit in the constantly changing world of commerce and industry.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 23, 1958

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution passed unanimously by approximately 5,000 representatives of the Ohio division of the Polish-American Congress on the occasion of Polish Constitution Day on May 11, 1958. On that day the ceremonies sponsored by the Polish American Congress, the Polish Legion of American Veterans, the Polish Army Veterans Associations, the Polish National Alliance, and many other Polish organizations were a demonstration of the desire of Americans of Polish descent for the restoration of freedom of Poland. On that occasion the assembled persons were addressed by the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, Governor of Michigan, as the principal speaker:

Whereas since its very inception 14 years ago, the Polish American Congress stands unalterably opposed to communism and condemns its tyranny, its insidious designs for world conquest and its suppression of civil liberties. We cannot agree with those few American statesmen, politicians, and publicists, who insist on regarding Poland as a Communist country, and would deny the Polish people any help from the United States; and

Whereas it is true that Poland is presently governed by a very insignificant minority of adherents to the Moscow-dominated Communist Party. This situation, however, is not of Poland's free choice. It has been forced on Poland by treacherous means of Red conspiracy and with tacit consent of the West. Poland's 28 million people continue loyally dedicated to democratic principles; and

Whereas throughout her 1,000-year history, Poland, as a powerful nation on the ramparts of Christendom, has offered time and

again proof of her steadfast and unyielding allegiance to the tentes and democratic ideals of western civilization, mainly, her last effort as a subjugated ally of the Western Powers during World War II; and

Whereas this noble tradition of 10 centuries cannot be changed by Communist oppression of recent years. Historically, traditionally, culturally—the Polish people are not susceptible to Communist persuasion and will never accept it even in the face of overwhelming pressure from the Kremlin; and

Whereas a Poland, broken in spirit through our indifference to her plight, to her rights, and to her deeds of the past, would be a major calamity for the West for we cannot emphasize too strongly that a free Poland is the real key to peace in Europe. We strongly urge continued assistance to Poland not only in the form of surplus commodities but of credits to help build her consumer industry; and

Whereas we commend the stand of the President of the United States and the Secretary of State against a hasty and ill prepared summit conference between the heads of governments of the free world and the Communist bloc; and

Whereas it is our considered opinion, that in addition to undeserved gains in propaganda value, the Soviet Union is striving to create among the subjugated nations within the Red empire an impression that the West, by implications, if not by written consent, is accepting the intolerable status quo among the captive nations in central and east central Europe; and

Whereas if the United States decides upon a summit conference with Soviet leaders we strongly urge that the first prerequisite of such a conference, should be a demand by the United States for the liberation of the satellite nations and under no circumstances should the United States agree that liberation of Poland from Communist rule is an internal matter for the Poles to determine. The Red regime was forced on the Poles by acts of omission from the West and restoration of her liberty is a world responsibility; and

Whereas we further believe that American foreign policy would gain immeasurably in stature in central Europe if the United States would now take effective steps to ratify Poland's western boundaries as agreed at the Potsdam Conference. It is an indisputable fact that the formal ratification of Poland's western boundaries along the Oder-Neisse Rivers would deprive the Soviet Union of her only claim for keeping Soviet troops in Poland under the guise of helping Poland protect her western boundaries; and

Whereas we further believe that the United States should expose the fraud presently being perpetrated by the Soviets and the present Communist regime in Poland that the hundreds of thousands of Poles taken from their homeland to Soviet slave labor camps by the Communists in the early phases of World War II are now being returned to Poland. The United States should not be misled by the so-called reproachment between the present Communist regime of Poland and Moscow rulers regarding the Polish repatriates. The United States should proclaim to the world that any continued imprisonment of these gallant Poles in Russia is a violation of the United Nations Charter which the Soviets have signed, and is in violation of the accepted conduct of civilized nations; and

Whereas we should treat Russian's move to suspend nuclear tests with suspicion. The Russians will never deviate from their goal of world conquest. While talking about peace and suspension of nuclear tests, the Reds are building the world's greatest war machine. The Polish-American Congress feels that it would be a tragic mistake to recognize the so-called Rapacki plan to create a nuclear-free buffer zone in central Europe because it is clearly apparent that the Soviet Union has authorized this move merely because the Soviets themselves are fearful of giving their satellite captives nuclear weapons; and

Whereas we feel that for too long American policy has been on the defensive regarding our dealings with the Communists. We feel that a firm and decisive policy toward the Soviet Union will have the most effective results toward world peace and one such area where decisive action can be taken now is for the United States Congress to adopt the recommendations of a select committee of the United States Congress which in 1952 indicated the Communists for the Katyn massacre and urged that the Soviet Union be tried before the International World Court; and

Whereas we further strongly urge our State Department to demand of the Polish Government that the $1 CARE food packages be admitted into Poland for general distribution to relieve hunger and privation—as a condition of any further discussions with the Polish Government on cultural and economic exchanges; and

Whereas historians justly speak of Jamestown colonists as the "Beginners of the Nation" and Poles were among them, being instrumental in building the first factory in America, the historic Glasshouse, and in manufacturing resin byproducts, contrary to popular beliefs, created by ethnic prejudices at the turn of the century, Americans of Polish origin are not latecomers to American shores, their heritage reaches the earliest epoch of American history that in October of 1958, 350 years will have passed since the landing of the first Poles in Jamestown, founded in 1607 as the first permanent English settlement in the New World. We call upon all Poles and all Polish-American organizations to commemorate the 350th anniversary of the coming of the first Poles to America and to join with the Polish-American Congress the national observance planned throughout our country: Be it therefore

Resolved, That freedom and independence are and always will be a permanent goal of our Nation's policy. We pledge our moral and all material resources to help Poland in her difficult progress toward full freedom—and to support American policy in its search for a just and lasting peace and international security in a world where freedom reigns.

LEONARD J. WOLĘDZKO,
Chairman.
WALTER DWORAKOWSKI,
STANLEY SAMOK,
JERZY DOMANSKI,
W. OSIKA.

Nixon Plagiarizes Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 23, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Is NIXON Un-Republican?" which appeared in the North Virginia Sun of May 22, 1958:

IS NIXON UN-REPUBLICAN?

Attention all investigators and members for the un-Republican activities committee:

The Northern Virginia Sun has just come into possession of convincing evidence that (hold on to your seats) Vice President NIXON is hewing to the Trumanist line.

Upon his return from his recent South American trip, the Vice President told the crowd that greeted him at the airport, "the only war the people of the United States want to wage is a war against poverty, misery, diseases, wherever it exists in the world."

Investigators and members of the un-Republican activities committee will note the almost word-for-word similarity between Mr. NIXON's words and those of Mr. Truman of May 24, 1951:

"The only kind of war we seek is the good old fight against man's ancient enemies * * * poverty, disease, hunger, and illiteracy."

One might be willing to pass off the similarity as mere coincidence, were it not for the fact that this was not the first time Mr. NIXON had followed this particular Trumanist line.

But what is one to conclude when one considers that in 1954, Mr. NIXON said, "If we can find the road to peace, for the first time in history, man can launch a winning war on poverty, disease and misery in the world, and that is the only war the people of the United States want to wage."

Actually, we hope that the un-Republican activities committee will treat Mr. NIXON with mercy, for the thought expressed is, we believe, a noble and worthy one, no matter what its origin or what its author or spokesman.

We Want Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from one of the many, many constituents who want peace comes a copy of a letter written to the Governor of Michigan.

The letter follows:

HASTINGS, MICH., *November 22, 1957.*
The Honorable G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
Office of the Governor,
Lansing, Mich.

DEAR GOVERNOR WILLIAMS: Thank you for your exceptionally nice letter and serious sideration of the paper on Political Expediency.

This time I most respectfully request your thought and help on the concept of Women Around the World Outlawing War—enough of this hateful, wasteful nonsense—say we. This might seem like an overly ambitious giant step, but break it down to the basic, primitive law of nature—mothers protecting the young and innocent—and it is as right and reasonable as can be.

Since we have made friends with the Germans and the Japanese after war, isn't it a sensible shortcut to make friends with the Russians prior to war, with its many innocent victims on both sides.

We as people have to do something for ourselves to maintain traditional independence. It is neither right nor healthy to place all burdens on the politicians.

Peace is not inherited—excerpt from a letter by Dr. G. P. Bidder to the London Times, November 1939:

"Too many people think and speak as if peace were the natural state of the world, disturbed from time to time by wicked men like Alexander, Napoleon, and Hitler.

"There is no peace in Nature; peace is the greatest product of the human intellect. The world will have peace some time, for man is very great and becomes greater. Let us abstain from the folly of pretending again that we shall have peace by the removal of Hitler, or the Nazis, or Stalin.

"If our minds are great enough now and our ideals are wise enough, the best men among us may set a new order in the world which will give it peace—trebling the value of every man's work and his time for happiness.

"This year, next year, in a hundred years, in a thousand years, this will be attained. Peace will not be won by conquest or obliteration; it must be invented and constructed and maintained by endless effort, such as is now given to the perfection of war."

All good wishes.

Very sincerely,

ANGIE LEA CASE WAIT,
Member of the President's Committee for Traffic Safety.

Resolution of Catholic War Veterans Against Reduction of National Guard Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the New York Democratic delegation has heretofore protested to the Department of Defense the proposal of that Department to reduce the strength of the National Guard. I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following resolution adopted by the Kings County chapter of the Catholic War Veterans on April 25, 1958, recording that organization in opposition to the proposed cut:

"RESOLUTION 32

"Whereas the Department of the Army is proceeding with plans to reduce the Army National Guard strength by approximately 30 percent for the fiscal year 1959; and

"Whereas the House Armed Services Committee, following 2 weeks of hearings, unanimously adopted Resolution 1—which provides for maintaining the strength of the guard for the fiscal year 1959 at the current 400,000 for sufficient funds for an input of 55,000 nonprior servicemen into 6 months' training, and directed that the revised troop basis for the Army National Guard be developed with the approval of the States and Territories; and

"Whereas the proposed reduction will require the discharge of 1,700 full-time employees of the guard and the elimination of 5,000 officers and warrant officers, the great majority of them highly trained in military skills; and

"Whereas the loss of these officers constitutes a writeoff of a valuable national resource and military skills at a time when the Pentagon is pressing for an increase in pay to attract and retain such competent personnel; and

"Whereas the proposed reduction would effect a wholesale elimination of units who are a vital part of the Nation's trained Reserve force, and a writeoff of millions of dollars invested over the years in the training of these units, and would adversely affect the security of our country, especially in these uncertain times; and

"Whereas the economy of the communities where National Guard units would be eliminated will be adversely affected: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Kings County chapter, Catholic War Veterans go on record as opposed to reduction in the strength of the Army National Guard for the fiscal year 1959 and that the recommendations of the House Armed Services Committee—to maintain the strength of the guard at 400,000 for the fiscal year 1959, to allow sufficient funds for the input of 55,000 nonprior service men into 6-months training, and that any revised troop basis for the Army National Guard be developed with the approval of the States and Territories—be adhered to by the Department of the Army; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the State and national departments of the Catholic War Veterans for concurrent action."

The above resolution was unanimously adopted by the Kings County chapter, Catholic War Veterans, at a regular county chapter meeting held at room 4, Boro Hall, Brooklyn, N. Y., on Friday evening, April 25, 1958, and is being forwarded for your information and guidance.

MARTIN J. O'REILLY, Jr.,
County Commander.

Postal Rates and Pay

SPEECH
OF
HON. TOM MURRAY
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following summary:

SUMMARY OF CONFERENCE REPORT—MAJOR POINTS

Postal pay: 7½ percent increase for all postal employees except level 20; temporary cost-of-living increase of 2½ percent for levels 1 through 6; 1½ percent for level 7; average increase of 10 percent; retroactive to January 1, 1958. Cost: (1) Annual, $265 million; (2) retroactive, $96 million (5 mo.).

Postal rates, revenue to be derived: Approximately $550 million when all rates are in effect.

First-class mail: Letters from 3 cents to 4 cents; airmail from 6 cents to 7 cents; postal and post cards from 2 cents to 3 cents; airmail post cars from 4 cents to 5 cents—effective August 1, 1958.

Second-class mail: Reading portion: Three 10-percent increases, first increase effective January 1, 1959.

Advertising portion: Three 18-percent increases, first increase effective January 1, 1959.

Minimum rate per piece: From one-eighth cent to one-fourth cent on January 1, 1959; to three-eighths cent on January 1, 1960; and to one-half cent on January 1, 1961. No increase on nonprofit, and so forth, organizations or for classroom use.

Controlled circulation: From 10 cents per pound for under 8 ounces and 11 cents per pound for over 8 ounces to a uniform 12 cents per pound, regardless of weight.

Third-class mail: Individual items—weighing less than 16 ounces—2 cents to 3 cents on first 2 ounces and 1 cent to 1½ cents on each additional ounce, effective January 1, 1959.

Books and catalogs: 2 cents to 3 cents on first 2 ounces and additional ounces; 1½ cents for each additional 2 ounces to 1½ cents for each additional ounce, effective January 1, 1959.

Bulk rates: Pound rate from 14 cents to 16 cents on circulars and merchandise, effective January 1, 1959; books and catalogs not increased. Minimum per piece rates from 1½ cents to 2 cents January 1, 1959, and to 2½ cents on July 1, 1960; bulk mailing fee increased from $10 to $20; odd sizes and shapes from 3 cents to 6 cents; no increase on nonprofit, and so forth, organizations until July 1, 1960, when the per piece minimum will be increased from 1 cent to 1¼ cents.

Books: Increased from 8 cents on the first pound and 4 cents on each additional pound to 9 cents on the first pound and 5 cents on each additional pound; extends rates to certain additional material. Continues existing library book rates and extends them to certain additional material.

Miscellaneous: 4-percent leeway before Postmaster General petitions ICC for increases in parcel post rates. Retirement contributions considered as a postal cost.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the motion to approve the conference report.

Hermann B. Deutsch—Journalist, Author, Broadcaster, Raconteur, Gourmet, Outdoorsman, and Citoyen Extraordinaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged last week to attend a testimonial dinner honoring Hermann B. Deutsch on the occasion of his 40th anniversary as a member of the repetorial staff of the New Orleans Item.

Forty of Mr. Deutsch's oldest friends were there to pay him homage on his 40th anniversary.

I was particularly grateful to be included in chosen 40 as Hermann Deutsch and myself started in the newspaper game in New Orleans almost simultaneously. The difference between us—and our ages—was that Hermann Deutsch was already a seasoned reporter when he became associated with the New Orleans Item and I was still in high school when I began writing sports for the Times-Picayune.

During the course of the years we became rivals in the field of news reporting and then competitors in the arena of political reporting. During those years we fought each other with every weapon at our command. There were no holds barred. It was our job to get the story and get it first and "damned be he who first cried, 'hold enough'." During all those years of rivalry we always had a respect for the other's ability which respect

caused to be cemented a personal friendship which has never sagged.

On the occasion of Hermann Deutsch's 40th anniversary I was particularly privileged to deliver to him a letter of felicitations from the President of the United States. It was a well-merited and well-deserved honor.

The things you should know about Hermann Deutsch and his career are best told in an editorial from his own newspaper, the New Orleans Item, and a story by one of his colleagues, the very able and competent Thomas Sancton, an author and splendid in his own right.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I now insert these two articles which so eloquently tell the story of Hermann B. Deutsch—journalist, author, broadcaster, raconteur, gourmet, outdoorsman, and citoyen extraordinaire.

"I Write as I Please"

The remarkable Mr. Deutsch—

How else can one sum up the abilities and the achievements of Hermann Bacher Deutsch, who this month marks his 40th year on the Item?

How else does one convey the astonishing capacity of one man to do so many things so well—whether it be writing or gardening, cooking or broadcasting, fishing or story telling, hunting or long-distance swimming (at which he once set a world's record)?

Hermann Deutsch's four decades on the Item are an exciting kaleidoscope of Louisiana and national history.

They embrace, as he himself noted some years ago:

"Two world wars, the coming and going of a prohibition interlude, the advent of women's suffrage, the final achievement of flood control over the Mississippi, the decline and fall of New Orleans' ancient political bossdom, the birth of radio and television, consignment of the city's legalized district of prostitution to the same limbo which earlier had received the Louisiana lottery, the genesis and dissolution of the Huey Long era, the flaming skyrocket rise of the Klan menace and its dark, sticklike disappearance."

On another occasion he observed that he also had covered the writing of Louisiana's 1921 constitution; the hanging of six men from the same gallows in a single execution; countless regular and (truly) extraordinary sessions of the legislature, Armistice Day celebrations, yacht races, doll dressing contests, murder trials, a Eucharistic Congress, the New Orleans visits of three Presidents, levee crevasses, and the award of prizes in a school essay contest.

Hermann Deutsch is first and foremost a great reporter, a distinguished member of the breed to whom the story is the thing, without regard to time or hardship in chasing it down.

At 69, he looks at today through today's eyes. His curiosity is undiminished. He yearns for new horizons, new adventures.

Would he like to go to sea on an aircraft carrier? He would and does. Would he like to hop to Europe or Latin America? He would and does. And through his phrase-turning, his readers go along too.

Did we say the remarkable Mr. Deutsch? It really should be the remarkable Dr. Deutsch or Professor Deutsch. For there is a doctorate of philosophy in biology from the University of Chicago and a spell at teaching in a West Virginia college.

"I Write As I Please" is how Hermann titled his daily column which he began in 1949. (He had been associate editor since 1942, then chief editorial writer after the late Marshall Ballard's retirement.) And he does write as he pleases. In the Item and elsewhere.

He has had more pieces than one would want to count in the Saturday Evening Post, Cosmopolitan, Esquire, Collier's, and, even prior to his New Orleans days, in the late Literary Digest and such now-forgotten publications as Every Week and Illustrated World. He has written books—and has two movies to his credit.

He's a man with formidable convictions, a massive fund of information, a willingness to debate, and strong lungs. With Hermann Deutsch around, there's never a dull moment. And, come to think of it, in a newsroom that's the way it ought to be.

Deutsch: 40 Years on the Item

(By Thomas Sancton)

Forty years ago this past Saturday, Hermann Deutsch—having arrived by paddle-wheel steamboat at a Mississippi landing several seasons earlier—walked into the Item office and found his destiny as one of modern journalism's great and enduring talents.

How does one describe the life and works, the ideas, the personality, of a man who for 40 years has pounded out millions of words on the dramatic and vivid interests of his life—millions of other words on his keen observations, his travels, his memories, his own beliefs, his deepest insights?

It would take a book—a large one, many faceted. In this space let is simply be noted how Hermann Deutsch came to New Orleans in 1915 and to the Item in 1918—a brilliant, aggressive youth who with a buddy, Don Higgins, hit town with some vague plans to "travel around the world."

One day recently, strolling with the interviewer along the shaded Metairie streets where Deutsch lives, he told how the journey started.

It began in Chicago, Higgins, just graduated from the University of Wisconsin, and Deutsch, fresh out of the University of Chicago, made the step which must be every cub's first step. They entered a newspaper office, approached the Olympian editor—gulped—and then asked for a job. The paper was the Chicago Journal.

The editor (cunning rascal) told Deutsch and Higgins, little realizing both were men of talent, there was but one job open; and they would have to fight for it.

For days thereafter they beat their brains out competing for the single job. They would cast malevolent glances at one another across the desk. Then one day—suddenly—they made their separate peace. They decided to share the job.

The work paid them a total of $15 a week. With two other roommates, each earning about the same amount, their pooled incomes made possible a princely way of life. The century was young. Money was really money.

Then, one day, it came—the wanderlust.

Deutsch and Don Higgins gave up their Chicago work and started south, to sail from New Orleans for a voyage around the world. They traveled by train to St. Louis, to catch a steamboat southbound.

There, however, they learned that the storied Mississippi steamboats had come on bad times. Indeed they had all but vanished The next passenger steamer south would not leave St. Louis for 17 days.

So the wanderers decided to spend the time on a side adventure.

Deutsch and Higgins caught a train to Watertown, downriver, then took the first beckoning road that led into the Ozark hills. At night they rented rooms from natives of the hills. It was a world of incredible discovery for two youths from the cement canyons of Chicago.

They met some old-timers in the mountains, who spoke like patriarchs of Abraham's days, and others who spoke like rubes on a Chicago stage.

Hermann Deutsch, years later, was to become a marksman of rare skill, a wingshot worthy to walk the dove and quail brush with the best hunters in the Deep South.

But he remembers still his astonishment at seeing long rifles on pegs above the fireplaces, and learning they were still used as regular hunting pieces.

Some, perhaps, were as old as the American Revolution.

"There was one old man who boarded us for a night," Hermann recalls, "who got down his long rifle as we talked of these things. It had an octagonal barrel. The old man said:

" 'I'm not much of a shot myself, because I flinch away from the flash. But my pappy, now, he could bark a squirrel at 100 yards.' "

Deutsch still recalls the amazement he and Higgins felt to realize they were talking to a hillman who hunted with a flintlock—long, long after the repeating rifle had ushered in the age of modern firearms, in the Civil War.

They returned to a river port, at the end of their unforgettable journey through the Ozark Mountains.

There they caught the southbound steamboat they had first seen almost 3 weeks earlier in St. Louis. The porter remembered them as the youths who had come aboard asking about passage south.

"It seemed the most natural thing in the world to him, apparently, that we should wait all that time to catch the boat," Deutsch said.

That was one of the many rich and subtle details of a changing world, a changing sense of time and purpose and leisure and outlook—that came to the youths as they moved down toward New Orleans between the high bluff banks of the Mississippi.

After switching steamboats farther down the river, they arrived here at a landing at Canal Street in a day when crude levees shored by rough timbers lined the waterfront. There were no modern docks.

"We were almost broke. I think Don and I had about $8 between us," Deutsch recalls. "So we ate our first breakfast here on a steamboat. Then we set out to explore."

It is hard to think of a time when Hermann Deutsch, who probably has put in type in 40 years as much authoritative eyewitness observation and accounting of personal experiences in Louisiana as has any journalist in generations—it is hard to think of a time when he set foot here for the very first time.

With Higgins he walked the first block along Canal Street. In the recent interview I asked: "Now, without the sentiment which the question almost begs to be expressed, tell me: Did you know from the first moment that New Orleans was your city?"

Hermann paused thoughtfully. Then he said:

"Yes, I think I did."

"As you left the river, what sight left the dominant impression on you, forever?"

"The Customhouse," said Deutsch.

The interviewer, remembering something else, then smiled at the mysteries of human taste and fashions.

"Forgive this beginner's presumption, but you do know that Mark Twain, in Life on the Mississippi, published in the 1880's, called that very customhouse the ugliest building in the world."

Deutsch, with a smile of unusual patience—Mark Twain of course being far removed from the field of disputations among living men—said:

"What Mark Twain saw as the ugliest building, I saw as one of the most impressive. And I believe that before I had walked half a dozen blocks out Canal Street I knew that New Orleans was my home."

Today, four decades later, he often defeats descendants of New Orleans founders on issues of New Orleans history and culture.

Hermann, who rushes to a rousing ink battle like a Viking with battleax, likes nothing

better than to be called a simpleton, to be villified by experts or called an ignoramus by an ignoramus.

This provides the opening for lively dispute. And no type of writing so rivets the attention of a reader—which is the instinctive goal of newsmen.

All these rousing and readible wars in the letters columns turn, usually, on the question of judgment. But the question is obscured, often, by Deutsch's opponents by charges of pig-headedness, or mossback prejudices.

But there are few people who ever worked with Deutsch who would be fool enough to call him a simpleton in the sense of a weak IQ. There are still fewer, doubtless, who would be inclined to gamble their own money in an IQ contest with Hermann Deutsch—or with any of his remarkable family, for that matter.

Hermann, for instance, long before his New Orleans arrival, had mastered the ability to write swift, expert shorthand. He had learned it in Cincinnati from "Old Man" Pittman himself, inventor of a basic school. On arriving in any new town, Hermann usually would drift to the local Underwood placement agencies which were flourishing in those days and, in routine fashion, he would be placed in a secretarial job—usually by the next day.

In New Orleans, he got his first job in this way at a big freight depot for a railway. This sustained him until a newspaper staff job opened. Higgins got a job eventually on a newspaper here. Both started their New Orleans careers in a newspaper era which often saw newspaper staffs crossing over like square dancers in a dosey-do line.

Deutsch worked at first for the Times-Picayune. Then he joined the States. He also did theatrical publicity work. In May 1918, Clarke Salmon of the Item sent for him.

"How much are you getting paid?" he asked the young reporter. The figure was $25. But the big issue, with the ambitious young Hermann Deutsch, was that no raises at all had come his way in a long time.

"I'll hire you for $35," said Salmon.

"I have 2 weeks' vacation coming to me on the States," answered Deutsch.

"I'll also give you your 2 weeks, beginning in a few days."

"I have a friend named Don Higgins, an excellent newspaperman," said Deutsch. "He would like to make a move, too."

"I know Higgins' work," said Salmon. "I'll hire the both of you."

That is how the Item's Hermann Deutsch, 40 years ago Saturday, joined the staff of this newspaper—where he was to pound out his millions of words; and to cast his own outline on the cultural horizons of the State; and to grow in commanding knowledge of politics, people, photography, sport, cuisine, geography—and just name it.

In time, also, he was to become indistinguishable from the newspaper he has served through more than half its own existence.

Nine years ago, he began to write his daily column. As associated editor, with long years of service in the grade, it never occurred to Hermann Deutsch to forbear to speak his own mind when the editorial page expressed policies he sometimes felt were unrealistic.

Unrealistic, however, is a genteel word for Associate Editor Deutsch's own salty blast-offs.

He has on occasion endorsed his own candidates; Eisenhower for one when the paper supported Adlai Stevenson. He has laughed scornfully on occasion at unrealistic projects cherished by the newspaper or by earnest and powerful groups—full educational TV, for one example; and, for other candidates or procedures of certain Jefferson Parish reform groups.

To some of his colleagues, one telling characteristic marks Hermann Deutsch now and forever as the craftsman who really cares. It is the sight of his studious concentration, his moving pen, as he goes wholeheartedly at the task of editing his own column—the painstaking scratching here; the writing in there; the change of a verb, an adjective: his trips to the dictionary, the atlas, the almanac to check his formidable memory.

Only those craftsmen who care chop away at their own work—whether it be in marble, paint, or the flimsy stuff of paper with lines etched by a pounded typewriter ribbon. Hermann cares about his work. He always did.

That is why, on his worst days as on the best, what he writes has indeed mattered.

It is the reason that, in 40 years, his written record in the columns of the New Orleans Item have piled up a Himalayan peak of information and it is why this record will serve future researchers, who need the accounts of such eyewitnesses and the opinions of such bold minds to write the basic histories of any time or place.

Let Down in Enthusiasm Over Our Education System's Improvement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been wondering about the let down in enthusiasm over improvements in our educational system, an enthusiasm which had reached fever pitch in the nation-wide concern over our lag in scientific know how.

Last week I was very interested to see a thoughtful analysis of this let down by our able news commentator, Malvina Lindsay in the Washington Post of May 15. Under unanimous consent I include Mrs. Lindsay's concerned discussion of this strange apathy as follows:

IN SPUTNIK'S WAKE—SCHOOL APATHY

(By Malvina Lindsay)

The public, which so recently was aroused over sputnik and eager to mass produce scientists and start crash programs in education generally, now is showing waning interest in this undramatic and long-range activity.

Bills providing aid to school construction seem to be bogged down in congressional committees by partisan wrangling. And Members of Congress are receiving relatively little mail concerning them. Yet their mail was heavy when legislation relating to pay television was before Congress.

Also in many communities the drive to counteract this Nation's lag in education has been stalled or detoured by indifference or by group controversy.

Is it that American grassroots sentiment responds only to acute crisis? Is our emphasis on material values so great that only legislation relating to things moves us? Are we incapable of interest in long-range goals?

Excitement over sputnik could not have been expected to continue at fever pitch. Nor could all the earnest resolves that grew out of that fright retain their burning zeal. But more followthrough was to be counted on from a people that had been fully informed about the weakness of their educational ramparts.

Meanwhile the need for action grows. A study of school overcrowding made public yesterday by the National Education Association shows that about 300,000 city grade-school children are on half-day schedules, compared with around 250,000 2 years ago. More than half of urban grade-school children are in overcrowded classes. Testimony before a House Education Subcommittee showed that about 800,000 children in all grades were on half-day schedules.

Oversized classes are one of the major handicaps to discovery and development of talent, to maintaining of discipline, and to helping each child realize his potentialities.

If the public is unmoved by educational lacks under its nose, small wonder it is even more unmoved by what those lacks are piling up on the horizon, namely, loss to the totalitarian world of the battle of productivity.

Not only scientists, but persons highly trained in all walks of life will be urgently needed if the economy of tomorrow is to expand rapidly enough. By 1965 a 35 percent increase in numbers of workers in professional and technical fields will be required, the United States Department of Labor estimates.

Two House education subcommittees have just approved a $240 million, 4-year aid program to improve science and language training in elementary and high schools. A $260 million program of scholarships and loans for science and mathematics students has also been approved. But the basis for such programs must be laid in all-round improved teaching and facilities in elementary schools.

Controversy over feudal domain in one form or another is largely responsible for slowing up educational defense. The bogey of Federal interference with State educational affairs causes some opposition to proposed legislation. Meanwhile, many States are not able or willing to step up adequately their own expenditures for education. But the effects of a lag in education in any region soon permeate the whole national economy, since the fruits of ignorance, like those of talent, cannot be confined within State borders.

While many parents now are deeply concerned about half-day schedules, overcrowded classes and deteriorating instruction in the schools their children attend, they do not seem to be able to take the political steps that would promote action to change this. Then, too, educational legislation lacks highly paid lobbyists and well-organized pressure forces. It lacks glamour, tangibility, and attention-getting devices. It faces the same problem as American foreign policy—that of getting public support for its long-range needs.

The more discouraged proponents of a bold, dynamic educational offensive say that the best hope for it would be for the Russians to put a man on the moon or to announce that as a result of Soviet productivity every man, woman, and child would receive a big Zil car. There may be danger of such salvation coming too late.

A Poll Among Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 23, 1958

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the results of a poll taken by Mr. Arthur A. Wolpin, head of the Department of Social Studies at Perth Amboy High School, Perth Amboy, N. J., among the students

in Problems of American Democracy on the questionnaire I recently sent to the constituents in my congressional district. I felt the results of this poll are of general interest.

The results of the poll follow:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN SHOULD KNOW WHAT YOU THINK

1. Do you believe that Soviet technological achievements indicate the need for greater expenditures for national defense? Yes, 187; no, 63; no opinion, 30.

2. Do you believe a need is indicated for greater Federal expenditures to improve the American education system? Yes, 234; no, 27; no opinion, 5.

3. Do you believe Congress should press for greater unification of the armed services in the Defense Department? Yes, 173; no, 75; no opinion, 32.

4. Would you favor complete unification of the armed services, putting all servicemen in a single uniform and reorganizing the Defense Department on the basis of strategic mission assignments? Yes, 33; no, 220; no opinion, 24.

5. Do you favor cuts in nondefense programs such as agriculture, water resource development, etc., in order to permit larger expenditures for national defense and scientific development? Yes, 38; no, 221; no opinion, 24.

6. Do you consider our overseas mutual security program an essential part of our national defense effort? Yes, 206; no, 22; no opinion, 49.

7. Do you favor President Eisenhower's reciprocal trade program? Yes, 91; no, 42; no opinion, 149.

8. If a choice had to be made between a balanced budget and providing adequate funds for national security, do you believe first priority should be given to national security? Yes, 190; no, 57; no opinion, 22.

9. Do you favor Federal legislation aimed at preventing the misuse of labor-management welfare and pension funds? Yes, 215; no, 23; no opinion, 40.

10. Do you believe that Congress should go beyond welfare fund legislation and attempt to police general union finances, election procedures, etc.? Yes, 94; no, 134; no opinion, 52.

Speech of Hon. Francis E. Dorn, of New York, Before the Legislature of the Republic of Costa Rica

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 23, 1958

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I include, under leave to extend my remarks, a speech which was made in the Spanish language by my good friend and colleague, the Honorable FRANCIS E. DORN of New York, before the legislature of the Republic of Costa Rica. Congressman DORN was recently designated a member of the United States delegation to attend the ceremonies occasioned by the inauguration of His Excellency Señor Don Mario Echandi Jiménez as President of the Republic of Costa Rica, held at San José during the week of May 7, 1958.

At a time when our official relations south of the border have been strained, it is extremely heartening that a Member of this Congress was able to make such a highly effective appearance before the Costa Rican Legislature. Congressman DORN, who was selected by the Speaker to represent the Congress of the United States during these important ceremonies, has rendered a service to his country which deserves our gratitude and our admiration. The fact that he was able to deliver his remarks in the Spanish language has left an impression upon our South and Central American neighbors which is indeed welcome at this period of stress in hemispheric solidarity:

I feel very close to Costa Rica, because my wife, who was born in Central America, looks upon your country as her second home, having recuperated in Costa Rica for 1 year from a serious illness in your salubrious climate and her love for your country and its citizens has become my love.

The glorious history of our two countries has evolved in both a traditional respect for the rights of man founded on equality and universal suffrage for all.

As our countries have a common love of liberty, so we have a common contempt of those who would tear down that liberty, and are united in a common stand of mutual protection and mutual understanding and mutual help against the common foe of us both, communism.

Although tired and weary from my labors in the United States Congress, I nevertheless felt that the importance of the Costa Rican inauguration warranted my taking the arduous nonstop trip from Washington to Costa Rica.

This immediately proved worthwhile from the moment when I was met at the beautiful new airport of Costa Rica by a delegation from this assembly. My heart was warmed by the cordiality of the greeting and the glow that was then enkindled by your representatives, and this has been constantly refired by your hospitality.

I will carry to the United States Congress and to the people of my country a "simpatico" in the form of a torch burning in my heart which will light similar fires in the hearts of the citizens of my country so that we will continue to work together forever in the common cause of true world peace.

Honor Representative O'Brien of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 23, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, in an unprecedented action, the House, on Thursday, paid unusual and high tribute to one of its colleagues, the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, of the Sixth District of Illinois. Through speedy and unanimous adoption of H. R. 12613, the membership of this great body showed its esteem for TOM O'BRIEN, and gave recognition to his fine qualities for leadership. The House determined that the lock and dam to be constructed on the Calumet River, Ill., between turning basin No. 5, at Lake Calumet, and the junction of the Little Calumet River and Grand Calumet River, such lock and dam to be located at approximately 134th Street, shall be known and designated hereafter as the Thomas J. O'Brien Lock and Dam.

It was my pleasure to call up this bill and request approval of it. I was elated when this request received unanimous consideration because it gave positive proof of the high esteem in which our colleague, TOM O'BRIEN, is held by the Members of this body.

Under leave to do so, I would like to include with my remarks an editorial which appeared in a Calumet City newspaper:

HONOR REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN

Perhaps the most unheralded man behind the tremendous progress that has been made on the Calumet-Sag Channel improvement project in recent years is Congressman THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Democrat, Sixth District.

One of the pioneers in Congress—he recently marked his 80th birthday—Congressman O'Brien has taken a personal interest in the Cal-Sag project because of its tremendous importance to the industrial future and the workingmen of Chicago.

It was through O'BRIEN'S quiet influence that the entire Illinois congressional delegation was lined up behind the Cal-Sag project. He has consistently led the fight for appropriations year after year.

As a result of his efforts, the Cal-Sag project is well on its way to completion. Bids have already been advertised for a 1,000-foot lock to be built in the Little Calument River below Lake Calumet and will soon be asked for widening Acme Bend,' one of the worst bottlenecks on the waterway.

We think that Representative O'BRIEN should be given some permanent recognition of his fine work. We recommend that the new lock, construction of which will start by fall, be named the "Thomas J. O'Brien Lock" in honor of the Congressman.

It would be the kind of "thank you" that he'd appreciate.

Report of New York County Lawyers' Association on S. 3386

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the committee on the Federal courts of the New York County Lawyers' Association adopted, on April 28, 1958, a report recommending against the enactment of S. 3386, which seeks to limit the jurisdiction of the Federal courts in certain cases involving the right of persons to practice law before State courts.

The report of the committee is as follows:

NEW YORK COUNTY
LAWYERS' ASSOCIATION,
COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION,
New York, N. Y.

Report of committee on the Federal courts on S. 3386, which seeks to amend part IV of title 28 of the United States Code, in relation to limiting the jurisdiction of the Federal courts in cases involving the right to practice law.

RECOMMENDATION DISAPPROVAL

This bill would deprive all courts of the United States of jurisdiction of suits presenting the question of whether a State had properly denied to an applicant the privilege of practicing law in that State because of subversive, criminal or corrupt activities, or because of his refusal to answer any question of a governing body of the State relating to subversive, criminal or corrupt activities. The bill is an attempt to overrule the decisions of the Supreme Court in *Schware* v. *Board of Bar Examiners* (335 U. S. 232), and *Konigsberg* v. *State Bar of California* (353 U. S. 252).

The committee takes no position as to whether or not the aforesaid two cases were correctly decided. However, it disapproves this bill because of its belief that Congress should not attempt to overrule specific decisions of the court with which it disagrees by limiting the jurisdiction of the court. Further, the aforesaid cases were decided on constitutional grounds and it is doubtful that Congress may deprive citizens of the right to invoke the aid of the courts of the United States to protect their constitutional rights.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL COURTS.

Rewriting the History of Alger Hiss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 23, 1958

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that certain apologists for the treasonable conduct of Alger Hiss are becoming more and more vocal in trying to delude the public into thinking that Hiss was wrongly convicted.

Apparently the American public is slated for a brainwashing for the purpose of making martyrs of such treasonable men as exemplified by Alger Hiss.

In order to put the Hiss situation in its proper focus, the Richmond News Leader, in its editorial of May 20, concluded with these words:

Eight of the 12 jurors agreed on conviction at the first trial; all 12 agreed at the second. And if history is not to be swallowed in clouds of smoky conjecture, that verdict, freely and fairly arrived at, will have to stand.

The editorial from the Richmond News Leader follows:

REWRITING THE HISTORY OF HISS

This is an interesting time for the student of history—an interesting time, and a horrifying time as well—for we live in an age in which history not only is being created; it is being corrupted as well. Little by little, we are seeing in our own time the truth of Matthew Arnold's bitter comment that reality often is swept away "on the breast of that huge Mississippi of falsehood called history." And we are seeing also that Emerson was right when he remarked that "there is properly no history; only biography."

Three examples serve to make the point. These are the histories, or biographies, of Joe McCarthy, Robert Oppenheimer, and Alger Hiss. The good that McCarthy accomplished, in awakening a drowsy Nation to the nature of Communist subversion, is firmly interred with the Senator's bones; all that lives after him is the evil of McCarthyism, and a more overblown evil never was spun out of thin air. So, too, but in a directly opposite direction, a myth of Dr. Oppenheimer takes form and substance; he is seen now, as he lectures on ethics at Harvard, the innocent victim of witch hunts—a virtuous man, cruelly wronged.

What prompts these reflections is a new book on the Hiss case, The Unfinished Story of Alger Hiss, by Fred J. Cook. More than 8 years have passed since a jury convicted Hiss of perjury and Judge Goddard sentenced him to 5 years' imprisonment, yet the effort continues to make of Alger Hiss a martyr to the liberal cause. The smokescreen still mounts, and the haze, obscuring fact and recollection, so distorts reality that reality is fast becoming lost.

Mr. Cook is a reporter for the New York World-Telegram and Sun. His book is an elaboration of an article he wrote last year for the Nation. His thesis is that there can be no compromise in one's view of the Hiss case: "Either Alger Hiss was a traitor to his country and remains one of the most colossal liars and hypocrites in history or he is an American Dreyfus, framed on the highest levels of justice for political advantage." Oddly, Mr. Cook does not come right out and state his conviction that an innocent Hiss was framed, but in a long peroration at the close of his book he submits that only a person who can believe the unbelievable could believe otherwise.

On what foundation is the glowing innocence of Mr. Hiss kindled up? The bonfires arise from perhaps the flimsiest mass of misstatement, innuendo, insignificant haggling, and blind surmise ever assembled. To read Mr. Cook, everybody was against Alger Hiss from the beginning; Whittaker Chambers was a liar; Judge Goddard was prejudiced; the jurors were denied essential evidence; and Hiss' only faults were that he naturally found it impossible to remember remote events precisely, and, further, that he left a cold and lawyerlike impression on the jury. All this is put forward with such an air of objectivity that the inattentive reader is bound to be impressed.

Those who insist upon a decent respect for truth will be amazed to learn from Mr. Cook that: "There can be no doubt that Hiss fought his battle for vindication from the start in a hostile atmosphere. * * * The scales against [Hiss] were weighted by a heavily partisan press which accepted without question * * * the official pronouncements of the House committee regarding Chambers' reliability and Hiss' evasiveness."

This is what we mean by rewriting history. For the facts were, of course, that at the outset all the advantage was on Hiss' side and none was on Chambers' side. Far from a "hostile atmosphere," Hiss enjoyed all the sympathy, adulation, and influential support that flows naturally to one of his position and background. Major newspapers, such as the Washington Post and the New York Times, were wholly in his camp. It was Hiss, not Chambers, who could command two Supreme Court Justices as character witnesses. To the President of the United States, the prosecution of Alger Hiss was no more than a red herring; the Secretary of State would not turn his back upon so stanch a friend. It was not until Hiss damned himself by evasiveness that segments of the press, one by one, began reluctantly to confess the possibility that Chambers might be telling the truth.

Throughout his book, Mr. Cook magnifies small points and minimizes large ones. He spends pages belaboring Chambers' frequent assertion that he broke with communism in 1937, when actually Chambers was still engaged in espionage through March of 1938. It does not seem to have occurred to Mr. Cook that a devout Communist's break with his party is not essentially different from a devout churchman's break with his faith. As Mrs. Chambers was to testify, her husband's break did not come at a special hour—it was a long time in coming and thought out very thoroughly and suffered through, and he finally broke. But if one is to haggle over dates, it is worth recalling that in his very first appearance before the House committee on August 3, 1948, Chambers began by saying, "It is 10 years since I broke away from the Communist Party." He did not say 11 years; he said 10 years, and that was before the pumpkin papers, relating to events in the early months of 1938, were to appear.

This niggling, lint-picking approach to the testimony manifests itself in many other ways in Mr. Cook's brief. Thus he charges Chambers with embellishing fact by testifying that Mrs. Hiss once had pointed out a road near Paoli down which their farm lay. Actually, Mr. Cook goes on to say, Mrs. Hiss' father lived in a commuter's home "that only fancifully might be called a farm."

The fact of this very minor matter is that Hiss himself testified before the House committee, when the point was under scrutiny, that "I suppose it could be called a farm." To the ordinary reader, or juror, the impression emerges of truthful testimony on Chambers' part. One sees Mrs. Hiss, on this drive, pointing down a road: "My father lives down there; he has a little farm." And Chambers responds, perhaps, with some comment that he hopes to have a farm himself one day, and the incident catches and sticks in his memory, and emerges a decade later under committee examination: "She once showed me while we were driving beyond Paoli the road down which their farm lay."

The case against Alger Hiss was built not only on the dramatic evidence of a Woodstock typewriter; it was also built on the cumulative foundation of a hundred such small points and details. In the end, it was this array of tiny arrows that pointed overwhelmingly to Hiss' guilt. Eight of the 12 jurors agreed on conviction at the first trial; all 12 agreed at the second. And if history is not to be swallowed in clouds of smoky conjecture, that verdict, freely and fairly arrived at, will have to stand.

Tough, Speedy SEC—Slaps Three Wrists, 2½ Years Late

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Leslie Gould, which appeared in the New York Journal-American of May 9, 1958, is worthy of the attention of our colleagues, and especially of the congressional committees having jurisdiction over this agency:

TOUGH, SPEEDY SEC—SLAPS THREE WRISTS, 2½ YEARS LATE

After a big furor a year ago, and 30 months after the complained-of deed, the SEC has slapped on the wrist three brokerage firms—one a member of the stock exchange and a second a member of the American Stock Exchange.

This is the Crowell-Collier bond case of the summer of 1955, where a favored few on a deal cooked up by the Stock Exchange firm made a fast 80-percent profit.

This was done by handling the deal initially as a private placement and therefore

not subject to SEC registration. The bonds were convertible into stock at prices substantially below the market.

EXCHANGE FIRM INVOLVED

The SEC held long public hearings 18 months after the fact and now, more than a year later—more than 30 months in total elapsed time—the SEC hands down its decision. This is that the deal violated SEC rules.

As punishment, the SEC has suspended the three firms from the National Association of Securities Dealers—the NASD.

The Stock Exchange firm which negotiated the deal with Crowell-Collier—Elliott & Co.—is suspended for 20 days, beginning May 19, from the NASD. This was the stiffest penalty.

PENALTIES MEAN NOTHING

The other 2 houses—Gilligan, Will & Co., American Stock Exchange member and specialists in the Crowell-Collier stock—and Dempsey & Co. of Chicago—are suspended for 5 days.

This punishment means nothing. The Stock Exchange and the American Exchange see no reason for disciplinary action against their two members, saying the case involves only SEC rules and not rules of the exchanges.

ONLY NASD AFFECTED

The firms for the period of suspension are barred only from certain NASD privileges, such as participation in underwritings and the purchase of over-the-counter securities from other dealers under the public price.

In the over-the-counter market, dealers make their profit in the difference between what they pay another dealer for the securities and the markup to the public. This in general is about the same as existing commissions on the exchanges, although it can be larger.

Under the suspension order, the activities of the firms in the listed market—the exchanges of which they are members—are in no way restricted.

So, the whole business means very little. The SEC might better have "stood in bed" on this one.

SEC DOES THE USUAL

The original $3 million offering of Crowell-Collier bonds provided for conversion into stock at $5 a share, which was $4 under the then market for the shares on the American Stock Exchange.

Crowell-Collier got into difficulties about a year after the bond financing, and the stock from a high of $10 in 1955 sold down to $3.75 late in 1956. The low in 1957 was $5.50. The stock has recovered this year to around $10.

The SEC's Washington office did its usual stunt. It handed out releases on its disciplinary action hours before its decision reached the parties involved.

One of the worst features of this very questionable operation is that the SEC says nothing about the tipping of the stock around the time of the bond sale, which made it possible for the favored few to make a handsome, quick profit.

The Steamship Lines Help To Sink the Plywood Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my experience, in the business world and in politics, that men and organizations directly concerned with the financial operations of any given situation have the keenest sense of dangers which might harm their financial interests. The region of the wallet is a most sensitive area.

Therefore, I was delighted to receive today a letter from Mr. Ralph B. Dewey, president of the Pacific American Steamship Association of San Francisco. Mr. Dewey's association is made up of the principal American-flag dry cargo carriers operating on the Pacific coast. Their ships carry Japanese hardwood plywood to American west coast ports and they carry back to Japan all the myriad goods purchased by Japan. Furthermore, two of the member lines have extensive lumber interests in the Pacific Northwest, so that the association had the benefit of their advice in formulating the firm stand which the association has taken against the hardwood plywood import quota bills sponsored by my distinguished colleague from Washington [Mr. MACK] and others.

The association states that its investigation discloses that "the demand for import restrictions on this commodity—hardwood plywood—is the work of a certain few who are using the opportunity to create a smokescreen and cloud the real root cause for the difficulties now encountered by the Douglas fir plywood industry—namely overproduction."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the followin letter to me from Mr. Ralph B. Dewey, president of the Pacific American Steamship Association of San Francisco:

PACIFIC AMERICAN,
STEAMSHIP ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., May 23, 1958.

Hon. CHARLES O. PORTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PORTER: Having noted with interest your speech of April 24, 1958, which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to take this opportunity to make known to you the position of the Pacific American Steamship Association on the matter of import restrictions on shipments of hardwood plywood coming into the United States.

The Pacific American Steamship Association is a trade association representing the principal American-flag dry-cargo carriers operating on the Pacific coast. Member lines of this association, who operate vessels in the trans-Pacific trades, have expressed alarm over the introduction of H. R. 5964, S. 1598, and similar bills, which would establish import restrictions on hardwood plywood.

These member lines engaged in the trans-Pacific trades enjoy a substantial volume of inbound hardwood plywood, and of course, desire to preserve this trade. Because of that, we have investigated the reason for the introduction of this legislation, and were amazed to discover how absurd a proposal this legislation really is. The most obvious irrationality is the fact that imported hardwood plywood, most of which comes from Japan, is not at all competitive with the plywood industry in the Pacific Northwest, nor, in fact, in the entire United States. The threat of import competition to the United States plywood industry simply doesnt' exist. Because of our carriage of a considerable amount of imported plywood, our member lines are rather close to the Pacific coast lumber industry. In fact, two member lines also have extensive lumber interest in the Pacific Northwest, and thus this association has had the benefit of their knowledge of that industry and their comments on these proposed restrictions. In short, our investigation has disclosed that the demand for import restrictions on this commodity is the work of a certain few who are using the opportunity to create a smokescreen and cloud the real root cause for the difficulties now encountered by the Douglas fir plywood industry—namely, overproduction. To further indicate the irrationality of this legislative proposal, it is pointed out that Douglas fir is a soft wood, and the market for plywood of this type is entirely separated from the market for imported hardwood plywood, most of which is imported from Japan.

Japan is creating additional markets for products from the Pacific Northwest, much of which is carried outbound by our member-line vessels. Restrictions can only mean retaliatory measures by the Japanese, the ultimate result of which will mean loss of business to both this country and Japan and the loss of employment of our own people, both in the steamship industry and the lumber industry.

It goes without saying that international trade creates job opportunities and it is an established fact that about 7 percent of our total labor force is involved in some form of international trade. Less foreign trade means fewer jobs and fewer job opportunities.

In the past, this association has always favored increased reciprocal trade. It has done so because of the basic premise that we can't sell unless we buy. The steamship industry is dependent upon free international trade, and our costly expansion and ship replacement program is predicated upon the continued expansion of a stable world commerce. Further, our vessels are engaged exclusively in the trades to and from the continental United States. Developing new markets as well as maintaining present ones is essential to this industry, as is the stability of international trade both for imports and exports.

For these reasons, we request your immediate action to put to a complete halt the perpetuation of this paradoxical proposal.

Very truly yours,

RALPH B. DEWEY,
President.

The Impact of the Housing and Home Finance Administration in Florida and the Nation—Address of Albert M. Cole, United States Housing Administrator, at the Urban Renewal Conference, Orlando, Fla., May 9, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Albert M. Cole, Administrator, Housing and Home Financing Agency, gave a very enlightening speech at the urban renewal conference in Orlando, Fla., on Friday, May 9. I also had the privilege of attending and briefly addressing this excellent meeting. There is so much valuable information on programs available to all the States and local communities in the Nation, Florida being an example of one of the States possible activities, that I believe inclusion in the RECORD of Mr. Cole's remarks is in order that other Members of the House might

have a bird's-eye view of the value of the HHFA programs.

In my own remarks to the conference I cited some examples in my own district where the program had proven most valuable. Included were: the $35,000 advanced planning loan to the Billsboro County Port Authority for long-range planning for development of Tampa Harbor; $68,000 in an advance planning loan to Pinellas County for sewage programing; and the approval of a workable program for the city of Tampa which is the first step in an urban renewal and redevelopment for public use program. Florida, of course, faced a problem as the supreme court of the State struck down the State redevelopment law as unconstitutional. This was referred to by Mr. Cole so far as it relates to property to be planned and developed for private use—but he also pointed out this decision does not prevent use of all the tools of HHFA so long as it relates to public purposes and uses. I voiced my opinion that many Florida communities have been asleep at the switch in making long-range plans for future development and in using all the tools made available through HHFA and other Federal laws, such as Public Law 660, and the Water Pollution Control Act providing 30-percent Federal participation in sewage treatment works. It was my since hope that the Orlando conference would awaken Florida out of its lethargy.

Florida is one of the fastest growing States in the Nation and as such it is essential that public-spirited citizens and public officials join hands in making long-range plans for proper development of the State—for provision of adequate roads, public buildings, parks, public parking, recreational facilities, sewage and waste treatment programs, slum clearance, police and fire protection, and carry out other public services and provide other public facilities—and to use every tool available to accomplish this. The same is true in many communities in other States throughout the Nation.

I believe Mr. Cole's remarks will be of value in assisting the people to meet this challenge.

ADDRESS BY ALBERT M. COLE, UNITED STATES HOUSING ADMINISTRATOR, AT URBAN RENEWAL CONFERENCE, CENTRAL CHRISTIAN CHURCH, ORLANDO, FLA., MAY 9, 1958

Since this is an important meeting and I have to compress what I have to say, I am not going to burden you with any oratory. You can take it from me that any time a former Congressman decides to bypass oratorical effects he is really serious.

The representative of the Housing Administrator for the Southeastern region, which includes Florida, is, of course, Walter Keyes. He is the man you will want to go to with your problems.

Firstly, I'd like to explain how I plan to organize my remarks. I thought I would split them into two parts. In the first part, I'll discuss the nationwide situation—in other words, what is going on throughout the country with respect to the programs we are here to discuss—urban renewal, metropolitan planning, and others.

The second part I'll devote to Florida. In any case, we have to take a bird's-eye view of the whole in order to get the Florida situation in better perspective.

Now in giving you a brief overall picture of nationwide developments, I am going to use a device that has proved helpful in the past. I am going to ask you to imagine—and also to fix in your minds—that there are three problem areas. Loosely speaking, these are:

Suburban or metropolitan sprawl.
Municipal sprawl.
Downtown sprawl.

As for the first—suburban sprawl—here is the position:

We are on the way to creating a septic-tank suburban civilization—a maze of septic-tank suburbias. We are doing this because we are repeating, in principle, the mistakes we permitted in our cities and which we are spending billions of dollars to correct.

What is happening is, of course, a part of a great transformation—call it explosion—that is taking place in our living patterns.

Because our cities grew planlessly and in any case were unfit to handle our automobile way of life, people have been beating it out to the country. At least it used to be the country.

The green fields and the old swimming pond have been replaced by hot-dog stands, filling stations, superhighways, highway intersections, airports, outdoor movies, indoor skating rinks, and shopping centers.

These things have their place, but usually they are in the wrong place.

In many, if not most cases, there isn't a plan, or what plans there are aren't being implemented in relation to the whole. The financial cost of straightening out this mess is going to be enormous. And who is going to bear the cost? The taxpayers—you and I, our children and grandchildren.

One of our most important programs, known as 701, relates to this problem of urban sprawl. It is designed to assist metropolitan planning. It authorizes Federal financial aid on a matching basis to official State, metropolitan, or regional planning agencies for the planning of metropolitan and other urban regions.

Some 40 areas are now participating. Others are applying.

Problem No. 2 is urban or municipal sprawl. All of us know what has been happening in our cities. Antiquated codes, cock-eyed zoning—you might almost term it antizoning—automobile congestion; in brief, disorganization such as no successful business could or would tolerate—these things have reduced many municipalities close to bankruptcy.

You may remember that it was here in Florida, at Miami, that I warned municipalities that if they didn't start putting their house in order they would go bankrupt.

There is no need for me to tell you that a great reawakening, a process of reassessment has been taking place. All over the Nation cities are struggling to make up for lost time.

And why not? The money they have been losing has been their own. Consider the financial advantages of urban renewal, quite apart from any others.

Assessed values in one small New York city have risen from $18 million to $40 million in the last 6 years as a result of urban renewal activities. A west-coast city estimates an increase in value of one area from $29 million to $170 million.

Obviously, if I start to go into details about urban-renewal programs, we would be here not only all afternoon but all evening and probably all week. So I will just touch on a high spot.

The overall picture is that more than 500 urban renewal projects are under some form of Federal contract in some 300 cities, and by the end of this year, for the first time, the number in actual execution will be about equal to those in planning.

The third of the three problems is downtown sprawl. On account of the deterioration of municipal areas, the downtown business and shopping areas are no longer the centers of influence they once were. Tax revenues are declining sharply.

In 1930 the downtown core of Fort Worth produced 22.54 percent of the city's total tax revenue. In 1955 the figure was down to 11.03 percent.

In view of this growing problem, this administration has sent to the Congress a proposal for a new program to assist cities to fight downtown blight. It would authorize the Federal Government in effect to guarantee repayment of private loans for the purpose up to a total of $150 million.

* * * * *

So much for the national picture. Next, the Florida picture.

The position is that the Florida Supreme Court, in 1952, in the case of Adams v. the Housing Authority of the City of Daytona Beach, held the State redevelopment law to be unconstitutional. As a result of that decision Florida communities have been prevented from sharing in the full benefits of Federal programs which have been available to communities in other States.

Specifically, it has not been possible since 1952 for any Florida community to obtain Federal financial assistance for a title I project contemplating slum clearance and urban redevelopment and urban renewal if the project land is to be sold for private use.

I am well aware of all this. I have been following subsequent developments with interest. But let me interpolate that I haven't come to Orlando to tell Floridians what to do about a problem that is strictly their business.

As a Federal official my position is that there are certain Federal tools available to communities if they wish to make use of them. But if they don't wish to make use of them, or wish to use them only in part—then that's up to them.

As a matter of fact, there are eight States in the Union that for one reason or other do not have the necessary legislation to enable their communities to share in federally assisted slum clearance and related programs. Florida is 1 of those 8.

Actually, all I wish to do here today—all it is in my power to do—is to offer some factual observations based on the current situation. Certain things can be done in Florida as the law stands; certain things can't be done.

Here is the rollcall as it appears to me:

Point 1: Under certain conditions and with certain provisos a Florida community might be eligible for title I Federal assistance. That is assuming the project area to be acquired would be used for such purposes as parks, playgrounds, or public buildings. However, even here a court test might be necessary. The legal and technical questions that arise are such that generalities are quite impossible. All of this would have to be a matter for exploration.

Point 2: Participation in FHA section 220 mortgage insurance is possible in Florida. Section 220 is a special type of insurance under which FHA undertakes to insure home mortgages in areas which have become run down but which are to be redeveloped or rehabilitated with or without Federal assistance. It is available for both new and existing structures. However, there is one compelling requirement—that the community involved must have a workable program. This matter of the workable program is of a great importance. I shall return to it later.

Point 3: Participation in FHA section 221 financing is possible in Florida. This is designed to assist the relocation of families displaced by urban renewal activity or other governmental action such as highway construction.

FHA 221 financing is favorable, to say the least. FHA can insure 100 percent on mortgages up to $9,000 and they can run for as long as 40 years. The only cash requirement is $200, which may go toward covering closing costs and other expenses.

Here again a workable program is essential.

I am happy to announce at this juncture that section 221 financing has just been made available for 1,700 units of low-cost private housing in Tampa for displaced families. At least 1,300 of them are to be provided by new construction. I signed the certification just before I left Washington.

Needless to say, Tampa has a workable program.

Point 4: Participation in the section 701 planning program is possible in Florida.

We are authorized to provide grants to official State agencies for use in giving planning aid to communities of less than 25,000 population. Also under this program grants can be made available for metropolitan area planning.

Here I have another announcement.

The Urban Renewal Commissioner has just approved a Federal grant to the Florida Development Commission of $28,300 to assist seven Florida communities create comprehensive plans for their growth and development. These seven are: Cottondale, DeLand, Fort Walton Beach, Lake City, MacClenny, St. Augustine, and Winter Haven.

The grants will finance half the cost of the planning work. They are the first of their kind in this State.

Point 5: The program of public facility loans to State and local governments to finance the construction of public works, is available in Florida. Up until a few days ago five Florida applications totaling $1,437,000 had been approved.

Also available are advances from a revolving fund to defray the cost of planning various public works. Such advances are repayable without interest when construction starts or when the contract is awarded. Under the current planning program 11 Florida applications have been approved totaling $300,000. Under previous programs 141 other Florida applications had been approved.

Loans are also available to Florida institutions under the college housing program. There have been 16 approved loans so far for some fine colleges and universities. These involve $20 million in Federal funds.

Point 6 (and finally): Let me amplify my previous references to the workable program. This is a subject about which I have firm convictions. I have been close to it for some years.

The idea of the workable program came into being while I was Chairman of President Eisenhower's Advisory Committee on Housing Policies and Programs. That was in 1953. The Committee, you will recall, was engaged in forging a new approach to the problems of slums and blight, and our work culminated in the Housing Act of 1954.

As we discussed things in our Committee it was clear that the process of urban renewal must begin with the community itself. A community is the creation and reflection of its own people. But before a community can help itself, or can ask the Federal Government for assistance, it must first know itself. It must review its failings and its virtues candidly and purposefully. In short, it must devise a plan to set its house in order. This plan we call the workable program.

I won't go into details. The point I want to make to you is that a community that lacks a plan is deluding itself. The planless, aimless, slaphappy era is nearing its end. The slaphappy community collapses eventually under its own deadweight.

A program of action by and for the community itself is a necessity in the world of today, and of course it is doubly important to Florida towns and cities. As things stand your constitutional restrictions limit your participation with the Federal Government. This puts the job squarely up to you. So your job has to begin with your own planning, your own workable program in your community.

Yet quite apart from the question of possible Federal aid, the workable program concept has a much broader meaning.

It is a matter of community survival.

No more and no less.

Medal of Honor Award to Mr. H. Leslie Hoffman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, last night Mr. H. Leslie Hoffman, president of Hoffman Electronics Corp., of Los Angeles, was awarded the medal of honor of the Electronics Industries Association at its 34th annual convention in Chicago.

Mr. Hoffman, whose firm is one of the outstanding small businesses in my district, has well earned this honor for his contributions to the betterment of the electronics industry, both nationally and on the west coast. It is a pleasure to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of his address to the convention:

STATEMENT BY H. LESLIE HOFFMAN, PRESIDENT, HOFFMAN ELECTRONICS CORP., AT AWARDS DINNER, ELECTRONIC INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION, SHERATON HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 22, 1958, ON RECEIPT OF EIA MEDAL OF HONOR AWARD FOR OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO ELECTRONICS INDUSTRY

Thank you, Paul. Ladies and gentlemen, distinguished guests, and fellow members of EIA. I am deeply grateful to you and to all the members of EIA for judging me worthy of so high an honor. It is a heartwarming experience for both Mrs. Hoffman and me.

I am proud, very proud, to be permitted to join the ranks of people who have previously been awarded the medal of honor. It is an elite group, indeed, that includes the names of such men as General Sarnoff, Doc Baker, Bob Sprague, Les Muter, Paul Galvin, and Max Balcom. These are the men who have been in the forefront of the dramatic growth of our great industry. I only hope that I can measure up to the tradition that they have established.

This is a return engagement for both of us. Two years ago it was my signal pleasure to hand you the medal of honor. It was much easier to find the proper words for that occasion than it is tonight when I am the recipient.

Only a few years ago ours was a relatively simple business—close knit, compact, and concerned with making just one product. But almost faster than we could realize what was happening, it has mushroomed into an enormously complex industry. We now produce many products and work in widely diversified fields. Our products and services have become essential to the national security and have provided a more satisfying and comfortable life to millions of Americans in their homes, their offices, and in their leisure hours.

Many of us can remember when the electronics industry had a market volume of half a billion dollars a year. Yet last year our industry set a sales record of $7½ billion—15 times what it was only a few years ago—and thus it has become the fifth industry in manufacturing volume in the United States. It is significant that this growth was sparked by new ideas and new products—the end result of research. Seventy-five percent of today's employment is involved in projects which were born within the last 10 years.

Not long ago I suggested that the electronics industry might well become the economic barometer of our Nation because of its breadth, depth, and scope. Certainly there is no single industry in America today which holds, at one and the same time, the major responsibility in our military and scientific battle with Russia and the prime stimulant for a dynamic and growing economy.

Yesterday we were responsible only for originating and transmitting the voice of broadcast communications. Today we have not only the responsibility of giving our military systems voice but also we must endow them with sight beyond the horizon and guide them unerringly into outer space. We must build for these systems brains quicker and surer than any possessed by man, and muscles whose components must react in microseconds.

But important as this is, I would like to draw to your attention a responsibility that I believe is even greater perhaps than the one we have assumed in the defense of the free world through military strength.

Overnight the headlines have changeed from sputniks, Explorers and Vanguards to talk of recession and labor negotiations—and now back to sputniks. This focuses our thinking on the salient elements of our economy.

Our economy is predicated on the thesis that we can maintain the highest military standards and the highest living standards at one and the same time, without either being sacrificed for the other. This is no small order. It means that in the international race for superiority and survival, we have established objectives and responsibilities for ourselves which the Russian dictators have not recognized for the Russian people.

Thus, we find ourselves with two challenges instead of one—and they go hand in hand. They are so interwoven that we cannot—and must not—try to consider them apart. To put all of our effort into one at the expense of the other would be a catastrophe.

What are these goals?

The first is economic. It is the target we must reach if we are to keep the United States a healthy, virile entity, strong enough to give the free world the leadership it must have. To accomplish this, we must increase our gross national product from $430 billion of today, to $600 billion in the next decade.

Our second basic goal is to create and maintain a superior military establishment that will insure peace in today's uneasy world, with the ultimate objective of a permanent peace.

Both of these obtainable goals need to be reached without inflating our dollar still further.

You may notice that I put the economic, non-military goal first. I did so intentionally because we cannot support the growing strength of our military establishment without a sound, vigorous, and expanding economy.

The average factory worker in the United States, in April of 1958, received $2.10 per hour—8 times that of Japan's average of 26 cents per hour, and approximately 3 times that of France, West Germany, and England whose average is 72 cents, 68 cents, and 80 cents respectively.

Germany and Japan have made inroads into our once-strong economic areas. Why? For the past 10 years these dynamic and hard-working nations have devoted most of their best manpower, facilities, and efforts to creating new products and improved machines and techniques for civilian uses. They have been relatively free from the heavy burden of armaments. Their top scientists and engineers have concentrated

on non-military projects. Unfortunately, we cannot discount either their productivity or the quality of their products.

We face the prospect of losing our markets at home and abroad unless we can equalize these wage differences through greater productivity. We should not forget that our greater productivity, is the fountainhead of our higher standard of living. In order to increase our productivity, we need new tools, new techniques, and new products generated by commercial research and supported by long-range planning by both Government and industry on the commercial front.

Russia flatly and officially has challenged us on production. Nikita Khrushchev many times has said in public that the Soviets will outproduce the United States on all fronts, civilian as well as military. To support this claim, the Kremlin boast that more scientists and engineers are being trained and graduated into industry, business, and agriculture than in any other country. Heavy stress is being placed on research.

It is generally agreed that Russia's economy is growing faster than ours. Today our industrial productivity is still three times that of the Soviets. We are told, however, that most Russian industries are increasing production annually at the rate of about 10 percent. We are still ahead, but the only certain way to stay ahead is to accelerate our rate of growth.

The result of research can, many times, be not only spectacular but also a real stimulant to the economy. All of us here tonight are quite familiar with what the development of television did for our radio industry some 10 years ago and in the subsequent years. This success story, predicated on research, can be multiplied many times over in all phases of industry if adequate resarch is undertaken.

The time has come for Government to help industry expand commercial research substantially. Up to this time, industry has carried the commercial research expense alone—and in most cases only the giants can afford it. Now I believe it is eminently proper to ask the Government to share this task with us to insure that more research is done and that it is accomplished on a broader front.

We are told that the Government budget for fiscal 1958 was $3 billion for research and development, with $300 million going to nonmilitary activity. We do not question the propriety of spending such large sums on research and development to insure weapon superiority; however, we do believe it proper for our Government to invest in commercial research in order to insure a superior economy.

Our country operates on the incentive system. The harder we work and the more creatively we think, the greater our rewards will be. This is the basic concept of our free capitalistic economy. Without such an incentive to spur us, however, this country would not be what it is today.

I therefore propose tonight that the Government provide industry an incentive to improve and enlarge commercial research. I am suggesting that this incentive should be in the form of a tax credit that would apply to both product and market research. I am confident that with this incentive activity in commercial research would double in a short period of time. What that would mean in terms of fresh ideas, new products, greater business, and additional tax revenue to the Government staggers the imagination.

Now, that last point—additional tax revenue to the Government—is important. Before we explore this idea further, I want to emphasize that in suggesting a tax credit of this sort we are not joining the parade of those who advocate a reduction in taxes to simply permit more spending. We are making a sound business proposition—suggesting an investment on the part of both Government and industry from which both parties will profit.

What will the Government get out of it? I am confident that every million dollars invested by the Government on this program today will return several million in future tax collections.

Today we are exploring, with hope and some apprehension, the possibility of a planned disarmament. Certainly it is pertinent to raise the question, What new products and services can we develop in our civilian economy to replace the $40 billion per year that we are now spending on armaments? This is the type of long-range planning that Government and industry should be considering and implementing.

Let's consider for a moment a few possible avenues for commercial research.

Think for a moment what it would mean to all of us if we could develop an economical process for converting salt water into fresh water. Think for a moment what a stimulant the development of all of our new energy sources—nuclear, solar, and chemical—and the storage of these energies would be to our economy as well as to the world. A low-cost solar energy converter could do much to improve the economic and political conditions in the large population areas of Asia,

Think for a moment what doubling the amount of commercial research in electronics alone would do for education, transportation, communications, and health. Those more familiar with other industries could cite the effect of greater emphasis of research on commercial products for each of their industries. Two quick areas that demand immediate attention are aircraft collisions and accidents and deaths on highways.

However, let's take a look at our own industry as an example of the problem that I have been attempting to describe. I cannot recall a time when we did not have something which we could look forward to in our electronic consumer products. At the time we had radio we were looking ahead to television. At the time we had black and white we were looking ahead to color. We now have color—which has yet to reach its full marketing impact—but after color, what?

The television industry, the automobile industry, and the appliance industry cannot expand the basic economy significantly merely through replacement sales or by putting new dresses on old concepts. We need basic, new ideas and we need to expand our markets through the stimulation of planned obsolescence.

Our industry has many examples of new products resulting from research and its stimulating effect on growth and expanded employment. For instance, consider semiconductors. Here we have a new industry whose sales are forecast to be $1 billion by 1960. Significantly, it has not injured the existing tube industry because new applications and new usages were found.

Research costs big money. The days are gone when a single man like Lee deForest worked long hours in a shop to develop the audion tube. Today it takes research teams, but we continue to be in a position where only our big corporations can afford commercial research.

The reaction I have received from people I have talked to about this idea has encouraged me to spend considerable time with our tax people to develop a possible plan to implement this thought. I suggest these broad outlines merely as a place to start, and with no particular claim that it is the complete answer.

This is my proposal:

I propose that corporations be given a direct credit on their Federal taxes amounting to 35 percent of the amount spent on approved research and development of commercial products and services—this 35 percent tax credit to be over and above the fact that such expenditures would be recognized as normal business expense.

I propose that the approved expenditures for any company be limited to 1 percent of the corporation's gross sales and that the tax credit be limited to 35 percent of such expenditures or $500,000 each year, whichever is the lesser.

A quick example: Let's take a company doing $50 million a year and showing a profit. One percent of its sales would be $500,000. Assuming it spent this amount, or more, it would have a tax credit of $175,000. This research expense would be a normal business expense and, consequently, the Government would pay 52 percent, or $260,000. This would mean that the company would invest $65,000 of its own operating capital in this research project,

I have had our tax people do some research to determine just how much this potential tax credit would be. It is their estimate that it would amount to approximately $900 million—or roughly one-third of the total $3 billion budget that our Government allocated for military research.

A clear definition of how this tax credit is to be applied could be administered by the Treasury Department—the same as all other special considerations.

Obviously, there could be considerable difference of opinion as to what should be incorporated in the definition of commercial and industrial product and market research. I am confident, however, considering the stakes involved to the well-being of our Nation, that any of these differences can be resolved and that we can develop a clear, equitable, and effective program.

There is byproduct besides the advantages that expanded research would do to vitalize and expand our economy. I believe that if the proposal were to be adopted, a great number of small firms desiring and needing research, but without the facilities and manpower to pursue it, would turn, naturally, to the universities. Thus, we accomplish a much needed flow of funds into our colleges and universities. I need not expand on how significant it would be to stimulate a revitalization of our technical and marketing effort on commercial products in our universities.

I am confident that the basic idea I have presented tonight can and should be implemented and submitted to the proper people in our Government for study and adoption, not only by our industry but by all who qualify. I will be glad to elaborate on this suggestion tomorrow at the board of directors if they so desire. I have some illustrations as to just how this incentive-tax credit would be applied.

Let's review my proposal.

We are in a battle for survival—not just physically, but our way of life. We cannot fail. But to succeed we must have a strong and expanding economy. To accelerate the blood-stream of our economy, we need a continual flow of new products, new materials, new ideas, and new techniques from all phases of our economic life. Expanded commercial research is essential to accomplish this objective. Industry today is in a vise of rising costs and lower profit margins and cannot afford to expand its research without a new stimulant and a new incentive.

The incentive-tax credit that I propose tonight would provide this stimulant, not only for today but for a better world of tomorrow.

Let us in the electronics industry get tuned in with our own destiny. Our industry has become synonymous with the economy and the society of tomorrow. There is no other industry where expanded commercial research would mean as much to the economy as in electronics. We in electronics are the logical people to take the lead. Incentive commercial research is the keystone to a $600 billion economy.

"What Are We Willing To Give Up for National Security"—Bernard M. Baruch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 23, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the elder statesman, Bernard M. Baruch, has often spoken wise words to the American people and recently he has spoken wise words again. I agree with him utterly when he warns that we must think our present problems through and discipline ourselves to meet them by whatever actions are necessary.

Members of this House know that few of us here are by nature alarmists. But it is now literally true that we are challenged by a hardened, disciplined adversary and that we have not as a people taken the steps to repulse that adversary.

It is literally true that our people do not yet fully comprehend the nature of the diplomatic and potential military offensive we face.

Here it is not my purpose to assess blame. But clearly it is not enough for us to have a foreign policy that lacks support by adequate military strength. It is not enough for us to be second best in our total military posture. The kind of world we live in awards no security to the second best.

Earnestly I hope, Mr. Speaker, that in this session we shall be able to obtain clear guidance to our national needs, in their full scope, and that during this session the people shall be called to respond to these needs as they have been called clearly in other times of crisis.

Our people are not soft when it is explained to them why they must do things necessary for survival. For the preservation of our basic values they have sacrificed in the past, and they will do it again if clear and urgent words are spoken explaining what is required.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I offer the following message from Mr. Baruch, printed in the American Weekly and taken from his book, A Philosophy for Our Time:

WHAT ARE WE WILLING TO GIVE UP?
(By Bernard M. Baruch)

We face a challenge. It was expressed well by an item I clipped from a newspaper back in 1947. It told of a boast made by a Soviet general that the Western democracies were bound to be defeated because they would not make the necessary sacrifices. The Western democracies prized their living standards too highly to accept the disciplines to put guns over butter.

The Soviet Government though, the general boasted, would force the sacrifices to mobilize. A lean, hungry, but mobilized Russia would overrun a Western world which couldn't bring itself to mobilize—in time.

Wherever we have won in the cold war, it has been where we made the necessary sacrifices. Wherever we have lost, it has been where we failed to give up what was needed to insure victory.

Again and again we have tried to evade this truth. We have acted as if an effective foreign policy could be laid down by making a fine speech or by proclaiming lofty aims.

For a time we seem to be getting away with this masquerade of words that some call foreign policy. Then something happens, as in Korea or Indochina, which strips off the mask and shows that our foreign policy is worth no more—nor less—than our ability to see that policy through with men and other resources.

And so it will always be. The acid test of any policy we lay down—and it is a test the Soviets will be sure to put us to—will always be our answer to one question:

What are we willing to give up to see that policy through?

Those who argue against universal military training, or readiness to mobilize, because these things infringe on the freedoms for which we are fighting, mistake both the nature of the cold war and the nature of government.

The only freedom man can ever have is the freedom to discipline himself. That is what we are fighting for, to maintain our right to self-discipline instead of having the disciplines of slavery and tyranny thrust upon us by a conquering enemy.

The test is not one of faith but of performance. It will not be enough to demonstrate that we believe in self-government. We must succeed in making self-government work, first by thinking our problems through, and second, disciplining ourselves to whatever actions may be necessary.

Think.

Discipline.

Those are the two weapons we must rely on in this crucial battle in man's long war to govern himself. If that battle is lost, the cause of self-government will sink into eclipse not to rise again until after a new dark age of worldwide slavery has been undergone.

To sum up, on this vital issue of man's ability to govern himself, we must now either put up or be shut up.

Back Door Swindle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1958

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a timely article published by the I. U. D. Digest.

The quarterly I. U. D. Digest, published by the AFL–CIO, is without question one of the best journals of thoughtful opinion and careful issue analysis being published in the United States today. This distinguished journal is without peer in its field, and it enjoys an enviable reputation among journalists and publishers the country over.

This journal is free of any advertisers' pressures or prejudices, and it is not inhibited by any fear that it might justly offend powerful financial interests. As a consequence, it is frequently a source of good reporting on important matters which the editors of commercial publications regard as a little too delicate for fully candid treatment, or perhaps too delicate for mention at all.

The bill to create a new Financial Institutions Act, S. 1451, appears to be one of those exceptionally delicate subjects. In any case, whatever the reason may be, it is one of those subjects which has been generally overlooked and neglected by the daily press and by the commercial journals—and I might say peculiarly so, considering the importance of the subject matter and, let us say, the dramatic content, of this subject matter.

Some of the Members are not, as I understand it, readers of the I. U. D. Digest, and may have missed seeing the account of this banker legislation in the spring 1958 issue. This legislation is now pending in the House and I know that many of the Members who have not seen the I. U. D. Digest article would wish it brought to their attention. I believe, Mr. Speaker, they will find it highly readable as well as informative.

The article follows:

BACK DOOR SWINDLE

When a clever confidence operator swindles a few thousand people out of their hard-earned cash—say several hundred thousand dollars, or even a million—he is clapped into prison to dampen his enthusiasm for other people's money.

When a confidence game runs into hundreds of millions and is perpetrated by respectable bankers, it becomes a matter for remedial legislation. We don't even call it a swindle.

There is today pending before Congress a bill whose sponsors say has only the purpose of bringing under one cover all laws which relate to commercial banking. It passed the Senate in the first session of the present Congress. Virtually no one questioned that it provided genuine codification of the banking laws until it reached the House of Representatives.

But until Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, discovered that it contained some very peculiar provisions, there appeared to be every prospect that it would slide through the House untouched. PATMAN is a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee with a long-time interest in banking.

He discovered that this bill, called the Financial Institutions Act (S. 1451), went much further than codification of the laws. During many months of hearings he called this to the attention of BRENT SPENCE, Democrat, of Kentucky, chairman of the committee. But only after the hearings were over was the committee staff put to work digging out the substantive changes from existing law which the bill contained. Their report revealed that at least 117 substantive changes had been written into the Nations' banking laws without notice being taken of that fact—in the Senate.

Here appeared to be a misrepresentation of great magnitude—one that had slipped in by the backdoor. The bill had been represented by its sponsors as nothing really new. Now it was disclosed to contain a whole flock of new laws of far-reaching importance.

USURY LAWS

Outstanding among the basic changes in banking laws which this measure proposed was the repeal of the usury laws. Any repeal or weakening of usury laws strikes directly at labor. Protection against usury is of tremendous importance to all consumers, as well as to small business and farmers. Taking the lid off of interest rates at the consumer level means increased cost to buyers of automobiles, furniture, refrigerators, TV sets—in short, everything consumers purchase on time payments, including vacation travel.

It also means increased cost of farm machinery, office machines, and all kinds of equipment which farmers and small-business people purchase on time.

This hits the little man in front and in back. He pays more for consumer durable goods. The market for his products shrinks as a result of decreased consumer purchasing power, whether that market is trucks that must be sold or vegetables carried in those trucks.

Seldom has there been so flagrant a hocuspocus about any bit of legislation. When the history of pernicious lawmaking is written, the financial institutions bill of 1957 will go down in the book as a towering example of how badly our legislative system sometimes works—up to a certain point, at least. While there is little hope that the bill will be thrown out, there remains some hope that it can be amended to eliminate its worst features.

Take a glance at its legislative history.

If the sponsors of the banking laws were correct in saying that this is merely a codification bill, it would be quite unimportant—merely a housekeeping matter. It has been found highly satisfactory to the banking industry. Everyone in the Eisenhower administration concerned with banking has pronounced it exemplary. It slid through the Senate as routine business—nothing new in it.

LOBBY OPERATION

But why, if it is merely a recodification, did the American Bankers Association and the United States Chamber of Commerce put on a long, intensive lobbying operation to assure the passage of this bill? During the last year measures of enormous importance have come before Congress. Yet the financial institutions bill has never lost priority position on the calendar.

And it was only after hearings were closed in the House that the Banking and Currency Committee staff discovered that this bill had altered the law in 117 places. This staff report was dated March 7, 1958. It is too late now to question witnesses about all these changes.

In commenting upon this bill Representative PATMAN has said:

"The history of this bill violated all the rules of good procedure which democratic legislatures have learned over the last 300 or 400 years. Not the least such violation concerns the usual rule against putting substantive amendments to law into a general recodification. If the bill accomplishes nothing else, it proves the soundness of that rule. It dramatizes the point that when changes in law are mixed into a codification bill, these changes are likely to be enacted without sufficient public understanding of what is being done, and without sufficient understanding by the legislative body itself."

This was not an easy bill to understand. One has to look sharply at several clauses, and then consider them all together, to catch on to the very tricky game the bankers are playing. In any case, it appears to have been entirely too subtle for the newspaper reporters who have largely ignored the bill and its implications.

Take the business of knocking out the usury laws, for example. Section 35 (a), title I, would do that. Congressman PATMAN calls this section, which would actually promote usury, the Ebenezer Scrooge amendment, after the famous miser in Charles Dickens' Christmas Carol.

The history of the Ebenezer Scrooge amendment is quite intriguing. The event which appears to have triggered the financial institutions bill was a decision in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit entitled *W. E. Daniel and E. A. Dillard* v. *the First National Bank of Birmingham* (227 Fed. 2d 353). This decision in November 1955, followed by a supplemental decision in the same court the following January, electrified the banking world. However, the bankers didn't rush to the press. They kept their concern very quietly to themselves.

Some of them had been reaping unconscionable profits on what they thought was a loophole in the usury law. Upon the advice of their shrewdest lawyers, they had been charging interest on certain types of credit in excess of what the law allows. But it turned out that the loophole wasn't there. Billions (yes, billions) of dollars were involved.

CONDITIONAL SALES CONTRACT

The biggest bank in Alabama was found to be violating the usury law. Arguments in defense of an alleged loophole, contained in a brief filed by the Alabama Bankers Association, were slapped down by the courts.

What was this dreamed-up loophole?

The bankers had invented a new kind of credit paper since the Federal usury law was passed, and since most of the State laws were passed. This is called the "conditional sales contract." The usury laws mention such things as loans, discounts, extensions of credit, etc., and they also contain a phrase, "other evidences of indebtedness." But they do not mention the conditional sales contract.

So the bankers got to thinking, or at least hoping, that when credit is extended by means of the conditional sales contract the usury laws could be ignored. Their lawyers gave them support for going on this theory. And the penalty for ignoring the law was rather slight. Indeed, there is none unless the individual who has been overcharged discovers the fact and brings suit. In that case, the court can order a refund of double the amount of excess interest paid.

In the Daniel case, a couple of truck drivers were buying the vehicles they drove from a trucking company. The court held they had been required to pay usurious interest. The decision destroyed the imagined loophole of the conditional sales contract. In effect, said the court, usury by any other name is still usury.

So what were the banks to do? In every city in this nation there were national banks holding conditional sales contracts similar to those which had been declared illegal. These had been purchased from auto dealers and merchants of other goods and services.

At the end of December last, commercial banks held more than $6 billion in automobile paper alone. Some $4 billion of this had been purchased from dealers. The interest on this purchased paper, most of which was in the form of conditional sales contracts, amounted to hundreds of millions of dollars annually. After the Daniel decision this because hot money. What could the bankers do about this very touchy situation, which might result in a deluge of lawsuits if customers wised up?

The answer to their dilemma appeared to be to keep very, very quiet until they could get the law changed. And this they proceeded to attempt. But they haven't quite gotten there yet.

If the American Bankers Association had asked outright for a repeal of the usury laws, there is little question that Congress would have turned them down flatly. So they thought up a pretty good scheme. They would ask for a codification of the banking laws—no substantive changes, of course.

The person they picked to engineer this job through Congress was Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Democrat, of Virginia, who became acting Chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee just as this legislation was brought forward. During the summer of 1956, ROBERTSON discovered that the banking laws of the United States never had been codified. He appears to have overlooked the fact that the United States Code consulted by every practicing lawyer codified the banking and credit laws, that a new edition is issued every 6 years, with supplements annually, and that this code for many years has satisfied the law profession.

Nevertheless, Senator ROBERTSON's assumption that the banking laws had never been codified was considered conclusive proof that codification was required instantly.

In August 1956 the Virginia Senator announced the appointment of an advisory committee, which was to work up the so-called codification. Senator ROBERTSON was very proud of his advisory group. On this 27-man committee, 22 were bankers. Each was either a president, vice president, or board chairman of his bank.

Rather naively Senator ROBERTSON remarked at hearings on his bill:

"During the past 24 years I have attended a lot of hearings in Washington, and I do not remember any in which as much concentrated wealth was represented as we have here this morning. For instance, the bankers alone represent over $250 billion of liquid assets. It necessarily follows that a lot of people in this country ought to be interested in their views on how to make their money safer, or how to make it more plentiful, or how to let those that have not got it, and I think they ought to have it, get it."

If there is any doubt as to why the bankers suddenly became interested in codifying the laws that govern their operations, it is made clear in the testimony before the Senate committee of the chairman of the advisory committee, Kenneth Cravens, a St. Louis banker, who, incidentally, did not put the usury amendment into the draft of the bill submitted to the subcommittee. It was only when the Senate committee itself reported the official bill that this bit of legislation came to light, although the committee gave no reason for its existence. In fact, no one has yet claimed fathership of this clause.

If we turn to the Senate hearings, however, we find mention of the amendment in the testimony of Cravens. He said it was his understanding that the purpose of the amendment was to overturn a ruling of the Supreme Court in *National Bank* v. *Johnson* (104 U. S. 271). He approved that purpose, but without giving a hint as to what the ruling was, or what the consequence of overruling it would be. More recently the Federal Reserve Board also has stated that the amendment would reverse the principle held in *National Bank* v. *Johnson*.

STATE LAWS

Now what is the principle evoked in this ruling of the Supreme Court of more than 77 years' standing?

First we should note that there are two kinds of commercial banks: national banks which are chartered by the Federal Government, and State banks which are chartered by the States. The Federal usury law names a maximum rate of interest at 7 percent. However, many States set no maximum for the kind of credit extended under conditional sales contracts. But the Federal statute applies to national banks only when there is no State law which names a different maximum rate. Hence, it aims to give protection only when the State law does not do so.

But the Alabama State laws did not apply to the conditional sales contracts involved in the Daniel case; so the Federal usury law did apply.

Now section 35 of the bankers' bill reverses the principle of *National Banks* v. *Johnson*. The new approach is essentially this: If State law sets no maximum for a particular kind of credit transaction, there will be no Federal law either. The practical effect is to repeal the Federal law in many cases. The laws of most States permit the banks to buy usurious paper from automobile dealers, furniture dealers, appliance dealers, loan sharks, and others, even though their laws do not permit the banks to make usurious loans directly to consumers.

Many bankers are too dignified or respectable to look across the counter at their customers and tell them that they are going to charge an interest rate of 15 percent, or even

more. Yet instances have been brought to light where 60 percent has been charged by dealers. And the bankers have no objection if the dealer, or someone else, drives such a bargain.

SMALL STATE PROTECTION

Unfortunately, only a handful of States have modernized their laws to establish firm consumer protection against exorbitant interest charges through the relatively new device of the conditional sales contract. The others still permit bankers to extend credit through the back door, through dealers and loan sharks acting as their agents.

The bankers say that strict enforcement of the Federal laws would place national banks at a disadvantage with State banks. They demand what they call parity treatment. Even the Federal agencies which are supposed to be most directly responsible for this bill approve the parity idea. The assumption appears to be that customers would prefer to go across the street to a State bank that would charge them higher rates of interest than are permitted to national banks.

The bill, nevertheless, seems inconsistent regarding its desire to create parity for State banks. Section 51, title I, says that the States cannot require any license of a national bank to do business in their territory. It says that State banking authorities may not examine national banks. It even goes further, declaring that State cannot have laws which interfere with the citizens of the State doing business with national banks. In other words, it places national banks beyond the reach of State law.

It is illuminating to note that when the bankers were writing these exemptions for themselves they included the new terms—such as conditional sales contract and installment consumer paper—which they did not recognize in the sections where they were dealing with what are supopsed to be prohibitions and limitations.

It is also extremely enlightening to note who will enforce the State laws. The answer is only a Federal official—the Comptroller of the Currency—so far as national banks are concerned. Section 3 sets up the Comptroller as supervisor of the national banks, and section 51 prohibits the States even from taking steps to find out whether or not there is compliance with their laws.

It is as if the Soviet Government said to one of its satellite countries:

"We are not going to interfere with your country. We are going to be democratic, and depend upon the laws your legislature passes. But we shall enforce them for you just so you won't be bothered. Indeed, we are not going to let you find out whether they are being enforced."

Furthermore, section 49 of the bankers' bill says that reports which the Comptroller makes when his agents examine the national banks are to be privileged. They are going to have immunity from subpena of any court.

There is another section of the bill which makes certain that the General Accounting Office will have no authority to audit the Comptroller of the Currency. It is based upon the strange practice which allows the Comptroller's office to operate upon fees which it collects from the banks. The Comptroller does not have to come to Congress for appropriations. And the bankers' bill declares that the fees he collects from them "shall not be construed to be Government funds or appropriated moneys."

PATMAN is today questioning whether there is any justification for giving the national banks immunity from State laws. They are 100 percent private, profitmaking business. He says:

"If the Federal Government can give national banks immunity from State law, it can give drugstores, automobile dealers, farmers, or any other business such exemption."

Nor does he see any reason why the Office of the Comptroller should be exempted from audit by the General Accounting Office as though it were owned by the private banks. He believes the Office of the Comptroller should be under budget control and audit review, as any other Federal office, and not operate under secrecy.

ROADBLOCK

The few points reviewed here are enough to stamp the financial institutions bill as an extremely tricky piece of legislation. Obviously it is not what it is claimed to be—merely a codification of present laws. It is sufficiently something other than represented to be called a first-class swindle—one that could cost the public hundreds of millions of dollars. Nor would the reader escape its effects upon the cost of everything he buys.

But it is also something more. In the never-ending battle to protect the public against the growing power of great economic concentration this bill would place blocks in the way of true banking reform—reform which would amend the usury laws in the interest of the public, reforms which would bring the operations of the Comptroller of the Currency under Federal supervision, reforms which would check the growing tendency of private bankers to swallow the Federal Reserve System.

The financial institutions bill should have a much more thorough public examination than either the Senate or House Banking and Currency Committees have afforded. Amendments now are being considered by the House committee. Some will be made. Eventually the House and Senate committees will go into conference on the measure. There is still a chance that its worst features may be eliminated.

Cystic Fibrosis Bill, H. R. 12331

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COYA KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I circularized my colleagues in the House, and also in the Senate, soliciting support of the bill H. R. 12331, calling for intensive research on the dread children's disease, cystic fibrosis. Under unanimous consent, I include here the letter, the bill, and descriptive material sent out yesterday:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 20, 1598.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: On May 5, I introduced a bill to provide for intensive research into the dread disease, cystic fibrosis, which takes its yearly toll in the lives of our children. This bill is H. R. 12331, copy of which is attached. I commend it to your attention, seeking your help in securing its passage before the end of this session of the 85th Congress.

The disease is hereditary and almost always fatal. Children may live through its horror until the late teens, but the agony of those years in addition to the heartsick burden of the parents standing helplessly by, creates one of the saddest pictures of our modern world.

Research into cause, transmission of the disease-bearing genes, relieving medication and possible cure, should be pursued with the greatest speed. The care of these children is constant, the medication very expensive. Hopeless as the living problems are, the parents face the future of heavy indebtedness as well. Surely, something must be done, and at the earliest possible time—to give these burdened families help—and hope.

The bill is pending before the House Interstate Commerce Committee. Any assistance you can give this bill will be most welcome. Of course, if you could see your way clear to introduce the bill, this would be of great assistance. In either case, you will have not only my gratitude, but also the gratitude of the helpless CF families all over the country.

Kindest personal regards,

Sincerely,

Congresswoman COYA KNUTSON.

P. S.—For additional information, may I refer you to the following items in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: March 20, page 4408; April 21, A3575 and A3565; April 28, A3836 and A3842; May 1, A4024.

A bill to require the Surgeon General to undertake a special research program with respect to cystic fibrosis

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress hereby finds that the disease of cystic fibrosis constitutes a national health problem which is of exceptional gravity because (1) recent studies show its incidence to be far higher than heretofore realized, (2) it is a disease of children, with an exceptionally high mortality rate, (3) little is known about the disease, and (4) relatively little research is being conducted in this field. It is, therefore, the purpose of this act to provide for a special cystic fibrosis research program.

SEC. 2. The Surgeon General shall without delay develop and carry out a massive research attack on cystic fibrosis through a cooperative effort among the National Institutes of Health.

SEC. 3. In carrying out his duties under the first section, the Surgeon General shall—

(a) establish a special organization of the National Institutes of Health to which he shall assign responsibility for coordinating and expediting the research attack within and among the several National Institutes of Health;

(b) take such action as may be necessary to insure that research grants and research projects in the field of cystic fibrosis are given a priority consistent with the magnitude of the research problem presented by cystic fibrosis;

(c) make a concentrated effort (1) to discover research personnel competent to carry out research in this field, (2) to interest such persons in undertaking research in such field, and (3) to provide preliminary training necessary to enable persons with the requisite capacity to obtain the training necessary to enable them to conduct research in this field;

(d) devise procedures to discover avenues of approach which show promise of contributing to the success of the research attack provided for in the first section.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $200,000 to be used for carrying out this act. The funds appropriated under this section shall be in addition to funds appropriated under other provisions of law for medical research.

THEIR "VALLEY OF THE SHADOW OF DEATH": CYSTIC FIBROSIS

WHAT IS CYSTIC FIBROSIS?

A disease that strikes children more frequently than such better known ailments as leukemia and nephrosis, cystic fibrosis affects their lungs and digestion.

In fact it strikes about 1 child in every 600 born. This means about 7,000 cases a year. About half of these unfortunate youngsters die before reaching 5 years of age. For the remaining victims, the long-range outlook is still bleak. Doctors are seeking a cure for this disease, as well as its cause, but they need help desperately.

WHAT ARE THE SYMPTOMS?

Chronic coughing, difficulty in breathing, pneumonia, a large appetite but small gain

in weight, and bulky diarrhea. There may be a swollen abdomen and club-shaped fingers.

WHAT PRODUCES THESE SYMPTOMS?

The basic cause of cystic fibrosis is still a puzzle. For some unknown reason the child's mucous glands do not function properly, but secrete so much abnormally thick mucus that the lungs and the pancreatic ducts become clogged and cannot function normally.

The child's respiratory system is disturbed when the mucus blocks the air pasages of his lungs. Chronic infection results and the child often perishes as his lungs can no longer overcome the persistent obstruction.

The child's digestive system is disrupted when the mucus blocks his pancreas, a small organ near the stomach. This prevents the free flow of pancreatic juices that are vital to healthy absorption of food and regular elimination.

WHAT IS THE TREATMENT?

To control respiratory infection, daily antibiotics are prescribed. Often germ-fighting, detergent solutions are sprayed into the air passages periodically in the form of a fine mist. Severe cases may require intermittent positive pressure breathing to help overcome severe obstruction.

To restore more normal digestion and bowel movements, the child is given enzyme preparations to replace the blocked pancreatic juices. A high-protein, low-fat diet, laced with large doses of vitamins, also may be advised. Sometimes surgery is required to open intestinal obstructions in newborn infants.

Mortality of cystic fibrosis, 1938–40, 100 percent of diagnosed cases died before adolescence; 1957, with early diagnosis and best care, 50 to 60 percent should reach adolescence.

IS THERE ANY QUICK DIAGNOSIS?

Yes, just recently a fingertip test was developed that makes diagnosing cystic fibrosis relatively simple. The child touches his hand or foot to a gelatinlike chemical solution, and if the high amount of salt found in the sweat of cystic fibrosis children is present on his skin, a yellowish imprint appears.

WHY IS THIS MALADY SO DANGEROUS?

As yet few people—even physicians—know much about this disease despite its being so deadly. All too often precious days, weeks, and even months pass by while youngsters are mistakenly treated for asthma, bronchitis, allergy, celiac, or other diseases.

Meanwhile, cystic fibrosis is sapping the little victim's vitality, choking off his air supply by clogging the lungs with thick mucus, at the same time it is starving his body by blocking the pancreas.

This ailment is taking more lives than necessary because the American people are not yet fully awake to its threat. Only relatively small amounts of money have thus far been raised for research into its cause and cure.

Average age of death with diagnosis and treatment, 1946, 2 years; 1956, 5 years.

The weapons now being used to hold back the disease are expensive, but cystic fibrosis is no respector of a family's income. Not contagious, it afflicts the offspring of parents who pass along the inherited tendency in their genes.

We cannot allow these unfortunate children to continue suffering. Dark as their future seems, we must keep them alive today because a cure may come tomorrow.

Help the National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation, and you will bring new hope to thousands of little children often doomed to lose their lives before they have really begun to live.

Contributions are tax deductible.

NATIONAL CYSTIC FIBROSIS RESEARCH FOUNDATION,
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Address of Hon. Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in these days when we hear so much criticism of the Supreme Court, I was very much pleased to read an address by the distinguished Chief Justice of the United States, delivered at the annual meeting of the American Law Institute on May 21, 1958. I think all Senators could benefit by reading the address, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY EARL WARREN, CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN LAW INSTITUTE, MAY 21, 1958

I am appearing before you not to make an address, but in accordance with custom to give you a report to which your great interest in justice entitles you. Furthermore, it is in anticipation of services to be rendered and because of the interest that has guided you through the years and which brings you from all parts of the country to Washington at the end of another year. Your continuous study of the ever-present problems facing our judicial system gives us the confidence to believe that your presence here and the results you are sure to accomplish will result in immeasurable benefit to the better administration of justice.

These words which were used in connection with the observance of Law Day, U. S. A., come to my mind:

"Freedom and justice for the individual—grounded in a just system of laws and protected by the courts—are the keystones of America's strength and its main claim to moral leadership in the world community. Perhaps better than any other facts of American life, the peoples of the world understand the meaning of liberty and opportunity for the individual citizen in this country."

This is a great concept. It challenges us to reexamine our profession and our system of justice to determine whether we are presently approaching or receding from this goal. High-minded concepts should indeed be our objectives, but the real test of our system is the extent to which our ideals are given actual concrete reality in the lives of our people. A system of laws—however just—that exists only in theory is a slim basis for a claim to moral leadership in the world community. It is a weak reed to support our national strength.

We must not forget that the role of the courts is not merely to define the right. It is also to administer the remedy. Unless the remedy is actually applied to persons and things, the right is a mere pious idea.

With these thoughts in mind, I must report that the delay and the choking congestion in the Federal courts today have created a crucial problem for constitutional government in the United States. It is so chronically prevalent that it is compromising the quantity and quality of justice available to the individual citizen and, in so doing, it is leaving vulnerable throughout the world the reputation of the United States for protecting and securing these rights and remedies.

We have made some progress, but the truth is that for every inch we gain, the normal healthy economic and population growth of our country extends a yard—leaving in its wake a whole new volume of litigation for the courts. As an illustration, since I last met with you the backlog in civil actions alone, in United States district courts, has increased by more than 5,000 new cases. The Federal judiciary is simply unable—as long as it lacks a sufficient number of judges, improved administrative and procedural techniques, and ample supporting staff—to keep pace with the dynamic growth of our country.

The business of the district courts is the best evidence of this. If we go back to the prewar year 1941—the first year that complete statistics were compiled in the administrative office—we can trace a veritable upward surge in the volume of litigation in our Federal trial courts.

You know, of course, that I am not referring to the criminal business of the courts because, despite its importance, it takes only a minor portion of the court time. Criminal business has priority and is promptly disposed of.

It is, rather, the civil business of the courts which has skyrocketed since 1941. In that year, 38,000 civil cases were filed, and an equal number of cases were disposed of. The pending caseload at the end of the year was 29,000. The time interval—the vital issue-to-trial period—during which time the case is entirely in the control of the court, was only 5 months for the average or median case. In that year, 1941, we had approximately 200 trial judges.

Today—16 years later—the number of cases filed annually has increased to 62,000, and the pending backlog of business totals some 66,000 cases. We have, in our Federal trial courts, 250 judges.

In other words, the numbers of cases filed annually in Federal district courts has increased more than 60 percent since 1941. The backlog of cases has risen more than 125 percent. But, in contrast, there has been but a 25 percent increase in the number of judges to handle the increased volume of business. This also applies generally to supporting personnel.

The inevitable result has been a most discouraging increase in the length of time for getting a case heard. From 5 months in 1941, the interval from issue-to-trial for the median case has risen to 9 months. At the present time, over 38 percent of all the civil cases in the Federal courts are subject to undue delay—that is, delay from 1 to 4 years between the date of filing and the time of trial. This delay is chiefly in our large metropolitan areas. For example, in Brooklyn the delay is 42 months; in Pittsburgh, 33 months; in Cleveland, 30 months; in New York City, 26 months; Philadelphia, 26 months; Milwaukee, 26 months; Denver, 20 months; Chicago, 18 months; and in San Francisco, 13 months. The Judicial Conference, as you know, has established an objective standard of 6 months for a normal case from the time it is filed until it is tried. Unfortunately, there were but 7 out of 94 districts which met the 6 months' standard in 1957. They include the Middle District of Alabama and the Southern District of West Virginia, and such populated areas as Memphis, Tulsa, Albuquerque, Dallas, and Fort Worth. The actual median case throughout the United States takes 12 months.

The median time interval in the courts of appeal from filing of the complete record to final disposition ranges from 3.8 months in the fastest circuit to 10.4 months in the slowest. This time must be added before final disposition of the case is reached.

The upward trend in the number of appeals seems to be leveling off, at least temporarily, but in the second, fourth, and fifth circuits the additional judges recommended by the Judicial Conference must be supplied or the growing pressure of business will surely force these courts behind.

Now, after the interested parties have exhausted the appellate procedure, they have a right to seek a review in the Supreme Court. That also takes a considerable period of time. Fortunately, because of our discretionary power on certiorari, the Court has been able to keep abreast of its work every year since 1928. While the work has increased very greatly since that time, in recent years the flow of cases has been somewhat uniform.

The number of cases docketed in the Court during the past year has continued at the same high level of the preceding 2 years. As of May 19 there were 1,013 cases on the appellate docket and 781 cases on the miscellaneous docket, an increase of 25 as of the same time last year. There have been 154 cases argued before the Court compared to 145 in the preceding year, an increase of 9. On May 19 we had disposed of 1,391 cases from both dockets, compared to 1,380 at that time last year. On the appellate docket 567 petitions for certiorari have been denied and 90 petitions have been granted. On the miscellaneous docket 571 petitions for certiorari and applications for leave to file extraordinary writs have been denied and 19 petitions have been granted. We have every reason to believe that at the last session of this term we will be able to say, as the Court has said every year since 1928, when it acquired the certiorari jurisdiction, that all cases ready for argument have been heard and decided. However, until the discretionary writ of certiorari was authorized by the Congress, the Supreme Court found itself falling further and further behind, as are the other courts in the Federal system. We can all derive satisfaction from that innovation in court administration because I have no doubt that if it were not for that change, the Supreme Court would be suffering from the same congestion that confronts the other courts in our judicial system. As a remedy was found for the congestion in the Supreme Court, so we must search day by day and year by year for remedies to put the district courts and the courts of appeals on a current basis. There is no single answer, but I have the confidence to believe that if the bench and bar come to a realization of the dangers involved, that we can and will find the remedy. If we really believe in our system, we must have that faith.

As I have stated, the backlog in civil business has already increased by more than 5,000

cases in the district courts this year, and it is continuing to spiral upward. But I should emphasize, the total number of cases is not an entirely satisfactory criterion for measuring the problem of congestion. The type of case is important, too. For example, during the war and shortly thereafter we had on our dockets a large number of Government price and rent control cases, which took a minimum amount of time. Studies that we have made show that on the average, cases between private individuals, the majority of them under the diversity of citizenship jurisdiction, take 3 times as much time to handle as Government cases. These private cases, therefore, are the most important factor in the caseload. And it is this group which has increased most rapidly. Between 1941 and 1957, private civil cases based upon diversity of citizenship jurisdiction increased from some 7,000 per year to over 23,000. The backlog has increased 150 percent.

Bankruptcy matters, while usually handled by the referees, are also an important part of Federal court business. The number of bankruptcy cases has not increased significantly excepting cases involving wage earners. Although it is true that during the fiscal year 1957 the total backlog of bankruptcy cases of all types rose from 59,000 to 68,000 cases, the fact is that about 80 percent of the total are employee-type cases and almost 20 percent of these were filed under chapter 13 as wage-earner plans for the payment of indebtedness. If it seems somewhat misleading to lump the chapter 13 proceedings with ordinary bankruptcy, it should be borne in mind that each of them constitutes another case for the courts to handle no matter what section of the act may be relied upon.

These statistics are a record of delay piled upon delay in the Federal courts. But, serious as they may be, they are no accurate measure of the extent to which our administrative weaknesses have caused injustice. They do not reflect the hardship and suffering cause to unfortunate victims of such delays, nor the inadequate settlements which individuals are frequently forced to accept on that account. Neither do these figures include what are probably the worst and most numerous cases of all: those instances in which citizens with causes that cry for justice under law have turned from our court system in despair and have sought ways of working out their problems without resort to the courts at all.

It is evident that if this condition is not remedied it will seriously undermine what we have described as "the keystone of America's strength," and will dilute what we have proclaimed as "our main claim to moral leadership in the world community." Certainly we must be gravely concerned when our judicial machinery is facing an outlook of this kind.

The immediate and most pressing need is for additional judges. No new judgeships have been authorized for more than 4 years and, indeed, during that period we have lost 3 positions as the result of the expiration of judgeships created on a temporary basis. The Judicial Conference has recommended to the present Congress the creation of 45 additional judgeships, many of which were contained in the omnibus bill originally introduced in the 84th Congress. These are not just requests from localities for more judges. They are recommendations of the Judicial Conference of the United States based upon serious study of the statistics and conditions facing the particular districts and circuits for which the additional judges have been recommended.

I regret to report that this legislation—so vital to the administration of justice in the Federal courts—has still not received the consideration of Congress.

Our judges have done a magnificent job carrying an increased burden. In 1941, the average number of civil cases disposed of per judge was 169; in 1957, this figure had increased by 37 percent to 232.

We all recognize that additional judges are needed. But, within the judicial structure itself, we must have more efficient court administration; we must make a more flexible use of Federal judgepower by transfer from one district to another; and we must utilize, far more than we have, pretrial procedure.

We need the enactment of legislation authorizing the Judicial Conference to make a continuing study which will assist the Supreme Court in the revision of our Federal rules; and we need a realistic limitation of the diversity of citizenship and Federal question jurisdiction in light of present-day conditions.

Equally important, we need to have filled the 10 vacancies which now exist on the district courts. These vacancies—in the face of increasing business and a shortage of judges—are of serious concern to the district courts.

This brings me to the steps we have taken, since I met with you last May, to improve our own administrative machinery.

First, I should like to mention that we have strengthened the Judicial Conference of the United States by the addition of district judges—a district judge selected to represent each circuit, thus doubling the membership of the Conference. The importance of this, of course, is that we now have as members trial judges who are experiencing daily the complex problems which plague the courts. Already, we have availed ourselves of this increased membership to establish a budget committee to study, appraise, and make recommendations as to the overall needs of the judicial branch.

Second, we have moved to strengthen the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. I am sure you remember that Mr. Henry P. Chandler retired as Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and Mr. Elmore Whitehurst resigned as Assistant Director to accept another position in the Federal service. These two men guided the Administrative Office since it was established and did a very fine job of it.

I am especially proud to report at this point that we were successful in prevailing upon Mr. Warren Olney III, former Assistant Attorney General of the United States, to accept the position as Director of the Administrative Office. As many of you know, Warren Olney has a wide and distinguished record in the field we broadly refer to as the administration of justice, combining the experience of both a scholar and a dynamic administrator.

For Assistant Director, we have been fortunate to obtain the services of Mr. William Ellis, who possesses the best technical and fiscal law experience to be obtained in the executive branch of the Government.

These two individuals are combining their talents and diverse experience to give to the Administrative Office expert and resourceful leadership and I, for one, am very optimistic about their chances of accomplishment. I know that they will appreciate your advice and suggestions as they tackle their difficult task.

You will also be interested to know that the Attorney General, Mr. Rogers, will convene the second nationwide conference on court congestion and delay on June 16. Again, he will bring together representatives of all agencies having any responsibility for the administration of justice—the courts, bar associations, law schools, public representatives, and, of course, the Department of Justice, itself. It is a good omen, to my way of thinking when the full power and prestige of the United States Government is brought to bear on this problem.

I have mentioned a more flexible use of Federal judgepower by transfer from one district to another. This is not a satisfactory permanent solution to the lack of a sufficient number of judges to carry on our business, but it can be of great help in taking care of the situation until Congress has acted. We have in the Federal courts in those districts having purely Federal jurisdiction 13 districts where in 1957 the number of private cases filed per judge exceeded 200. We also have 31 districts where it was less than 100, the average for the country per judge being 151. To bring about an adjustment of this situation is one of the challenges to the Judicial Conference and to the Circuit Councils.

A greater and more effective use of pretrial procedure is another measure to expedite court business. This procedural tool, given to the courts by rule 16 of the Federal rules, can be more widely and more efficiently used. Judge Alfred Murrah, the dynamic chairman of the pretrial committee, calls it applied commonsense. The Conference has been urging that pretrial should be used in every civil case before trial, except where the district judge expressly enters an order to the contrary. The report of the Conference pretrial committee indicates that there has been a steady increase in the use of pretrial in recent years, but in many circuits it still appears to depend in the individual districts on whether the individual judges like the procedure or not. I agree with the committee that pretrial procedure has proved itself and that it should be as much a part of our Federal court procedure as the other requirements set down in the rules of civil procedure for processing a case.

The exception when it is not used should be unusual and should result from the particular nature of the case rather than on account of the predilections of the judge.

I should also like to mention in the category of long-range improvements in judicial administration the proposal endorsed by the Judicial Conference of legislative authorization for it to participate in the rulemaking function of the Supreme Court.

The bill does not alter the rulemaking power of the Court. It merely authorizes the Judicial Conference to maintain continuing studies of the rules, through committees, and to recommend needed changes in the rules for consideration of the Supreme Court. That Court can adopt, modify, or reject the Conference recommendations.

If the bill is adopted the restudy of the court rules will call for close cooperation of the bench and bar to make the judicial rulemaking process more nearly a science. I am hopeful that the bill will pass this session of Congress. If it does your individual assistance in the rulemaking process will be called for and will be greatly appreciated.

The Judicial Conference has also recommended an amendment of the statutes conferring Federal question and diversity jurisdiction on the district courts.

It may eliminate a number of cases that are not of sufficient importance to challenge the jurisdiction of the Federal courts on such grounds. It must be remembered that when the jurisdictional amount of $3,000 was fixed in 1911, the purchasing power of the dollar was about three times what it is now. It is, therefore, appropriate that there should be a corresponding increase in this amount, and the Judicial Conference is recommending it be raised to $10,000. The bill, which was approved by the Conference and is now pending in Congress, would have a considerable effect on the cases where a corporation is involved by providing that "a corporation shall be deemed a citizen of any State by which it has been incorporated or the State where it has its principal place of business."

It is hard to say just what this will accomplish, but at all events it should be helpful because there are many corporations doing a strictly local business with a foreign charter, and the necessity for diversity juris-

diction in litigation affecting them in the State where they do business would no longer seem to exist. The phrase "principal place of business" was used following the words of the Bankruptcy Act which employs this same language as a basis for jurisdiction in a bankruptcy case. There are a number of cases in the books which construe this language. These provisions would give at least some measure of temporary relief to the Federal courts because they would decrease the number of Federal question and diversity cases filed and these are on the average the most time-consuming type of cases for the courts.

In making this overall report to you, I am not criticizing individual judges because I firmly believe that by and large judges are as devoted public servants as can be found anywhere. However, in a sprawling, detached judicial system such as ours is, with 250 judges dispersed from Maine to California and from Washington to Florida, judicial administration and modern procedures, as well as sufficient personnel of necessity play a large part in the efficiency of the system, and it is to promote your continued interest in this field that I feel justified in taking the time of the members of this important Institute to give you these dry but important statistics.

Finally, may I extend to you, on behalf of all the members of the Supreme Court, best wishes for a successful conference. If the Court work would permit my doing so, I would like nothing better than to attend all of your sessions, but we are now in the closing weeks of the term, and there are very few moments for anything except studying cases and writing opinions, if we are to adjourn within a reasonable time.

As a matter of fact, we are to convene for our last session of arguments within the next hour.

University of Wisconsin Statement on Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the University of Wisconsin faculty has adopted an important policy statement on the question of Federal aid to education. The statement was drafted by the university committee, which is the faculty's principal committee on policy. The full faculty then considered the statement, and revised and adopted it.

There are some points made in the statement which must not be lost from view. One is that a Federal-aid program which merely subsidizes the student, and does nothing to aid the institution—which must supply part of the cost of educating every student it enrolls—would mean financial disaster to most institutions of higher education. A second point is that the Federal Government should avoid programs which distort and unbalance the educational offerings of the colleges and limit the freedom of the student to select whatever field of concentration he pleases. The best way to get an adequate number of scientists is to strengthen education all along the line.

Mr. President, the concern of the University of Wisconsin faculty with providing leadership in the great national town meeting over the crisis in education is in the fine tradition of the university. In Wisconsin it is said that the boundaries of the campus are the boundaries of the State. In these times of national peril they may expand, and should expand, to the boundaries of the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of policy of the faculty of the University of Wisconsin be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PROPOSED FEDERAL AID TO HIGHER EDUCATION (REVISED MAY 12, 1958)

The faculty of the University of Wisconsin is aware of the great need for financial support of education now and in the immediate future. If the Federal Government is to be a major source of aid to higher education, then such support must be given in a manner that will guarantee the traditional freedom of each university to determine its basic educational goals, and to allow its intellectual and financial resources to be utilized without distortion of purposes or impairment of educational results by ill or hastily conceived conditions of acceptance of the aid. Consequently, to those engaged in the formulation of Federal aid programs of financial assistance to institutions of higher learning, we urge the following considerations:

I. SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS

Federal scholarship programs should be designed to recruit gifted students primarily on the basis of merit, should provide compensation to the institution as well as to the student, and should include both graduate and undergraduate students.

1. Opinions differ as to how much consideration should be given to need in addition to intellectual ability and achievement in administering scholarship programs. We assume that in the final analysis the Federal support programs, which are being currently discussed as pertinent to our national security and welfare, have special concern for the gifted minds among which one can reasonably expect to find the imaginative and urgently needed leaders of the next adult generation. We believe that the relatively limited number of such students constitutes one of our greatest resources and that they should be aggressively recruited and encouraged in their intellectual efforts regardless of their prior social background or economic environment. We believe that such minds are too rare to risk their loss to society. Consequently, in efforts to recruit and encourage the highly gifted student, as contrasted with the good or average student, we suggest that the factor of merit be given primary consideration.

2. A program which merely provides financial aid to the student, without corresponding aid to the institution to meet costs not compensated by tuition, may only tend to increase the financial problems of the institution as enrollments increase. Every student receives financial aid from the college or university he attends, in the amount of the difference between the actual cost of education and the tuition he pays. If the purpose of the scholarship program is to attract additional students of exceptional ability, and the program is successful in achieving its purpose, it will inevitably increase enrollment pressures and attendant educational costs.

3. An important problem of higher education is the attraction of better students to the universities and colleges at the undergraduate level. Equally or more crucial is the attraction of superior students into graduate work and into teaching and research. While these two are interrelated, encouragement and support of graduate students is of special significance relative to the gifted mind.

II. FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR A BALANCED EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Legislation should permit universities to maintain their initiative in developing a balanced educational program, and permit students freedom of choice in selecting field of study.

1. In recent months public statements have been made urging special measures of support for education in science, engineering, and modern foreign languages. We recognize the urgent need for citizens highly trained in the above areas. But we also recognize an equal need for intellectual leadership on all fronts. The sciences increasingly provide us with the means for both the improvement of the welfare of mankind and for his destruction. The ultimate decisions which will determine the destiny of the free world will be made, in considerable measure, through judgments stemming from other disciplines. Hence, any program of aid to education, under the influence of expediency, should not be unbalanced nor shortsighted, but rather should encourage the training of our best young minds for leadership in all of the areas of learning.

2. Any program of education in a free society should provide a real measure of choice of education to the individual student. We have no fear that gifted minds of scientific or linguistic aptitudes will not seek the fields in which they are most effective. On the other hand, to encourage individuals capable of high achievement to devote themselves to concentration in inappropriate programs of study could be wasteful and result in a high incidence of failure or mediocrity of performance.

III. LONG-RANGE-AID PROGRAMS

Programs must aim at improvement of education at all levels and should recognize the need for long-range programs.

The problems of higher education require long-range solutions, not temporary palliatives. Extensive Federal aid on a temporary basis may serve only to stimulate a growth which cannot be sustained by State or private resources once Federal aid were withdrawn. Education is a long process and improvement in quality must take place at all levels. Higher edueation builds on the foundations provided by elementary and secondary education and highly unusual results cannot be expected, for example, within the 4-year span of one college class.

IV. THE DANGERS OF MATCHING GRANTS TO STIMULATE SPECIFIC PROGRAMS

It should be recognized that grants on a matching basis to stimulate specific programs may create dangers to other programs of an accepting university. Since finances for many institutions are limited by endowments or by State appropriations, the diversion of funds for one program may result in less funds for others. Moreover, extension of aid on such a basis may provide no opportunity for those institutions which have already extended themselves financially.

V. CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

Within a Federal-aid programs funds for construction would serve a vital need for an expanding college population. We believe that any such construction program should be subject to the same principles of liberal use as stated in sections II and IV relative to other programs.

Liberty Under Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very outstanding address entitled "Liberty Under Law," delivered by the Honorable Robert McC. Figg, Jr., of Charleston, S. C., at the annual convention of the South Carolina Bar Association on Thursday, May 1, 1958.

Mr. Figg is one of the most prominent and astute lawyers in the Nation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIBERTY UNDER LAW

Law Day has been proclaimed by the President of the United States as a day of national dedication to the principle of government under laws.[1] It is a day for the American people to remember our heritage of liberty, justice, and equality under law, and to recognize our obligation to preserve and strengthen that great heritage. It is a day for us to renew our loyalty to the principle of fundamental rights of individuals guaranteed by organic law, which principle is the heart and sinew of our Nation, distinguishing our government from all those which rule by might alone, and making it an inspiration and a beacon of hope for oppressed peoples everywhere.

May 1 is also the day on which international communism celebrates its past victories and looks forward to its future conquests. There can be no better date for us to recall the basic moral and philosophical principles upon which our society is based, and to contrast these principles with the cynical, immoral, and atheistic philosophy that underlies the international Communist conspiracy.[2]

The striking contrast between our governmental system and the totalitarian systems of the world is the great measure of liberty which our law extends to every individual in our land, not only our citizens but even the strangers within our gates. Individual liberty is the cardinal objective of government and law under our Anglo-American traditions.

Our Declaration of Independence declared that governments are instituted to secure liberty as one of the inalienable rights of men.

The Constitution of the United States recites that it was ordained to establish justice and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

The preamble to the constitution of this State reads:

"We, the people of the State of South Carolina, in convention assembled, grateful to God for our liberties, do ordain and establish this constitution for the preservation and perpetuation of the same."

Our State supreme court sitting en banc declared many years ago through Mr. Justice Woods that "the fundamental principle of these constitutions is that the welfare of all the people is prompted by the enjoyment of equal liberty by all alike, and that even if prosperity is not always promoted by constitutional guaranties, liberty is better than prosperity."[3]

In our legal and governmental institutions, we have endeavored to follow the teaching of St. James in his Epistle that "whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he not being a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed."[4]

Under our tradition as a free people, we live under a government of laws and not of men. The term "law" embraces all legal and equitable rules defining human rights and duties, and providing for their enforcement, not only as between man and man, but also betweeen government and its citizens.[5]

As Chief Justice Hughes once held,[6] the Constitution does not recognize an absolute and uncontrolled liberty. The liberty safeguarded by our institutions is liberty in a social organization which requires the protection of law against the evils which menace the health, safety, morals, and welfare of the people. Liberty is necessarily subject to regulation which is reasonable in relation to its objective and is adopted in the interests of the community.

One man's absolute liberty must end in law where the liberty of another begins, as otherwise one individual could be deprived of the essentials of liberty by the actions of another. By means of regulation of the kind mentioned, law has supplanted force in human relations, and the right secured to everyone to pursue his happiness unrestrained except by just, equal, and impartial laws.[7]

The founders of our Nation, in order to spell out beyond any reasonable doubt the fundamental rights of those living under our law, and to guarantee those rights in express terms, appended a Bill of Rights to the Constitution. The States of the Union have all written the same or substantially similar guaranties into their organic laws.

It is appropriate on this day to recount these rights in some detail. When we do this, we see in our minds the specter of tragic and bloody events that only recently have occurred in other countries where such rights are nonexistent or utterly ineffective.

Our guaranteed rights include the free exercise of religion; freedom of speech and of the press; peaceable assembly; petitioning the Government for the redress of grievances; the right to keep and bear arms; and the right to be secure in our persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable intrusions of constituted authority.

They also include protection against excessive bail, excessive fines, cruel and unusual punishments, successive trials for the same cause, and self-incrimination as the result of torture or otherwise.

In so many words, we are given the guaranty of the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the vicinage; the right to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; the right to be confronted with the witnesses for the prosecution and to compel the attendance of defense witnesses; and the right to have the assistance of counsel for our defense.

Taken together, these rights make certain that in our country a contest in the criminal court between the Government on the one hand and an accused individual on the other is an equal contest, despite the disparity in size and strength between the parties.

Under our law, no individual can be arrested and held for days, weeks, months, or even years, as has happened time and again in other lands, and left to wonder why. The right to have the assistance of counsel and the existence in the Constitution of protection against the suspension of the great writ of habeas corpus as the means of forcing the according of all of the other constitutional rights are effective insurance that our people cannot suffer the fate of long imprisonment without the entry of a charge, a fate too often visited upon unfortunates under totalitarian systems of law.

The right to counsel is a recognition that written law will not automatically protect liberty. There have been many times in the history of liberty when its continued existence has depended upon the courage and devotion to duty of lawyers who have been called upon to assert and defend it, and we as lawyers still have the continuing duty and privilege of fulfilling the constitutional guaranty of the right to the assistance of counsel when called to serve.

Among the most precious liberties accorded by our law is the presumption of innocence. This presumption clothes an accused from the time that a charge is made against him and remains with him until it has been removed by proof of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. The Supreme Court of our State once declared the philosophy of our law that it is deemed better in the administration of justice that many guilty persons escape than that one innocent person should suffer.[8]

So long as we have the writ of habeas corpus, the right of an effective trial by jury, and the presumption of innocence, every American will be enabled thereby to stand erect on his own two feet and with confidence say to the world, "I am indeed a free man."

Contained in the Bill of Rights is another priceless guaranty, one that may properly be called the broadest and mightiest of all, the provision that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law.

On the 19th day of June, in the year 1215, the sovereign in Magna Carta declared that "no freeman shall be taken, or imprisoned, or disseised, or outlawed, or exiled, or anywise destroyed; nor shall we go upon him, nor send him out, but by the lawful judgment of his peers or by the law of the land."[9]

The phrase "due process of law" in our Bill of Rights is the exact equivalent of the ancient phrase, the law of the land, and its application to the relation between man and government in our jurisprudence has well nigh made it the synonym of, liberty under law.

By Magna Carta the sovereign and the sovereign power were acknowledged to be subject to the law of the land, a concept expressed some centuries later by Sir Edward Coke in his famous declaration that "the king is under God and the law."

The heritage of liberty under law and of the supremacy of law thus derived from Magna Carta through the centuries came to our shores with the English common law. South Carolina in the year 1712 was the first of the colonies to adopt the common law system.

---

[1] Presidental proclamation of February 2, 1958.

[2] Law Day—U. S. A., President Charles S. Rhyne of the American Bar Association, vol. 44 American Bar Association Journal, p. 313.

[3] *Ex parte Holleman* (79 S. C. 9, 26; 60 S. E. 19; 21 L. R. A. (N. S.) 242; 14 Ann. Cas. 1105).

[4] James 1: 25.

[5] Compare *Jenkins* v. *Ballantyne* ((Utah), 16 L. R. A. 689).

[6] *West Coast Hotel Co.* v. *Parrish* (300 U. S. 379, 391).

[7] Compare Field, Jr., concurring in *Butcher's Union Co.* v. *Crescent City Co.* (111 U. S. 746, 759).

[8] *State* v. *Browder* (183 S. C. 447, 191 S. E. 302).

[9] Volume 12, American Jurisprudence, p. 261.

In 1819 Justice William Johnson, a South Carolinian, as a member of the United States Supreme Court, said: [10]

"As to the words from Magna Carta * * * after volumes spoken and written at length with a view to their exposition, the good sense of mankind has at length settled down to this: that they were intended to secure the individual from the arbitrary exercise of the powers of government, unrestrained by the established principles of private right and distributive justice."

The United States Supreme Court has said that the liberty mentioned in the guaranty of due process of law means not only the right of the citizen to be free from the mere physical restraint of his person, as by incarceration, but the term is deemed to embrace the right of the citizen to be free in the enjoyment of all his faculties; to be free to use them in all lawful ways; to live and work where he will; to earn his livelihood by any lawful calling; to pursue any livelihood or avocation; and for that purpose to enter into all contracts which may be proper, necessary, and essential to his carrying out to a successful conclusion the purposes mentioned.[11]

This enumeration suggests the breadth of the guaranty of due process in relation to liberty, but does not contain, by any means, all of the instances to which the conception has been applied.

It is not inappropriate to refer here to our antitrust and antimonopoly statutes that have been passed to protect and effectuate the right of every American to engage in business freely and exercise to the full extent of his abilities the privileges of our system of free enterprise, without being crushed by legalized cartels and even State and State-granted monopolies which destroy such opportunity in many countries. Such cartels and monopolies not only abridge or destroy the right and effective opportunity of the individual to engage in business, but also deprive the economy of the country of the benefits of competitive production and distribution, and the lower prices and higher standard of living that result therefrom.

In setting up our National Government to secure the blessings of liberty, the founders separated governmental powers into 3 parts, and created 3 branches of the Government to exercise those powers, the executive, legislative, and judicial.

Justice Brandeis expressed the purpose of such division when he observed:

"The doctrine of the separation of powers was adopted by the Convention of 1787 not to promote efficiency but to preclude the exercise of arbitrary power. The purpose was not to avoid friction, but, by means of the inevitable friction incident to the distribution of the governmental powers among the three departments, to save the people from autocracy." [12]

Our governmental structure was recently described by a Supreme Court Justice as follows:

"A constitutional democracy like ours is perhaps the most difficult of man's special arrangements to manage successfully. * * * The founders of the Nation * * * acted on the conviction that the experience of man sheds a good deal of light * * * not merely on the need for effective power, if a society is to be at once cohesive and civilized, but also on the need for limitations on the power of the governors over the governed.

"These long headed statesmen had no illusions that our people enjoyed biological or psychological or sociological immunities from the hazards of concentrated power. * * * The accretion of dangerous power does not come in a day. It does come, however, slowly, from the generative force of unchecked disregard of the restrictions that fence in even the most disinterested assertion of authority.[13]

Shortly before his elevation to the bench, Edward Douglas White, afterward Chief Justice, said this of the Supreme Court of the United States:

"The glory and ornament of our system which distinguishes it from every other government on the face of the earth is that there is a great and mighty power hovering over the Constitution of the land to which has been delegated the awful responsibility of restraining all the coordinate departments of government within the walls of the governmental fabric which our fathers built for our protection and immunity." [14]

The Supreme Court has on a number of occasions, in the exercise of judicial power, set straight the legislative and executive branches of the Government when they exceeded their authority or usurped or encroached upon the exercise of functions not committed to them. In so doing the Court served the cause of liberty well.

But the Court itself is sometimes guilty of usurpation or of amending the Constitution by changing settled interpretations.

Not long after his elevation to the Supreme Court, Justice White was impelled to dissent from the Court's decision overruling previous precedents and declaring the Federal income tax law of that day unconstitutional. Justice White, with the concurrence of Justice Harlan, wrote:

"If the permanency of [the Court's] conclusions is to depend upon the personal opinions of those who, from time to time, may make up its membership, it will inevitably become a theater of political strife, and its action will be without coherence or consistency. * * * The rights of every individual are guaranteed by the safeguards which have been thrown around them by our adjudications. * * * The fundamental conception of a judicial body is that of one hedged about by precedents which are binding on the court without regard to the personality of its members. Break down this belief in judicial continuity, and let it be felt that on great constitutional questions this court is to depart from the settled conclusions of its predecessors, and to determine them all according to the mere opinion of those who temporarily fill its bench, and our Constitution will, in my judgment, be bereft of value and become a most dangerous instrument to the rights and liberties of the people." [15]

Currently many throughout the Nation feel that the Court, as presently constituted, has shown a proclivity for intruding into matters beyond its competence or amending the Constitution by changing long-settled constructions. There is strong support for this feeling among outstanding authorities on constitutional law and government, as witness the quite recent public expressions of Prof. Edward S. Corwin in the New York Times of March 16 and the Harvard lectures of Judge Learned Hand.

Under our system of Government under law, it is within our concept of liberty that even so august a tribunal as the Supreme Court is subject to public discussion of a critical nature.

Professor Corwin bluntly says that the country needs protection against what he calls the aggressive tendency of the Court, but he believes that fragmentizing appellate jurisdiction on matters of national (as opposed to essentially local) concern among the 11 circuits of the Nation would be like throwing the baby out with the bath.

Hitherto in our history the exercise of judicial self-restraint has been relied on to confine or return the Court to its constitutional orbit. With the growth in size of our Nation, and the increasing complexities of our Federal-State, and our international relations and problems, it may be that the time has come to provide, in the Constitution, for some amplification of the judicial branch of the Government in the consideration of grave constitutional issues and conflicts between the several branches of Government. An effective approach may be the establishment of an en banc Court in somewhat the form provided for in the South Carolina Constitution for the consideration of constitutional questions on which the Court itself is in substantial disagreement, whereunder the circuit judges are called to the assistance of and sit with the Supreme Court Justices on the argument of such questions.[16] Such a broadening of the base of decision, with regional representation throughout the Nation, would be calculated to fortify and strengthen the judicial branch of the Government in public esteem, and to make that branch of our Government an even more effective guardian of the liberty that government was instituted by the founders to secure.

In closing, let me quote from the address of President Charles S. Rhyne of the American Bar Association on the subject of Law Day—U. S. A.:

"We tend to take too much for granted the great principles which underlie our Government. We have a legal system which, in spite of the size of our country and the necessary complexities of its organization, assures for the average citizen more vigorous protection for life and person, more widespread justice, more equality under law, more effective protection for individual rights, more evenly distributed economic opportunity, more security in person and property, and greater personal freedom; than any other system yet developed in all the history of mankind. What more meaningful proof is there that life under the rule of law assures the best existence yet devised by man?"

---

[10] *Bank of Columbia* v. *Okely* (4 Wheat. 235, 244).

[11] *Allgeyer* v. *Louisiana* (165 U. S. 578).

[12] *Myers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52, 293) (dissenting opinion); compare Douglas, J., concurring, *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.* v. *Sawyer* (343 U. S. 579, 629, 630).

[13] Frankfurter, J., concurring, *Youngstown Sheet & Tube* v *Sawyer*, cit, *supra* note 12, pp. 593–595.

[14] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 23, p. 6516.

[15] *Pollock* v. *Farmers' Loan & Trust Co.* (157 U. S. 429, 651, 652) (dissenting opinion).

[16] South Carolina Constitution (1895) art. V, sec. 12.

The Late Elmer Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following statement on Elmer Davis by Edward P. Morgan, delivered on the American Broadcasting Network, Thursday, May 22.

Among the host of tributes to Elmer Davis, none, I feel, have better caught the quality and significance of the man and his work than Edward Morgan's moving story of the memorial service in Washington's National Cathedral.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At noon today, a modest number of people, decorously dressed and clothed too, with solemn thoughts, forsook the full May sunshine and bright midday bustle of the Capital streets for the vaulted coolness, the quietly awesome grandeur of Washington's National Cathedral. They entered this place in a mixed mood of sadness and respect to pay their tributes, silently and each in a private way, to Elmer Davis.

Somewhere in the far internal distance the organ produced the strains of requiem, its subdued melodic sinews encircling the vast crossing of the cathedral and binding the men and women there into a kind of human faggot, a bundle strong and singular in its common, collective, dignified sorrow.

Three or four baskets of flowers sprouted unostentatiously from the base of the pulpit as if simply notifying the massive chandeliers of the tenderly vigorous light of their natural beauty. No sobbing cut out the organ sinews, no ponderous black veils choked the clear respectful scene. Down the north transcept aisle now, preceded by the verger bent slightly with the burden of his long staff, accompanied by Canon Luther Miller, moved the tall, straight figure of the dean of the cathedral, the very Reverend Francis B. Sayre. The congregation, including four women in vivid purple robes and caps of the choir, rose as they entered to commence the memorial service.

For a moment, as if in accidental recognition of the fact that Elmer Davis himself was never completely at ease with electronic gadgets, Dean Sayre had trouble adjusting his microphone. Then the service moved quickly through a simple ritual as if in tribute to the tart, nourishing tenderness of Davis' own broadcasts.

There was the 23d Psalm, and then the 121st. Certainly, one's thoughts ran, Elmer Davis feared no evil, either in the presence or the absence of his enemies, and he was not ashamed to lift up his eyes unto the hills from whence came his help.

Finally, Dean Sayre mounted to the pulpit and quoted from the eighth chapter of the Gospel of St. John. The beacon of Elmer Davis' life must verily have been that verse which says "and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Yet there were indeed those who would have killed his voice, having heard his truth. And who more than this man could testify "But I seek not my own glory"?

Then, in just a few minutes more than an Elmer Davis commentary took, the service was over, most of the crowd melted quickly into the dazzling sunshine outside. A few found their way to the north entrance to grasp the hand of a little, white-haired woman in black, the bravely dry-eyed widow. Inside an acolyte snuffed out the candles beside the alter. The flame of the topmost taper in the right hand candelabrum refused at first to die and even after the acolyte had stifled it again, it seemed somehow to continue to burn, with a defiance befitting the occasion.

It would be easy and soothing to say that the bright sharp truths of Elmer Davis will burn forever, but there is a dark danger that this may not be so. A man of his stonelike integrity, his towering, fearless, and wonderful anger, his rasping conscience, such a man does not sit comfortable or evoke a warm unanimous welcome from any society in any era. With too many of us in our time there exists the careless lack of appreciation of his abrasive value. When, I wonder, has there been more need for a scrub brush applied to the pudgy skin of a softening populace? When have we been in such short supply of the probing needle that deflates swollen, distorted values, pinning flapdoodle, claptrap, pomposity, hypocrisy and fear to the wall? When have we been more thickly siruped with the unctuous, pear-shaped tones poured on by special interests and more desperately groping for the clean, salty twang of truth in the general interest?

A man like Elmer Davis cannot be replaced. His words may live in memory but really only if people remember them to live by them, determined, as he was, to build a structure of social justice to protect man's sanity from an avalanche of goo.

This is Edward Morgan saying good night from Washington.

Frances Rose Leutscher—A True Friend of Wisconsin's People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last month thousands of Wisconsin citizens were saddened by the death of one of their truest friends. Mrs. Frances Rose Leutscher, who was the executive secretary of the Democratic Party of Wisconsin during the past several years of its rising strength and influence, was stricken with a heart attack at only 38 years of age. She had been suffering for years from heart disease, but it was typical of her quiet strength of character that very few of her closest associates had any hint of the danger under which she lived.

Mr. President, a fine and richly deserved tribute to Mrs. Leutscher was paid by Mr. Patrick Lucey, who, as State chairman, was Fran's closest associate in her work. Mr. Lucey's tribute has appeared in a number of publications in Wisconsin. I request unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this brief statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORKING PEOPLE LOST A GOOD FRIEND

(Statement by Patrick J. Lucey, chairman, Democratic Party of Wisconsin)

The working people of Wisconsin lost a great and good friend today. Just a little bit of the tragedy of her passing is that so many thousands of them will never know her.

Frances Leutscher has served for most of this past decade as executive secretary of the Democratic Party of Wisconsin.

During that time she married. Her last name changed from Rose to Leutscher, but to 10,000 working Democrats it mattered not—she was still just "Fran" to them. They all loved her and she them.

RELEASES FOR OTHERS

She turned out many press releases for others. I recall but one that bore her own name. Significantly it was the one just last week when she proudly announced a new record for Democratic membership. Ten thousand had paid their annual dues by April 15. That had never happened before.

Many who read the Wisconsin Democrat paper knew that Fran wrote most of the stories herself—yes, including those which quoted an unknown expert on election statistics. The expert was Fran. We used offset type because it was cheaper. This meant that every character of print was typed and pasted into place by Fran. It was a lot of work, but she made each deadline without complaint.

Fran was an idealist of the practical kind. When the Democrats win this year, as folks tell me they will, people who work in mines, on farms, in factories, behind grocery and drugstore counters, schoolteachers, professional people who will benefit from social reforms. They will benefit from Fran's work through the trying years, but she won't be there. They won't be able to say, "thank you."

Fran was no sentimentalist. She would scoff at this statement. She had a sense of history though, because once when I was critical of the condition of the files, she said, "Oh, let the historical society worry about files. We have work to do."

Fran is gone. Ten thousand Democrats join her personal friends and relatives in mourning her death. Perhaps the papers won't print this. Why should they—they couldn't know her greatness, but this release will be distributed as if she were writing it for someone else.

One to each of the Madison TV stations, 1 to the Capital Times, 1 to the State Journal, 1 to UP, and 1 to the Milwaukee Journal, 1 to the Milwaukee Sentinel, and 1 to John Wyngaard.

An Antimilitary Defense Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, one of our colleagues recently introduced legislation which is known as the Antimilitary Aircraft Workshop Competition Act. A better title for this legislation could well be the antimilitary defense bill. It suggests that aircraft overhaul and repair facilities such as those now operating in the major naval air stations and Air Force depots should be discontinued and the work of overhauling these complex military machines let out on contract to business.

I am certainly not opposed to the Government letting out contracts for civilian production of normal civilian goods and services, but it does not make sense to try to divest the fighting units of our country from the facilities and the manpower vital to the maintenance of an adequate fighting force. The overhaul and repair shops at North Island in my district, at Alameda, Norfolk, and other installations, are a vital part of our Navy's striking force. They are ready at a moment's notice to provide overhaul and repair facilities for peacetime and wartime operations. They keep our carrier-based aircraft in fighting trim. I shudder to think what delays might result if we needed aircraft in a hurry and had to take the time to go through the normal business channels to get this work done.

I know the Navy considers the overhaul and repair facilities a vital part of

their mobilization requirement. While it is true that these facilities could be mothballed, we cannot put away on a shelf the talents of the thousands of men and women who have gained experience and the intricate technical know-how and expect to have them ready in an emergency. To keep our fleet operating with a real striking potential, we must have not only the facilities but the manpower in being ready for any call.

I am proud of the fine work the civilian specialists are performing in the Government facilities around the country. I am particularly proud of their work at the naval bases in my district. As a businessman, I say it is just good business to keep these facilities operating as long as the fleet itself sails the seas.

Private Commercial Laboratories Are Indispensable Asset to Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, at a recent conference held in Corvallis, Oreg., where the theme of the conference centered attention on research and development for small business, Mr. David B. Charlton, a businessman from Portland, Oreg., participating as a panelist, spoke on the subject: Technical Research Agencies for Small Business.

In our schools and colleges, basic science is studied and the research activity there carried on advances man's knowledge of the world in which he lives. However, outside the schools, research too is conducted in private laboratories as a commercial enterprise. It is well to note that the function of the colleges is considered to be quite properly in the field of basic research, while the function of the private research firm is generally considered to be in the realm of applied science. A private laboratory functions by applying those principles developed through the basic research of the college laboratory. Both are indispensable in our complex society.

Mr. President, I am sure Mr. David Charlton's explanation will interest my colleagues, who vote vast sums to support much of the research activity of schools and colleges. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that Mr. Charlton's statement be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TECHNICAL RESEARCH AGENCIES FOR SMALL BUSINESS

1. COMMERCIAL

(By David B. Charlton, Charlton Laboratories, Portland, Oreg.)

Research and development as an aid to small business firms has been divided into two main categories for the purpose of this conference, namely, technical research and business research. The first day of the program dealt primarily with definitions, needs, goals, and what can be accomplished in research programs developed by small business.

The agenda for this the second day of the conference is designed to describe the types of research agencies and sources of information which are available to small business. The first panel of speakers will describe the services of the technical research agencies. These include independent consultants, laboratories of many sizes and kinds, engineering firms, nonprofit research institutes, college, and State laboratories and Federal agencies.

The topic assigned to me is Commercial. This, of course, means the taxpaying business firms and individuals represented in the first 3 or 6 groups enumerated above. Perhaps the word "independent" would be a better descriptive term. We are not tax-favored in any way and we have no connection with a State or Federal agency. We are in business and are, therefore, commercial but we are not part of another organization which is also commercial such as a manufacturing firm that has its own technical staff in laboratories that are often designated as captive.

The independent scientific laboratories in this country are an integral part of our national economy and are vigorous exponents of the American system and of the principles of private enterprise. As commercial organizations, they are dedicated to assist the development of American industry and make specific contributions to the communities in which they are located. There are over 300 independent laboratories staffed with over 5,000 scientists and technologists located in all the major cities of the United States. But some are in the smaller cities; for example, one of the largest on the Pacific coast is in Fresno, Calif. Pioneering work in the development of the raisin industry was performed there. At present it is perhaps best known for its service to the petroleum industry. It is estimated that these laboratories serve 60,000 clients. No doubt an even greater number of clients utilize the services of consulting engineers in a great variety of industrial development work.

A few brief descriptions of testing and development work performed by the closely related organizations with which I am connected, Charlton Laboratories & Metallurgical Engineers, Inc., will serve to illustrate the various types of problems we handle for small business concerns. Much of our work is quality control analysis and testing, but it is an essential service and lots of real problems are solved. Shortly after my laboratory was available to clients (which means I was looking for work) a local food processor had a product causing outbreaks of food poisoning. It proved to be bacterial in nature, the source was determined and eliminated. This illustrates how we helped an existing company stay in business and for the past 23 years it has utilized our laboratory services on a monthly basis.

About the same time a man who loved dogs started making dog food. He knew little about food products and had trouble—at least the dogs did. Some dogs that ate the food, which was not well balanced nutritionally, had fits. We advised him on the food formulation and the trouble was overcome. We performed quality control work over a period of years. The business grew and later on equipped its own laboratory. Good merchandising advise must have been obtained since the business was sold recently for about $1 million.

An example of development work in the consulting engineering field will illustrate how local manufacturing concerns are benefited. A Portland concern that manufactures truck and trailer bodies consulted with us on the design of a new body type to be used in the transportation of wood chips. We suggested one that would be made of steel yet light in weight. It would compete with those made of aluminum. A model was designed by us, tested in use, and is now in production. Several other trailer-body designs were subsequently produced. In this case, the consultant supplied the novel idea.

On the other hand, take the case of a logging-equipment manufacturer who was approached by an inventor with an idea that involved a new design for log loading tongs. Since we serve this company on a continuing basis, we produced a working model and studied its feasibilities. Would it work as represented? What are the "bugs" if any? How much would it cost? Since there appeared to be a market for it we prepared the material and dimensional specifications, supervised field tests, and the production control testing.

Each of the 2 companies just referred to has only about 60 employees, yet they are about the median size for Oregon industrial concerns.

One more example illustrating assistance to a new industry—a welding-rod manufacturer—may be of interest. To start in manufacture, our services involved the design of equipment, plant layout, casting specifications, and procedures from furnace charge to electrode coatings. Based on our client's requirements the billing ranged from $100 to $500 per month over a 2-year period. The business now has 10 employees and the product is distributed through the 11 Western States.

So you see by these examples that manufacturing firms need technical help in developing new products and processes with which to overcome their competitors and competitive products. The less exciting but essential functions such as quality control over materials purchased, conformance of product to specification standards, investigation of failures in mechanical products and of spoilage in food products, byproduct utilization, and control over air and water pollution factors can be performed by the independent laboratory.

The selection of the right laboratory or consultant for a particular analysis or research project is not unlike the situation one faces in the choice of a physician. Usually there is a family doctor whom you know and trust. He knows you and has no doubt had various tests made and prescribed for you on many occasions. Should an operation or treatment be required that can best be done by another doctor or at a clinic specialized in a particular field of medicine, he will refer you there and consult with you later. Similarly, we enjoy the confidence of our clients who, in turn, refer others to us. A simple phone call will clear the way for an interview for which you are under no obligation. In those cases where we are not staffed adequately or lack specialized equipment to handle your problem we will refer you to a laboratory that can do so. Through our membership in the American Council of Independent Laboratories we are personally familiar with the facilities, specializations, and key staff people of the member laboratories. As in the case of lawyers and doctors most of us name our laboratories or offices after ourselves, which is not very impressive in comparison with institutions bearing names of States, universities, and millionaire philanthropists.

Manufacturers that maintain laboratory facilities—and those that don't—both utilize independent laboratory services as needed and frequently on a retainer basis. The choice may be a small laboratory or an independent consultant who maintains no office or laboratory staff but possesses engineering or scientific knowledge in a specialized field. It may also be a very large organization well staffed in a variety of technical fields. For example, the United States

Testing Co. has one large plant and several branch operations with a technical staff of over 500, volume of business of several million dollars annually. This laboratory organization had its beginnings in 1880 providing an impartial inspection and weighng service to buyers and sellers of raw silk and wool. Today it is not only serving the textile industries in research and testing work, but many other industries as well. Another independent laboratory that has been in business about 50 years is well known for its leadership in the nutritional and biochemical research fields.

Mention should be made of certain operating policies and the charges made for our services. Engineers have generally well-known standards in these matters based upon a code of professional ethics. They do not advertise except a small professional card type of announcement placed in appropriate technical and trade publications. Chemists, physicists and many other scientifically trained people in business generally follow the same procedures as those of the organized professions. Our reports are our product and are based upon our knowledge and reputation which in turn gets us business through recommendations from our clients. The reports are the exclusive property of the client. However, we protect the public from misrepresentation of our reports by requiring our clients to have our review and approval on any advertising or promotional material where our reports are involved. Our charges are usually based upon an hourly or daily charge rate stated in advance. The client is informed on any extra costs for special equipment or analytical and testing services that may be involved. On a research project where its duration and complexity are not known it is customary to set up a budget with reporting of results and charges at regular intervals.

The independent research laboratory or engineering firm is the logical type of organization to serve small business firms. This professional group is aware of the needs and problems of small business concerns and we are trained in doing research and making investigations with the objective of a practical application of findings. Get acquainted sessions as are provided by this conference should be beneficial to all concerned with the growth of Oregon industries.

Cost of Living and the Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, an editorial in the New York Times makes some hard sense on the troubling problems of a rising cost of living in the midst of an economic recession. The editorial points out that the principal increases have come in the cost of medical care and rent, and makes clear that the rising cost of living needs to be analyzed; to use it as a blanket excuse to take no action to deal with recession is inexcusable.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Perspective on Inflation," published in the New York Times of May 23, 1958, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERSPECTIVE ON INFLATION

It is hardly happy news that the cost of living, as measured by the Government's Consumer Price Index reached another new high last month. If there are any pleasant aspects to the matter, they arise from the fact that the latest rise was comparatively small—two-tenths of 1 percent—and from the belief expressed in Washington that no important additional increases are likely in the months immediately ahead.

Whatever the future may hold the hard fact is that the cost of living has risen 3.5 percent in the past year and 23.5 percent since the index' base period, 1947–49. In the aggregate this record represents a significant degree of inflation, and this inflation is obviously behind much of the present fear that energetic antirecession measures may be unwise in that they may spur further inflation. To many it seems that we have a choice between the evil of, say, 5,000,000 unemployed and the evil of further price rises, and there is a substantial body of opinion which fears the latter more than the former.

Yet, before such a defeatist view is accepted it is wise to seek perspective by looking a bit more closely at the pattern of inflation which the official data reveal. This look suggests that the past decade's pattern of price rises is something quite different from the classic one of too much money chasing too few goods—the model many have in mind when they argue against, say, a tax cut, on the ground that it will be inflationary.

The figures show that the greatest rises since 1947–49 have not been in merchandise categories but in the cost of medical care and in the magnitude of rents. Medical care is largely a service area in which the problem of increased productivity is typically difficult; the more than 37 percent rise in rents undoubtedly reflects the pressure of increasing population on housing space and the partial rectification of the wartime and post-war rent freezes. On the other hand, less than average price increases have taken place in such key commodity classifications as food, gas, and electricity, clothing and housefurnishings. Of course, in recent months food prices, particularly prices of fruits and vegetables have risen relatively sharply, but this has been the result primarily of unusual weather conditions, not of extraordinary demand.

Antisubversive—Special Resolution No. 1 of American Legion, Department of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the American Legion, the Department of Illinois, at its annual convention in August of 1957. This resolution was unanimously adopted when the Legionnaires of Illinois met at their 39th annual convention.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANTISUBVERSIVE—SPECIAL RESOLUTION NO. 1

Whereas it has pleased Almighty God, the Supreme Commander, to summon to His immortal army the beloved patriot, Joseph R. McCarthy; and

Whereas we humbly bow to the will of divine providence, while ever cherishing in our hearts the memory of his distinguished service to our Nation. Comrade McCarthy served Wisconsin with justice and dignity in the courts first as a lawyer and later as a circuit judge. Then in World War II, with men and women whose courage was tested and burnished bright by the crucible of war, he served proudly and bravely as a United States marine in the South Pacific. Continuing his service to State and Nation in the Halls of the United States Congress, the honored Senator made substantial contributions to Americanism and as a stalwart foe of communism that will be forever recorded in the annals of American history: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, Department of Illinois, in convention assembled, 2d day of August in the year 1957, mourns the passing of the distinguished Legionnaire, Comrade McCarthy, May 2, 1957, and in token of our common grief and great loss to our Nation, prayerfully stand with bowed heads in his memory and his honor; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be presented to his bereaved family, a second copy be forwarded to the 39th national convention of the American Legion, meeting in Atlantic City, N. J., September 14–19 for its concurrence, and a third copy presented for inscription in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

HAROLD A. CUMMINS,
Commander.
JAMES S. GWALTNEY,
Adjutant.

(The foregoing resolution was unanimously adopted at the 39th annual convention of the American Legion, department of Illinois.)

Right of Expression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial which was published in the Northwest Arkansas Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIGHT OF EXPRESSION

Industrialist Cyrus Eaton may go before the House Un-American Activities Committee at a hearing in Washington—called there by the committee to testify. As this is written, the industrialist says all he knows about it is that the committee director, Representative Richard Arens, has issued a public statement in which he said the industrialist will be subpoenaed before the committee at an appropriate time.

Eaton reports "I have not heard from the so-called Un-American Activities Committee, so I assume that the release issued by a member of its staff is for the usual publicity seeking purposes."

The issue has arisen because of an interview in which Eaton reportedly expressed concern over police state methods used in

this country and described the Federal Bureau of Investigation as one of many agencies engaged in snooping, informing and creeping up on people.

In response to the announcement from Arens that Eaton will be summoned to Washington to appear before the committee, the industrialist remarked:

"Needless to say I shall be delighted to appear before any congressional committee for a serious discussion of the Federal secret police and intelligence agencies, and the effects, as I see them, of their sub rosa activities against the freedoms guaranteed to the citizens by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. * * * The charge that anyone who challenges them is 'giving aid and comfort to the enemy' is the familiar but threadbare line that is constantly employed to throttle the traditional American freedoms for which the Founding Fathers of this Republic were willing to lay down their lives."

Aren't we indeed moving toward the very "police state" that Mr. Eaton is talking about when an American citizen is summoned to appear before a congressional committee because he is forthright in expressing his own views concerning a Federal agency? Apparently that is what the American industrialist has done—in his views the FBI is subject to mistakes, just as any other agency or individual. Certainly it can make errors of omission and commission. Americans always have had the freedom and the liberty to disagree vocally if they wanted to.

We don't like some things some of the other Federal agencies do sometimes, and we are pretty sure the State Department makes grave mistakes which will affect every citizen. If we say so are we to be ordered to Washington for questioning as though we are un-American?

Absolute immunity from the scrutiny or the criticism of the public does not belong to any individual or agency operating in the name of the United States Government.

Talmadge Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial entitled "New Farm Program," from the May 20, 1958, issue of the Albertville (Ala.) Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW FARM PROGRAM

Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, of Georgia, recently came up with some basic concepts for a new farm program which we think have a good deal of merit.

In his speech on the floor of the Senate, Mr. TALMADGE pointed out that the time has come when Congress must face up to the fact that our present farm program has been a miserable failure. He also pointed up the unfortunate fact that our present dilemma is the product of partisan politics.

We think the time has come, as Mr. TALMADGE says, that the Federal Government free the farmer to plan and sell his crops as he sees fit, with the Government paying him the difference between the prices he receives for commodities sold for domestic consumption and parity.

The Georgia Senator has suggested this five-point program:

1. Eliminate all acreage controls and Government loans.

2. Assign each farmer growing basic commodities a domestic production quota to be expressed in terms of unit measurements (pounds, bushels, bales, etc.) which would be the same percentage of the national consumption of basic commodities that the farmer's historic acreage base bears to the total national acreage base.

3. Guarantee and pay to each farmer a sales price support of the difference between the price he receives for his domestic production quota and 100 percent of parity.

4. Require each farmer to submit a bill of sale with his application for sales price support payments.

5. Impose a maximum of $25,000 on the amount of sales price support payments which any individual farmer could receive.

In simple terms, Mr. TALMADGE is proposing that farmers be allowed to grow just as much of all crops as they want to. On each basic commodity a basic production quota would be determined by the actual domestic consumption of the commodity.

Let's take cotton, for example. If our domestic consumption was 8 million bales per year, this quota would be apportioned among all farmers who wish to grow cotton, based on their past history in producing the crop. A farmer might have a domestic quota of 8 bales, which would mean that he could market 8 bales that year with 100 percent of parity price support. He could grow and sell all the other cotton he pleased, but he would have to sell the rest of it at world market price. On his 8 domestic bales, the Government would simply pay him what the price lacked coming up to parity.

Senator TALMADGE quotes figures compiled from the Legislative Reference Service indicating that such a farm program as this would save the Government two to three billion dollars a year over the present farm program.

At the same time, he figures, it would put an extra $500 million a year into the farmers' pockets.

The agriculture committe of the Albertville Chamber of Commerce submitted a very similar proposal as this to our Representatives in Congress several months ago as its recommendation on the kind of farm program we need.

We are inclined to feel that we would all be better off if all segments of our economy were entirely free from Government control and allowed to seek their own levels. But it is unrealistic to say that farmers should be denied Government subsidies, when practically every other economic group in the country has them. Certainly farmers have the right to expect just as much economic protection from the Federal Government as labor gets through the guaranteed wage and industry through the tariff.

This paper is convinced of the urgent need for the present Congress to set up a more realistic farm program. We believe that Mr. TALMADGE has offered at least the basic principles around which to build such a program. We urge all our citizens to study the matter carefully and to write to Congressman ALBERT RAINS and JOHN SPARKMAN your views.

Democratic Gubernatorial Candidate Walter Reuther

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, a speech by Miss Zasu Pitts, motion picture and television actress, in support of the gubernatorial candidacy of Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, is attracting a great deal of attention all over the State of California.

The speech has been recorded and is being broadcast by Mrs. Helen Knowland on her 5,000 mile bus campaign on behalf of her husband. I don't know that I have seen or heard any statement that so adequately sums up the political activity of Labor Czar Reuther. Its entire text follows:

There is a mighty interesting contest going on in California about who is going to be the next Governor, our own Senator KNOWLAND or the Democratic candidate, Walter Reuther. I know that Reuther's running under another name, Pat Brown, I think it is, but Reuther is already the Governor of Michigan.

He uses the name of Williams in that State, and I think even 1 State under the control of Walter Reuther is 1 State too many. I have been told that the Reuthers have put up over $750,000 for this campaign.

That's easy to do if you're using somebody else's money. It's as easy as falling off a log if you can dip it up in buckets from a union treasury like the Reuthers have.

I'll bet before this campaign is over that they'll dip deeper than they did back in Ohio for $12 million, you remember, when they thought they had beaten Robert Taft.

I am sure the union workers of California are just as patriotic and intelligent as those in Ohio, and they certainly told Mr. Reuther where to go.

Fallout Shelters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask that the column, Fallout Shelters, written by Warren Unna and published in the Washington Post of Friday, May 23, 1958, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This article clearly points out what I have contended for a long, long time—that our civilian defense program is lagging far behind and that the administration should come forward with a program worthy of the name.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FALLOUT SHELTERS

(By Warren Unna)

CIVIL DEFENSE GETTING ATTENTION—BUT IT'S SLIGHT

Civil defense, that unpleasant stepchild of Government which most people would just as soon not be reminded of, has been getting some slight attention lately—but pretty slight.

The administration last month announced that effective July 1 it would merge the Federal Civil Defense Administration and the Office of Defense Mobilizatiton. FCDA Administrater Leo A. Hoegh and ODM Director Gordon Gray said the move would mean less duplication and more efficiency.

Early this month, Hoegh said there now is a national shelter policy: The encouragement of structures which will protect people from radioactive fallout. He said the Federal Government would take care of the

research and build "a limited number" of prototype shelters with alternate uses as underground garages, subways, and school assembly areas. But the main financing is up to the State and local governments.

Hoegh also announced the purchase of 800,000 fallout detectors, half of which will be distributed around the country, for indoctrination among high school students as well as among local Government personnel.

Chairman CHET HOLIFIELD (Democrat of California), of the House Military Operations Subcommittee concluded 7 hearing days this month, taking testimony to update that which he has accumulated during the past 3 years on the state of the Nation's civil defense.

HOLIFIELD has had a bill pending in the House since last year which calls for a national shelter program, federally financed, with a Cabinet seat to insure that civil-defense matters are carried out.

Although not optimistic over the chances for his bill, HOLIFIELD has made it plain that some bill had better be passed, and soon.

In an interview in last month's edition of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, HOLIFIELD declared: "If the Russians know that a nuclear attack can break our will to resist, they might be induced to gamble. On the other hand, if they know we are capable of surviving an attack they might be deterred."

HOLIFIELD's previous hearings induced former FCDA Administrator Val Peterson to abandon his run-and-hide doctrine for one calling for a $32 billion—that's right, billion—Federal shelter program.

Last fall's Gaither committee recommendations have never been made public, even to Congress, but it is known that this group of experts urged the administration to spend $5 billion a year for shelters for the next 5 years.

Those close to the Gaither report now say its shelter recommendations are the deadest part of the overall findings—so far as the administration is concerned.

And yet another study group, headed by Nelson A. Rockefeller, last January made public its findings and also urged a Federal shelter construction program, integrated with the Nation's hopes for economic expansion.

The Rockefeller report found shelters for radioactive fallout more feasible than those for burn and blast.

FCDA's Hoegh seems to be in agreement with this: "There is no assurance that even the deepest shelter would give protection to a sufficient number of people to justify the cost. In addition, there may not be sufficient warning time, in view of the development of missile capabilities, to permit the effective use of blast shelters."

Ellis A. Johnson, Chief of the Operations Research Organization and head of the Army's own shelter study, told the Holifield subcommittee this month that fallout shelters are "absolutely essential" and declared: "Fallout shelters can be provided at about one-half the cost of blast-proof shelters and they can be substituted for or supplemented by low-cost modifications of existing shelters in basements and in those buildings that still stand after an attack."

Johnson, who was a member of the Rockefeller study group, cited Sweden, a country of seven million, which is taking civil defense problems so seriously that she has already built the more expensive underground blast shelters to protect more than 20 percent of her people.

As impressed as he is by Sweden's civil defense progress, so depressed is Johnson by the lack of it in this country.

"I think the time for action is now," he told the Holifield subcommittee. "I'm scared by this 1961–63 ICBM capability of the Soviet Union. If we wait 1 more year, it will be a year we can never buy back."

Fort Garard, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, for years I have been greatly interested in the early history of our Nation. The gradual westward movement was made possible by certain forts in various parts of our country. There are many of these in western Pennsylvania.

When I was Governor of our Commonwealth, I arranged for the placing of more than 2,000 plaques in various parts of the State. I have noticed that Fort Garard was marked by appropriate ceremonies yesterday afternoon. This is the location of the massacre of part of the family of the celebrated Baptist minister, Rev. John Corbly.

Hon. Stephen McCann, a member of the Pennsylvania Legislature, was largely responsible in having this fort permanently marked, and he made the address on that occasion.

There is a very good account in the Washington (Pa.) Observer of Friday, May 23, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAQUE TO BE UNVEILED SUNDAY AT SITE OF ONE OF COUNTY'S FRONTIER FORTS

GARARDS FORT.—The site of Fort Garard, one of the early frontier forts of western Pennsylvania, is to be marked by a historical plaque which will be unveiled Sunday afternoon, May 25.

The marker has been erected by the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission and is located on Route 616, about a quarter of a mile east of Garards Fort, which is named for the stockade.

The dedication ceremony will be combined with memorial services at the Historic Garards Fort Cemetery, which contains the graves of Indian fighters and men who fought in the Revolutionary War, War of 1812, Civil War, Spanish-American War, World War I, and World War II.

The memorial service will be held at the cemetery at 2 p. m. by Greene County Post 3190, Veterans of Foreign Wars, at Carmichaels.

The marker will be unveiled at 3 p. m., with Assemblyman McCann delivering the dedicatory address. County Superintendent of Schools, D. C. Longanecker, who was born in a house on the old Jonathan Garard farm, where the fort was located, will give a brief history of the fort.

Historical records indicate the fort was completed in late 1773 or early 1774. It was 100 feet square and was built of long, straight logs, which were split in half. The outer row of logs was placed with the flat side out, close together, and stood 15 feet high. An inner row of such half-logs had the split side inward, one being placed in each space between the logs of the outer row. There was one large, wooden gate, and several buildings were inside the stockade.

The woods around the fort were cleared to extreme gunshot distance from the stockade, with not even a stump or log left to shelter an enemy.

One of the few remnants of the fort is the entrance to a small, underground passage, large enough for a person to crawl through. This passage apparently came up in one corner of the fort and was there so that, in an emergency, a person could crawl into the fort without the main gate being opened.

This tunnel entrance can be seen on the farm which is now owned by Mrs. Vern B. Core and occupied by Mrs. Core and her son-in-law and daughter, Mr. and Mrs. Harold Bunner. Mrs. Core is the widow of Dr. A. R. Core.

The well which was in the stockade still gives good drinking water and is used daily by the occupants. The hillside vegetable storage house on the farm was also part of the old fort. Mrs. Bunner said it has been rebuilt several times, and that the original stones were always used.

The fort has always been linked with the Corbly massacre, which took place Sunday morning, May 10, 1782. Rev. John Corbly, who was pastor of the Goshen Baptist Church, founded at Garards Fort in 1774, was on his way to the stockade to hold services. With him were his wife and children.

Indians leaped from ambush and killed his wife and three children. Two other daughters were scalped, and one later died.

The grave of both Rev. John Corbly, who was a captain in the home guard and in the minuteman of Fort Garard, and that of his wife are in the Garards Fort Cemetery. Her tombstone is marked with the following epitaph:

"Beneath the Indian Tommy Hawk,
Me and my babe we fell;
Was hurried suddenly away,
With Jesus for to dwell."

Graves of other Indian fighters and Revolutionary War soldiers in the cemetery are those of Nicholas Livengood, George Morris, Benjjamin Sutton, Sr., Jeremiah Long, Abner Mundell, Lt. James Williamson, J. R. Minor and Peter Meyers, Sr.

J. P. Minor is the only veteran of the War of 1812 buried there, but there are 23 Civil War soldiers interred. They are Otho Darr, Evan Evans, William Gass, William Hunt, Eri Gregg (Morris), John Myers, William Thomas Ruse, William Deets, William W. Evans, Harrison Gump, James Husk, Lt. J. M. Morris, Samuel Robinson, Henry Rush, Benjamin Evans, William L. Freeland, Dr. Hill, Benjamin Lantz, Alpaeus Maple, William H. H. Morris, Thomas Benton Roberts and John Stickles.

John Rich, who served in the field artillery, is the single Spanish-American War veteran buried in the cemetery. World War I dead are Cpl. William Barb, Ruben H. Haines, Lt. A. R. Core, Reed Long, Sylvia Darr, and Clarence Rumble.

Conrad Wayne Huggins, reported the first man from Greene County losing his life overseas in World War II, is 1 of 3 soldiers of that war buried in the cemetery. Others are Robert Dillon and William F. Rhodes.

The roster also includes one soldier, W. J. Johnson, who served in either the Civil or Spanish-American War.

The program for the 2 p. m. memorial service at the cemetery:

Selection, Greene County Band.

Invocation, Rev. Errol G. Smith, Garads Fort Methodist Church.

Address, Assemblyman Stephen McCann.

Memorial ritual and salute by firing squad, Greene County Post 3190, VFW.

The program for the 3 p. m. historical marker dedication:

America, Greene County Band.

Invocation, Rev. Clark M. Neptune, John Corbly Memorial Baptist Church.

Historical résumé, D. C. Lonanecker.
Stars and Stripes Forever, band.
Unveiling of marker.
Dedicatory address, Assemblyman Stephen McCann.

Assemblyman McCann, Warren H. Roberts, Columbus Henry and D. C. Lonanecker were instrumental in obtaining the marker from the State.

Meeting the Teacher Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most imaginative proposals to use existing manpower resources to meet a national need that I have seen is the plan of the United States Army to supply Regular and retired officers as teachers in the mathematics and science departments of public schools. It is now the responsibility of school systems and teacher organizations to find ways to take advantage of this proposal.

Mr. President, the Army's suggestion is described fully in an article written by Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of May 23, 1958. I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "The Army Program for the Public Schools," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE ARMY PROGRAM FOR THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 22.—The United States Army has now organized a formal and active program for supplying retired Regular and Reserve officers as teachers in the science and mathematics departments of those public high schools (more rarely colleges) that may wish to avail themselves of this largely unused source of education. Secretary Brucker has prepared an announcement of the details of this program, which is the Army's response to a finding by the research division of the National Educational Association that in 1957 the supply of such teachers in the high schools was only one-third of the demand.

"Among Army personnel, retired and approaching retirement," this announcement reads, "are substantial numbers who have essentially all of the academic preparation required for teaching, a profession closely related to the military in many respects. Army men who have baccalaureate degrees and special competency in at least one core subject (science, physics, mathematics, history, language) can offer our high schools and colleges the crystalized lessons of almost a full lifetime of teaching and being taught; the seasoned understanding of young people; and a rich resource of contacts with other peoples of the world."

The idea is a couple of years old. But not until the recent military demonstrations of Soviet Russian advances in science did it appeal with urgency to retired military personnel or arouse much interest among administrators of the high schools. But early in January of this year Dewey Short, Assistant Secretary of the Army, began to develop the idea into an organized program for his branch of the armed services. The forthcoming announcement by the Secretary of the Army will herald the success of Short's efforts.

DETAILS OF THE PROJECT

In a memorandum he circulated, dated January 7 last, the Assistant Secretary outlined three methods for consideration in the building of the Army project on which he has concentrated. He cited the notation by the President's Committee on Education in 1957 that the retired military personnel—Army, Navy, and Air Force—was an "untapped reservoir" of well-qualified high school teachers in short supply in certain departments. And on the prompting of this memorandum the following program has been established:

The Adjutant General will maintain a name and credential file of officers qualified for high school teaching whose services may be applied for. Their average ages on retirement are the mid-forties for reserve, and the mid-fifties for regular, officers.

The Army will write the major commanders enjoining their cooperation in publicizing the national teacher shortage and the opportunities in the educational field for officers retired or about to be. The latter group will get letters offering full information on prospects to any who may be interested.

An Army staff study on the subject will be circulated in the Army Information Digest and other appropriate publications.

Letters of information on the program will be sent to national educational associations, with requests for their support.

Civilian education advisers, employed in the Army's world-wide program of general educational development in more than 300 centers, will receive packets of guidance and counseling materials so that they may provide authoritative assistance to interested Army personnel. These packets will also be supplied to the Army's Retired Activities Units.

A STATEMENT OF DESIGN

The Secretary's forthcoming announcement will formally inaugurate the program and be addressed to all Army personnel, active and retired. On the premise that education is national defense the Nation's schools are as assuredly action agents of national security as are the military services, the announcement will state the following as the design of the action program:

"To inform, motivate and assist Army personnel in preparing themselves as appropriate, and offering their services as teachers in the Nation's schools. As the focal point, the office of the Adjutant General will continue to cooperate closely with the Retired Officers' Associations, the United States Employment Service, national educational associations and both State and local school jurisdictions. Correspondence with individual schools and colleges is welcomed."

The Navy and the Air Force, this correspondent was informed today, have also taken steps to interest their qualified Regular and Reserve officers in retirement in helping to fill up the high school teachers' shortage and to interest the high schools in availing themselves of this material. But on the evidence of Secretary Brucker's manifesto, it would appear that the Army is the first of the services to organize the effort as a major project.

Now it remains to be demonstrated whether the various teachers' organizations will cooperate with—or, on the trades union closed shop principle, will move to obstruct—those educational authorities who may wish to relieve shortages in the departments of science and mathematics with availables from this new and exceptionally qualified source.

Anti-Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "Anti-Americanism," which was published in the Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times of May 17, 1958]

ANTI-AMERICANISM

Acts of anti-Americanism, such as occurred in South America against Vice President NIXON, the riots in Lebanon, and the friction in Canada, will be thoroughly investigated by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee beginning next week. This could well be a very important inquiry because, until the violent action against Mr. NIXON, the United States somewhat blithely had thought everyone outside of the Iron Curtain was either friendly or decent in attitudes toward this country. This is the time to get at the basis of the frictions before it is too late.

Fundamentally, in the last few years there has been a lack of concern, particularly in the legislative branch, toward preserving foreign friendship. There is a tendency to form legislative attitudes from isolated irregularities in foreign lands. The State Department presents for legislative enactment a program, and that program is cut apart because of real or feigned legislative indignation over the isolated irregularities.

Canada, for example, is protesting again over the way the infringements on Canadian sovereignty appear to take the form of overlooking Canadian economic interests. The legislative branch threatens import quotas on lead, zinc, and oil in such a manner that hits directly at the basic economic structure of Canada. Mr. Benson disposes of wheat through dumping, and in so doing throws into economic collapse the wheat industry of Canada.

The Treasury Department attempts to levy a $4 million tax against a Canadian company that was owned by American citizens. This is the Premium Ore Co., operated by Cyrus Eaton of Cleveland. This concern started mining in Canada in 1942, with a 3-year Canadian tax exemption. In 1953, the Bureau of Internal Revenue in Washington prosecuted the company for alleged unpaid taxes. This matter, according to United States courts, is covered in a tax treaty between the United States and Canada. Nevertheless, the Treasury Department is now appealing, and Canada, quite rightfully, protests that the appeal violates the spirit of the tax treaty. The tendency is, in the words of Senator FULBRIGHT, for the United States to lack tact and disregard the sovereignty of the American neighbors.

President Eisenhower is engaged in trying to renew reciprocal trade the tariff program of the past 25 years. Reciprocal trade may have its flaws, but the evidence of reciprocity in the handling of tariffs indicates a willingness and a desire on the part of the United States to negotiate with foreign countries, rather than declare legislatively and unilaterally that this or that impost will be so much. After all, there are two industries in every tariff negotiation—the industry of

the foreign country, and the industry of this country. Reciprocal trade indicates an attempt to relate the importance of both industries to a common purpose. Unilateral tariff pronouncements disregard the industry of the foreign country and suggest that there is only one industry of importance, and that is the American industry.

Do this a number of times, and there cannot help but be an accumulation of anti-American feelings. Add further the fact that the United States is still the wealthiest country in the world with a general policy of increasing the economic stature of its friends among Western nations. Then try to square this with specific acts that undermine the economies of foreign nations and again there is an opportunity for anti-Americanism.

Finally, the Senate committee ought to recognize in its investigation that foreign countries in reviewing the relations with the United States, can recall high-handed acts of isolationism years ago by this country. Necessarily, they must wonder whether there will be a return to this isolationism. In the last 25 years this country has been international in its views and efforts. But there is increasing evidence that under one guise or another the United States is narrowing its attitudes and restricting its policies a little here and a little there so that resentment is accumulating.

John Foster Dulles and his brother, Allen Welsh Dulles, go before the Senate and point out that the biggest problem that confronts the United States today is the Russian program to trade with foreign countries in such a manner as to expand the economies of those foreign countries. The two Dulles brothers argue that the United States must compete with this tremendous Russian effort if it is to succeed in maintaining its world superiority. This kind of competition, however, is not enhanced by such things as high tariffs, import restrictions, and the like. If the United States is to export, it must import.

Communists can be expected to make the most of capitalism's economic failures. As the leading capitalist nation in the world, this country must not permit situations to arise in its relations with other countries in which the capitalistic defects invite Communist inroads.

The Foreign-Aid Fiasco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column by Henry Hazlitt entitled "The Foreign-Aid Fiasco," from the May 26, 1958, issue of Newsweek.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOREIGN-AID FIASCO
(By Henry Hazlitt)

The treatment of the Nixon party in South America—the face-spitting, the rock-hurling, the desecration of the American flag—is an end result of our policy of total foreign entanglement in the last dozen years, and in particular of the foreign-aid program.

It may not be possible to determine the exact extent to which the South American riots were inspired by organized Communist plots directed locally or from Moscow, and to what extent they reflected genuine national feeling. In any case, the Communists won another major propaganda victory, and our own world prestige suffered another major blow. The Nixon tour was primarily an effort to woo South American good will an to secure a demonstration of it. Instead, our Vice President and his wife were insulted, physically attacked, and shamefully humiliated. The rioters successfully showed that they hate us and do not fear us. From this standpoint it is hard to deny the Moscow radio's triumphant claim that the Nixon tour was a fiasco.

WE CAN'T BUY ALLIES

A few months ago (January 13) I quoted here a passage from Machiavelli in which he pointed out that, in international affairs, "it is much safer to be feared than loved, if 1 of the 2 has to be wanting" and that "the friendship that is gained by purchase is bought but not secured." James Burnham, in National Review (May 17), has taken an even more appropriate quotation from the same source: "When things are so managed in a government, that the neighbors purchase its comity, and make themselves its pensioners, 'tis a certain sign of the potency of that government; but when the neighbors on the contrary receive money from it, 'tis as infallible a sign of its weakness."

From the very beginning, one of the main purposes of our foreign-aid program, in whatever euphemistic forms it may have been expressed, has been to buy the friendship and good will of other nations—to buy allies. It has not only failed to do so; it has done the opposite. We overlooked the elementary fact that the recipient of alms feels humiliated in accepting them. They wound its national pride; they advertise its dependence on the giver. The recipient resents any quid pro quo or any conditions, even when these are in its own interest. One of the signs carried by the mob that attacked NIXON in Lima was "Peru is not for sale." Even if this was composed by Communists, they could count on it to inflame anti-American feeling.

GET RICH BY GIVEAWAY?

For many other reasons our foreign-aid policy has produced exactly the opposite results from those its supporters expected. To woo a country with bribes or their equivalent is to make that country feel that any alliance is primarily for our benefit rather than for its own. It regards such offerings as a sign of weakness. We lose respect by them. We have extended foreign aid to some 60 countries. The crowning irony is that nations that should have got not a cent from us are resentful and embittered because they get less than other nations.

The economic case for foreign aid is even worse. If there had been no economic foreign-aid program, countries wishing private American capital for development would have had to adopt sound political and economic policies to attract it. Government-to-government foreign aid has made this unnecessary. It has supported and prolonged foreign exchange control, inflation, confiscatory taxes, and socialism. And so on it has on net balance retarded, not advanced, world production and economic recovery.

The reductio ad absurdum of all the economic arguments for foreign aid has been solemnly put forward by the Secretary of State. "The great bulk of our mutual-security funds—over three-fourths," he said on March 24—"are spent in the United States. * * * To cut these funds would be to cut employment here at home." This is the argument that we get rich by giving our goods away. We could, of course, create the same employment by making the same goods to dump into the sea. If we want to subsidize our exporters, there are cheaper ways of doing it than giving away $100 for every $5 or $10 of net profit that exporters might get from added foreign sales.

Meet the President's Pastor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, Guideposts for June has a most interesting article on the subject Meet the President's Pastor, by Paul Wooton. The work of the church means so much in these trying times that I feel this article should have deep consideration by all of us who appreciate the greatness of our country.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On Thanksgiving, 1957, 2 days after he had suffered a cerebral disturbance, President and Mrs. Eisenhower drove up Connecticut Avenue to an old gray stone church whose walls have turned dark from 70 years of weathering—the National Presbyterian Church.

As a morning-coated usher escorted the President and Mrs. Eisenhower to their pew, an involuntary murmur rose from the congregation: no one had expected to see the President so soon after his illness.

After the service, the pastor, Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, walked to the Eisenhowers' pew and personally escorted the Chief Executive and Mrs. Eisenhower to the rear of the church. On the steps outside they paused while cameras flashed. The pictures that appeared in the papers the next morning seemed to catch a look of mutual admiration as these two men exchanged handshakes.

As an elder of National Presbyterian Church, I wrote to General Eisenhower during his first candidacy for president, and said that "We would be complimented if you would throw in your lot with us." From the first, we had some reason to think that the Eisenhowers might accept our invitation. Mrs. Eisenhower was a Presebyterian and their son, John, years ago had been a member of our church's Boy Scout troop. Also, General Eisenhower knew and liked our pastor.

Dr. Elson was born 51 years ago in Monongahela City, Pa. From the time he was in his early teens, he was struggling with the choice of going into the ministry, or into the Army. When young Elson opened the mail one morning to find that he had been designated to take the entrance examination for West Point, the decision could be put off no longer. That summer his parents were spending their vacation in a mountain cabin, and Edward went along, still wondering which career he would choose.

One day when his parents were away, he closed the cabin door, dropped to his knees and began to pray.

"I prayed all day, asking God for help," Dr. Elson recalls. "By the time my parents returned, I knew that I would go into the ministry. I did, but I still could not give up my interest in the Army. Two days after my ordination, I joined the reserves as a chaplain."

Dr. Elson still carries himself with military bearing. He walks fast, speaks fast, works fast. During the Second World War he went on active duty and saw 169 consecutive days of action in Europe. He first met General Eisenhower during this tour of duty.

Over the years, the Eisenhowers and the Elsons have become good friends. Dr. Elson and his wife, Helen Louise, are frequent guests at White House dinners. It was more than a formality when, after her husband's heart attack in September 1955, one of the first persons Mrs. Eisenhower called was Dr. Elson.

Whenever he is asked what difficulties there are in having such a close relationship with the President, Dr. Elson answers: "Difficulties? Difficulties? There are no difficulties."

But of course there really are. In every mail Dr. Elson gets letters urging him to intercede with the White House on some matter. These letters always get a polite but firm reply in the negative. More difficult to control, are the people who use the church simply as a chance to do some sightseeing. One Sunday during his pastoral prayer, Dr. Elson heard a commotion and looked up in time to see a young husband stand up in his pew and hold his wife high in the air so that she could get a glimpse of the President.

The church office is constantly bombarded with telephone calls, asking when the Eisenhowers will be in church. These callers are always given the same answer: "We never announce when any of the members of our church will be attending worship. We have services at 9 and 11. Visitors are welcome."

Actually, the church is advised in advance when the President will be there. Some time before the Sunday service begins, usually on a Saturday evening, a member of the Secret Service puts in a call to the church, advising that the President will come to either the 11 o'clock, or, more often, the 9 o'clock service. This is kept secret. Any announcement is given out at the White House.

An hour before the President is due, Secret Service men inspect the church carefully. Firemen and policemen take up their posts at all doors.

Since he came to Washington as President, this procedure has been repeated some 250 times, for Eisenhower is far more than a casual churchgoer. On the Sunday he flew back from the Geneva Conference, tired and harried, he rushed to the White House, changed clothing, and went immediately to church. At the services, he seems particularly to enjoy the singing. (What a Friend We Have in Jesus is perhaps his favorite hymn.) Recently he sent copies of one of Dr. Elson's sermons to many of his friends. The subject: The Mastery of Moods.

Dr. Elson is painstaking with his sermons. "It is sometimes frightening to preach here," he says, "it always is humbling. This pastorate particularly compels one to ask continually for divine guidance."

Perhaps in no other church has there ever been such a grouping of important officials. John Foster Dulles, the Secretary of State, and J. Edgar Hoover are members, as are half of the Cabinet, a third of the Supreme Court, and many Senators, Representatives and Federal judges. Dr. Elson cannot but be aware of their presence. In the back pews are reporters, busily taking notes for copy that literally is read around the world.

The doors of National Presbyterian are open 7 days a week. Nearly 130 meetings and services are held here every month. Our pastor especially is proud of our large young people's group, and that its program is vital and alive. To meet the heavy demands on his time, Dr. Elson puts in a long day, with each minute accounted for and carefully spent.

But not all of our pastor's time is spent in scurry and press. There is also time for meditation and prayer, and here, it seems to me, is the true secret of Dr. Elson's standing in Washington.

Frequently after the day is over, Dr. Elson leaves his office and walks downstairs to the sanctuary. There he carefully closes all the doors, then glances around the empty church, walks slowly up the aisle, stops, moves into a pew. There he kneels. After a while he rises, looks around, moves to another pew, and again he kneels. For an hour he moves around the church, praying at each pew about the concerns of the pewholder. It might be that he prays for the problems of a Government clerk, or for a young man whose mother has just died.

Or it might be that he moves to Pew 41. On the armrest is a simple plaque: "Dwight D. Eisenhower. President of the United States. 1953—."

That is the way our pastor prays for his congregation.

TV Can Tell the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, for the information of Congress, I ask leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entiled "TV Can Tell the World," in the writing of which I collaborated, and which appears in the May issue of Think. It suggests some means which I believe we Americans can usefully employ in getting the true story of freedom across to many millions of people in less fortunate areas of the world.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TV CAN TELL THE WORLD

(By Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, as told to Katherine Kirkbride)

When a group of us in the Senate studied the problems of international communications, we saw the television picture as the medium that could show the American way of life to the peoples of the world, and unite both individuals and nations in common understanding. But to build a TV network around the world presented technical obstacles.

The microwave that carries the picture is a straight wave. Television in the United States is set up on 30-to-100-mile relays across the country. To cross the Atlantic Ocean with this wave we need to go 290 miles—the longest single distance between land masses of the North Atlantic. To send the 6 million-cycle wide-band television picture across the horizon was an ingineering feat challenging the ingenuity of the most enterprising engineers.

Yet on September 13, 1957, twin square antennas built by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., just outside Florida City, Fla., beamed a high-frequency wave into the sky. One hundred and eighty-five miles to the southeast, similar antennas waited. When enough of the signal made the 5-mile trip to the tropospheric ceiling of the sky and reflected back over the horizon to reach the waiting antennas, American communication engineers had achieved one of their most historic triumphs.

Across Habana's television screens that night flashed pictures of boxers fighting in upstate New York. Men in the Havana bistros watched German middleweight Frank Szuzina knock out Randy Sandy in the 10th round in the War Memorial Auditorium, Syracuse, N. Y. But the men in Habana saw more than a prize fight on a TV screen that night. They witnessed the first wide-band picture ever broadcast "live" from one nation to another over an extended body of water.

A little more testing, more power, and the new means of electronic transmission called scatter propagation, would send the television picture the 290 miles needed to cross between Iceland and the Faeroe Islands of the North Atlantic.

Similar square antennas would stride North Atlantic icecaps to beam the picture to England. From England the picture would travel through Europe by a system of retelevising called Eurovision. Eurovision converts technical lineages to carry the TV picture from country to country through Europe to Turkey. Stations in Saudi Arabia, Iran, Kuwait on the Persian Gulf, India, Thailand, the Philippines, Australia, Okinawa, Japan, and other countries, would complete the world circuit.

Almost every month now, new stations join the world network. A new station is being built in Spain. International Telephone and Telegraph Co. has built telephone and telegraph scatter relays between Puerto Rico and Santo Domingo, and while these narrow-band relays do not yet carry the wide-picture band, they establish the locations for later picture relays to reach into this area. Turn the globe around, and you see new IT&T towers sending scatter telephone and telegraph communications 230 miles between the Mediterranean islands of Sardinia and Minorca.

Only recently, the Japanese Government issued construction permits for 43 new stations in Japan, 36 of these to be private enterprise. And, as the stations spring up around the world, as new narrow-band telephone and telegraph scatter relays pioneer other routes, as new stations penetrate the Middle East and into Asia, it leaves only crossing the North Atlantic to link the world network. With the historic Havana broadcast the decisive technical hazard has been overcome.

The next step, crossing the North Atlantic route to England, we should achieve within the next year. RCA's distinguished Dr. H. H. Beverage, vice president in charge of research and development, believes the problem now is one of servicing the relays after they are built. Sturdy helicopters will be needed to fly technicians to outposts whipped by 100-mile winds. Dr. Beverage estimates that the series of relays to cross the North Atlantic will reach a cost of some $50 million, though international lawyer and telecommunications pioneer Henry Holthusen believes this figure is high.

The historic relays between Florida City and Habana, costing $3 million, were built by American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and by International Telephone & Telegraph Co. in Cuba. The services of the antennas were leased by NBC, which sold the fights to the Gillette Co. Gillette found such a responsive audience in Habana that they responded by signing a long-term contract to broadcast the Friday nights fights to Cuba. And more recently, boxing matches have been broadcast back from the Sports Palace in Habana to the United States.

The development of international television to this point has been almost as long and as hazardous as the trip the microwave signals took through the Florida sky. As far back as November 2, 1949, RCA's board chairman, Gen. David Sarnoff, forecast, "We shall look across the hemispheres from nation to nation," and he believed the added sense of neighborliness to be attained would help us better understand each other.

About the same time, in the United States Senate, the members of the Smith-Mundt committee, advised by Henry Holthusen, were puzzling over the problems of the Voice of America. Had the Voice really done the things we had hoped it would do? Had it sold the idea of freedom, the institutions of democracy, to other nations of the world? Or did we need to add to the Voice the Vision of America? Henry Holthusen and I spent many hours in closed conference, Holthusen championing as David Sarnoff had, the television picture as the most potent force to unite the world's peoples.

On June 5, 1950, I introduced the idea of international television on the floor of the United States Senate, in a 90-minute Senate speech entitled "The Vision of America." I said we must energetically contend for the individual freedoms and liberties of all peoples. Two-thirds of the world's peoples are illiterate, while the lands they occupy are rich in nature's abundance. Soviet-paid agents move into these dark areas of the world, spreading discontent, chaos, offering bribes. Hungry, suffering peoples are easily lulled by false promises that can enslave them. We could help these peoples to help themselves. We did not seek to impose upon these people any particular pattern or system of government, I told the Senate. We hoped they might improve their lot and emerge as free men, masters of their own fates.

We saw the screen as a teacher. A single blackboard, a single teacher, could remedy the illiteracy of thousands. One TV transmitter with its screen and its relays could teach thousands of people to boil water, to keep themselves clean, teach them inoculation against disease. It could also teach them the use of new tools, new methods for tilling the soil, how to rotate their crops. Our State Department reports showed areas in India, for instance, where men farmed as their forefathers did centuries before them, having no way to learn new methods. In one area the use of a longer hoe increased food production many times. And the TV screen could help these peoples in underdeveloped lands without the debts of foreign contribution.

Henry Holthusen believed the picture could help where monetary gifts would fail. "Show people how to improve their lot," he said, "and they will attract the foreign credit that builds sound economy." We both believed the picture could show foreign peoples how their American brothers lived, and would show the Americans the problems and the cultures of the peoples of Europe and of Asia. Whole nations, lulled into tyranny by constant conditioning, could be roused to new effort toward freedom. When they saw the vitality, the rewards of American life on the screen, they could be spurred to new efforts to improve their way of life.

Henry Holthusen traveled to many countries, telling the television story, to Japan, Turkey, Egypt, the Philippines, Thailand, through Central and South America. In Japan, government and communications leaders hailed him as bringing a fresh age of progress to Japan. Japanese Government leaders, who were about to adopt Russia's 625-line standards of television, yielded to Holthusen's suggestions and changed to America's 525-line standards so that in future years Japan could become the key to the Far Eastern network.

A few months after Japan's first 525-line anchor station, JOAX, officially opened in Tokyo, 2,000 people stood in Tokyo Square to watch a single American kinescope broadcast of an American boxing match. And government leaders saw the screen as an aid in solving Japan's most vital problem—her food supply. On the other side of the world, Eurovision linked the nations of Europe in special events broadcasts of such happenings as the Salzburg festival, the international soccer matches, the Olympic games. In France, groups of 50 to 100 gathered to buy a community TV set for their local teleclub.

Even Russia had tried to join the trend by beaming her cultural TV broadcasts into Finland and Norway, and from Eastern into Western Germany. But Russia can never show her way of life to the world as America will, because Russian everyday living is held behind a vengeful Iron Curtain. In time, with the aid of the new over-the-horizon "scatter propagation," we may penetrate this curtain and show our way of life to the Russian people.

We will bring education to the areas of the world where illiteracy causes famine. We can place large screens in outlying areas and show thousands of people at one time the techniques of the modern know-how we take for granted in America. We will be able to show our workingman, our schools, our great cities, the rewards of living in a country that is free. We have found the weapon that can be decisive in winning the cold war.

We have had this medium for years. The television picture has flourished in America, but we had given little thought to its powers except as an entertainment medium. Its history, since its inception in 1884 as Nipkow's disc, through Baird's experiments in England, Braun's cathode ray tube, the iconoscope of RCA's V. K. Zworykin, and then the image orthicon developed under Zworykin's direction, has been an exciting one technically. To the engineering accomplishments has been added the unconquerable determination of David Sarnoff in guiding the TV picture to its final conclusion. But in recent years, the wonder of television has waned and become an accommodation we were almost complacent about.

The thought of its use in an international network was an idea staggering human imagination at first. But we have had the caliber of men who were not easily blocked by obstacles. We had our Smith-Mundt committee, which had studied the chaos of post-World War II Europe. And we had the counsel of Henry F. Holthusen. We had the sturdy determination of America's great communications companies. True, we have also had the skeptics. But not so many years before us, David Sarnoff had disregarded the pessimists who had said it could never be done, when he had guided television, itself, into existence. And now, our American engineers have created an advance in communications equal to the beginnings of short wave, in their efforts to televise the American way of life to all peoples.

Already an Air Force installation reaches across the icecap outposts of the North Atlantic, carrying telephone and telegraph messages. These are the trailblazers, pioneering the outpost locations. The historic broadcasts to Havana make it possible for the wide-picture band to follow this route, after additional power and testing can assure us the reliability of transmission through the several relays needed to cross the Atlantic.

Then the final chain in the international network link will close. And the world will be joined in the greatest single medium ever conceived to create understanding among the world's peoples.

A Storm Is Always a Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a splendid address entitled "A Storm Is Always a Challenge," which was delivered by Mr. Norman Knight on the occasion of the 15th anniversary dinner of the Boston Food Brokers Association, held the evening of April 28, 1958, in Boston, Mass.

There is not a more forward-looking or progressive-minded business executive in the United States than Mr. Knight:

"A STORM IS ALWAYS A CHALLENGE"

(Address by Norman Knight,[1] 50th anniversary dinner, Boston Food Brokers Association, Somerset Hotel, Boston, April 28, 1958)

Frank Sweeney, Bill Knott, Watson Rogers, John MacNeil, Wally Pierce, past presidents of the Boston Food Broker's Association, honored guests, it is a rare opportunity for me to sit among so many men whom I admire and respect.

This Nation has seen great progress these past 5 decades—our achievements as a people are phenomenal in areas of material living standards, continuing spiritual values, and recognition of individual dignity.

Nowhere, though, in all the histories of all the great nations of the world, past and present, have there ever evolved better methods than ours for the manufacture, distribution, and sale of food.

And nowhere in any one region of this great Nation can there be assembled an equal number of people associated with this great food marketing triumph of the 20th century who can match the contributions of New Englanders, many of you here in this ballroom, tonight, who with your collective efforts have pioneered, perspired, persevered, persisted and performed in such a manner as to set the standards for America in your chosen fields as manufacturers, brokers and retailers.

Charles F. Kettering said: "We have a lot of people revolutionizing the world because they never have had to present a working model."

That's what I admire so much about so many of New England's food industry leaders—you've brought the future into the present and then you've made it work.

Therefore, do not expect me to criticize that which I find to be as healthy and vigorous as in New England food marketing.

Do share with me, though, some thoughts which all of us in the communications field and you in areas of food marketing can express together with feelings of mutual respect and a fundamental knowledge that ours is a common objective designed to bring a better way of living to New Englanders and to maintain the proud Yankee tradition of setting standards for all America to follow.

That which we have in New England is substantial, no matter what criterion is used as a basis of comparison.

Illustrating this claim best is the imposing statement that New England, with only 2.2 percent of the land area of the United States has 7.5 percent of all bank deposits; 6.8 percent of all life insurance; 11.8 percent of all bank, insurance company, and investment trust assets; 8.7 percent of all manufacturing establishments; 9 percent of all manufacturing employment.

And yet, startling as are these figures, the plain truth is that New England's greatest growth is still ahead, because we have more of the greatest natural resource than does any other region of this or any other country—manpower, with vision, with courage, with strength.

You New England leaders in food marketing—manufacturers, brokers, and retailers—

[1] Norman Knight is president of the Yankee Network Division, RKO Teleradio Pictures, Inc., whose New England operations include the Yankee Network, WNAC radio, WNAC–FM and WNAC–TV.

can well be proud of past accomplishments, but we urge you to continue to recognize your responsibilities to this democracy that cradled your success and to the consuming public which financed your growth.

Perhaps your most important responsibility is to each other. There are those among you who must patiently and understandingly bring to newer and less experienced associates the great lessons you have learned. Among these is the interdependence of all facets of the industry.

No coddling is necessary—no good salesman wants special favors; no useless or inferior product should be nurtured to success.

But neither should a salesman with good ideas and quality merchandise be denied access to the market place—nor a deserving entrepreneur severed from opportunity to achieve growth.

For it would be a sad day if ever these proud achievements of your hearts and minds should be shattered, if not financially then morally, by those who arrive late on the scene with either a lack of understanding of human values or varying degrees of pomposity, selfishness, or complacency which can only invite long-term deterioration.

With the forces of food marketing constructively creating new opportunities for all, it is my fondest hope that the communications elements which constitute the great advertising force in our economy can join with you in the next 50 years to achieve a better standard of living for New Englanders than any of us even dared to dream.

For today, the food manufacturer can prosper with only intelligent advertising; the broker can sell strongest when he merchandises that advertising; the retailer can serve consumers best and profit most when he aggressively capitalizes on the advertising of manufacturers and the merchandising of that advertising by brokers.

Brokers can well take time today to remember a lesson learned by hard experience—that a salesman representing a food product must know a great deal about the merchandising of advertising.

And this knowledge starts with what must be the salesman's unshaken belief that good advertising does work, does produce sales, does make his job easier, does affect larger profits for himself, his company, his product. He must believe in advertising.

A 1950 survey made by sales management among district managers of large national advertisers in the consumer goods field indicated that it was possible to place an actual dollar value on the power of advertising as a merchandising tool.

This survey tells us that companies who have mastered the merchandising of advertising actually buy their advertising for only 47 cents on every dollar spent.

While large numbers of advertisers pay the full dollar for their advertising * * * the merchandising masters—the real dollar-stretchers—prove that sound merchandising methods derive 53 cents greater worth from every advertising dollar.

Many manufacturers and brokers will in the next 50 years bring to retailers ideas that will be of considerable help to those retailers who are in a position to utilize them. Conversely, many salesmen have much to take back to their companies after visits with buyers.

It is well for all to remember that—

There is no profit in merchandise—there is profit only in the movement of merchandise.

Merchandise must move and fast.

Stiff markups are of the past.

Storekeeps want wide margins.

Merchants want fast movement.

Products that bring greater numbers of consumers into a store constitute the most profitable merchandise any retailer can carry.

The most important merchandising principle in food marketing is just one 3-word thought: "Get people in."

With the forces of food marketing and advertising joined together, our next 50 years will bring us a prosperity almost beyond comprehension.

Expect to see: precooked meals of every type; dehydrated foods with fresh taste; frozen canned foods; extensive use of radar ovens for preparation of frozen ready-to-eat meals; canning in plastics and aluminum; increased number of marketing cooperatives by growers; all factors (costs, competition, lower margins) to favor growth of alert, agressive brokers; survival of progressive independent retailers; retail chain store development into merchandising phenomena whose complicated operations will demand the best energies and abilities of New England's finest manpower.

We can never expect utopia.

Someone once defined utopia as conditions that will prevail when Americans enjoy: 1950 wages, 1926 dividends, 1932 prices, and 1910 taxes.

But if we never achieve utopia throughout this country, you can be sure that here in New England we will come the closest to it * * * for here abound the qualities of aggressiveness, thrift, and hard work.

And when things get a little rugged (as they are now for some of our fellow businessmen and larger numbers of our fellow citizens), here in these qualities will be the determination to create a better life for all.

This excerpt from Archibald Rutledge's Beauty in the Heart best conveys my closing thought:

"Going up a mountain path one day, I met a mountaineer with an axe in his hand. I walked with him and asked him what he was going to cut. 'I need a piece of timber to fix my wagon,' he said. 'I need the toughest kind of wood I can get. That kind always grows on top of the mountain, where all the storms hit the hardest.'

"Storms rend and mar; but they strengthen, they build and they may bring forth serene and changeless beauty. The beauty born of storms has a nobility about it. A girl's first bloom lacks significance and spiritual durability. It can represent no effort, no decision, no struggle, no strength or valor on the part of its possessor. Years later, when the girl has become a woman, if she has reacted gallantly to trouble, there will come to her a beauty that has about it the air of immortality. That is because it is rooted in character.

"We are prone to lament that the world is not better. Yet the fact that it is full of trouble affords us our only chance to spend our hearts. A time of prosperity is a dangerous time; the soul loafs and grows fat. Times of storm and peril are the ones that show what we are made of. A storm is always a challenge; there seems to be something in the heart that rises up to meet it."

More Support for Banning Nuclear Testing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the most encouraging news to come to my attention this past weekend has been the President's proposal to the Soviet Premier that scientific talks get underway in Geneva in 3 weeks on ways of policing a nuclear weapons test ban.

The most discouraging news is that the United Nations scientists have found that nuclear-test radiation is causing harm to world health and that it threatens uncounted injury to future generations.

These are matters, Mr. Speaker, which concern mankind and which have prompted men and women throughout our Nation to write to me asking that I continue to urge that nuclear testing cease.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a second set of excerpts from a number of the letters which I have recently received, and which oppose the continuation of nuclear testing:

Thank God for men such as you who have the courage to stand up for your convictions against the pressure of war madness. If we do not stop these bomb tests which are poisoning our air, water, and food; if we do not outlaw all nuclear weapons and do these things now, it will soon be too late. So, here is one small citizen who applauds you and prays for you.

MRS. MARION R. LOVEKIN.

TUCSON, ARIZ.

It is rather difficult to get a full picture from press stories of what transpired in your criticism of Admiral Strauss and the Atomic Energy Commission. We are a small paper and, of course, have no wire service.

We feel the issue you raise is extremely important and should be brought to the attention of our readers.

CONRAD KOMOROWSKI,
For the editorial board of People's Voice (Glos Ludowy).

DETROIT, MICH.

I wish to support you and all other Congressmen who have the courage and the sense to ask for an end to nuclear tests. * * * Thank you for your courageous, challenging, and sensible position.

MRS. EDNA P. LEGG.

POUGHKEEPSIE, N. Y.

I hope that you will continue your good work—wish I were in your State so that I could support you with my vote but if there is anything else I can do, please let me know.

MRS. TED BERLIN.

MALIBU, CALIF.

I feel that our course comes daily perilously closer to insanity and it seems to me the crew of the "Golden Rule" deserves every possible support for at least dramatizing the issue in a way more effective than almost any other I can think of.

Thank you again for giving this support. Oregon can indeed be proud of its representation in Congress.

MISS IRMGARD LENEL.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.

I commend you for your plea for the cessation of the testing and encourage you to continue to take this stand. There are many of us who feel very strongly as you do, but who are unheard. It is only through people like yourself that we may speak. I sincerely thank you for this effort and any effort that you might make in the future.

MRS. A. PERRINO,
Central Methodist Church.

DETROIT, MICH.

It is so rare that a national representative has the courage to speak out against the

continuance of H-bomb testing that I am writing to commend you for your stand. The case against discontinuing testing has become so feeble that it requires lies by the AEC on detection limits and other aspects of the problem to defend it. The clean-bomb arguments are something out of Jonathan Swift. I hope that you will continue your efforts to arouse the public to demand a halt to these senseless tests.

C. W. GRIFFIN,

ERLTON, N. J.

Mr. wife and I heartily thank you for arousing the people of this country to the terrible danger of these nuclear tests. We have read several of your statements in the New York Times and find that there seems to be much courage required to go against the official statements of AEC and of Mr. J. Foster Dulles. We thank you for helping to bring this issue into the open for discussion.

ROBERT and ANN STOWELL.

WILTON, N. H.

Please accept gratitude of New England American Friends Service Committee for your opposition to continued nuclear tests. We support you and others in attempts to end this evil and explore paths to disarmament.

ROBERT A. LYON,
Executive Secretary.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

I wish to commend you on your opposition to the continuance of atomic tests.

HENRY R. KORMAN.

LONGVIEW, WASH.

I want to commend you most heartily for the stand you took this week in your opposition to the continuance of the nuclear tests. Praise God for a few men of courage in these perilous days.

HELEN E. DOLLEY.

COMPTON, CALIF.

I am very glad indeed that you are taking the position you are. I have felt for some time that the AEC has been too autocratic and has wielded too much power over the American people through its policy of secrecy and hocus pocus. Keep it up. I don't think the people are so stupid they won't act reasonably if they know the facts.

LIONEL CHADWICK.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

Nuclear testing, with its deadly accompaniment of radioactivity is a menace to the future of all peoples. If agreement can be reached on ending tests, with inspection, it must be the duty of our Government to seek such an agreement. To this end, the AEC serves merely as an obstacle to the search for peaceful alternatives to the arms race.

MRS. L. MAUSNER.

RIDGEFIELD, N. J.

As a Democrat I feel especially happy when I hear one of my own voicing sentiments that are for the good of mankind. The people and especially thinking people are questioning the wisdom of nuclear tests and are looking for wise leadership.

MARION R. INNERST.

PASADENA, CALIF.

One cannot escape the conclusion that a few willful men are practicing a gross and vicious deception upon the American public, and that it is high time their motivations and aims were brought to light. More power to you, sir.

MATTHEW P. HYLAND.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Please be assured that your forthright and fearless efforts to stop nuclear testing have a large and appreciative following. I hope you will persevere courageously, and that others wil join you in working toward a safe and peaceful world.

ANTON KUERTI.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

We stand squarely behind you on your efforts for cessation of nuclear testing and for disarmament. We have given much thought to the subject and can only come to the inevitable conclusion that the United States must unconditionally stop testing nuclear weapons.

Although reports are contradictory and misleading, the indications are that radioactive poisons are already accumulating to a danger point and no one is certain how serious the effects will be on generations yet unborn. If there is doubt then under no circumstances have we the moral right to risk the health and life of people yet to come because of our present follies.

It seems that the people are not really informed and somehow should be made more aware of the dangers.

ROWLAND and CAROLYN ORUM.

OAKRIDGE, OREG.

Your speech should have been printed in headlines. It is what the entire world is waiting for, or should be waiting for. At last there is a gleam of hope that our Congress is waking up. * * * My son * * * flies jets on this useless test expedition that is so morally wrong and so dreadfully wasteful.

Mrs. ELMA RHODES.

SPANARD, ALASKA.

You are speaking for large numbers of us who seem to have little opportunity to be heard or represented in Washington.

Mrs. EZRA EVANS.

MEDFORD, N. J.

Though you are not a representative of California, which is my State, in fact you do represent me better than our own Senators, for you stand for what we believe is right. I am referring to your speech in Congress criticizing our government officials for setting off nuclear explosions without notifying the people of this country that such action had been taken.

Here in California we have been exposed to a great amount of radiation from fallout, both from explosions in Nevada and those in the Pacific, even from those set off in Siberia. We are the ones who get the first dose of strontium 90. * * * Please do not flag in your efforts to bring sanity to our country. Many who are too shy to write their representatives at Washington are frightened and angry just the same.

PHYLLIS ZAKHEIM,

SEBASTOPOL, CALIF.

About a week ago, I read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD your statement made upon your return from the Eniwetok Proving Grounds concerning your proposals to help avert all-out thermonuclear war. In my humble estimation, I honestly believe that this was as fine a statement as has ever been made on the floor of the House. * * * Your actions with regard to Trujillo, Latin American problems, plywood, and avoidance of thermonuclear war are certainly consistent with the finest traditions of a liberal Democratic Party. Please keep up the good work.

FELIX M. PUTTERMAN.

NEW YORK CITY.

My husband and I would like to thank you for your efforts toward informing the public of the dangers of fallout. We most wholeheartedly support you. If only there were more like you.

MARY WEST.

MILL VALLEY, CALIF.

I am writing to express my support of your stand against the nuclear tests and to say that I hope you will have many opportunities to speak out on this vital issue. I am working with others in my own community who share this conviction and realization of the need for action. I am sure that you are speaking for many concerned people all over the world.

Mrs. RUTH FORRESTER GOODHARD.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.

My husband and family and I all heartily agree with you that all nuclear tests should be stopped (indeed, should have been stopped long ago—or before they began) for the reasons which you enumerate and which are sheer common sense. Anything less is immoral and insane. I have long intended to write you our thanks for your H. R. 8296 * * * and haven't we learned yet that an arms race, continued, can lead only to war?

Mrs. KURT BUSIEK.

MOCKSVILLE, N. C.

Oregon State College Study of Farm Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an informative editorial from the Oregonian of May 19, 1958, entitled "Spreading Farm Dollar." This editorial emphasizes a most illuminating study of farm purchasing power conducted recently by Dr. Gerald E. Korzan, of the faculty of Oregon State College at Corvallis.

It emphasizes in detail how the income of farmers spreads out through the entire economy, and creates jobs and purchasing power in all realms of business and industry.

Because farm income is vital not only to Oregon, but all 47 of the other States, I ask unanimous consent that the Oregonian editorial describing Dr. Korzan's significant study be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of May 19, 1958]

SPREADING FARM DOLLAR

In round numbers, Oregon farmers take in $400 million a year. This provides employment for approximately 30,000 commercial farm operators and the equivalent of 17,972 full-time farm laborers.

In itself, this is an extremely important contribution to the State's economy. But city and country are not separate entities; everyone realizes that the welfare of the one is closely allied to the welfare of the other. Other jobs—purchasing power—are generated by Oregon agriculture, and a study recently completed by Dr. Gerald E. Korzan of Oregon State College gives some idea of the economic ripples that move outward from the farms.

Basing estimates on data for 1956, a fairly typical agricultural year, the Oregon State

College agricultural economist has produced intriguing figures. Of the $395 million in total cash farm income in 1956, Oregon farmers kept $94 million, or about a quarter of the total, as net farm income. They paid out $53,900,000 in wages to their hired help and spent a whopping $247,100,000 for goods and services.

Dr. Korzan has computed that $25,300,000 of these latter expenses represented direct employment to persons other than the farmers themselves and their hired men. This is the equivalent of 5,615 full-time jobs, including 1,626 having to do with repair and operation of capital items, 1,593 with depreciation and other consumption of farm capital, 700 with feed, 422 with interest, 158 with fertilizer, 116 with seed and 1,000 with miscellaneous expenses.

But farm products move on beyond the farmyard gate. They are processed and handled by others from then on. The Oregon State College economist figures that $176 million was added to farm product value on processing in only the first step beyond the farm gate. Of this, processors' supplies and miscellaneous expenses accounted for $108,400,000 and processors' direct payroll, $67,600,000.

This first-step processing, thus, provided the equivalent of 16,874 full-time jobs. Added to the 30,000 farm operators, 17,972 farm workers and 5,615 jobs represented by goods and services furnished the farmers, this makes a grand total of 70,461 full-time jobs supported by agriculture in Oregon through primary processing.

This annual payroll of $241 million was more than twice the 1956 payroll for contract construction in Oregon, nearly 10 times as great as the primary metals industry payroll and amounted to 63 percent of the lumber and wood products payroll, Clancy Jean, manager of the agricultural department of the Portland Chamber of Commerce, points out. The chamber had asked Oregon State College to make the study now available.

Annually, the number of Oregon jobs supplied by agriculture is considerably higher than that given in the study. The money spent for processors' supplies bought a lot of cans, other kinds of containers, labels, etc., produced by Oregon workers. Also wholesaling, storage, and transportation were not taken into account because the extent of their payroll and revenue production was difficult to assess.

The study proves beyond question that agriculture plays a much larger part in the overall economy of the State than is represented by the total farm cash income figure. And much of it is not as seasonal as is generally supposed, marketing activities, for example, going on, for the most part, the year around. A prosperous agriculture should be the aim of every Oregonian.

Resolutions of the Tennessee Municipal League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Tennessee Municipal League had its annual meeting at Nashville, Tenn., Tuesday, May 13, 1958. Various matters of public importance were thoroughly considered by the members of the Tennessee Municipal League, and resolutions were passed giving the position of the members of the league on these various issues. The resolutions were thoroughly discussed and undoubtedly represent the viewpoint of most of the citizens of the State of Tennessee, as well as the outstanding municipal officials who constitute the Tennessee Municipal League.

I ask unanimous consent that these resolutions be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TVA PROGRAM

RESOLUTION ON TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE CANAL COMPACT

Whereas the opening of a waterway between the Tennessee River and the Tombigbee River will provide a direct route for water shipping between the Tennessee Valley and the Gulf of Mexico, cutting hundreds of miles from the present route and vastly adding to the advantages of our State's commerce and industry; and

Whereas the feasibility of this long dreamed-of project now is under intensive restudy by the Army Corps of Engineers and will be the subject of a fresh report to Congress at this session; and

Whereas our neighboring States of Alabama and Mississippi by legislation action and gubernatorial affirmation have recently established a compact for an aggressive and continuing effort to bring this waterway into being and have cordially invited the participation of the State of Tennessee in said compact and enterprise; and

Whereas the opening of this waterway is a matter of equal concern to the people of our State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Tennessee Municipal League recommend that the State of Tennessee join Alabama and Mississippi in the Tennessee-Tombigbee Canal compact and in vigorous action to advance the common interest of the three States in the development of a great shared resource.

RESOLUTION ON PRIVATE UTILITY ATTACKS ON TVA

Whereas the vested private utility monopoly of the Nation continues to stage in the magazine press and in other media their scandalous and unprincipled attack upon TVA, seeking by the grossest misrepresentations and most brazen insinuations to poison the minds of the people against this world-famous American river control project; and

Whereas at the instance of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, and other aroused Members of Congress, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and the Federal Power Commission have been moved to declare that the burden of this costly campaign no longer may be settled on the shoulders of the Federal taxpayers and the ratepayers of these giant corporations, but must be paid hereafter by their stockholders; and

Whereas the recklessness of this campaign of detraction should at least be checked by the said ruling, which is long overdue, and the interest of truth should be served: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Tennessee Municipal League convey its commendation to Senator KEFAUVER and those who have stood with him in his attention to this matter, and that it commend the vigilance of the Federal Power Commission and of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to the end that the consumers of the services of the aforesaid corporate enemies of TVA no longer be taxed to support a propaganda campaign whose vicious purpose is to discredit the TVA "yardstick" and defeat their own proper hopes of obtaining electric power at better rates.

RESOLUTION ON SELF-FINANCING LEGISLATION

Whereas the municipalities and countrysides of this State are by choice distributors of and consumers of TVA power at exemplary rates which permit the common use of twice as much power as is used by the average consumer outside the TVA region, brightening the homes and quickening the industry of the people; and

Whereas assurance of the adequacy of this power supply in the future is of vital concern to the whole body of this State; and

Whereas there is now before Congress a plan whereby TVA would be authorized to go into the private money market to obtain capital for building needed additional powerplants by selling revenue bonds backed solely by TVA's own earnings, that is by the ability and willingness of the users of TVA power to pay their power bills, this plan having already been approved by an overwhelming vote in the Senate and is soon to be brought to a vote in the House; and

Whereas enactment of this TVA self-financing plan will remove the uncertainties which of late years have hung like a sword over the electric power supply of our State and will demonstrate to the Nation what already is clear to the people of Tennessee—that TVA's power users are in fact paying fully for the TVA power system; and

Whereas this TVA self-financing plan is unique in that instead of calling for more room in the Federal Budget it provides a sound means of obtaining investment funds for expansion of the TVA power system without governmental obligation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress and especially each and every Representative of Tennessee in Congress be again apprised of the will and wish of this organization for the enactment of said TVA self-financing legislation as approved by the appropriate committees of the House and Senate and as recommended by the board of directors of TVA itself, and that this action be taken by Congress without alterations of the pending bill that would hamper or cripple the Tennessee Valley Authority in procuring and expending the funds needed to keep its power services at all times abreast of the needs of the State, the region, and the Nation.

CITIZENS FOR TVA

RESOLUTION ON CITIZENS FOR TVA

Whereas our State and area have no cause more important to the present and future welfare of the people than the planned development of the great resources with which nature has endowed us; and

Whereas our association has been and is a sponsoring member of the one citizens organization in the Tennessee Valley region created for and working for the comprehensive and integrated development of our water resources in the Tennessee and Cumberland Valleys, including the long-projected Tennessee-Tombigbee Canal; and

Whereas Citizens for TVA, now in its fifth year, is sponsored for this work likewise by 14 other State and regional associations, including the municipal associations of our sister States of Kentucky and Alabama, and the rural electric associations of Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, and North Carolina, by the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association and State labor organizations within the TVA region; and

Whereas the programs of Citizens for TVA, approved and ordered by its sponsoring members, look to the preservation of TVA from its powerful and unremitting enemies, to presenting the true story of TVA to the national opinion, to continuation of the

allied development of the Cumberland for navigation, flood control and power, to the advancement of projects for linking our State's growing waterways with other arms of the Inland Waterway System and the Gulf of Mexico, to the enlightenment of our own people and of people everywhere upon the realities and merits of the great resource-use projects and possibilities of our area and the rallying of favorable sentiment for these undertakings on a national scale; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That our association express and otherwise manifest its appreciation of the work of Citizens for TVA to these ends and continue its sponsoring support of Citizens for TVA as an instrument for the effectuation of our prudent and forward-looking interest in the fullest, coordinated development of our water resources.

POLICY ON FEDERAL PUBLIC WORKS ASSISTANCE

The Tennessee Municipal League supports the prompt enactment by Congress of legislation which would extend Federal matching grants to local governments to undertake construction of a broad range of vitally needed public works facilities, and consideration by Congress of a Federal low-interest loan program for local public works.

Tennessee counties and communities have a $500 million-plus backlog of needed local public works improvements. They lack the debt capacity and the tax resources to finance any substantial portion of these public works. City and county general obligation debt now exceeds $423 million and municipal revenue-supported debt exceeds $327 million.

Federal emergency aid to combat the current economic recession already is being made available to State governments for highways, unemployment compensation, and other purposes. Federal expenditure programs are being increased. Local governments should receive their fair share of such assistance from the Federal Government.

RESOLUTION ON INCREASED FEDERAL HIGHWAY AID

Whereas United States Senator ALBERT GORE assumed leadership in the passage of the 1956 Federal Highways Act to create a 41,000-mile network of interstate superhighways, and in the appropriation of an additional $1.8 billion this year for the Interstate System along with provision for total additional Federal and State appropriations of $12.5 billion during the life of the interstate superhighways program; and

Whereas this additional appropriation will enable the return of the nationwide interstate system construction program to the original 13-year completion schedule rather than the 25-year stretch-out proposed by leaders of the present administration; and

Whereas the additional Federal funds now available for regular Federal aid to highways are estimated to include $8,200,000 more for Tennessee in 1958, and Tennessee's prospective share of the interstate funds is estimated to be approximately $60 million in 1959 and $75 million in 1960; and

Whereas the members of the Tennessee Municipal League have actively supported a great new highway program in the Nation and in Tennessee, and have had outstanding leadership in advocating this program through the efforts of Mayor Ben West, of Nashville, as highway committee chairman, and former president of the American Municipal Association, and of Mayor P. R. Olgiati of Chattanooga, and other municipal officials active in Tennesseans for Better Roads; and

Whereas the Tennessee Municipal League has supported the adoption by Congress of new and higher cost estimates for the Interstate Highway System, and continual increases in regular Federal aid to highways: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Tennessee Municipal League commend Senator GORE for his successful efforts in behalf of the interstate highways legislation and other legislation affecting Tennessee highways; and be it further

Resolved, That the Tennessee Municipal League also commend other members of the Tennessee delegation in Congress who have contributed strong leadership and support in behalf of beneficial highways legislation.

POLICY ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO SMALL INDUSTRY AND UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS

The Tennessee Municipal League supports Federal financial assistance to small industry and underdeveloped areas now denied adequate financing from private investment sources.

The Tennessee Municipal League endorses and supports the Douglas-Payne bill (S. 3633) to provide $375 million in Federal loans and grants to aid areas with economic troubles. This includes both industrial areas with high unemployment levels over a long period, and rural areas with low-income families.

This bill would authorize a $100 million revolving fund for loans for industrial projects in rural redevelopment areas; authorize a $100 million revolving fund for loans for public facilities in redevelopment areas, which would increase opportunities for reemployment; authorize $75 million for grants for public facilities in redevelopment areas; and authorize $4,500,000 a year for technical assistance.

The bill would meet some of the objectives of the Tennessee Municipal League board of directors resolution calling upon Congress to provide Federal matching grants to local governments for public works facilities. Also, it offers the prospect of real and immediate economic assistance to the underdeveloped areas of Tennessee in addition to urban areas now suffering the effects of the nationwide recession.

The Tennessee Municipal League also endorses and supports the objectives of the bill introduced by Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON to set up a Small Business Investment Administration. This agency could borrow $250 million from the Treasury, and invest up to $250,000 each in privately organized small business investment companies.

The present Small Business Administration has been limited to meeting short-term credit needs. Small businesses and industry in Tennessee and the Nation have been unable, through SBA and private sources of capital, to expand and grow in the face of increasing economic concentration. They must have access to long-term loans and development capital.

STATEMENT ON TAX EVASION BY THE FEDERAL CONTRACTORS

The Tennessee Municipal League strongly urges that the Congress enact legislation providing that no person may claim an exemption from otherwise applicable State and local taxes arising out of business conducted in a State, on the grounds that such person is a private contractor and at the same time a purchasing agent of the United States for the purpose of procuring tangible personal property to be used in the performance of his contract.

Senate-approved bill S. 6, which has been pending before the House Ways and Means Committee since March, should be promptly enacted to close this tax loophole which is robbing the State of Tennessee of millions of dollars of sales tax revenue vitally needed to finance education and other programs of the State.

Our Ailing Regulatory Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Anthony Lewis. Mr. Lewis specializes in reporting on the courts and regulatory commissions as a member of the New York Times staff in Washington. The article is taken from his address to the Federal trial examiners conference on April 29, 1958. It appeared in the New Republic of May 19, 1958:

OUR AILING REGULATORY AGENCIES
(By Anthony Lewis)

It would be hard to avoid realizing that there has been a significant loss of confidence in the regulatory agencies. Nothing has illustrated this more sharply, I think, than the recent order of the court of appeals here sending the Miami channel 10 case back to the Communications Commission for a hearing on charges of improper influence. The Commission had suggested a remand with instructions simply to do whatever seemed appropriate. The court, in what seemed to me a most unusual order, told the Commission exactly what issues to investigate, what kind of hearing to hold, when to report back—practically everything except what room to have the hearing in. And then the court ordered that the Attorney General be invited into the proceeding as an amicus, presumably to keep an eye on the Commission. In my view that order plainly implies a lack of confidence in the Commission. And I think it is an indication of the trend of feeling among some judges and among a great many lawyers.

What are the reasons for this loss of confidence in the administraitve process?

First, there is, of course, the charge of improper approaches by parties and members of Congress in adjudicatory matters.

Mr. OREN HARRIS' congressional investigation has at least laid bare the existence of this evil. Putting aside the sad case of Mr. Mack, I was fascinated by the testimony of a former Communications Commission Chairman who said he was approached by various parties to a Boston television case. They didn't want to influence him or do anything wrong, this gentleman testified, they just wanted to tell him what fine fellows they were.

I think some of us have tended to become cynical about this business of ex parte representation, coming to believe it is an inevitable evil that just has to be lived with. It was a tonic in that regard to hear the oral argument in the court of appeals on the Miami case. The court was genuinely outraged at the whole idea of parties and Congressmen speaking privately to commissioners in an adjudicatory proceeding. Some might regard the judges' tardy discovery of corruption as naive, but I found it a welcome expression of moral indignation.

Beyond the question of overt corruption there is what may be a more serious charge—that the final judges in the administrative process often have their minds made up before they consider the case. As one lawyer put it to me, "They don't need to be bought. They know the result they want to reach on almost any issue, and everyone else knows it, too." Of course that is an exaggerated statement, but there seems to be enough to it to worry a lot of people. Nothing gives a lawyer

a sense of greater futility, I should think, than arguing to deaf ears. I watch oral argument quite regularly in the Supreme Court, and it is a fascinating process. We all know that the members of the Court have points of view—some of them very well established indeed. Yet, more often than not, I believe the oral argument of a case affects the results. The Justices appear open to persuasion; they want information and help from counsel. The complaint from some lawyers who practice before the regulatory agencies is that they are just going through the motions. One example that I must say bothers me is what happens to comparative television cases after the court of appeals reverses a decision of the Communications Commission. In two recent cases the court in quite strong language indicated that there seemed to be no rational way to apply the rules and come out the way the Commission had. On remand, the Commission voted exactly the same way—and I gather none of the lawyers had any particular hopes to the contrary. In no case has a television station actually on the air ever lost its license as a result of a court decision. The law of averages alone would suggest to me that a disinterested Commission, not deciding on the basis of previous commitments, would occasionally change its mind.

This allegation of the closed mind is related to another complaint—against the process of decision itself. These criticisms go essentially to the fact that those who decide the issues eventually are too remote from what should be the decision-making processes of trial and evaluation of the evidence. The parties try out their case before the hearing examiner. The issues are threshed out at length and a record built up. But then the final decision is made—the charge is—by men who have not read the record. And the failure of the judges to write their own opinions is even more bitterly criticized. As the critics see it, we have here a body which takes no responsibility to know the facts in a case or to justify the rationale of the result. The critics would say that reduces the role of the commissioners or board members to nodding their heads—and with that separation of the judges from the process they lose the personal identification and responsibility that are the only real check on arbitrary decisions.

These are the most frequently heard criticisms of the administrative process. But there are two others of a broader character that must also be considered.

The first amounts to a charge that too many agencies are just plain stodgy. After all, the men who had the great dreams about the administrative process saw it as a new, creative tool of government—flexible, ready to attack new problems, not held back by encrustations of tradition, really able to deal with the multiple difficulties of an industrialized society. Instead, the critics see administrative agencies that plod along, doing routine tasks in a routine way, bound by fictions and habits as hampering as those of the courts and apparently incapable of taking the bold action of a legislative character philosophers of the administrative process envisaged.

Which brings me to the last of these indictments. This is the charge that the agencies have become too identified with the industries they are supposed to regulate, so that the regulated have become regulators. It is said that board members, appointed only for a term of years, must inevitably look to the regulated industry for their future. If the member wants to be reappointed, he will almost certainly need the support of the industry. If he is not reappointed, his professional future almost certainly lies with that same industry. And so a kind of unspoken accommodation of views takes place.

I myself believe there is a good deal to this last charge—the identification of an agency with its industry—but I would not place it only on the personal need of commissioners for industry approval. That seems too simplified an explanation. I think the trouble is that in most cases a regulatory agency has responsibility for a particular, narrow segment of the economy. The board member has to mingle with leaders of the industry and get to know it. In such a situation anyone would tend to concern himself more and more with the special problems of the particular field, letting the broader concept of public interest slip into the background, not seeing the forest for the trees. The antitrust problem is a good example. Again and again the Justice Department finds itself at odds with the regulatory agencies about antitrust enforcement. The Maritime Board rejects antitrust considerations which seem important to the Justice Department in rate matters. The Communications Commission "loses" a letter from the Department objecting to a station transfer on antitrust grounds. The Power Commission disagrees with Justice about whether some pipeline amalgamation should be allowed. Over and over, the agency seems to be taking the view that it must protect its own industries against too stringent an application of the antitrust laws.

One reason that may underlie the faults which are being found in the administrative agencies is that the agencies have aged without acquiring the usual accoutrements of age—respect, and wise traditions. The demerits of age—the delays and cautions of the courts—now do seem to be part of the administrative process. But where is the sense of tradition and pride that glorifies the courts? In part this failing can be traced to a lack of respect for the jobs themselves—a lack of sufficient prestige. If we have had some small men in administrative agencies, it is perhaps because those who have made the nominations regarded them as small plums. I think there is something wrong with asking a man here from the Middle West as a possible candidate for a commission whose work he knows—and then, when that vacancy turns out to be filled, fobbing him off to another agency about which he knows nothing. I think there is something wrong when we can have as chairman of an agency a man who goes around at social gatherings trying to set himself up in law partnership with men upon whose cases he is presently passing.

And along with the lack of pride and tradition is a lack of personal pride in one's own craftsmanship. A judge is an independent force. His opinions bear his name. He builds up a body of cases with his stamp. No office of opinions and review does his work for him. He is a figure in his own right. In the administrative agencies, I would guess, the lack of personal identification of board members with the process of decision underlies many of the procedural shortcomings.

I think, too, it is of basic importance to recognize that the agencies are not the only sinners. My own feeling is that a large proportion of the blame can be apportioned to Congress. Certainly the example set by Congress in recent years is no guide to the way the administrative process should work. To begin at the bottom, venality has not been a stranger at the Capitol. Why should the agencies be above deciding issues by preconceptions when Senators are not ashamed to take a leading part in matters in which they have a personal economic interest? Why should the agencies be expected to act swiftly and creatively on new problems when Congress is so hampered by inertia? What can impel the Communications Commission to try to deal rationally with the problem of pay television when a committee of Congress summarily orders it to forget years of hearings and not even hold a test? Nor is the executive branch immune to criticism for lack of vigorous, creative leadership.

Perhaps the underlying reason for our Government failures is a decay in our political life. Louis M. Lyons, curator of the Nieman Foundation at Harvard University, spoke with accuracy last week of "the drabness of our contemporary public life." If we have an uncreative Government, surely it is because we have voters who are not interested in new ideas.

Let me mention some cures that have been suggested for the alleged ills of the administrative agencies. The first, about which we have heard a good deal, is that Congress or the agencies themselves should promulgate a code of ethics. This, it is said, would eliminate influence peddling. Well, I am somewhat cynical about this proposal. Of course, it is fine to be on the side of morality. But no one should be fooled into thinking that a command to be honest is going to correct all the deficiencies of the administrative process. These deficiencies, as I have tried to indicate, go very much deeper than overt corruption. And I think that the appointment of strong-minded commissioners would be a much surer guaranty of disinterested decisions than any code of ethics.

Some have suggested that members of the agencies be appointed for life, like judges. The idea would be: make them independent of pressures from industry and Congress—the unspoken as well as open pressures. But this idea seems to me to deprive the administrative process of one of the major reasons for its extistence—the constant influx of new men and new ideas to meet new problems. I am not ready to entrust lifetime appointees with such rapidly changing problems as gas regulation or television techniques. Or, I should amend that to say that if appointments are to be for life, I see no reason not to go the whole way and turn the whole business over to the courts.

That is the third suggestion we hear—let the courts take over. Somewhat strangely, this proposal has support from two entirely different schools. There are some who never did trust the idea of administrative agencies and who prefer the more familiar atmosphere of the courts. There are others, veterans of the agencies themselves, who have become so discouraged with what they regard as an irrational, unresponsive process of decision that they would go for the radical cure of letting the courts handle at least the so-called adjudicatory aspects of agency business. Some persons have proposed a general administrative court. Others would give the regular Federal courts jurisdiction.

Perhaps the very word "court" brings with it some tradition of disinterestedness, and to that extent it might be valuable to give the name of court to one or more agencies. But the difficulty is in knowing how to divide adjudicatory from legislative functions. At present, for example, it is regarded as adjudicatory for the Communications Commission to choose between competing applicants for a television channel. But it is legislative when the Commission removes that channel from one city and assigns it to another. Even if you could draw the line sharply, who is to carry on the agencies' policymaking activities after the supposedly judicial aspects have been assigned somewhere else? Some observers feel that these policy functions should be given right back to the executive branch—that the Commerce Department, for example, should make television channel allocations. But I am not at all sure that the already existing pressures would not then become overwhelming.

The one aspect of the Court proposal that appeals to me is the idea of one governmental body concerning itself with many different industries and different problems. I

do subscribe to the charge that expertise—concentration on 1 industry, 1 set of problems—has been damaging to the administrative process. I think it has made many agencies tend to identify with the regulated industry, to forget the broader concepts of public interest. In fairness I should add that the regulatory agencies are not, of course, the only examples of industry orientation in our Government. The Agriculture Department, for example, might be said to fall into the same category. And beyond the matter of identification with the regulated industry, I think confinement to a narrow area of problems tends to stifle the broad intellectual processes we need. A judge told me recently that the best part of his job was that he did not have only one kind of case. His court's great advantage, he said, was that it passed on wills and torts and criminal cases as well as administrative matters. He said the variety of cases produced a cross-fertilization of ideas that he regarded as essential.

For all these reasons I would look favorably on any device to broaden the purview of the administrative agency heads. One idea that has been suggested has been to combine some of the agencies. Another is to appoint roving commissioners who would sit with one agency for a certain time, then move to another. Objections will be heard, and there are valid ones. But I would sacrifice a good deal to get agency heads out of a single track of problems and out of a specialized relationship with one industry.

As I indicated earlier, I would favor procedural reform to emphasize the role of the individual commissioner or board member. I think he should have a sufficient staff of his own so that he can take the responsibility for his own opinions. There is nothing like drafting an opinion, and knowing it will appear in print under your name, to make a judge of any kind rething his decision in a case.

I must say also that I would go for less regulation in general. I think sometimes that as a Nation we have become psychologically too adjusted to regulation. When I see the Supreme Court taking its time deciding whether the ICC should have given a different permit to a small trucker to haul goods between two cities, I just wonder whether we would not be better off letting anyone haul whatever he wants, subject only to safety regulations. Wouldn't it be fun to forget all the arguments about pay television and just let anyone go ahead who wants to, letting the fittest system of television survive the resulting donnybrook? I know this is a heretical thought, but I would not mind a touch of the robber baron here and there in our overprotected life. At least it would be more interesting.

The Need for Price Reductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Dr. Paul F. Gemmill, professor of economics, Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, University of Pennsylvania, has written a thoughtful letter to the editor of the New York Times regarding the cutting of prices. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Gemmill's letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 30, 1958]

CUTTING PRICES ADVOCATED—RELIEF FOR SELLERS OF GOODS SAID TO LIE IN OFFERING REDUCTIONS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Herbert Hoover tried not too successfully to lick the great depression of the 1930's with the phrase "Prosperity is just around the corner." If in fighting the present recession we are again to place reliance in words rather than deeds, I propose that the slogan "You auto buy now," which is being directed at the potential consumer, be matched or perhaps superseded by another, "You ought to cut prices now," aimed at would-be sellers of goods.

I object strenuously to the notion which is being expressed today that consumers have an obligation to buy, though they may already have all the goods they need, simply to help manufacturers reduce their over-expanded inventories and thus put them in position to resume production.

Surely, in a competitive, private enterprise economy it is the producers' job to turn out the goods that consumers want, and in the quantities wanted; and not the duty of consumers to buy goods they do not want, at prices they consider excessive, simply for the sake of keeping producers busy. Have our slogan-writers forgotten that the goal of an economy is consumption and that production is merely a means of reaching the goal?

BUYING WITH CARE

Indeed, the consumer in our economy has a definite obligation always to buy with care, to reward efficiency by buying from producers whose costs (and hence whose selling prices) are low; and to penalize inefficiency and undue cupidity by refusing to buy from those who ask what seem to him to be unwarrantedly high prices. If he fails thus to discipline producers, he is neglecting a duty to the economy, and lowering its efficiency.

The present recession is largely the outcome of a good many businessmen guessing wrong, overproducing, and now finding themselves in possession of large inventories of goods in which the consuming public manifests little interest. It seems unlikely that even the cleverest of slogans, unless aided by price cuts, will be able to wipe out these excessive inventories promptly.

If the help of the consumers (who, I submit, have not the slightest moral obligation to buy) is to be enlisted in reducing the excess inventories which industrialists have piled up, this help will be forthcoming just as soon as—and let us hope not before—the sellers of goods offer them at prices which are genuinely attractive.

BUSINESS RISKS

Businessmen in a private-enterprise economy voluntarily assume business risks. They expect and are expected to reap profits when they are lucky, and to take losses when they are not. The price cuts that are called for in the present situation will be either moderate or substantial, depending upon the extent to which a given businessman has misjudged his market. The losses that are thus borne by him are the price he pays for the privilege of operating in a private-enterprise economy and reaping profits when the going is good.

If prices are not cut and producers are allowed to escape from their present predicament without taking any loss whatsoever because misguided purchasers have heeded their cry to buy now, they will have failed to learn from experience, the great teacher, that inflation and overproduction have painful consequences. The economy will be the weaker for that unlearned lesson.

The lesson can be taught if consumers will insist that the economic game be played according to the established rules of a private-enterprise economy, and steadfastly refuse to buy at prices they consider unduly high. Moreover, this adherence to the principles of the capitalistic system may contribute materially to the stability and survival of our present economic order.

PAUL F. GEMMILL,
Professor of Economics, Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, University of Pennsylvania.
PHILADELPHIA, *April 25, 1958.*

TVA After 25 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. HOBLITZELL, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. HOBLITZELL. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article under the heading "TVA After 25 Years," written by Raymond Moley, and published in Newsweek of May 26.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TVA AFTER 25 YEARS

(By Raymond Moley)

On May 18, no inconsiderable enthusiasm over the entire 80,000 square miles served by the Tennessee Valley Authority marked that agency's birthday. This commemorative event comes just as legislation is pending in Congress to expand greatly the independence and operations of the institution.

The TVA, like many other agencies of the Federal Government, was a child of economic distress. But, unlike many other alphabetical agencies established in 1933, it was a permanent affair. The TVA, however, was not a product of the so-called brain trust, as were most of the other agencies started by President Roosevelt. Indeed, the titular head of that group during 1932 was as much astonished as almost everyone else when, sometime before the new President was inaugurated, there burst into the press the revolutionary concept of an immense experiment in planned economy for a great region, to be built around the long-dormant Muscle Shoals installation of World War I.

The idea, as well as the detailed provisions of the act, came from Senator George Norris, a dedicated battler for public ownership of power. There had never been the slightest suggestion of such a plan in candidate Roosevelt's campaign. All that he had to say was that the Federal Government should develop Muscle Shoals as a "measuring rod" in the regulation of private utilities.

PLENARY POWER

The act itself was unique in several respects. It provided that the directors should be in sympathy with the objectives of the project, which were indeterminate. A director might be removed under the curious charge of "contumacy," a provision which proved to be something that the President didn't like. Also, there should be no politics in the selection of personnel, and the working force should not be under civil-service regulations.

The purpose of TVA as defined in the act included unified development of the Tennessee River area under the complete con-

trol of a corporation wholly owned by the Federal Government; flood control in the entire valley; navigation aid; reforestation and the proper use of marginal lands, and agricultural and industrial development of the valley; operation of Government power and chemical properties; and the economic and social well-being of the people of the valley and adjoining territory.

I am not concerned with terminology here. But if this is not socialism, then Socialists at home and abroad who have hailed it as a great first step to the abundant life are badly fooled. Certainly to call the TVA democracy in action, as its adherents hail it, is a misnomer because the directorate responsible only to the President and Congress has plenary power—a power that has grown with the years.

A PROSPEROUS CHILD

According to a report of the Comptroller General of the United States issued less than a year ago, the Federal Government from the beginning to June 30, 1957, has made $2,041,500,542 available to the TVA. The TVA has repaid $277,908,515. In the same period TVA has had a net income of $413,430,539 from its power operations and net expenses of $175,818,690 for its other operations. Hence, the equity of the Federal Government was a little over $2 billion.

There has been no requirement that the TVA pay interest on this investment. Uncle Sam, says the agency, is not a creditor but a stockholder—in short, is holding the bag.

The Comptroller General has repeatedly recommended that this prosperous child pay interest on this money, but Congress has never required it. Nor does the TVA pay any Federal taxes on its property or operations. It pays local and State governments something in lieu of taxes, but private companies point out that while these in lieu payments were only 3.88 percent of gross revenues in 1957, investor-owned companies paid 22.7 percent of their gross in 1957.

The Kerr bill, which would permit the TVA to finance its own expansion by bonds secured by its very large profits, passed the Senate last August, and is now pending in the House. It has been strongly condemned by the Comptroller General. The merits and demerits of that proposal I shall consider later.

Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, at the request of officials of the Missouri Department of the Veterans of World War I, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a resolution adopted by the department at its State convention, May 18, 1958, as follows:

Whereas the National Tribune-Stars and Stripes, in its front-page editorial of April 24, 1958, stated that the leadership of war veterans' organizations vigorously presented their programs to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, but since that time appear content to sit back and wait to see what the administration may do for the neglected war veterans; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration, Budget Bureau, and other Government departments are under the direct orders of the President, have removed thousands of war veterans from the pension rolls, and reduced many thousands more, in carrying out recommendation No. 70 of the Omar N. Bradley Commission report; and

Whereas the hope of all war veterans' groups for relief lies with the Members of Congress, this election year: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Missouri Department of the veterans of World War I, United States of America, Inc., at its annual convention held in West Plains, Mo., May 17 and 18, 1958, That all national officers of the Veterans of World War I, United States of America, Inc., are hereby urgently requested to promptly contact the leadership of other veterans' organizations, and ask that all attend a meeting to be promptly held in Washington, D. C., for the purpose of demanding that the Veterans' Affairs Committee pass bills to implement the mandates of the various veterans' organizations, at this session of Congress; be it further

Resolved, That copies hereof be promptly mailed to all officers and committee members of our national organization.

B. E. KOEGER,
Commander, Missouri Department.
H. L. BRATTON,
Adjutant, Missouri Department.

Address by Hon. Carmine DeSapio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday evening, May 22, 1958, the dinner of the executive committee of the Democratic Party of Kings County was held at the Hotel St. George in Brooklyn.

Well oversubscribed, the dinner was a financial success, but more important to me was the serious and constructive approach by the speaker to the problems facing our Nation.

As the national committeewoman of the Democratic Party of New York, I am proud to present the address of the national committeeman of the State of New York, the Honorable Carmine DeSapio:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE CARMINE DESAPIO, NATIONAL COMMITTEEMAN, DEMOCRATIC PARTY, NEW YORK STATE

My good friends and fellow Democrats, it is always great personal pleasure for me to meet with all of you ladies and gentlemen of Kings County to witness anew the vitality which you have infused into the life and activities of your Democratic county organization, and to express my warm personal regard and friendship for our very dear friend, Joe Sharkey.

For, here in Brooklyn, you have created a very remarkable and very powerful force for civic and governmental progress.

And—perhaps still more significantly—you have not been content merely to stand back and admire what you have created. Rather, you have sought constantly to build upon it; to improve, to refine and to polish it in accordance with a political philosophy founded upon the simple truth that the only valid function of politics—and therefore, the primary responsibility of the politician—is to serve the people.

And I believe that your outstanding success, both in securing and in advancing the welfare of the people of Brooklyn, is directly traceable to your capacity for understanding the tremendous diversity of human interests, human hopes, and needs, which is represented by the nearly 8 million Americans who proudly call Brooklyn their home.

As we all were reminded last week, on the annual occasion of I Am An American Day, the need for unity among all Americans—and with our friends throughout the free world—never has been greater than it is at present. The importance of rededicating ourselves to the task of providing constructive leadership for all freedom-loving peoples never has been more challenging than it is today. And the urgent necessity for reaffirming—through deeds, rather than through mere words—our loyalty and devotion to our representative form of government—to our country—never has commanded the attention of all Americans so strongly as it does at this critical moment in history.

Our party always has prided itself upon its ability to interpret the problems of the people in terms of contemporary social and economic life.

And we have insisted—always—upon recognizing, acknowledging and honoring simple human dignity above all other things. In our efforts to provide maximum public service, we have encouraged the people to work with us, to become active participants in progress, and to share with us in the joy of achievement.

You—the loyal and dedicated Democrats of Kings County—have done this in Brooklyn. You have reaped the rewards of civic development throughout your community and you have, thereby, earned the confidence and trust of your fellow citizens.

The result—as almost any alert student of contemporary American politics knows—is that you have built the largest and strongest political organization in America upon your partnership with the people of Brooklyn.

During the past 2 weeks, your concept of human relations—this sense of partnership achieved through an active, intelligent sharing of problems and accomplishments which is a guiding principle of Democrats everywhere—was sharply accented by a series of unhappy, unidignified and unnecessary events in Latin America.

For the lamentable demonstrations which greeted the Vice President of the United States on his widely prepublicized good neighbor tour of South America revealed, dramatically and painfully, the terrible failure of the Republican administration in Washington to appreciate the fact that successful human relations—at the international or any other level—is compounded of constancy, sincerity, and understanding and that neighborliness consists of more than borrowing an occasional measure of moral support with appropriate expressions of gratitude.

My friends, these are goals which, as Americans and as New Yorkers, all of us who are present here tonight share which, as alert citizens, we demand and which, as Democrats, we will achieve.

The established fact that the anti-Nixon demonstrations were organized and led by Communists, and that they were directed against a symbol of the United States Government, rather than against the Vice President personally, does not really explain the violence in Peru and Venezuela or the less dramatic but equally significant hostility which greeted him in Uruguay, Argentina, and Bolivia.

Nor does the fact that NIXON acquitted himself well, exempt the administration in Washington from having gratuitously placed him on trial before our South American neighbors.

For it has become quite clear that the Communist-inspired rioting provided a long-pent-up emotional outlet for the grievances of many Peruvian and Venezuelan citizens who have no more sympathy for the Communist ideology than has NIXON himself.

Those grievances stem from what many Latin Americans consider, and not without reason, the arrogance of the Eisenhower administration's refusal to treat their countries as free and equal nations.

It is one thing for administration spokesmen to declare that because we are a great and powerful nation, we must expect to have some enemies. It is quite another when our Government's foreign economic policies and diplomatic blunders incite our closest international friends to hold anti-American demonstrations—as they did in France last week; to burn a United States Information Agency library—as they did in pro-Western Lebanon last week; and to do physical violence to the man whom many Republicans hope will be the next President of the United States—as they did in South America last week.

The failure—the refusal—of the Eisenhower administration to consult our neighbors to the south on matters which cannot help but concern them is hardly conducive to friendship, cooperation, good neighborliness or plain commonsense.

We need only to glance briefly at the reference record in dealing with the American farmer, with organized labor, with the consumer, with the small-business man, with the individual taxpayer to see reflected in our domestic affairs that same brand of arrogance which has brought our international prestige to a new low during the past few weeks and which has centered on our National Capital the anger, the disappointment, and the disillusionment of much of the free world.

There are today, in Washington, in Albany and in many of the major seats of government throughout our country, a great number of brilliant American statesmen and capable administrators. Unfortunately, few of these men and women are associated with the political party which will control the White House until 1960.

And if our country is to move forward toward 1960 without relinquishing its position of strength and leadership among the nations of the free world, then you and I—and all of our fellow-Democrats throughout the United States—must redouble our efforts to install them in positions of leadership in our National, State, and local governments.

If we are to pull ourselves out of the valley of economic recession—from which, just the other night, Mr. Eisenhower gazed so wistfully up at a future "bursting with vitality and promise"—then our Democratic party must equip the 86th Congress with the necessary majority to overcome the President's fondness for merely hoping that everything will turn out fine in the end.

We have, within our party, the men and women who can—and who will—translate the hopes and the dreams of the people—and even some of Mr. Eisenhower's rosier visions—into reality.

In our own State, we have our very great Governor, Averell Harriman, who understands—as fully as any living American—the importance of meaningful, constructive partnership between the people and their government who, during the past 4 years, has dedicated himself to the task of reestablishing New York as the prototype of compassionate, foward-looking government in America and who, during the next 4 years, will lead our State to new summits of positive achievement.

The Metropolis in Transition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by Dr. Alfred H. Williams at a dinner of the National Planning Association held in Washington, D. C.:

The 1958 award by the National Planning Association of its gold medal is significant because it is a recognition of the work of not one individual in one city but many individuals in many cities striving to improve the quality of life in the metropolitan sector of American civilization. There is, of course, apprehension about other sectors. Throughout the country there is a widespread concern, a feeling of foreboding, as to the future of our entire civilization. Despite the fact that Americans are characteristically optimistic, confident, possessed of high self-esteem, we have come finally to realize that our mode of life is being put, and will continue to be put, to severe test on many fronts. Currently there is an urgent sense of need to achieve better results in the areas of science, technology, education, stable economic growth, private and public morality, and international relations. This present mood is in marked contrast to the attitude of self-satisfaction that existed when we announced the doctrine of "manifest destiny" at the time of the Spanish-American War. But a mood of apprehension has advantages if it leads to objectives self-examination. Tonight I suggest we look at one aspect of our present-day life, the growth and decay of metropolitan areas.

Large cities of the United States almost without exception face acute problems. The details vary, but the general pattern is the same; static population in the central core of the metropolitan area, unplanned sprawling growth in the suburban areas, outmoded means of transport and resultant traffic congestion, blighted housing, shrinking tax bases, juvenile delinquency, shortage of water, lack of open spaces, poor recreational facilities, obsolete factory buildings, minority group frictions, unwillingness of local governmental units to cooperate. Back of these developments, and basic to them, are two facts: an unexpected increase in the rate of population growth, and a steady increase in the proportion of total population resident in standard metropolitan areas. In the United States the rapid growth of the population, if its continues, will yield a population of 200 million by 1968, and if the current expansion of metropolitan areas is maintained, 75 percent of the 200 million Americans will be resident in such metropolitan areas.

The first response of the citizens of these areas to the problems we are discussing has been to make a survey. There have been 50 such studies sincce 1945; the bulk of them have come since 1950. As one studies these surveys in detail, it becomes apparent that it is almost impossible to overestimate the complexity, the difficulty, and the importance of making progress on the metropolitan front, of achieving the cooperative action that is needed to bring solutions. The difficuties are of two sorts: political and economic.

First, as to those problems which are political—that is to say, governmental—in nature. Central to the task of achieving functional, dynamic unity in the area of metropolitan government is the concept and the reality of sovereignty. Deeply rooted in American traditions and values is the goal of self-government. It is a cherished value; citizens of small, incorporated units are very reluctant to relinquish the rights of self-government to larger gomernmental units. Equally clear is the fact that the problems of traffic congestion, sewage disposal, police administration, park facilities, water supply, air pollution, etc., etc., traverse governmental lines and cannot be adequately handled by splinter governments. If we are unwilling to create structures of government broad enough to correspond to the size of regional problems, then progress must be achieved along less formal collaborative lines buttressed by thorough-going educational efforts within the electorate. Perhaps we might term such an approach "progress by project." This calls for skilled use of all of the arts of exposition, discussion, and creative compromise. The difficulties encountered in the metropolitan regions which center in Miami, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Detroit, Los Angeles, and other large cities give point to this generalization. Indeed, the major difficulties that are faced by the entire human family at all levels of government are ones calling for improvement in the arts and techniques of collaboration.

The second set of problems are economic in nature. The economics of a metropolitan area, like economics in general, has to do with the distribution of scarce resources. The key word in this sentence is "scarce." There are not enough resources to supply all demands. How shall these scarce resources be allocated between private needs and public needs? By the latter I mean needs for schoolteachers and school buildings, public parks, clean air, storm sewers, civic agencies, public housing, probation officers, adequate transportation facilities, etc. The attitude of the man in the street seems to be somewhat as follows: "The money in my pocket is my own. Please do not tell me how to spend it. As to public expenditures, I do not really understand them; they are too complex for me. This is the reason why I vote for a mayor, a governor, a Senator, and a President. Public expenditures are their responsibility; don't bother me about them. I have enough headaches of my own." On the personal expenditure front, allurements to spend are put before the individual citizen by all business enterprises. These enterprises, under our competitive system, are working constantly, with great resourcefulness, to lure from the pockets of each consumer his private funds. Corporate management, under the dictum of "root, hog, or die," drives to induce the general public to spend for personal purposes. When we turn to the public expenditure front, a different situation confronts us. Although each citizen participates in public purchases, he seldom, if ever, is acutely conscious of the fact that public funds are in part his funds. This raises the question as to who shall set up the allurements on the public expenditure front. In a recent CED symposium on the economic trends of the next 20 years, a participant made the following statement: "A considerable proportion of current consumption, not only of the rich, but of a large part of our people, satisfies only trivial or frivolous needs." He called for a shift toward social objectives such as better education and better health. He expressed the moral judgment that we must risk some reduction in our rate of growth in order to apply our expanding capacity to worthy and

meaningful uses. He asserted that if this shift is a risk, it is a risk well worthwhile.

Because of the widespread and growing volume of the difficult urban problems that were mentioned at the outset, it is suggested that the National Planning Commission renew its 1957 request for a White House conference. The need for a White Conference on Urban Life is almost as pressing as the needs which resulted in White House Conferences on Higher Education and the Family. By the use of White House prestige, there can be assembled scores of specialists on critical aspects of metropolitan life. These leaders could, in face to face discussions, cross-fertilize and inspire each other's thinking. Included in this group would be administrators, politicians, architects, engineers, foundation officers, trade union leaders, corporation executives, editors, professional planners, and others. A White House Conference could, by means of thoroughgoing staff work and skilled chairmanship, bring into focus the vast, intricately-related congery of activities that characterize life in the metropolitan area. A conference could, by reason of the pulling power of White House sponsorship, bring up to the point of public visibility the shortcomings and the possibilities of life in metropoltan areas, where ever larger groups of human beings insist on congregating, and where life, all too frequently, is shabby and barren. It is quite possible that such a White House conference could induce us to take a fresh look at our group behavior, set new goals, and adopt more rational means of attaining these ends. When this association made its initial request for a Conference, it was, I take it, with such an objective in mind and with the conviction that the time has come for the country to see the problem whole.

When Autos Lag, All United States Feels It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1958

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request permission to insert in the RECORD the following article from the New York Times dated May 25, 1958:

WHEN AUTOS LAG, ALL UNITED STATES FEELS IT—INDUSTRY INVOLVES MILLIONS OF AMERICANS—NEW CARS TAKE 10 PERCENT OF INCOME—A BIG SOURCE OF TAXES—ABSENCE OF A SPRING UPTURN CONCERNS FAR-REMOVED AREAS OF ECONOMY

(By Richard Rutter)

Brazil and coffee. Chile and copper. Ceylon and tea. America—and what? Autos, of course.

For all this Nation's vaunted industrial diversification, this one key industry has an almost controlling effect on the economy. This is not a one-crop economy, certainly, but Detroit does have an overriding impact. The present recession underscores this situation. On all sides the talk is of autos—"You auto buy now," massive layoffs in the industry, lagging sales and production, contract negotiations.

This may help to explain why unemployment has risen over the last nine months to the highest level in nineteen years. One out of every six businesses in the United States is dependent in some way on the automotive industry. That includes supply stores, repairs and services, storage and parking, manufacturing, drive-in theaters, motels, tourist courts, rentals of cars and trucks, taxicabs, auto wreckers, and gasoline stations.

More than 10 million people are employed in highway industries—1 out of every 7 persons working in the United States today.

There are about 45,000 car and truck dealers. The auto industry buys 42 percent of all sheet steel and something like 390 million pounds of textiles for upholstery.

TAIL WAGGING THE CHASSIS?

Sales of new cars have been running about 30 percent below the 1957 level. Spring was not only late, it never arrived at all for the industry. Unless there is an upsurge in the fourth quarter, auto makers will do well to sell 4 million cars this year. Nearly 6 million were sold last year and a record total of 7,200,000 in 1955.

It is significant that car production actually turned down last year well before the recession became apparent. Thereafter steel went down, automotive equipment and, eventually, just about everything else. Is it a case of the tail—autos—wagging the body of the economy? Could be.

There are now about 750,000 new cars in dealers' hands, possibly a record figure for this time of year, when cars in the past have sold briskly. Production for the first half of the year will come to about 2,200,000 cars; the summer lull is approaching and nothing like a major upturn is probable before the fall. That, in turn, is why few observers see a general business snapback before the leaves turn.

It is almost impossible to exaggerate the importance of the automobile industry in the great American industrial complex. The statistics are overwhelming. For instance, dollar sales are in the billions, and the number of persons engaged in the field, directly and indirectly, runs into the millions.

Sales of automotive replacement parts alone (all figures are the latest available) run to almost $2 billion a year, at wholesale. Some 36 percent of all radios go into new cars. Batteries, of course, are almost exclusively an auto item. These number more than 25 million a year. Some 85 million tires are sold each year. Here surely is a clear-cut case of an entire industry that goes as Detroit goes.

Retail sales as a whole so far this year are lagging behind the 1957 pace. One big reason is the dip in automotive sales. These have totaled about $34 billion in recent years. They are down sharply in 1958.

In the recession of 1948–49, significantly, automotive sales rose from $18.7 billion in 1948 to $26.7 billion in 1950. There is no doubt that this helped to prevent a more serious business deterioration. On the other hand, in the 1954–55 recession auto sales did slump $7 billion, affecting the entire economy.

Then there's the export market. This aggregates more than $1,500,000,000 a year, including cars, trucks, and accessories. Small foreign cars have been making inroads on the American market, but this country's exports have risen steadily since 1950. This year, however, some decline is expected.

The United States makes about 65 percent of all the cars produced in the world. England comes second, a far second, followed by Germany and France. The Soviet Union turns out fewer than 100,000 cars a year.

Detroit has reason for not being overpessimistic about the present contretemps. There are some 20 million passenger cars that are over 5 years old, and the replacement market is huge. All that's lacking is the urge to buy. In addition, 11 percent of all trucks date back to before World War II.

Installment credit has been the big impetus to car purchases since World War II. More than 60 percent of all cars are bought on time. Terms are still easy. The amount of auto credit outstanding totals more than $15 billion.

Some other figures: Motor vehicle insurance premiums are well over $4 billion a year. Auto purchases comprise almost 10 percent of all personal income. One out of every six patents issued is in the automotive field. Factory payrolls in this industry are more than $3 billion a year.

It is possible that Detroit is pricing itself out of new-car sales. This has been mentioned by many economists, and the man in the street is pretty vociferous on the subject. Auto makers for their part insist they cannot cut prices in the light of steadily rising labor and material costs.

As of May 1958, it is not a happy situation. Is there an answer? Will autos get back on the glamour road of big production and big sales? No one seems to know.

Space Direction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial entitled "Space Direction," which appeared in the Boston Traveler on May 21, 1958.

The editorial properly states:

Space exploration quite possibly is the greatest challenge ever to face mankind. We are speeding toward problems, discoveries and adventures that will surpass anything we've ever imagined.

We must be absolutely certain that we enter this new experience with the best possible leadership and full cooperation from all agencies.

The editorial follows:

SPACE DIRECTION

The House Space Committee has chosen civilian perspective over military power as the appropriate leadership for our journeys beyond the earth.

A bill placing our nonmilitary space ventures under civilian control has won unanimous committee support. A copy already has been forwarded to Dr. James R. Killian, top science adviser for President Eisenhower.

There's no question, of course, but what this action will meet with enthusiastic approval at the White House. The President's recommendations have been consistently in support of the idea that the best way for us to outstrip Russia in the space race is through strong civilian direction. And now, if the House committee's action prevails, that's what we'll have.

Up to this point, the Senate Space Committee has taken a somewhat different view of space supervision. That group has leaned more toward a division of control between the civilian and the military, with the feeling that too much emphasis in civilian hands might hold back our military projects.

However, there's a lot more to be gained in space than the mere overtaking of the Russians in missile development. There's an opportunity to lead the way in what Congressman McCORMACK calls "the boldest and most sustained large-scale effort in the history of man's exploration." And to do that properly, we need to raise our sights beyond the limits of war possibilities.

We must not neglect our military problems, of course. But there's no reason to suppose that intelligent civilian leadership would allow that to happen. On the contrary, good civilian supervision would in-

evitably be drawing benefits from military progress and knowhow.

Space exploration quite possibly is the greatest challenge ever to face mankind. We are speeding toward problems, discoveries and adventures that will surpass anything we've ever imagined.

We must be absolutely certain that we enter this new experience with the best possible leadership and full cooperation from all agencies.

Outstanding Accomplishments of Vocational Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL M. LANDRUM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, within the past one-quarter century this Nation has achieved near miraculous growth in industrial and agricultural pursuits. A very large part of this progress has resulted from vocational education and the able and wise leadership of the men and women devoted to teaching in the vocational field.

In the most recent session of the Georgia General Assembly various members of the House of Representatives of Georgia took occasion to recognize its importance in our general education program by offering and passing a resolution citing some of the outstanding accomplishments of vocational education.

Two splendid young citizens of Georgia, Miss Priscilla Jones and Mr. Wesley Patrick, were also given special recognition for their individual attainments.

It is these young leaders, and thousands like them throughout America on whom we must depend for new ideas, and fresh thinking so necessary to keep our great democratic experiment alive and growing.

I invite your attention to the resolution and its tribute to vocational education and these young Georgians:

Resolution commending the State board of education, and the State department of education with emphasis on the vocational division; and for other purposes

Whereas the State board of education has vast responsibilities for the training of Georgia's youth in an ever-expanding population; and

Whereas demands are broadening for emphasis in various fields of instruction to meet changing needs; and

Whereas industrial demands are requiring increased numbers of trained personnel; and

Whereas technological and scientific advances have transformed agricultural and livestock pursuits into a more exacting industry; and

Whereas larger numbers of high-school graduates can be gainfully employed to assist in meeting the constantly increasing demands in the industrial, and agricultural expansion of the State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That recognition be given to the State board of education, and the State department of education for their constant efforts to properly provide public-school instruction and training at a high and satisfactory level for the youth of our State; and be it further

Resolved, That the vocational division of the State department of education be given special commendation for its outstanding work in training Georgia's youth for citizenship and outstanding leadership; be it further

Resolved, That special recognition be given to Miss Priscilla Jones, of Blakely, Early County, Ga., a graduate of the Blakely-Union High School, a former president of the Georgia chapters of the Future Homemakers of America, and the 1957 national winner (competing with 350,000 others) of the All-American Homemaker of Tomorrow award which, among other recognitions, provided a $5,000 college scholarship; and be it further

Resolved, That special recognition be given to Wesley Patrick, of Quitman, Brooks County, Ga., a graduate of Quitman High School a former State president of the Georgia chapters of the Future Farmers of America, and the 1957 national winner (competing with 400,000 others) of the Star Farmer of America award, which among other recognitions, provided a $1,000 award and a rancho type pickup truck; and be it further

Resolved, That the State board of education and local school continue their efforts in developing a strong and vigorous program of vocational training for the youth of Georgia with emphasis on agriculture, homemaking, trade and industrial training, distributive and vocational business training—with the idea of expanding high-school vocational programs and further development of area-trade schools; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each member of the State board of education and to the State superintendent of schools.

In house, read and adopted February 21, 1958.

J. BROWN,
Clerk of House.

Resolutions Adopted by Congregational Christian Conference of Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, at the annual meeting of the Congregational Christian Conference of Iowa on May 2 of this year, a resolution concerning the display of church flags was adopted and also a resolution favoring the extension of reciprocal trade agreements.

Both are of such wide interest that I include them in the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

RESOLUTION CONCERNING DISPLAY OF CHURCH FLAGS

Adopted at annual meeting of the Congregational Christian Conference of Iowa, on Friday, May 2, 1958:

"Whereas for the Christian, one's highest allegiance is to God; and

"Whereas our country has recognized the sovereignty of God in such ways as the adoption of the motto, 'In God we trust' for our coins and currency, and by the recent addition to the Pledge of Allegiance of the words, 'One nation, under God'; and

"Whereas our country believes in the separation of church and state, and

"Whereas if symbols are to be used in a church, they should be used to express proper truth and belief, and

"Whereas the flag code, officially approved by Congress in 1942 (Public Law 828, 77th Cong., ch. 806, 2d sess., H. J. Res. 359, sec. E, approved December 22, 1942), presumes to tell churches how they should use symbols in the church; and

"Whereas the flag code states that the symbol of our country, the American flag, has precedence in churches over a symbol of God, namely, the Christian flag, and should be placed in the position of honor, with the Christian flag relegated to a subordinate position: Be it

"*Resolved*, That this conference goes on record as reaffirming that as Christians, our highest allegiance is to God, and that Congress has, perhaps without intent or consideration of the deeper issues involved, exceeded its boundaries in attempting to tell the churches how to use their symbols in their houses of worship; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the State conference asks our elected representatives in Congress to work for the amendment of this portion of the flag code so that the Christian flag may legally be displayed at the place of honor in church, that is, at the right of the minister; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be brought before the general council meeting in Boston with the hope that this body take similar action, and that copies of this resolution be sent to Advance and to the Messenger, and to the Christian Century."

RESOLUTION CONCERNING RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Adopted at annual meeting of the Congregational Christian Conference of Iowa on Friday, May 2, 1958:

"Whereas the reciprocal trade agreements between our Nation and other nations have promoted harmony, good will, and the freer flow of goods and services between the friendly people of the earth, and have served as a powerful deterrent against the economic forces which make for war: Be it

"*Resolved*, That our conference goes on record as favoring the extension of said reciprocal trade agreements and copies be sent to the Representatives and Senators of Iowa in the Congress of the United States."

A Letter From Hon. Carlos P. Garcia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a copy of a letter, dated May 27, 1957, written by Hon. Carlos P. Garcia, President of the Philippines, to Mr. Max Abelman, 35 Tennis Court, Brooklyn, New York, N. Y., showing the friendship President Garcia has for the United States.

As President Garcia will visit the United States in the near future it is a pleasure for me to insert this letter in the RECORD.

President Garcia should receive a most hospitable welcome and his visit to the United States should be very fruitful and beneficial to his country.

Mr. Abelman, throughout the years, has been one of the best friends the Philippines and her people have in the United States.

The letter follows:

MALACAÑANG, MANILA, *May 27, 1957.*

Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, New York City, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. ABELMAN: I have just learned that you are one of the friends of the late President Ramon Magsaysay and that during his tenure, you kept an abiding interest in his administration by corresponding with him.

President Magsaysay, as is the general consensus, was truly a respected leader of international stature. He was not only the best friend of democracy in Asia but he did everything in his lifetime to fight its foremost enemy—communism—on every front. In his passing, the free world has indeed lost a formidable ally.

It is my sincere hope that you will continue to be generous with your abiding interest in this country. On my part, I see no plausible reason why I should depart from the policies of my illustrious predecessor insofar as the cordial relations of my country with the free world are concerned. Those relations being based on mutual respect and understanding and a kinship of lofty ideals, there is certainly nothing more to be desired.

With assurances of my highest esteem, I am

Very sincerely,

CARLOS GARCIA.

The Explosive Situation in Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following two articles written by George Rothwell Brown, which appeared in the New York Journal American on May 10 and May 17, 1958, respectively, in which Mr. Brown reports and comments upon the explosive situation in Panama:

[From the New York Journal-American of May 10, 1958]

RED THREAT IN PANAMA

(By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON.—The recently renewed outbreaks of anti-Americanism in Panama, Communist inspired, have been the boldest challenge thus far to the sovereignty of the United States over the Canal Zone.

They are believed in well-informed circles in Washington to be leading up to a demand in the United Nations for the internationalization of the Panama Canal, which would be a threat to the American lifeline.

The Communist design is aimed not so much at the Panama Canal, as at the Dardanelles and the Bosporous, as a part of Moscow's penetration in the Near East.

It is believed that the demand will be for the internationalization of all interoceanic waterways.

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, member of an Appropriations Committee subcommittee, which has special jurisdiction over all matters relating to the Panama Canal, pronounces Panama's anti-Americanism to be of Communist origin.

President Ernesto De La Guardia, Jr., of Panama, is himself not anti-American, but Mr. FLOOD feels he is being pushed by political extremists.

According to a dispatch from Panama this week, President De La Guardia said he will ask the United States to permit the Panamanian flag to fly over the Canal Zone.

This was demanded by demonstrators who marched on the presidential palace in what was called "Operational Sovereignty."

This is a direct challenge to American sovereignty, as guaranteed by the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903.

It was this treaty that granted the United States the right to build the Panama Canal, and gave to it possession of the Canal Zone "as if it were sovereign."

A year ago Soviet Ambassador Arkady A. Sobolev expressed the wish before the United Nations that the Panama Canal might be regulated on the same principles of Egypt's operation of the Suez Canal, that is by Panama instead of the United States.

[From the New York Journal-American of May 17, 1958]

ANTI-UNITED STATES ACTS IN PANAMA

(By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON.—Pressure is being brought to bear on Congress to adopt a pending resolution reasserting American sovereignty over the Canal Zone under the treaty of 1903.

The resolution introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, member of an appropriations subcommittee specializing in the Panama Canal is now before the House Merchant Marine Committee.

Partly as a result of the disclosure of Red infiltration in Latin America, highlighted by the recent attacks on Vice President NIXON, and partly because the Panama Government is being needled by similar radicals into an anti-American attitude, it now seems probable that the United States will have to take a formally declared stand.

The American people have an investment in the Panama Canal and its defenses, of close to three-quarters of a billion dollars. That investment is being jeopardized.

In the opinion of some canal authorities the situation in Panama is now the hottest item in our foreign affairs.

As in Peru, the Communists are using students as a front for the Red conspiracy to divest the United States of all sovereignty over the Panama Canal.

Recently Panama students planted 72 Panama flags in the Canal Zone, which is as strictly American as Hawaii or Alaska. There was no police prevention of this outrage.

The flags were seized, and turned over to the Government. Subsequently 59 of the same flags turned up in another anti-American student demonstration. The inference in Washington is that the Government returned these flags, after this highly provocative outbreak, to the demonstrators. There has been no punishment of anybody.

The feeling in Washington is that the state of affairs in Panama is becoming so disquieting that the United States cannot afford to temporize with it much longer.

Happy Days at Brewster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a news story from the Wenatchee Daily World written by Mr. George Richardson.

This well-written story outlines the inaugural period as the Brewster unit of the Chief Joseph reclamation project comes under water.

The article follows:

IRRIGATION—HAPPY DAYS AT BREWSTER—FARMERS BUSY TURNING DESERT INTO FERTILE FARMS ON FLAT

(By George Richardson)

BREWSTER.—The familiar apple trees on Brewster Flat will have some neighbors soon, thanks to irrigation waters flowing onto this big new United States Bureau of Reclamation project on the Columbia River.

Strawberries, pears, wheat, and dwarf apple trees are among the new plantings included on the site. The crops are in, and water is only a brief testing period away.

There are 24 families living on the land now. Others own land and have planted crops but live in town. A total of 796 acres will be under irrigation when testing is completed, nearly 300 more than the 500-acre estimate made when the project was approved.

Eventually, some 2,432 acres will be irrigated on Brewster Flat.

The water district will repay about $1.3 million—less than half the project's cost—to the Government. The remainder of the costs will be paid through surplus power revenues from nearby Chief Joseph Dam.

The project will be a boon to Brewster and the surrounding area, townspeople feel. Brewster's Mayor Al Lowry affirmed this when he said: "It may take time, but the completion of the project will mean a lot to the town."

But what do the people themselves think of the multi-million-dollar project?

Though not actually a farmer anymore, W. D. Crandall is perhaps one of the more qualified persons to speak on the subject. Crandall, who has been retired since 1944, started the Pioneer Pump Co. which has provided water for land on the project since 1928.

"I haven't got a hand in this one," he mused, "but I wish I did. This is the prettiest water system I've ever seen.

"Wish I had 20 acres of orchard land again. Wife wouldn't let me though, I suppose."

Crandall said about 1,240 acres of orchard was under water at one time and that another 1,500 to 1,800 acres were planted but never received water at all and eventually dried up and died. "Water was just too short," Crandall explained.

He took over from the Okanogan Power and Irrigation Co. later and his company kept water on the flat until the reclamation project went in.

Crandall, who served as a member of the water board for some 30 years before his retirement, was out looking over the orchard land owned by his son, Emery, who has 25 acres near where the Crandalls homesteaded many years ago.

For young Danny Gebbers, the project will mean an end to carrying water to his young trees.

Gebbers planted 10 acres last year and hauled water to the trees by truck. He's planted another 10 acres this year, knowing that the project would take over his carrying chores.

Strawberries are a comparatively new crop on Brewster Flat and the man putting them in is Herb Freeman. He has planted 5 acres of the lush, red berries and plans on more later.

When they are ripe, Freeman plans to throw the fields open as a "you pick" venture and will probably set up a processing plant along with it.

He said he plans to have a complete setup so all berry buyers will have to do is stick the strawberries in their lockers.

Besides his strawberry plants, Freeman also has about 30 acres of irrigated pasture and keeps horses on the land.

W. George McDonnell is a newcomer to the ranks of orchardists and he's off to a booming start. The former Brewster car dealer, his wife and seven children, decided to take advantage of the water and are in the process of putting in 20 acres of Goldens and Red Delicious.

The family has also planted 500 pear trees, another newcomer to the Brewster Flat area.

To help him with the new undertaking, McDonnell has asked for the advice of his father, Bill McDonnell, a Crescent Bar orchardist many years ago.

One of the few growers who still uses rill irrigation on a flat full of sprinklers is G. H. Driskell, who also serves as one of the directors of the water district.

He has been an orchardist here for 14 years and has 25 acres in apples, mostly winesaps and delicious.

The water won't mean a large expansion program for Driskell but, he says, it does mean rounding out the acreage where he wasn't able to water before.

"Adequate water will mean probably about five acres more for me," Driskell explained.

Dr. Harold W. Lamberton, a Brewster physician, is planting wheat on his acreage.

An experimenter is Ed Rinehart, a retired Los Angeles policeman who came to Brewster Flat in 1952.

He has planted 400 semi-dwarf apple trees. "I've always wanted to try the dwarfs," he said. "But there just wasn't the water before to experiment."

Rinehart bought the young trees in Kelowna, B. C., and said they'll produce around two boxes after the third year. He also has some 750 young apple trees on the rest of his 10 acres.

His well supplies water to four families in the area.

Project manager Don Storlie said getting domestic water is 1 of the 2 major problems confronting Brewster Flat. The fortunate ones find water at from 200 to 300 feet. Some find none at all.

"The other problem is roads," Storlie said as he bounced from farm to farm in his jeep to check water connections.

"Okanogan County commissioners say it will be from 2 to 10 years before anything can be done with the roads," Storlie said. "But the roads have already been surveyed and we've laid our pipelines accordingly."

Despite these two dark spots, Storlie said he feels the project is off and running.

Testing is nearly completed and most of the bugs—one of which is how to get rid of the excess air that builds up in front of the giant piston of water as the river is sucked into the pipes—are nearly worked out.

The Brewster area is happy with its spanking-new project and it plans to trot out the welcome mat for a large-scale celebration when the water is ready for full-time delivery.

"We'll have a big-name speaker, tours of the project, and the whole works," said Brewster attorney Jack Doty as he dashed off, busy helping the town get ready for the gala day.

A Successful Sales Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the president of the Maytag Co., Hon. Fred Maytag, of Newton, Iowa, has responded magnificently to President Eisenhower's recommendation to sell more goods in order to improve the economic situation, and has conducted a very successful sales campaign.

I am sure Members of the House will be interested in a telegram Mr. Maytag sent to the President on May 22. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include his wire.

I am sure other Members of Congress will conclude, as I have, that if business people throughout the country will follow the pattern of the Maytag Co. and other manufacturers who are making an all-out effort to increase sales, the recession will be of short duration with the full employment that will naturally follow:

THE MAYTAG CO.,
Newton, Iowa, May 22, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.:

My compliments on your excellent speech to AMA conference which I was unable to attend because I was too busy taking orders. We believe good merchandise and hard selling are an unbeatable combination to stimulate consumer purchasing and to maximize employment. At 8 o'clock this morning the Maytag Co. concluded highly successful sales campaign during which our top executives were on duty continuously for 72 hours receiving telephoned orders from our 235 field representatives. They sold more than $17 million worth of Maytag appliances at the rate of 1 every 4 seconds. This is our response to your challenge and our contribution for this month.

With warmest regards.

FRED MAYTAG II,
President.

A Resolution To Reduce Accidents and Deaths on Our Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a concurrent resolution I introduced in the House today. I shall push for its enactment before the long Memorial Day weekend holiday.

The resolution follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ENDEAVORING TO REDUCE THE NUMBER OF ACCIDENTS AND DEATHS FROM ACCIDENTS ON THE HIGHWAYS

Whereas millions of motor vehicle traffic accidents occur in the United States every year; and

Whereas there are millions of persons injured and permanently crippled as a result of these accidents; and

Whereas there are many thousands of persons killed as a result of these accidents; and

Whereas many of these accidents occur over long weekends due to a holiday; and

Whereas many drivers of motor vehicles over these holiday weekends are inexperienced; and

Whereas many of the motor vehicles in operation on the highways over these weekends are mechanically defective; and

Whereas speed is very largely the cause of these accidents; and

Whereas it is the desire of the Congress of the United States to prevent as many motor vehicle accidents as possible over holiday weekends and prevent death and injury on the highways; and

Whereas it is the desire of Congress to take whatever steps that are possible to limit these accidents: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (a) it is the sense of the Congress that the speed of all motor vehicles on the highways over holiday weekends, with the exception of emergency vehicles, should be limited to 50 miles an hour, and that no vehicle should be permitted to operate on the highways over such weekend if it has not been inspected and certified to be in safe operating condition.

(b) The President of the United States is requested to notify the governors of the several States of this resolution, and to request their cooperation in its implementation.

Tucker Sno-Cat Corp. Awarded United States Navy Certificate of Merit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the Tucker Sno-Cat Corp., of Medford, Oreg., in the Fourth Congressional District has been awarded the United States Navy's certificate of merit.

The mobile and versatile Sno-Cats are building an international reputation. It is a real pleasure for me to join in honoring the company, its employees and President E. M. Tucker. I have driven in a Tucker Sno-Cat and someday I hope it will be possible for many of my colleagues to do so.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story from the May 21, 1958, Medford Mail Tribune which sets forth the reasons for the Navy award to this Oregon company:

SNO-CAT COMPANY RECEIVES ONE OF HIGHEST HONORS—VEHICLES TOOK PART IN ANTARCTICA

Tucker Sno-Cat Corp., of Medford, has been awarded the United States Navy's certificate of merit, one of the highest honors the Navy can bestow, it was reported today.

The award was made for the Sno-Cat company's participation in supplying its over-the-snow vehicles for Operation Deep Freeze, the Navy's expedition to the Antarctic in connection with the International Geophysical Year.

The Tucker company also supplied Sno-Cats to other participating governments.

MAKE TRIP

Four of the big vehicles were the only ones to make the trek all the way across the Antarctic continent, the first time this has been done by motorized ground transport, with Sir Vivian Fuchs, of Great Britain.

Formal presentation of the certificate of merit will be arranged by Rear Adm. E. J. Peltier, chief of the Navy's civil engineers.

E. M. Tucker, president of the company, was notified of the award in a letter from Thomas S. Gates, Jr., Secretary of the Navy.

Gates' letter follows:

"MY DEAR MR. TUCKER: It is my great pleasure to inform you that Tucker Sno-Cat Corp. has been awarded the Navy Certificate

of Merit for its outstanding contributions to the Department of the Navy in the fields of development, technology, and production for Operation Deep Freeze.

"This is one of the highest honors which the Navy can grant, and on this occasion I wish to express personally the Navy's deep appreciation of the unselfish interest and patriotic service which you and your company have so generously extended to the Naval Establishment.

"I am asking Rear Adm. E. J. Peltier, Chief of Civil Engineers, to make arrangements for presentation.

"With hearty congratulations and best wishes.

"Yours sincerely,

"THOMAS S. GATES, Jr.,
"Secretary of the Navy."

More Pay—No More Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to place in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in this morning's New York Daily News. It outlines a pamphlet written by Dr. Arthur R. Upgren, director of the bureau of economic studies of Macalester College, entitled "Productivity and Wages." Both the editorial and Dr. Upgren's conclusions deserve careful study.

The editorial follows:

MORE PAY—NO MORE INFLATION

You hear any amount of talk these days about how the big labor unions, by continually forcing wages upward, are dooming the United States to an inflation which will keep creeping along indefinitely or else break into a gallop that will end in a colossal depression.

Big labor union leaders, notably Walter P. Reuther, deny that wage boosts feed inflation.

What's the straight of it?

The most interesting discussion of this subject that we've seen recently is contained in a pamphlet entitled "Productivity and Wages," issued by the bureau of economic studies of Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn.

Macalester's economics director, Dr. Arthur R. Upgren, has studied the history of United States productivity (output of goods per man-hour) in the period 1947–56, as compared with the rises in prices and wages in those same 10 years.

He finds that nonfarm productivity increased by 26.1 percent, that nonfarm wages went up 61.4 percent, and that prices went up 21.7 percent.

Thus, wages in the 10-year period climbed about 2⅓ times as fast as did productivity. This means that labor was getting ever-bigger slices of a pie which was not getting bigger in production to the labor slices taken out of it.

This in turn accounted for the 21.7 percent rise in prices, as Dr. Upgren sees it. Organized workers whose wages kept going up could pay these prices without too much pain. But unorganized workers, and the millions of Americans on more or less fixed incomes, suffered from the price rise—and are still suffering.

The Upgren solution: hold wage increases to around 2.5 percent a year, thereby keeping them in line with the national increase in productivity of around 2.5 percent a year—and "this will double wages without (more) inflation in 28 years."

This reasoning probably won't appeal to the Reuthers and some of their followers. But we should think it would appeal to a large majority of Americans, and we hope the Upgren ideas may be widely circulated and as widely discussed.

Communists Hate Vice President Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column written by May Craig which appeared in the Portland (Maine) Press Herald of May 21, 1958:

COMMUNISTS HATE VICE PRESIDNT NIXON

(By May Craig)

WASHINGTON.—One thing must be frankly recognized by the people of the United States and that is that the Communists hate Vice President NIXON because of his anti-Communist record. In all the furor about the mistreatment of NIXON in some Latin American countries, this may have been lost sight of. There is no doubt that Communists helped to stir up trouble. Even the banners carried by the students who mobbed the Vice President show this, if one has the seeing eye to recognize it. As one travels around the world and meets Communists in many countries, one learns the Communist double-talk, the party line jargon.

Vice President NIXON pointed out after he came home, one of these doubletalk banners: "Independence for Puerto Rico." Fact is, Puerto Rico is a Commonwealth, a unique sort of semiautonomy which they chose and which was granted by the United States. They govern themselves, but we defend them and they get the advantage of free trade. Puerto Rico is prospering under its experienced and liberal Governor Muñoz Marín. It is doing so well that some of the United States officials and businessmen want to find out how they do it. They do not want complete independence. This was considered, with other forms of separation from Territorial status, years ago, and the Puerto Ricans chose what they have. They are satisfied with it. For Venezuelan students to be parading banners advocating independence for Puerto Rico is plain Communist Party line—Communists are always stirring up trouble in Puerto Rico. They would like to separate it from the United States and then take it over, as they are infiltrating everywhere with their false, bright blandishments covering the iron fist.

STOPOVER IN PUERTO RICO

Vice President NIXON stopped in Puerto Rico on his way home. He was guarded carefully in Venezuela on his way from the American Embassy to the airport, spent the night in Puerto Rico with the Governor, chatting about the whole situation. None knows the situation better than Governor Muñoz Marín. He has his troubles with the Communists. He had to apologize a couple of years ago when Puerto Ricans shot down five Members of the House of Representatives from the visitor's gallery. Never did I expect ever to see Members of the House lying on the floor of the House bleeding, with mobsters in the gallery shooting wildly at the whole membership. They said they were for independence for Puerto Rico, too. And you remember they tried to get into Blair House, where President Truman was staying while the White House was being remodeled?

It was a good thing for Mr. NIXON to have that quiet discussion with Muñoz-Marín, himself of Latin American extraction and a wise man. NIXON was a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee before he came to the Senate from California. He was a member of the Senate Government Operations Committee and a member of the Investigating Subcommittee. It was NIXON who really put Alger Hiss in jail. NIXON never gave up his belief that Hiss was guilty, even when most members of the House committee had given up hope of proving it. The Communists know that NIXON knows their technique backward and forward and that he would continue to understand it if he became President. It is a wonder to me that they did not kill him in Latin America. No public personage is safe if an assassin is willing to give his own life to kill the target. Huey Long was shot down in Louisiana State House by an assassin who knew he could not escape.

One reason for the mistreatment of NIXON in Latin America springs from this hatred of NIXON by Communists. One reason for Democratic dislike of Mr. NIXON is that he said they were soft toward communism, while they were in power. They were. We all were in those early days when we said communism was just "another political philosophy," and we remained soft while we said Russia was "our magnificent ally" in World War II.

THE DIRTY WORK

President Truman hates NIXON. Truman says NIXON called Truman a traitor. NIXON defies anybody to show him chapter and verse where he did this actually, in so many words. "Liberals" do not like Mr. NIXON partly because of his 1952 campaign when he attacked the Democratic Party and the "liberals" for being soft to communism. Fact is, NIXON was sent out to do the dirty work of the campaign, while Eisenhower remained on the high-level to attract straying independents.

Out in California, NIXON is controversial because of the campaign he waged to defeat Helen Gahagen Douglas for the House, the first time. That was a tough campaign and NIXON fights tough—the Communists know that. This pleasant-faced young man with the curly black hair is tough, don't be deceived about this. He would be tough as President. Friends of Mrs. Douglas resented bitterly NIXON's charges that she was soft to communism too. There are Californians today—and many liberals in Washington, who almost spit when they hear NIXON's name, because of that campaign against Mrs. Douglas. But that is American politics—if you can't take what comes, you better not run.

NIXON has become a wee bit more liberal himself, along with Eisenhower, who represents the new Republicans, but many of the Ike Republicans still think the conservative tinge remains in NIXON's character. I think so too. This may make him a middle-road candidate in 1960. It remains to be seen who the Democrats put up. General opinion here is that NIXON will be the candidate, though the President is still high-level about this too. He said at a recent press conference that there are a lot of darn good Republicans for candidate for President. The President did not tie himself to NIXON in the 1956 pre-convention campaign and the President allowed a member of his cabinet, Harold Stassen, to try to dump NIXON. However, the way the administration arranged a great welcome for NIXON on his return from

Latin America made it look pretty good for NIXON—whether or not the glow lasts until 1960.

It is possible that NIXON will succeed the President before 1960 by the resignation or death of Mr. Eisenhower. That would guarantee NIXON the GOP nomination. This would not suit the Communists. They do not hesitate at assassination—they killed President Castillo Armas in Guatemala. They have killed elsewhere. If they did kill NIXON and it could be proved on them it might bring such a world reaction against them, that it may deter them from such violence. But it is well to remember about the Latin American trip, and others NIXON may take abroad, that the Communists hate him and they will do anything to discredit him.

Coal Needs One Voice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hazleton (Pa.) Plain Speaker of May 22, 1958, which comments on the recommendations made by the Honorable John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America, in a speech which he made in Cincinnati:

COAL NEEDS ONE VOICE

President John L. Lewis, of the United Mine Workers of America, sounded a new rallying call to the coal industry in a recent speech before the Coal Convention of the American Mining Congress in Cincinnati. His theme was: "Coal Needs One Voice."

The fact that Lewis based his challenge on have been well known in the various segments of the coal mining industry. If a unity of action results from the plea, the voice of the anthracite industry would carry greater significance in the struggle for greater recognition from the Federal Government on the part coal plays in the life of the Nation.

As Lewis pointed out, no one agency speaks for the coal industry now. All its leaders are only able to speak for segments of the industry. The influence of their words and the impact of those words upon their hearers are minimized by the fact that they speak for a group in the industry.

Lewis suggested that such an agency or committee might meet quarterly and that it would be the voice not only of the investors of the industry, and the management of the industry but also of the manpower of the industry.

Despite the fact that in two World Wars the coal industry performed remarkable feats—it is an industry that is taken too much for granted by the Government. It is accepted as a matter of course, left to its own resources, without aid or reasonable assistance in expanding its markets or overcoming its scientific problems of research and experimentation.

There has been no particular or efficient effort made to find world markets that will insure generations yet to come of receiving great value from coal.

It would be a good thing if the suggestion for a national agency to speak for the coal industry bears fruit. It would be a voice, much stronger and much more effective on the things upon which all segments could agree, than the divided voices that have been raised on behalf of the industry in the past.

United Press-International Merger Raises Serious Antitrust Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 1, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the merger, agreed to May 16 and kept secret until announced May 24, of the United Press Association and the International News Service is highly important to the American public. The new organization, United Press International, takes over 5,000 papers from the United Press and 3,000 from the International News Service, as well as the international operations of International News Pictures and the still-picture service of both wire services.

The public has an acute interest in any merger that affects the control of the news it receives. It is essential in a democracy that there be continued strong and healthy competition in the gathering and distribution of news. This is the only means the public has to assure the flow of vital information essential in a democracy. This merger reduces the general news gathering agencies serving the American public from 3 to 2.

Competition now has been greatly reduced. It may be substantially lessened as that term is employed in the Celler-Kefauver amendment to the antimerger section of the Clayton Act. Undoubtedly the public's opportunity to get news has been substantially diminished.

News is a commodity that grows stale quickly. Any tendency toward monopoly in a business where the product is quickly outmoded is particularly dangerous.

I am glad that the Department of Justice ultimately was alerted to this action and is conducting an investigation to determine its legality under the Celler-Kefauver Act. However, since the agreement became effective on May 16, assets may have already become commingled. Thus it would be difficult to unscramble these assets if divestiture ultimately is ordered by a court after trial under the antimerger statutes.

This situation sharply points up the need for prompt enactment of my premerger notification bill—H. R. 7698. This bill was reported to the House on May 28, 1957, by the Judiciary Committee and has since been held up in the Rules Committee. My bill would have required notice of this merger to the Attorney General, 60 days prior to its consummation. If it had been law, we would not have had this situation where there has been combination of these companies before the Department of Justice even became aware the merger was contemplated. If the Department of Justice had notice in advance, a court may not now be faced with a fait accompli in this vital area of news gathering. As it is, the Department of Justice is confronted with a situation which will vastly increase the difficulty in enforcing the antimerger law.

Rates to Savers Heading Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a subject of interest to all of our citizens is discussed in an article by Sylvia Porter which appeared in the Washington Star on May 9, 1958. I am sure that Miss Porter is right in her prediction.

The article follows:

RATES TO SAVERS HEADING DOWN
(By Sylvia Porter)

Rates paid on savings by banks and savings institutions are now heading distinctly lower—the first change downward in almost 20 years.

If you have savings in a bank or a savings and loan association you're now being paid the absolute top in interest.

You'll get no higher rate than you're getting today, and the odds that your institution can or will continue to pay you as much as it is now paying are shrinking daily.

The odds that the rate paid to you will be shaved around July 1 or before December 1 are mounting rapidly.

Clue: Throughout the country savings institutions are starting to change the appeal in their ads, are beginning to soft-pedal rather than boast about the rates they pay on deposits. The shift in advertising policies is paving the way for the rate reductions.

Clue: Big banks in the great money centers have twice shaved the rates they pay on time deposits of other than small individual savers just since February. In February the rate paid on these deposits went down from 3 to 2½ percent; it is now down to 2 percent.

Clue: At a forum of bankers in Providence, R. I., a few days ago, one of the Nation's leading analysts of banks, M. A. Schapiro, openly recommended that banks reduce the rates paid on savings to maintain adequate earnings in this period.

Clue: Although bankers are naturally reluctant to discuss the subject publicly, the likelihood of cuts is being actively debated in closed meetings. From bankers in the West and South comes the prediction that unless conditions change markedly in the next 30 days, many reductions will be announced July 1.

The question is no longer one of direction in rates paid on savings. The direction is clear; it's down.

The question is only one of the precise timing of the reductions and the area in which the break in rates will start.

Just as interest rates paid on savings went up unevenly—rates today vary widely from region to region, between banks, and between banks and savings associations—so rates will go down unevenly.

But this is not the majority opinion and here is why:

The plunge in interest rates—which began last November when the Federal Reserve System abandoned its tight money policy and started to combat the recession with easy money—is cutting deeply into the earnings that financial institutions can get from loans and investments.

Easy money has two aspects. It means lower rates charged to borrowers and it also means lower rates paid to savers. Savers will discover this second meaning as 1958 rolls on.

Farming Today for Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article written by Miss Eleanor Gresham, of Cordova, Tenn., entitled "Farming Today for Tomorrow."

This young lady has so brilliantly written on this subject that I am anxious that my colleagues have the benefit of its examination.

The article is as follows:

FARMING TODAY FOR TOMORROW

(By Eleanor Gresham)

(Based on information compiled and contributed by John V. Reid, associate county agent, Shelby County)

Soil conservation—how often this topic is brought to the attention of all, especially the farm population. There is this remedy here, and there is that precaution there. True, society is fortunate in that there are new methods revealed in an effort to assure not only a prosperous present but an even brighter future.

However, how many heed any of these warnings or utilize this new research? Percentagewise, very few. Is it because there is a feeling of inadequacy, or is it a lack of equipment? Throughout the State of Tennessee and the Nation reasons may vary, but there is one locality in Tennessee in which definite and organized steps are being taken in an all-out movement to promote prosperity, both presently and in the future.

Shelby County, an area of 801 square miles and 6,000 farms, ranging from 1-acre truck farms to others of thousands of acres, lies in the extreme southwest corner of Tennessee. Creek valleys, gently rolling slopes, steep-sided hills, and a narrow strip of Mississippi River bottom produce cotton, corn, small grains, soybeans, hay, and truck crops with cotton the leader in monetary returns.

Like many other American counties it has an agricultural extension program in operation, but until the program was in swing some years ago, a mediocre existence on rundown land was all the future seemed to hold, for much of the hill land was being slowly eaten away by erosion. But under careful planning of agricultural leaders in the country, a series of subprojects were set up to serve, in the words of one local official, as stepping stones toward permanent prosperity.

The first of these steps, the organization of the Shelby County Soil Erosion Control Association, was taken in 1934. Making heavy equipment for soil erosion and water control work available to farmers at cost, was its primary objective. This is the only nonprofit cooperative of its kind in the United States.

The provision of heavy equipment was the first objective of the organization, but as more time became available with the addition of new staff members, additional objectives included: (1) To do mechanical soil erosion control work that could be used as a model for that kind of work; (2) to try out and evaluate new methods of doing this work; and (3) to develop new techniques for doing this kind of work better and more cheaply and to pass these techniques on to the farmers and farm contractors.

The association now owns approximately $300,000 worth of equipment, including 2 new D6 Caterpillar tractors, terracing machines, and other earth-moving units. In its first 20 years of operation (1935–55), the association served 1,000 farms, terraced 27,500 acres, constructed 250,000 feet of ditches, and reclaimed 4,000 acres. Included among side jobs was the grading of 250 acres of church, school, and home grounds, and included among records set were 2,300 feet of standard terrace in 1 hour 55 minutes and one 12-foot dam that impounds water in a 4-acre lake at a cost of 8.7 cents per cubic yard.

This work has not been piecemeal, for professional agricultural workers plan each job as part of the overall program.

For example, on the 1,200-acre J. P. Chase and Son farm, a special terrace which doubles both as a road and terrace was developed. Installed wherever roads were needed, all parts of the farm can be reached without driving over field terraces.

Water doesn't escape the Chase farm easily as a result of the planned system for catching runoff. As a result of eight ponds on the farm, arranged in an interlocking system of overflow and carry-off ditches, the water is held to work its way slowly into the subsoil water reserves, instead of escaping to add flood damage downstream.

In 1947, came another significant step in Shelby County's series of projects—the establishment of permanent pasture demonstrations in every community. Intended to show how much such pastures could add to income from livestock, they also helped conserve soil.

A 30-acre field on the Roy Henderson farm was the scene of one demonstration pasture. Soil tests were made, the soil being treated in accordance with tests, and the best-known methods were used in the preparation and seeding of the pasture. Twelve hundred dollars was the cost of the improvement, and by keeping careful records, Henderson found that his pasture paid for itself in 100 days through increased milk flow. This is one example of other demonstrations which illustrate the additional income obtainable from well-managed pastures.

By starting a corn production project in 1953, the county took a third important step. After a look at the county's average corn yield of 30 bushels per acre, the county agricultural officials concluded, wisely, that it was a losing proposition. Not meeting costs in most cases, this level of production certainly did not give much income.

The first demonstration in the project was established in the W. G. Petty farm, Petty setting out to grow more corn on an acre than has ever been produced in Shelby County. With the help of soil tests and by using recommended practices, adapted hybrids and irrigation, his production on a middle grade hill soil was 171 bushels in 1953 and 165 in 1954. In 1955, Petty made more than 200 bushels per acre, showing that Shelby County land is capable of growing corn on a money-making basis.

What applies to corn growing also applies to cotton, and a new set of cotton demonstrations was started in 1955. Employing the most modern methods of cotton production, the kind that return the most income to the farmers using them, these were regarded as the fourth step in the county's improvement program.

A demonstration of what can be done with an entire farm and home has been a final step in the Shelby County program, with C. F. Chitwood, owner of a farm in the Mary's Creek Watershed of the county, volunteering the uses of his farm for the project. Although the work is just getting underway, a plan for the Chitwood farm is being developed by county agricultural officials which should provide maximum returns for many years.

The initiative in getting these subprojects started being taken by farm leaders in Shelby County, Federal and State Government agencies are lending assistance in all projects. Included among the agencies are the Soil Conservation Service, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committees, Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, and Agricultural Extension Service.

Demonstrating that it is possible to get a good return from rundown land, these Shelby County projects are of interest everywhere. Not only is there no real income from the use of out-of-date farming methods, but these methods also waste and destroy the soil, resulting in nothing for future generations to farm.

The farmer who takes advantage of modern, improved agriculture, in contrast to low-yield farming, builds and conserves the soil, thus making a step toward increasing country life enjoyment and raising the economic level of farmers. Active areas, such as Shelby County, contribute to the welfare of the Nation.

United States Air Force Reserve Honors Hazleton (Pa.) Publisher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story from the Hazleton Plain Speaker of May 22, 1958, reporting upon the certificate awarded to Mr. Frank Walser, Copublisher of the Plain Speaker, by the United States Air Force Reserve:

The United States Air Force Reserve, yesterday hoonred Frank Walser, copublisher of the Plain Speaker–Standard-Sentinel, when they presented him with a certificate of appreciation for his outstanding cooperation and enthusiastic support of the Air Reserve program.

The certificate was presented to the publisher by Lt. Charles Wyatt, commander of the 2605th Air Reserve Center, Wilkes-Barre, on behalf of Maj. Gen. Roger J. Brown, commander of the 1st Air Force.

The framed certificate was inscribed as follows: "In recognition of public services rendered to the Air Force Reserve, this certificate of appreciation is presented to the Plain Speaker-Standard-Sentinel. The recipient of this award has exhibited outstanding cooperation and continuous effort to further the national security of the United States by enthusiastic support of the Air Force Reserve." It was signed by General Brown.

It marks the first certificate of this type to be presented in the greater Hazleton area by the Wilkes-Barre Air Reserve Center, which has on its rolls more than a score of men from this area.

On hand to witness the presentation were Maj. Franklin D. Coslett, commander of the 9101st Air Reserve Group, Wilkes-Barre; Capt. Paul York, administrative officer of the Center, and Harrison M. Henritzy of the Information Services staff of the 9543d Air Reserve Squadron.

Our Flattening Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of May 10, 1958, is most timely. It is particularly worthy of the attention of the House Banking and Currency Committee, which is presently conducting hearings in connection with the current recession and attendant unemployment problems.

The editorial follows:

OUR FLATTENING ECONOMY

It has been customary for some time now for the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Labor Department to combine their figures on employment and put them out in the form of a joint release about this time each month.

It will be recalled, however, that this rule was suddenly fractured with respect to the statistics covering the month March 15–April 15. The Department of Commerce decided to beat the gun, which it did by releasing its own figures independently on May 1, or more than a week before the scheduled release of the combined figures of the two departments. What was the justification for this extraordinary act by the Commerce Department? Viewed circumstantially against the background of the Commerce Department's more or less notoriously Pollyannaish mentality where business is concerned; the only conclusion seemed to be that the Department couldn't wait to announce its discovery that unemployment had declined in the period from mid-March to mid-April. The fact that the decline was only a single fraction of what it should have been on a seasonal basis and was, in fact, scarcely more than the allowable margin of error, even on an unadjusted basis, was apparently regarded as of little consequence.

This week, running strictly on schedule, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has released its own, complementary figures. These statistics, which are in the general nature of an analysis of the Commerce Department's figures, do not make very enjoyable reading. They show that in absolute terms the drop in factory jobs was 267,000. Of this 267,000, moreover, 100,000, or 37 percent, could be attributed to seasonal influences. The other 63 percent, in short, was caused by the recession. In absolute terms the employment in all nonagricultural establishments showed a rise, though a microscopic one, of 56,000. Placed on a seasonally adjusted basis, however, this is transformed into a decline of nearly three times that number, to be exact, 160,000.

There is little in these statistics that show we are close to the point when we may look for a rebound in the economy. Even if one were to accept the frequently reiterated statement that a "saucering out" of the decline is now close at hand, this would not make any less desirable, not to say urgent, decisive action in the form of a sizable tax reduction.

The chief argument against such action by the administration seems to be that it would mean a substantial budget deficit. Perhaps the reply to the argument was best stated recently by Dr. Neil Jacoby, dean of the Graduate School of Business Administration, University of California, and former member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. As Dr. Jacoby points out, we already have a deficit. Moreover, he adds:

"This deficit [now put at $1.5 billion] will become larger as the business recession reduces the tax base, which is the amount of personal income and corporate profits on which taxes are paid. A $5 billion package tax cut would, of course, immediately increase the deficit now being automatically generated by the business recession. However, if the tax cut did serve to revive private expenditures by business firms and consumers; if it did shorten the recession and speed a vigorous recovery, it would expand the tax base and could readily reduce the Federal deficit that would otherwise exist. Our experience in combating the recession of 1953–54, when we reduced taxes by nearly $7.5 billion on an annual basis, indicates that there is a very good probability that, over a period of 2 or 3 years, tax reduction would reduce rather than increase the amount of deficit financing by the Federal Government."

Not Fantastic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I included an analytical editorial as to the future "Not Fantastic", appearing in the Washington Star of May 24, 1958:

NOT FANTASTIC

It is a measure of the fantastic nature of our age that Dag Hammarskjold, Secretary General of the United Nations, has seriously proposed to the Conference of Governors in Florida that all the world's powers promptly join in renouncing any territorial claims to outer space. By coincidence, in approving a bill to establish civilian control over our own country's nonmilitary ventures into the high heavens, a special House committee has called for essentially the same sort of international celestial agreement—to insure that man's coming exploration of the regions far above us will be carried out solely for peaceful purposes.

As Mr. Hammarskjold has put it, once this exploration goes beyond its present modest limits, the nations engaged in it will face the problem—legal and otherwise—of avoiding potentially dangerous rivalries in relation to celestial bodies like the moon, Mars and Venus. These are places, judging from all expert predictions, that will one day be visited by human travelers, to be exploited thereafter, in one way or another, for mankind's use. Accordingly, in Mr. Hammarskjold's words, "We have here a vital field of activities and joint interests for which rules must be established and procedures must be created that will render it possible for the world community to safeguard the observance of those rules." This means, of course, rules designed to insure that no one power will seek to extend its sovereignty to the interplanetary field and that the universe around us will be internationalized—with no single piece of it subject to the sovereignty or military control of any state—for the benefit of peoples everywhere.

At the moment, to the earthbound among us, all this may appear to add up to an issue too remote to be taken seriously. But that is not really the fact of the matter. Actually, as the experts have emphasized, the space age—an age in which man will almost certainly become a lunar voyager and interplanetary explorer—is rushing in upon us very fast. That is why Mr. Hammerskjold, with the support of the special House committee, has solemnly advocated an early international agreement on the subject. Fantastic as it may seem, the idea—which is scheduled for debate in the United Nations—is real enough to merit careful attention right now.

Address by His Excellency, Jose Ma. De Areilza, Spanish Ambassador to the United States, at the Pennsylvania State Convention of the Knights of Columbus Held at Wilkes-Barre on Sunday, May 4, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by Ambassador Areilza at Wilkes-Barre on May 4, 1958:

I am deeply honored by your invitation, dear Knights of Columbus of the State of Pennsylvania. Every Spaniard is proud of that great achievement, the discovery of the New World, carried out by our country back in the 16th century, under the inspiration of Queen Isabella and the genius of the great navigator. A famous Catholic author once said that, after the incarnation and the nativity of Our Lord, this was, actually, the most important date in universal history, as it helped the human race toward achieving unity, and, therefore, toward shaping a more complete and accurate image of the world.

But the discovery of Columbus was not just a single successful journey. It was really the beginning of a whole era of exploration and civilization. For 300 years our Spanish people came to the shores of America and created a whole new life, founding cities, building churches and universities, clearing roads, constructing ports, and bringing to the New World every element of modern life, from the printing press to the horse, from carriages with wheels to the seed of wheat and the stem of roses. Not only that, but their intermingling with the natives of Central and South America in a few generations created a mixed race of Spanish and native blood, thereby uniting Spain and America. Ours was not a very big country at the time. Therefore, our population was deeply affected by the tremendous strain of this epic achievement. Hundreds of thousands of Spaniards came over during those three centuries, and left the impressive tradition of their way of life and their philosophy here. Today, when one travels south of the Rio Grande in this continent, one can still find the presence of Spanish life, not only in the language of the countries, but also in their cultural inheritance, in their customs, their behavior, their family and social life, their prayers.

Yes, their prayers. Though we forget it too often, the whole achievement of the American discovery was substantially a religious fulfilment, a supreme spiritual adventure. A whole campaign of international slander has distorted the conquistadores' history during the last century. If one

listens to these professional calumniators, the Spaniards were the villians of the story, with their hearts full of hatred and greed, persecuting with infinite cruelty the poor, harmless Indians. A study of the documents which can be found in the archives of Europe and America proves exactly the contrary. There are certainly many episodes of human frailty and error associated with these conquerors, who were subject to passions and sin, like everyone else, but on the whole, the fabulous achievement of bringing the light of civilization to millions of people who lived in the midst of darkness and ignorance was carried out under the inspiration of Christian principles, and with the direct participation of the church. Bishops and theologians, friars and priests, took active part in the superhuman task. Thus, the laws concerning the natives were absolutely human, respectful and Christian, and for the first time in the history of international relations, the unknown races discovered in the new Continent were considered, not as booty for the conqueror, but as a new community of human beings who also were part of Christianity itself. This theory was going to become the most important step toward international law, and the present universally accepted principle of the community of nations.

That is why, as Ambassador of Spain, I am always pleased to visit some new city of your wonderful country, and take part in the gathering of the Knights of Columbus. Though located in Europe, Spain considers herself, to a certain extent, by reason of her American ties, as being a part of the American brotherhood, and, of course, as fundamentally a Catholic country, thus having two common affinities with the idea of your own organization.

Although the Spanish conquest was carried out especially in Central and South America, here also, in what today is the territory of the United States of America, one can still find, from Florida to California, an impressive trail of Spanish memories, as for instance, in the names of the cities, the rivers and the mountains; the souvenirs of Ponce de Leon, De Soto, Oñate, and Coronado; the rosary of the California missions; the dress and vocabulary of your Spanish cowboys; the friendly hospitality of the sun-loving South; the life at the ranches; the exultant joy of the rodeo; the emotion of visiting the first Catholic shrine, the first school, the first image of Our Lady in Saint Augustine, all created by the Spaniards.

But let us now leave the past with all the glory of our common inheritance of which we are so proud, and take a look at the present. Let me say a few words of what our common ties are today; of what the relationship between the United States and Spain is now, and what the problems we are facing together are. I believe we ambassadors have the duty of bringing these questions to the knowledge of the American people, because the people have the right to be informed about these important aspects of international life.

A great danger is facing us, the members of the free Christian civilization. A threat which is the most fearful of all historic challenges. One-third of the human race is enslaved by a revolutionary group that is trying to impose its dictatorship on the rest of the world. This power has immense resources, employs merciless methods, has no respect for human personality, no moral principles, and no belief in an eternal life for the soul. It also has a dangerously strong military force equipped with the most deadly weapons. As blackmailers, these people will not stop at anything, nor balk at any threat that will further their aims.

We know this enemy. We had to fight against him, more than 20 years ago, when the rest of the world was not really aware of the menace. Our country, back in 1936, was on the verge of falling into the hands of communism. Some people like to say that there were not many Communist members in the Spanish parliament at that time, and not many pro-Soviet members in the cabinet, to make such a possibility a real danger. But the Communist Party has never taken over a country with the consent of the people, or by the rule of the majority. It has always achieved its ends through the violent imposition of a small minority of terrorist fighters, or with the help of military occupation, and against the will of the people. Spain had to struggle for survival, to fight a desperate war to preserve her Christian faith, her traditional way of life, the basic principles of our common civilization. It was a 3-year battle, with an enormous loss of lives and wealth by our country. We learned then what Soviet respect for alien property was. Basing their attitude on the fact that the so-called loyalist Spanish government gave them the gold reserve of our national bank, worth more than $700 million, for safekeeping until the war was over, they removed it to Russia and never returned it. This gives us a good idea of what Soviet ethics are.

The Korean war was the turning point of the Western World's awareness of the Red danger. It was this great country of yours which was the first to see it, and to understand the extent and gravity of the situation. Thus our own war became understandable after 10 years of absolute misunderstanding and factual distortion. People began to think that through General Franco's fight and victory, the first Red satellite state in western Europe was prevented from being formed back in 1936. In 1953 my country and the United States signed an agreement of military and economic cooperation, which has been carried out with great success and excellent results on both sides. Spain offers the United States bases for her Air Force and receives economic aid and technical assistance for the development of production. Now, at the end of 5 years, the bases have been practically completed, and those who have visited them expressed great admiration for such an extraordinary technical achievement. These bases are considered the best that the United States possesses abroad.

As regards economic aid, it has been notably efficacious in improving the development of our productive resources, and I must state that in the present state of rapid expansion of our industrial and agricultural capacity that type of aid, especially in that which refers to capital goods, may give spectacular results, if it continues for some time. This serves as the best example of up to what point foreign aid may be useful for countries such as ours, which are experiencing a period of rapid expansion, together with grave economic difficulties due to adverse circumstances.

But Spain offers to the United States, in this cooperative period, something far more important than the existence of a network of modern military installations. That is the spiritual alliance of a country of 30 million inhabitants, with a strategic geographic position in the west, whose anticommunism is not merely formal, nor in need of stimulation, but rather fervently shared by the immense majority of its inhabitants. Our anti-Communists, has its origin in the tragic experience suffered by us more than 20 years ago, which cannot easily be forgotten. If, therefore, in the form of government which Spain has needed in order to survive, the political structure does not coincide exactly with other types of democratic government of the Anglo-Saxon world, this does not, by any means, indicate that an alliance, based on such substantial common interests, may not be discussed by instrumental ideological differences.

Some fanatics of the liberal ideology whose opinions we respect, though we do not share, suppose that the same political model, especially in that which refers to the representative system, and to civil liberty, should apply in a uniform manner to all the nations of the free world. But my understanding is, that if we accept this criterion, we fall into the same error as Soviet Russia, whom we justly accuse of imposing systems rigidly identical to that of Soviet Russia on all the countries within its orbit. Every country of the free world must be guaranteed complete liberty to dictate the form of government most suited to its traditions, its history, and to the mentality of its people.

And thus, in this hour of great threat for the world, we find ourselves confronted with an enormous danger, that we must face squarely, and without becoming confused by the wiles with which the enemy tries to sow confusion in our ranks.

An event has occurred which to me seems more important than all the technical and military advances over the last few years, and that is the recent rebellions in Hungary, Poland, and Eastern Germany. In these uprisings of the people against Communist tyranny, it was the workers themselves, that is to say, those people whom the Communists call the proletariat who took up arms against the occupying Soviet tanks and guns, which represented, however, the troops of the Communist paradise, theoretically ruled by the working class. After all, any university student knows that the criticism made by Karl Marx more than a hundred years ago regarding the failures of the capitalist system, was based on an analysis of facts which have now practically ceased to exist, since they concerned circumstances peculiar to the nations then beginning their industrial revolutions. And how can one apply this analysis to the working world of today, in which the colossal new sources of energy, the automation of machines, the enormous complexity of new techniques and the development of inventions have made sensational changes in the fundamental facts of the economic problem and the concepts used by Marx, which today have been completely modified, such as salary, values, supervalues, and capital remuneration? Marxism is a doctrine of which its adherents still speak, as one might discuss the light of a star which we still see, but which, however, died many years ago. The Communist rule which threatens us today uses the Marxist ideology like a smokescreen, fully aware of its falseness and inadequacy, to hide its true doctrines. These doctrines are those of a ruling class born of the bureaucratic revolution, whose only aspirations are toward the imposition on the world of its collective tyranny, to achieve its imperialistic aims.

I think that one should have the courage to call a spade a spade in this rather delicate ground, and leave aside conventional topics and phrases. The economic system of the United States has shown its efficacy, overcoming its first shortcomings, and creating a permanent revolution within itself. I have here a successful example of the production and distribution of wealth which is based, without any class prejudices, on private initiative, on social justice, and which is fully cognizant of all the revolutionary innovations in modern, industrial technique. The reason why this system thrives and flourishes so strongly is because it respects, above all, liberty, which is a very part of the life of man. And liberty can only flourish in a society such as ours, which possesses a religious creed that instills in man respect for his neighbor, whatever his class or race.

Our answer to the challenge of the present hour is, that one must be not only ma-

terially and militarily stronger than the enemy, but also superior to him on moral ground. And in this we will prevail, if we can succeed in offering to all the people of the world—those on our side, those who are noncommitted, and those who are under Communist tyranny—an economic system which offers greater material prosperity to the greatest number, a form of political life which respects personal liberty, and a spiritual hope that reminds man, as a child of God, of his eternal destiny.

Summer Fellowship Programs for Secondary-School Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a brief news article which appeared in the San Leandro (Calif.) Morning News just recently. The article is brief, but, to my mind, it is significant.

It states how one industrial company—the Maxwell House division of General Foods Corp.—is giving a helping hand to local high-school teachers in San Leandro, Calif.

Sidney L. Feener, Jr., the plant manager of the local Maxwell House operation, calls the program the summer fellowship program for secondary-school teachers.

His program, which is comparatively simple and inexpensive, strikes directly at an area of our educational system which has been of deep concern to us recently. It involves providing a grant or grants to secondary-school teachers to take advanced courses of study during the summer months at little or no expense to themselves.

It is my understanding that Mr. Feener's parent organization, General Foods, is going to expand this high-school teacher grant plan to many more of its plant communities. The program will become effective this summer.

The need to improve the quality of teaching in our secondary schools has been apparent for some time, and recent world events have added emphasis to this. One of the main reasons for our great teacher shortage is low pay, and this grassroots method of alleviating some of the teachers' financial burden is certainly welcome at this time. Furthermore, this novel program of teacher-aid will benefit the teachers themselves academically as well as benefit the local school system by strengthening it in areas where greater teaching skills are needed.

It is a source of personal satisfaction to me to know that an industry in my district of California is taking a lead in so practical and effective a plan to help teachers and hence the community school system.

I would hope that other industries, other communities, civic groups, and educators, would study this General Foods high-school teacher fellowship program, for this is an area in education which certainly needs to be helped at this time.

The article follows:

[From the San Leandro (Calif.) Morning News of April 16, 1958]

ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS STUDY GRANT FOR SAN LEANDRO TEACHERS O. K.'D

(By Culver Lewis)

A $1,000 grant to San Leandro High School teachers for advanced summer extension study was accepted by the board of education last night.

S. L. Feener, Jr., manager of the Maxwell House division of General Foods Corporation, Halcyon Drive and Washington Avenue, made the offer to the board on behalf of the corporation.

Feener explained that General Foods started such a program in LeRoy, New York, 2 years ago and it had proved very successful.

The board was informed that no strings were attached to the offer. Feener told the trustees that the purpose of the fund is to make possible further teacher study which would be of value to the students, the high-school teachers and the community of San Leandro."

Board President A. J. Oliveira expressed the trustee's appreciation and said it was "a fine gesture on the part of General Foods. I only hope that other local plants will follow suit."

Voluntarism at Its Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am an ardent subscriber to the view expressed by David Lawrence that "voluntarism is freedom's greatest vehicle of progress."

For this reason, I welcome activities which reflect this spirit of voluntarism as opposed to increasing reliance upon Government.

It seems to me particularly desirable that these methods be strengthened and expanded in the very important field of education.

Accordingly, I am happy to call the attention of the House to a program of aid to public schoolteachers which is being initiated in the Third Congressional District of Michigan.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent news article from the April 7 Battle Creek Enquirer and News, which describes this plan inaugurated by the Post division of General Foods Corp. in Battle Creek.

Mr. George Laimbeer, vice president and general manager of the Post division, describes the plan as the "summer fellowship program for secondary schoolteachers."

As the newspaper article points out, this program involves the awarding of grants to secondary schoolteachers in the Battle Creek, Lakeview, and Springfield high schools to enable the teachers to take advanced summer courses of study at little or no expense to themselves.

The local schools administer the program, set their own criteria, and make their own selection of the recipients of the awards according to their curriculum needs.

It seems to me that this is a program of very practical nongovernmental aid to education which can be emulated with profit by other industrial concerns and by civic groups.

I understand that other divisions of the General Foods Corp. are adopting the same program. However, I take particular pride in the announcement by Mr. Laimbeer not only because the ready-to-eat cereal company he heads is located in my district, but also because this concern, formerly the Postum Cereal Co., was the parent organization of General Foods Corp.

I warmly commend the decision of Mr. Laimbeer and his associates in General Foods to pioneer this program. It is one more timely reminder that reliance upon Government, and especially upon the Federal Government, is by no means the only or best solution of all our problems, and particularly the problems of education.

The newspaper article to which I referred follows:

AREA HIGH-SCHOOL TEACHERS TO RECEIVE GENERAL FOODS CORP. STUDY HELP

Fellowship grants which will aid senior high school teachers of Battle Creek, Lakeview, and Springfield in pursuing advanced study programs during the summer have been offered to the three school districts by the post and carton and container divisions of the General Foods Corp.

The grants, totaling $3,000, are to be allocated to the school districts in amounts proportionate to the number of high school teachers in each senior high school. This will provide the Battle Creek school district with $1,750; Lakeview $750 and Springfield, $500.

TRUSTEES TO WORK IT OUT

Formal acceptance of the funds by the three boards of education is expected this month. A company spokesman said the school trustees will be responsible for working out a plan to administer distribution of the grants to the maximum advantage of high school teachers.

John Crossen, planning and development manager for the Post division, stated that the general purpose of the grants "is to make possible further teacher study, which will be of value to students, to high-school teachers and to the communities."

He said there are "no strings attached" in the offer of fellowship funds. The company asks only that the money be used for senior high-school teacher study. Mechanics of the program will be left entirely to the school administrators, he said said

"General Foods has been studying the needs of educational systems over the last 4 or 5 years and found that although industry is already giving significant aid to higher education in the form of scholarships and fellowships, there was little being done at the secondary school level," Mr. Crossen stated.

He reported that General Food's Jell-O plant at LeRoy, N. Y., took the first step in this direction in 1956, in making available $1,000 to help selected high school teachers in LeRoy take advanced courses of study during the summer. The plan was so successful that it was repeated last year and is scheduled again this year.

He explained that the fellowship grants here will be made on an annual basis also,

if the first-year program this summer proves successful.

Offer of the grants was made during a recent meeting of Post and carton and container division officials with officers of the three school boards. Mr. Crossen presented the offer on behalf of George M. Laimbeer, Post division general manager, and Robert de S. Couch, carton and container division manager.

The program, which has become known in General Foods Corp. as the summer fellowship grant for secondary school teachers is described as unique in industry grants to education.

A Legacy from a Great Leader, John T. Alsop, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1958

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, recently John T. Alsop, Jr., for 18 years mayor of Jacksonville, passed away, to the great loss of the many whom he benefitted in his wide area of influence. His friend, Will Rogers, the famous comedian, gave him a title by which many addressed him even in his final years of semiretirement "The Mayor of Florida." Because of his wide area of service the title was particularly appropriate.

Mayor Alsop was always a great inspiration to me and a dear friend at all times. The Jacksonville Journal recently published the following editorial which may inspire not only those who knew him but also those who never had that opportunity:

NINE SUCCESSFUL RULES FOR SUCCESS

Mayor John T. Alsop, Jr., left his mark in many places around Jacksonville and in many places in the hearts of Jaxons.

But perhaps his greatest legacy will be his rules for success, nine maxims he followed from childhood. They are:

"Good sportsmanship in work as well as in play. Ever be fair.

Loyalty to family, friends, and business associates.

"Temperance in all things—work, play, and appetite. Don't worry. Practice self-restraint, thus insuring self-reliance.

"Adherence strictly to the Golden Rule, lest it becomes merely a platitude.

"Constant application and thoroughness, and to these add thrift and economy.

Cultivation of that greatest of all assets—personality—for it will be invaluable all through life.

"Let service be paramount always, whether it be with affairs of church, State, home, or business.

"Be positive in thought, speech, and action, but above all, be tolerant.

"So live that the world may be made better, your friends and neighbors made happier, and to paraphrase another, that even the undertaker will regret your passing."

The success of Mayor Alsop's formula for success can perhaps be measured by the fact that the undertaker—and every other person with whom he came in contact during his long life—truly regret his passing.

Governor Meyner Emphasizes the Importance of a Liberal National Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Robert B. Meyner is a strong supporter of a liberal national trade policy. On a recent trip to Europe he missed no single opportunity for acquainting European Government and business officials, as well as American businessmen abroad, with his earnest desire to increase trade between Western Europe and the United States and with the benefits and advantages of such trade.

Using dollar value as a measure, foreign trade through the New York-New Jersey port in 1957 was almost $9 billion, or about 38 percent of the total value of United States foreign trade. A measure of the importance of this trade is the fact that more than 3 million people in New Jersey and New York are directly or indirectly dependent for their livelihood upon it.

I include here the text of an address made by Gov. Robert B. Meyner at a luncheon of the Newark, N. J., Chamber of Commerce on May 9, 1958:

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT B. MEYNER, GOVERNOR, STATE OF NEW JERSEY, AT A LUNCHEON OF THE NEWARK CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, HOTEL ROBERT TREAT, MAY 9, 1958

The Newark Chamber of Commerce, in arranging this special meeting of New Jersey businessmen, has given me a greatly appreciated opportunity to report back to the people of the port district on one of the most constructive and gratifying experiences I have had as governor of this great State. For I am encouraged to believe that my mission to help sell the advantages of shipping by way of the port of New York-New Jersey has been accomplished.

Many of you here today were also here 5 weeks ago on April 2. At a Newark Chamber of Commerce luncheon then, I announced that Chairman Donald V. Lowe and other port authority commissioners had convinced me that it would be important in the port authority's trade development efforts for me to take the time to join the chairman on two of his many important trade promotion assignments in Western Europe, and to accept an invitation from the Irish Ministry of Industry and Commerce to discuss Irish-American trade.

I also disclosed that I would represent New Jersey at special ceremonies at the United States pavilion of the Brussels Universal and International Exhibition on New Jersey Day, and unveil the New Jersey State flag at the port of New York exhibit in the hall of transportation at the exhibition.

You will recall that the luncheon orginally was billed as a tribute to the port authority's first 10 years of achievement at port Newark and Newark Airport. It developed into an opportunity for the unveiling of a master plan for the completion of port Newark, the construction of a new Elizabeth Channel and the development of the Elizabeth port authority piers. When the Newark-Elizabeth sector of the port of New York is completed, as Commissioner Horace K. Corbin told us, it will represent a total investment by the port authority of $275 million. It will handle 40 percent of the cargo in the entire port of New York.

There will be jobs for 18,000 people at an annual payroll of $90 million. The construction job over the next 3 years alone will produce a labor payroll of $10 million.

It was with this inspiring send-off by the Newark chamber that we started our European trade development tour.

I do not want to anticipate Donald Lowe's personal report. But I think it is important to say that in the course of his trip through 18 European cities, he addressed audiences totaling over 2,000 government, shipping and business officials. At every point he had conferences with newspaper, radio, and television reporters on the advantages offered in shipping through our port facilities here in New Jersey and New York. He met with top officials in the ministries of transport of 6 countries as well as with about 25 United States Embassy and Consular officials, including four of our Ambassadors. He met with mayors and port officials and he inspected the seaports and airports in every city he visited.

No opportunity was missed for acquainting European government and business officials, as well as American businessmen abroad, with our earnest desire to increase trade between Western Europe and the United States and with the benefits and advantages of shipping via the port of New York-New Jersey.

In general, both Chairman Lowe and I stressed the importance of a liberal United States trade policy, and the advantages to shippers moving their goods through the port of New York-New Jersey.

We found the most intensive interest in the legislation now before Congress calling for the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. We took every opportunity to assure our European neighbors that Gov. Averell Harriman, the port authority commissioners and I firmly believe in the need for a liberal trade policy.

They are convinced, I am sure, that we are aware that the welfare and security of the United States, and indeed of all the nations of the free world, require that our trade policies encourage the movement of goods both to and from our shores. Our determination to do everything possible to meet the challenge of the Soviet economic offensive was greeted everywhere with enthusiasm and appreciation.

I should like to take a moment to emphasize the importance to us here in New York and New Jersey of the liberalization of our national trade policy. In 1957 our great port handled almost 13 million tons of foreign trade general cargo, the greatest volume of any United States port. In fact, we handled a fourth of the total United States export-import general cargo during the year. This is the type of cargo that provides more jobs and other benefits for our people than does the heavier bulk cargo that swells the tonnage record of some of our competing ports.

Using dollar value as a measure, foreign trade through our New York-New Jersey port in 1957 was almost $9 billion, or about 38 percent of the total value of United States foreign trade.

Another measure of the importance of port business is found in the fact that more than 3 million people in our bi-State port district are directly or indirectly dependent for their livelihood upon waterborne commerce through this gerat bi-State harbor.

You will remember that a recent survey by the League of Women Voters here in New Jersey found that a large majority of New Jersey manufacturers have "a direct interest in foreign trade." According to the survey, New Jersey, which is the Nation's sixth industrial producer, "has a considerable stake in a continued high level of international trade," and "the interests of New Jersey as a whole would best be served by policies designed at least to maintain and possibly increase the present level of international commerce."

In discussing the advantage to shippers in moving their goods through our port we followed the long established trade development program of the port authority. The timing of our port of New York sales drive was determined by the fact that the port authority has just added two new trade development offices to its port service. One of these is in London and the other on the Continent in Zurich.

Previously, one by one, on the basis of proven success over the past 13 years, the port authority has provided four trade development offices in the United States and a fifth in Rio de Janeiro. All of these offices are designed to meet the competition of the sales jobs that are being done by other United States ports. Naturally, they are out to increase their share of the cargo that moves between the United States and other nations.

Mrs. Meyner and I arrived in London on the morning of Thursday, April 24. This was inauguration day for the Port Authority's London trade development office. Chairman Lowe presided at a luncheon at the Dorchester Hotel attended by more than 500 guests. These included two Cabinet Ministers, five Parliamentary Secretaries, the American Minister for Economic Affairs and top-ranking officials in the fields of transportation, shipping and foreign trade. This was a most impressive affair.

I have no doubt that everyone concerned was made aware of our foreign trade policy, our port development program and the services available at the port authority's London office. The British Minister of Transport and Civil Aviation, Harold Watkinson, in his response to Chairman Lowe and me, congratulated the port authority on its foresight and determination. He repeated, on behalf of his country, our call for increased trade, travel and services between the United Kingdom and the United States. He described the London office as "a sign of the confidence that the Port Authority has in the future."

And then we went on to Dublin. There, I met with the Irish Ministry of Industry and Commerce. My host was Minister Sean Lemass who is also Deputy Prime Minister of the Irish Republic.

In Dublin, I of course called for an expansion of trade between Ireland and the United States. And I urge the businessmen and shippers to avail themselves of the services of the new London office. Minister Lemass was delighted to receive the New Jersey State flag and called it a symbol of the close tie of friendship which unites our two nations.

On our second day in Dublin we were the guests of the Dublin Port and Docks Board. Our inspection of the harbor facilities was most interesting and constructive. We also enjoyed meeting with Lord Mayor John Carroll.

We were happy to have an opportunity for a brief personal holiday in Paris before going on to Amsterdam where we were reunited with Chairman Lowe.

Since almost a half of the Dutch economy is involved in foreign trade, The Netherlands naturally supports lower tariff barriers. Our position on reciprocal trade therefore was the keystone of our approach to the encouragement of Netherlands' trade through this port.

Our stay in The Netherlands was marked by constant activity. We toured the great Schiphol Airport in Amsterdam. We also were conducted on a tour of the Port of Amsterdam under the guidance of municipal and port officials. The extent and modernity of the terminal and cargo handling facilities were most impressive. Significantly, here, as in the other port cities I visited in Europe, the officials stressed that first priority in postwar projects was given to reconstruction of port facilities. This, of course, was in recognition of the fact that commerce flowing through the ports is a major source of livelihood for their people—as it is of ours.

We were honored at a luncheon by the American Businessmen's Club of Amsterdam, attended by over a hundred American and Dutch Government and business officials who were greatly interested in the establishment of the port authority's continental trade development office at Zurich. I am sure they will make regular and profitable use of it to our mutual benefit.

A highlight of our trip was the important and warm courtesy extended to chairman and Mrs. Lowe and the port authority group as well as Mrs. Meyner and myself by Burgomaster and Mrs. van Hall at their official residence in Amsterdam. The affair, which was attended also by leading shipping and port officials of the city, was marked by exchanges of sincere friendship.

Amsterdam marked the final point on Chairman Lowe's exacting 7-week trade development tour. I want to say that he and Mrs. Lowe and the port authority staff members did a magnificent job in winning innumerable new friends and customers for the New York-New Jersey port.

I cannot over-emphasize the importance of the European press, radio, and television coverage received by our trade development program and our port facilities here in New Jersey and New York during the course of our trip. A part of the record is posted around this room. On our arrivals and departures we were interviewed by large groups representing all communications media. I believe it is important to our whole trade development effort that our story was published and broadcast throughout continental Europe, England, and Ireland. And it was encouraging to come home to find that so many stories had been printed here in the press of New Jersey and New York.

As you can see, this has been a busy 2 weeks. And now, I should like to make a few personal observations.

I feel that I have benefited greatly in obtaining first-hand information about European port problems and progress. I returned with a feeling that international trade is indispensable to the welfare and security of the free world. There was considerable expression of critical interest in the recession here in America.

I found great appreciation of our accomplishments in our port, and particularly in its great new marine and air terminal facilities. There was great interest, too, in the State of New Jersey and its people and industries. The chairman of our New Jersey economic ambassadors, Mr. Charles W. Engelhard, took the opportunity also of joining me in selling the advantages and opportunities of our great industrial State. I was particularly pleased to have had an opportunity to join with Chairman Lowe and the port-authority group in inspecting the ports and airports and of seeing at first-hand other evidence of the great progress which the people of Western Europe have made in rebuilding and expanding their transportation and terminal facilities since the end of World War II. In many respects, their building and promotion programs are remarkably similar to those which the port authority is undertaking at our port.

Mrs. Meyner and I had one more important piece of business to transact before we set out for home. This was our participation in New Day ceremonies at the Brussels World's Fair on Wednesday. As many of you know, the United States pavilion at the fair is honoring each of the 48 States with a day dedicated to their respective achievements. It was inspiring to see the flag of New Jersey raised at the beautiful American Pavilion.

I would like to say just a word about America's contribution to the fair. Howard S. Cullman, the United States Commissioner General, and his staff, have produced an exhibit of which all Americans can be proud. For me, the rivalry between the free world and Soviet bloc participation was summed up best in the words of a Belgian who said: "The Russian pavilion shows what they make. The American pavilion shows what they are."

Later on Wednesday, I visited our attractive New York-New Jersey port exhibit in the hall of transportation, featuring terminal city at New York International Airport as its central theme, an installation which I described as "America's aerial counterpart to the Statue of Liberty." In fulfilling its responsibility for the promotion and protection of land, sea, and air commerce through our bi-State port, I emphasized in a brief talk, the port authority is fostering and developing sound trade relationships between the United States and other nations of the world. By working for expanded international trade, it is performing a vital function in the field of international peace and good will.

I was also delighted to learn that there is continuing contact and exchange of information between the port authority and the port and airport officials of Western Europe. Such cooperation is the best guaranty of our mutual security and progress.

I firmly believe that the program which the port authority is undertaking abroad on behalf of the people and industries of this great northern New Jersey-New York port district, will yield substantial benefits in terms of increased commerce moving through this port. Moreover, I am convinced that the two new offices which have been opened by the port in Western Europe should certainly serve to put our friends at home and abroad on notice that the port of New Jersey and New York, aided by outstanding civic organizations such as the Newark Chamber of Commerce, has the competence, vision, resources and determination to maintain its position as America's greatest port.

The Honorable William H. Francis, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and unexpected passing of our distinguished friend, the Honorable William H. Francis, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Defense, is a shock to all of us. I have known him intimately for many years. He was brilliant and had a wealth of human understanding. In fact, he possessed everything that made life worthwhile.

The Republican Party of Texas and the Nation have lost one of their young and ablest leaders. During his service as Assistant Secretary of Defense, he brought great credit and distinction to his party, to himself, and to his family.

The Republicans and Democrats alike, in the executive branch and in the Congress, had the greatest respect and admiration for him.

I know that the membership of the House joins me in extending to his family our deepest understanding and sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Abundance for What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include an article by David Riesman, professor of sociology at the University of Chicago, which appeared in the April 1958 issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. In this article Dr. Riesman states that "we are a generation prepared for Paradise Lost who do not know what to do with paradise found," and at another point he says:

Serious discussion of the future is just what is missing in the United States; we live now, think later.

The full text follows:

ABUNDANCE FOR WHAT?

(By David Riesman)

I was one of those quasi-Keynesians who became convinced, shortly after we entered the Second World War, that great depressions were most unlikely in the American future. As I occasionally overstated matters to my economist friends: "Zealously budget-minded Congressmen and their supporters may be able to bring on a depression by the main force of stupidity, but it is most unlikely the country and even the Republicans would allow this." My conviction was based, less on confidence in the Keynesian armamentarium as politically feasible medicine, than on the surmise that the war had taught Americans the lesson that wars cure depressions and are, as conducted extraterritorially, less unpleasant: not a lesson to be learned in school or pulpit or even to be explicitly stated to oneself (save perhaps in lower-class male circles), but rather a tacit agreement that Government can control depression, if need be, by war and preparation for war. (There is some fragmentary evidence from surveys of public opinion that in the period from 1949 to 1956 more Americans have expected a major war than a major depression in the years ahead.)

DEFENSE SPENDING

It should be clear that I am not talking about the merchants of death. Such companies as Du Pont are much too frightened—and too responsible—to influence policy in favor of military rather than diplomatic preparations; and even the direct military producers would throw their weight in favor of their arm of the services out of patriotism rather than profits. Domestic support for American military spending is popular, despite the outcry against high taxes, in part because it has the tacit backing of people who recognize the support it gives the economy, or their fair city; in an era when corruption is less and less a vehicle for Government spending (despite what is said later about highways), this is the new, often relatively disinterested pork barrel, periodically supported by the U. S. S. R. and its allies.

To be sure, there are many influential taxpayers, whether in the Taber mold or the more sophisticated Humphrey mold, who do not like Government spending, even for defense; old-fashioned pre-Keynesians, ready to equate the morality of private with that of governmental budgets, they cannot accept what must seem to them the sleight of hand by which an economist like Sumner Slichter defends allopathic doses of inflation as a disagreeable remedy for worse diseases. They were not brought up to approve of waste, either in their own family, their own company, or their own country—and they are patriotic enough, and insular enough, to believe that what is good in the one realm is good also in the others. And they may even sense, from the baseline of their limitations, a certain lunacy in military spending anyway; they may feel that the amount the services can spend in competition with each other is almost as limitless as what could be spent on civil defense if we really took seriously the mutuality of threat implicit in our own and Soviet military policies. They may have come to realize that, while most American military men are (to my mind, quite astonishingly) deferential to important businessmen, there are some dedicated members of a warrior caste who—as in all militarized countries—have contempt for business caution, business selfishness, and business lack of political foresight.[1]

Businessmen of this stripe, moreover, have convictions: they are not shaken by the equally strong convictions of diplomats, politicians, or military men. They know a dollar is a dollar—or ought to be. Their own past, and their image of America's past, supports them.

Such businessmen, however influential the positions they hold, are not a very large group, although they probably exceed in number the "modern Republican," or Committee on Economic Development, or Keynes-influenced managerial businessmen (who read, rather than simply purchase or advertise in, Fortune or Business Week). Their power comes in large part from their control of the nostalgic rhetoric of an earlier, thriftier America—a rhetoric to which many small-business men and small-town professional men (including State committeemen and Congressmen) almost automatically respond. Nevertheless, the majority of businessmen, I suspect, do not unequivocally share the traditional convictions they think they hold: they are perfectly willing to join the ritualistic outcry against high taxes and Government spending, but their hearts are not always in it, especially of course if there is a jolt in the rate of economic expansion; such businessmen are like most of us in being able to coexist with apparently incompatible opinions, and with firmness of tone screening willingness to be unorthodox. Correspondingly, whatever temporary extravagances they may allow the local chamber of commerce or the NAM to perpetrate on their alleged behalf, they are too public relations minded to dare to be accused of undermining prosperity or sabotaging national defense and the national interest (as, let us say, the energetic Alsop brothers define the national interest). Many of them are accustomed, in their corporate capacity, to pay money in order to prevent a row or even criticism: money to their workers, to their civic associations, to their fellow executives. Running their businesses (and often their personal lives, too), like increasing numbers of other white-collar Americans, on the buy now, pay later, basis (greatly modified, however, by retained depreciation and dividends, and by Federal tax policy), they realize in spite of their comptrollers that "it's only money," and are reluctant Keynesians whatever their theoretical adherence.[2]

BUY NOW, PAY LATER

America has been, since Jacksonian times and earlier, a country in which the creditor class, and the creditor-minded, were a minority, and moderately slow inflation was hence politically popular. But only recently has the combination of alluring advertising, easy credit, and the loss of sumptuary restrains brought millions of consumers into the debtor class; a quite expensive "standard package" of durable consumer goods has now become a necessity.[3] To be deprived of this necessity seems both arbitrary and intolerable to people who cannot help sensing the economy's ability to produce, and who (save in rapidly dwindling rural and urban slum enclaves) see nothing in the status system that forbids their quest for possessions. One short-range consequence is that the moral basis of a George Humphrey is not widely shared in the planning of families and other future expenditures of the electorate at large, outside the business class; the electorate has no platform from which to be really indignant at Government debt, Government spending.[4]

They may, to be sure, assail the Government, projectively, for "bad habits they will not give up in their own case, but they will in the end be ambivalent, seeing in the Government the insurer of their own perilous course—a course which assumes that no one in their family will be seriously ill (beyond what Blue Cross or their corporate employer covers) or crazy, and that close to full employment will continue as before. It was a straw in the nonagricultural wind when a reporter in the town of Anaheim, Calif.—a town dependent on new and war-supported industry (and Disneyland)—inquired as to what residents might do in the case of a depression; the latter were all, in good suburban style, mortgaged 30 or more months ahead for cars, furniture, etc., as well as for their homes. One man replied:

"No one is worried, because there's a theory in town that if anything slips up the Government will declare a moratorium on all debts. No one knows who started the rumor, but these kids really think it's true. The Government would have to do something like that, they say to me, because otherwise this whole place might be a shambles overnight."[5]

It is only a step from this outlook to assume that the Government would be forced to stockpile cars.

WHAT GOALS FOR AMERICA?

What are some of the long-range implications of these versions of political economy? One is an orientation toward tangibles—toward what the military call "hardware." We have to consume, or stockpile, some thing. Yet, as many people at the same time recognize, there can be a surfeit of things: it is only for intangibles, and the people producing them, that markets are truly insatiable. We are coasting psychologically on the remaining gaps and deficiencies in the ever rising "standard package," but beyond that, we have very few goals, either individually or socially. Those Americans who attain, let us say, 25 percent or even 50 percent more income in stable dollars can quickly learn ways to spend it but if faced with 250 percent they cannot easily and rapidly learn new wants. The level and style of living of a well-to-do businessman at the turn of the century, with his large house, his many servants, his stable, objects d'art, and caretakers (and sometimes courtesans)—this is not for them. Their corporation or institution can

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

live this way (what I like to call "conspicuous production"), and they can benefit from its expense accounts, including a Canadian chalet or Florida yacht. But many in the younger generation of reasonably well-off Americans are not drivingly or basically materialistic: invidiousness in taste or acquisition is not their style. Contrary to the image envious non-American often have, ferocious desire for things for their own sake is declining, let alone desire for money or land for its own sake. Rather, as already indicated. Americans resent being deprived of the things they are supposed to have, and advertising tempts us with the halo of association rather than with the objects per se.

Thus, I suggest that there is a tendency for people, once accustomed to upper-middle-class norms, to lose zest for bounteous spending on consumer goods. This tendency remains hidden from us by the fact that, even in this stratum, there are still modest expansions underway, along the moving escalator of an inflation which is at once monetary and material; moreover, the look of asceticism, whether in Mies van der Rohe houses or foreign cars, is still a minority desire, hence expensive. More important, the zeal of the previously underprivileged to make up for lost time brings into the market for gaudy consumption more millions than education presently removes (of course, only in part) from the market. And enormous expenditures for research and development of new, or seemingly new, products, along with ever larger advertising budgets, have helped postpone the specter of satiation. Finally, I would admit that, as the country gets more tangled and crowded with unrestricted growth of population and urban sprawl, many upper-middle-income families will pay large sums simply to keep at their present level of amenity and space and sanitation.

Nevertheless, the basic stockpile on which our society's dynamism has rested—the stockpile of new and exhilarating wants—seems to me badly depleted. (I say this knowing that alarmists have thought this periodically—thus, Milton Friedman reminds me that in 1908 people thought the limit on autos had been reached; and I learn from George Katona's surveys of consumer expectations for the Federal Reserve Board that most Americans asked what they would want if they had the money to buy it, can come up with desires: a newer or another car, another room, a deepfreeze, air conditioning. But, after all that, then what?) The rate of increase expected in the next years in the gross national product exceeds what the country could readily absorb, given any really sizable drop in defense expenditures; we have no adequate plans for substitute goals, or the political channels for securing understanding and support for the process of developing such plans.

WHAT COULD REPLACE DEFENSE SPENDING?

Indeed, as Gerhard Colm's article, "Economic Implications of Disarmament,"[6] suggests, it is hard to forecast how we will deploy our rising productivity even without reducing defense expenditures. He sees education as absorbing much of the largest part of the surplus, highways and other transport facilities next, along with public works in general, hospitals, and water conservation. Education is, of course, one of the intangibles for which the demand curve is nearly completely flexible—but we do not have as a cultural goal the ethos of "each one, teach one," nor do our educators have a utopian vision of a humane education around which to build new curricula for adults and young people alike. Nor do we as yet have a culture in which the desire for quality in urban and rural landscape justifies conservation not only of a few natural grandeurs and historical mementos, but of the textures (and aesthetic values generally) which have been built over generations into whole regions and cities. Thus, when I recently suggested that New Orleans, for instance, be made a national park, with its homes inhabited by subsidized families (much as bear or deer are "subsidized" to live in Yellowstone), I was thought to be joking.

But, of course, I want to conserve not only precious urban and rural "prospects" (to use the old English term), but also the core of all our still viable metropolises: conserve them, not for the auto, but from the auto (as in Victor Gruen's plan for Fort Worth). Urban renewal is fabulously costly and, if done with enough taste and vision to keep people coming to the city even if they have a choice of locale, can certainly absorb much of our productivity in the next 20 years; but again, what is lacking is not only the willingness to tax and spend for such collective purposes—purposes that will outlive any one of us—but also the kind of political and cultural organizations to accomplish anything like so radical a change with no apparent crisis to make our "needs" visible and dramatic. That is, we appear to be in a trap in which we may become weary of the goods we have learned to miss not having, without having learned other than inchoately what we are missing when we do have them—let alone having learned how to institutionalize acquisition of such values as the complexity and beauty of certain cities, and the simplicity and quiet of certain countrysides, or their proper relation.

What are the economic consequences of this wantlessness? I rather doubt if we shall stockpile cars: the auto industry lacks the gerrymandered political base of the farmers, and their ideology of small family-scale business. We are, however, already stockpiling highways, with little regard for the consequences in the amenity both of city and country life the throughways will have. Highways—unlike schools, public and private health, nonobvious scenery, or nonslum redevelopment—are not controversial—though the residual car-less poor and bulldozered rich might wish they were; they disperse much patronage, and speed and efficiency of movement do have an aesthetic appeal to which Americans respond, though the appeal is buttressed by economic arguments. Even so, the new Federal highway program will spend in 15 years around 60 percent of what our military establishment spends in 1. There will be a multiplier effect in this program, of course, filtering through contractors, makers of road-building equipment, of bridges, concrete, and lumber. But defense contracts are geared into the whole manufacturing economy in a way that road-building contracts could never be. I doubt if roadbuilding can take up the impending slack due to the cheapening costs of total destruction, and I cannot conceive of an economy as rich as ours supported by public works alone, on any scale now contemplated, any more than pyramid building could sop up a gross national-product which will soon be $500 billion.[7]

Indeed, I would tentatively suggest that expenditures which serve no real social imperative, other than proping up the economy itself, will eventually produce wasteful by-products to slow that economy down in a tangle of vested inefficiencies, lowered morale, and lack of purpose and genuine inventiveness. Men will scarcely want to go on producing goods as mere items in a multiplier effect.

So the question comes back to what we want. For the present, though as already implied with perhaps diminishing enthusiasm filtering down from the elite, we unequivocally want to have good cars and good roads to drive them over. What else do we want as unequivocally? We want healthy babies and suburban homes to put them in, and we want an increasing variety of services (including education). We seem increasingly to look in our family life for some of the satisfactions missing in our economic and general social life—so much so, that in a recent science-fiction story, The Midas Touch, the upper classes are privileged by being allowed to spend less time and zeal in enforced consumption and more time at work or enjoying close personal ties.[8] But I repeat: there are few channels, political or economic, for translating these as yet undefined shades of feeling into a program which could give us alternatives both to spending for defense and to spending for spending's sake.

A NEW SITUATION

No society has ever been in this position before, or anywhere near it, and thus the dream of plenty has remained unsullied. Indeed pleasure in possessions has been for many people throughout history partly shored up by the surrounding backdrop of general poverty. At the present time some smaller countries are in much the same boat as the United States—these include Switzerland, West Germany, and several Scandinavian nations, which have the highest or close to the highest suicide rates in the world; these countries have solved many social problems which in the United States still have much (but still insufficient) psychological mileage in them. Likewise, if we cannot look to the experience of other times and other countries for models for the American future, we can also not discover much wisdom in earlier prophets of abundance, for very few of them foresaw the actual cornucopia of even so modestly efficient an industrial plant as ours.[9] Edward Bellamy's Looking Backward, for instance, which had an enormous impact in the Gilded Era, envisaged an amiable and genteel level of living, long since attained in amount throughout a large middle-income belt, though scarcely touched in inner peace and spaciousness. Even the most devoted apostles of capitalism in previous generations scarcely foresaw that it would soon outrun its most optimistic boosters (though Schumpeter did grasp this)—while its enemies like Karl Marx, who realized capitalism's power to subdue all earlier traditional levels of production and consumption, could not foresee its chastened managerial form nor indeed its bounteous exploitability. We are a generation, prepared for Paradise Lost, who do not know what to do with paradise found.

Several years ago, I had a chance to examine interviews done with ten seniors each at twenty colleges throughout the country—interviews in which the young men were asked what they expected their lives to be like in fifteen years, that is, in 1970. The demands these men were willing to put both on themselves and the planet were, I thought, rather modest: they expected to have a good professional or corporate job paying around $15,000, enough (as they figured it) to pay for a wife, three or four children, a home in the suburbs, a boat on a lake, two cars, and cultural amenities. The family—actual or prospective—loomed large in their thinking; both consumer goods and the society loomed small; their own careers were somewhere in between.[10] These young people struck me as being on the whole very decent, very nice. The family life they envisaged was empathic and warm; they would be good husbands and fathers and, within the limits of their suburb, good citizens. But in the whole lot of interviews, there was very little stirring of the discontent which could presage new needs, new wants, let alone an image of a

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

social pattern organized to supply them. Such young men might be prepared to speed up the rate of obsolescence of consumer goods by, let us say, one third, in order to exhaust inventories faster, if the patriotism of advertising urged them on. And they will almost undoubtedly continue the philoprogenitiveness which increases our population without engendering serious discussion as to how many people can live comfortably with each other in the American way. Indeed, serious discussion of the future is just what is missing in the United States: as our actual life spans have lengthened, our timetables of the imagination have shrunk: we live now, think later.

There is liberation in this from the penny-pinching of earlier generations of middle-class people who wanted to save for their businesses, their children, their funerals, their estates. There is liberation from pie-in-the-sky consolations for present misery. There is liberation in plenty itself, up to a point. And yet I think we fear the future's opacity, and try not to pierce it with concrete plans. The terrifying prospect of atomic and biological annihilation has been one factor in this foreshortening, but for most Americans it is not a very important (not nearly important enough) cloud on anticipation. What we fear to face is more than total destruction: it is total meaninglessness; and it is my contention that we may bring about the former, in some part because the latter inhibits our alternatives to what I have here depicted as our subrosa military keynesianism; and, perhaps more important, our future as a country is not inviting or challenging enough to mobilize our attention and our energies.

IS THE PROBLEM IMMINENT?

Since I began this paper, the sputnik has shot into the sky and shown that there is life in the old armaments race, the old comparisons, yet.[11] Democratic leaders have been attacking Republican budgetmindedness. They are like coaches whose athletes have broken training and lost a game. But the motivations which give vitality to an economy cannot for long endure on a merely sporting or collegiate basis—though one could well argue that the United States in two world wars postponed reckoning with aims which transcended levels of welfare and justice which the social thought of previous generations had proposed. We have seldom bothered to stockpile hopes, not for a rainy but for a sunny day.

There are those who would argue that people do not discover new values and meanings in prosperous times, but only in times of oppression, of war or other crisis; that at such a time, men must fall back on basic cultural imperatives or rediscover values that had been repressed during the good times. I am not sure this is historically correct: crisis evokes meanness as well as creativity; more important, "crisis" is itself a conception, a product of our conceptions, not a Kantian a priori proposition. The age of abundance has its grandeurs and miseries which are both like and unlike those of any other age; and the searching of aims and discovery of motives appropriate to our new forms of peril and opportunity, along with the discovery of ways to institutionalize our collective aspirations, seems to me the fundamental economic and meta-economic task.

(For assistance in the preparation of this paper, I am indebted to the center for the study of leisure, established at the University of Chicago under a grant from the Behavioral sciences division of the Ford Foundation. The paper was orginally written for the Committee for Economic Development.)

[1] Conversely, both in the American Army and Navy, there have been many leading men in the cold-war years who have had a keener sense of the madness of an arms race than many bellicose civilians: They have not had to show their manliness, or their patriotism or political purity, by gestures of jingoism.

[2] Attitudes toward Sewell Avery are a good test for business thinking. While some businessmen may still admire the saltiness and tenacity of Avery's character, very few admire his public relations or his hoarding attitude toward capital and fear of the future. And Montgomery Ward has now joined Sears, Roebuck in a managerial outlook favoring expansion as against stability.

[3] For elaboration of the notion of the "standard package," see my article, with Howard Roseborough, Careers and Consumer Behavior, in Consumer Behavior, volume 2, edited by Lincoln Clark (New York: New York University Press, 1955), pp. 1–18.

[4] Intimations as to the factors of buoyancy and anxiousness that enter into purchase plans in the expanding "discretionary" area turn up in the periodic surveys of consumer finances and purchases conducted by George Katona and his colleagues at the Survey Research Center for the Federal Reserve Board. (Less is known about the often comparable factors that enter into business investment decisions, though the McGraw-Hill surveys and the work of Franco Modigliani and others are illuminating.)

[5] See Bruce Bliven, Jr., The Golden Age of Buy Now, Pay Later, the Reporter, May 3, 1956, p. 21.

[6] Illinois Business Review, 14 (July 1957), 6–8.

[7] If not pyramids at home, Aswan Dams abroad? Congressional and general American experience with point 4 and its successor programs does not make me sanguine, especially as the newly industrialized and still xenophobic South turns increasingly away from its traditional internationalism. Great and courageous political leadership might conceivably change this, but few signs of it appear in either party.

[8] Frederic Pohl, The Case Against Tomorrow (New York: Ballantine Books, 1957).

[9] As any serious businessman knows, American efficiency is a legend which exists because other countries are either even more inefficient or have fewer cushions against waste; much of our productivity now gets eaten up by friction—some of which, as in much featherbedding, is based on fear of productivity itself.

[10] The interviews were originally done on behalf of Time; cf. my discussion in The Found Generation, The American Scholar, 25 (1956), 421–36.

[11] I would much rather have seen a race in which each country bombarded the other with consumer goods: with the Russians sending us tinned caviar and we sending them Chevrolets and Bendixes—though, of course, such competition would solve neither Soviet nor American problems of ultimate meaning. Cf. my article The Nylon War, Common Cause, 4: 379–85, 1951; also in: Individualism Reconsidered (Glencoe, Ill.: the Free Press, 1954), pp. 426–34.

The Future of American Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1958

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting herewith an analysis of the purpose and the implementation of the educational process in our modern era, as drawn up by the class of 1958, the 100th class to graduate from Northwestern University:

CLASS OF 1958,
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY,
Evanston, Ill., May 26, 1958.

Hon. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH,
House Office Building:

As members of the 100th graduating class of Northwestern University, we are concerned with the future of American education and what lies ahead for tomorrow's students.

With the rise of Sputnik I last fall, a panic-stricken howl went up from American Government officials, businessmen, amateur educators, and suddenly conscientious citizens against the American education system.

The threat of an atomic war and of Russia's rapid scientific advancement started an overnight movement to increase emphasis on science and technology in high schools and colleges.

But is education for social adjustment and vocational training only a passing fancy? Is technologically directed education the panacea for America's future?

Those who believe that America's security can only be assured by stepping up technological training in the schools may find that the person whose entire education was devoted toward learning to construct bigger and wider range rockets may be an excellent rocket builder. But he is incomplete as a man, incapable of putting rocket building into its proper place in his life.

The same criticism applies to education for becoming a journalist, radio announcer, businessman, or engineer. Before a man is any of these, he is a human being, and his first responsibility as a rational human being is to be conscious of himself, his society, and the universe around him.

A really basic education is one which brings man to this consciousness and trains him to live rationally. This is a liberal education.

What is the result of the liberal education which today's seniors have undergone?

It has made them think and open their eyes—at least sometimes. But in many ways it has developed an insecurity. As a student goes through college, he realizes how little he knows and how utterly incapable he is of putting his finger on the answers.

Knowledge can tear down the fortresses of security which have been erected in a person's youth—the youth in which he was taught pragmatically without the aim of teaching him to think for himself.

For some of this year's graduates the loss of the fortresses of youth has weakened their religious faith, made them cynical, and destroyed their faith in mankind.

These are some of the penalties for being able to think for oneself.

But on the other hand this type of education has produced freedom too—a freedom a person gains from knowing that he does not have to rely on others.

In this freedom some of this year's graduates have found a glory in accepting God on the basis of their own beliefs; a happiness instead of cynicism in knowing that they are free to enjoy life and improve it, and a trust in mankind based upon their freedom to search out the good in others.

Seniors imbued with this freedom know that within reasonable limits, at least, they can choose their life's work as they see fit; that others can do likewise. For the person who believes in personal liberty, a liberal education can be a good thing.

Perhaps the graduates who fall somewhere in between these two products of liberal education are the best equipped to meet the challenge of life.

The people who are critical, yet do not overlook accomplishment; the ones who search for answers, but are not frustrated when they find only partial ones; the people

who do not accept blindly, but still can accept—with sincerity—some things on faith.

To know that in the world of vast complexity one may not necessarily always be right or know the answer is education. That is knowledge.

But this goal is not always achieved and this year's seniors do not whitewash their 4 years of education with praise. While most of them have learned how to think for themselves—at least in some matters—many feel they have not been stimulated. They don't think they've been challenged to the fullest extent of their abilities.

Some blame the college administrator. They feel that he takes over the role of the parent and leads students through college. Things are controlled down to the point where there is no initiative. Fraternities and sororities may also tend to fulfill the father and mother roles.

Thinking is often done for the student in his social life. Women's hours are set, and men's hours are indirectly and partially controlled by those for women. Students are not trusted to make mature decisions about their social activities.

In class some professors baby students through courses by spoon feeding and pampering to the lowest common denominator in the group.

As a result, some students depend on authorities or their peers to make decisions for them.

The senior would have liked his 4 years of college to have been a gradual evolution from dependence to independence. Students, he feels, should have a better training at home and in high school so the dependence will not be so great at college.

What do this year's seniors think has to be done to enable education to produce youth capable of facing tomorrow's challenges?

Some propose segregated classes—segregated, that is, on the basis of capability and intelligence. Others say the answer is better teachers trained in schools with higher standards for work at higher pay. Still others say the level of required academic accomplishment should be raised, so exceptional students will be stimulated to a relatively higher attainment.

But today's seniors agree that whatever the answer, today's education system—as is the case with most other things—can stand improvement. The challenge of Russia, the challenge of progress, and the challenge of life demand it.

THE CLASS OF 1958, NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY, 100TH GRADUATING CLASS.

The Future of the Nation's Nursing Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following speech which I delivered at the American Nursing Home Association Convention in Atlantic City, N. J., on October 9, 1957:

SPEECH OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE SECOND DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND, AT THE AMERICAN NURSING HOME ASSOCIATION CONVENTION, ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., OCTOBER 9, 1957

It is a pleasure for me to participate in this meeting. I appreciate the opportunity of meeting with you as a group and of becoming acquainted with many of you personally. For I believe that you are performing a service that is vital to the health and well-being of millions of Americans.

In the field of health, I am, of course, a layman. My years in the Congress of the United States, however, have increased my awareness of progress and problems in health. As a member and in recent years as chairman of the House of Representatives Subcommittee on Appropriations which considers health and related matters, I have had many opportunities to become acquainted with health needs in the United States today.

I have also been watching the rapid growth of such organizations as yours—organizations dedicated to finding solutions to our pressing health problems.

A few years ago the American Nursing Home Association had only a handful of members, and only a few States were represented. Now you have thousands of members representing practically every State in the Nation. You have been drawn together by the need for high standards of care, by the benefits of mutual cooperation and interchange of knowledge, and by your earnest desire to brighten the later years of the millions who seek your services.

The work you are doing is of the utmost importance. As one of the senior medical officers of the Public Health Service has said: "Nursing homes are a greatly needed part of our current cultural pattern. The nursing home in which skilled nursing care is provided and where the patient is under a physician's direction is rapidly becoming a part of the constellation of medical care facilities. It is not a substitute for a hospital. It is not a substitute for the private home. It is, in fact, an entity in the medical care field for those now frequently found occupying beds in our hospitals who could be adequately cared for in facilities designed to meet their specific needs more realistically and less expensively."

Nursing homes of this kind are an invaluable addition to our total health resources in this country. They help to relieve the shortage of beds in general hospitals. For many people, they represent new hope, new opportunity to live in decent surroundings. In our complex society, we cannot do without this type of facility. And that is why it is your job, as well as ours, to see that these facilities have the highest possible standards of care and operation.

I believe you well know the needs and the factors which have given rise to them. The control of infection, higher standards of living, better medical and hospital care are all contributing to greater longevity and to the higher proportion of older people in our population.

With a population that now exceeds 170 million people, chronic illness and the problems of aging are of tremendous national significance. The age group 65 and over represents something over 10 percent of the population but accounts for about 40 percent of the chronically ill in this country. These older citizens occupy 22 percent of the long-term hospital beds and require between 80 and 90 percent of the nursing home beds and supplies.

These are not merely statistics, but millions of people—many of them suffering, bed ridden, and in need of care. I know you will agree that this represents an enormous responsibility, and one in which we all share.

The 25,000 nursing homes in this country have become increasingly important resources upon which the community must depend for the care of the chronically ill and the disabled aged. The fact that over 90 percent of these homes are privately owned indicates the nature of the responsibility that you shoulder as operators and directors. Studies made by the Public Health Service have revealed that 71 percent of the 450,000 beds in nursing homes are in privately owned homes, whereas only 15 percent are in publicly owned facilities.

The progress you have made in less than a decade of existence as an organized association is a tribute to your initiative and your dedication to the public good. It is a demonstration of the kind of voluntary action that has served to make our country great. Cooperation among private, voluntary, professional, and governmental agencies, and the public in general, has enabled us to meet our health and welfare problems in a manner that is perhaps not duplicated anywhere in the world.

What kind of patients do you serve in nursing homes? The Public Health Service study tells us that the average age of patients in nursing homes is 80. Less than half of these patients can walk unaided. More than half have periods in which they are disoriented. Two thirds have some type of circulatory disorder.

These facts clearly indicate the need for close medical supervision and skilled nursing care.

On the other hand, most nursing homes are small, and are limited in capacity and resources. For the country as a whole, they have an average capacity of 18 beds. The size of these institutions obviously limits the amount of medical and nursing services that can be provided. It would be unrealistic to expect every private nursing home to provide all the medical supervision, and nursing and restorative services that are usually available in general hospitals and large institutions.

The point to remember, I think, is that no one expects all these services to be given in every nursing home—provided they can be made available in some other practical way. There was a time when it seemed enough for a nursing home or a rehabilitation center to operate as a separate entity, without relation to any other health or medical service in the community, but now we know we can no longer afford this separation of functions. The ultimate test of any institution providing medical or related care today is that it makes available to a patient all of the services and comforts which he may need, oftentimes including some which the institution does not offer within its own four walls. This calls for very close coordination and good working relationships with other public and private community health facilities.

I understand that the average monthly charge for nursing home care in this country is about $150. In the Public Health Service study, it was learned that the average cost of nursing home care ranged from $90 to $200 per month.

It was found that approximately 50 percent of the patients in nursing homes are cared for through public funds and public assistance payments that ranged from $55 to $155 per month. It is obvious, therefore, that privately owned nursing homes have to keep their rates low. As a consequence they are seriously handicapped, in many instances, in the amount of medical and nursing service they can provide.

This is a serious problem, and I am happy to see that your association has invited to this convention some of the experts in the field of medicine and public health and welfare to discuss it with you. As a group, you need help in discharging your important responsibility. But the community also needs your help in providing the services and facilities within reach of most of the families.

There are avenues of approach to this problem that can be mutually beneficial to the nursing home operators, the chronically ill and disabled aged, and to the community in general. On financing, for example, welfare departments can help by recognizing the need for increasing the amount of welfare payments for those who are cared for at community expense.

Close working relationships with State and local welfare departments can, I am sure, accomplish a great deal in adjusting the cost of the services you provide to public assistance recipients. Through conventions such as this one, your association can help focus public attention on the problems of nursing home operators and directors and in so doing, develop support for meeting these problems.

I know that all of you are aware of the assistance you can obtain from the Small Business Administration and the Federal Housing Administration, and of the new amendments to the Hill-Burton legislation enacted by the Congress in 1954. The Congress is aware that these approaches do not solve the whole problem and is exploring for new, practical ways to aid privately operated nursing homes.

There is a vital need for private and public agencies to work together in the common task of improving the care for older people and the chronically ill. A great step forward would be the extension of health insurance plans to include nursing home fees, and broader coverage of heart, blood vessel, cancer, paralysis, and other ailments common to the elderly.

Individual institutions have a direct interest in the activities of other community agencies. For example, the policies and money paid by welfare agencies, as I indicated earlier, have a profound effect upon the care provided the indigent aged in institutions. Your association can play—and is playing—a vital role in elevating standards of efficiency and service in nursing homes, and in gaining public recognition for their contributions.

What we are all too likely to hear about, unfortunately, are the instances of inferior services and poor management. A newspaper headline shrieking about infirm and bedfast older people trapped in a disastrous nursing home fire. A magazine feature on crowded and dirty conditions in some nursing homes. An editorial on the expensive rates and hopelessly long waiting lists in some homes. These are the things that capture public attention, that create public impressions.

Your work, patient and painstaking, seldom makes the newspapers. It is nonetheless courageous and pioneering, although largely unsung. For you are creating, out of your own mind and spirit and determination, the kind of conditions that are fashioning for the nursing home an indispensable place in the constellation of national health resources.

I can assure you that you do not stand alone in this great task. I believe you will find many helpful allies in your States and Communities. The kind of leadership demonstrated here and the concerted support of all your affiliated State associations inspire this cooperation in all aspects of your work.

For example, I feel certain that State and local medical societies will, upon invitation, provide guidelines in the development and operation of medical care and rehabilitation programs for nursing home patients. Voluntary health and welfare agencies are also sources of valuable assistance.

State and local health departments are especially valuable resources that you can count upon for considerable help. On the staff of these agencies are people skilled in such fields as medical care, nursing administration, nutrition, social casework, records maintenance, health education, sanitation, safety, and engineering. Most State health departments have programs in chronic disease control and health of the aging that are closely related to your work.

I understand, for example, that many State health departments offer training for nursing home personnel, in patient care and education, and in nutrition. Some health departments provide professional consultation on all aspects of nursing home maintenance and operation. By working with your health department, you can help in the development of nursing home standards that are satisfactory to the operators and patients of nursing homes alike. Since the health departments in 43 States are responsible for setting standards for nursing home operation, the desirability of continuing cooperation with these agencies is obvious.

It seems to me that our nursing homes are going through the same process of maturing experienced by our hospitals. Not so many years ago, people still considered a hospital as a place to go to die. Today, our hospitals are becoming centers of preventive as well as curative medicine. They are becoming centers of life, not death.

In a very real sense, this is the future of the Nation's nursing homes, too. We know today that it is no longer necessary for older people to spend their later years merely vegetating. We know that modern medical care makes it possible for many who might otherwise be bedridden to be up and about most of the time.

Therefore, I believe, earnestly, that we can look forward to the day when a nursing home—like a hospital—will no longer be considered a place to go to die, but a haven of comfort and companionship which will add abundantly to the quality of living. The work of your associatoin is hastening the dawn of this new day. I believe you can make no more worthwhile contributions to our national health and progress.

Decline in Our Tuna Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions over the last several years, I have informed the House concerning the rapid decline of our formerly great tuna fisheries in the Pacific under the increasing weight of imports, chiefly from Japan.

Although the market for canned tuna in the United States has expanded steadily and rapidly in the postwar years, the domestic tuna fisheries which reached a peak of production in 1950, when they became the most valuable fishery of the United States, have declined steadily for the last 7 years and show every indication of continuing so to decline, unless the Congress takes remedial action.

The reason for this is quite simple. There is a tariff on canned tuna and there is no tariff on frozen tuna. This situation cannot be corrected by administrative action under our existing trade-agreement legislation. Such safeguards as are available to domestic industries under this legislation and under the policies adopted pursuant thereto are not available to our tuna industry.

The largest of the tuna commodities in international trade—frozen yellowfin, skipjack, and bigeye tuna—do not fall within the purview of the escape-clause provisions of the act. They bear no tariff and they are not the subject of a trade agreement. Accordingly, neither the escape-clause provisions in the present act nor those provided in the Extension Act now being contemplated in the Congress will have any effect with respect to them.

Frozen albacore tuna, on the other hand, is bound on the free list in the Japanese trade agreement. Consequently, even though it bears no duty, this commodity is subject to escape-clause proceedings. When our San Diego albacore fishermen's cooperative petitioned the Tariff Commission last August to have an escape-clause proceeding with respect to frozen albacore, the Tariff Commission turned them down on the basis that the Commission could do the industry no good under the law. If the Commission did find that frozen albacore imports had increased because of actions taken under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and did impose the full remedy available, that is a quota, this would not do the industry any good at all, because the albacore would simply come in as loins or disks for canning, as a separate commodity, or as tuna canned in brine—another separate commodity class.

The Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission testified to the accuracy of these statements before the House Committee on Ways and Means on February 20 of this year—page 217, hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means between February 17 and March 7, 1958, on renewal of Trade Agreements Act—and stated further that it would require specific legislation on tuna by the Congress to remedy this situation.

Because of these two factors, primarily, we have been unable to get any relief for this important industry under law and its decline has continued.

The extent of this decline has been documented by the United States Tariff Commission in its May 1, 1958, Report on Tuna Fish Investigations conducted pursuant to a resolution by the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate, dated August 20, 1957.

An even more detailed and graphic description of the decline of this industry, and the causes of this decline, has been issued by the Department of the Interior on May 22, 1958, in its Report of the Secretary of the Interior to the President and the Congress on Fresh or Frozen Yellowfin, Skipjack, and Bigeye Tuna. The summary and findings of this report are so succinct and direct that I wish to bring them to the attention of the House, as follows:

Since the early 1930's and especially after World War II, the United States supply of tuna available from the domestic catch and from imports has increased almost continuously to nearly 565 million pounds (whole-fish weight) in 1957. (Data for Puerto Rico and American Samoa have not been included since they were not available for official publication.) Almost the entire supply of tuna is consumed in the United States as canned products. The United States supply, however, originates from four different sources: (1) Domestic landings, principally yellowfin and skipjack tuna caught by the southern California bait boat and purse-seine fleets and albacore by the trolling fleet; (2) imports of fresh and frozen tuna, principally yellowfin and albacore tuna and lesser amounts of skipjack and bigeye tuna; (3) imports of canned tuna, principally packed

in brine; and (4) imports of frozen, cooked loins and disks, principally albacore.

The tuna industry is composed of many segments—large canners, small canners, importers, fishermen, and operators of large bait boats and purse seiners and of such smaller craft as albacore trollers. Each group is confronted with different problems, mainly associated with the species involved or with the stage at which it handles the tuna.

This report has been requested by the California vessel operators and fishermen who are the primary producers in supplying canneries with domestically caught yellowfin and skipjack tuna. (Some bigeye and bluefin tuna are also caught; the bigeye is included with yellowfin tuna in United States catch statistics.) Yellowfin and skipjack tuna usually comprise between 75 and 85 percent of the domestic landings of all tuna species. Downward trends have occurred in the production, employment, prices, and sales in the yellowfin and skipjack fishery, which is conducted almost entirely by bait boats and purse seiners. This report deals primarily with the trends in this fishery; other segments of the tuna industry are referred to where comparison is necessary.

Among the factors cited to account for the downward trend in production and the loss of markets in the yellowfin and skipjack fishery are (1) declining ex-vessel prices; (2) increasing competition from imports of frozen tuna, canned tuna in brine, and frozen cooked tuna loins and discs; (3) differing tariff rates on the various tuna import categories; (4) growing use by canneries of imported frozen yellowfin and skipjack; (5) higher costs of United States vessel operations; (6) higher costs of construction of United States tuna vessels; and (7) increasing insurance cost for United States tuna vessels.

The investigation conducted by the Department of the Interior presents the facts dealing with the yellowfin and skipjack fishery; the most salient of these facts are:

1. United States landings of yellowfin and skipjack tuna were at a peak of 324,711,000 pounds in 1950. Thereafter, despite the increase in the consumption of tuna, the trend has been downward; in 1957, landings were 237,113,000 pounds, which represented a 27 percent decline from the 1950 production.

2. Scientific research reveals that the yellowfin resource in the eastern Pacific was not overfished at the highest level of fishing effort during 1950 and that greater yields of skipjack can be realized without endangering the productivity of the resource.

3. The number and total carrying capacity of United States bait boats over 50 gross tons have shown a decline since 1951. The number of boats decreased 30 percent from 210 in 1951 to 146 in November 1957, and the carrying capacity 24 percent from 44,300 short tons to 33,875 tons.

4. The average ex-vessel price for yellowfin tuna declined 25 percent from an annual average of $345 per short ton in 1954 to $258 in 1957; for skipjack the price declined 28 percent from $304 per ton to $220.

5. Because of the reduced landings, the decrease in the number of vessels, and the lowered ex-vessel prices, earnings of the fishermen and opportunities for their employment in the California yellowfin and skipjack fishery have decreased. The number of berths on bait boats decreased by 27 percent from 2,730 in 1951 to 1,989 in 1956; on purse seiners engaged in the tuna fishery the decline has been 50 percent, 1,661 in 1949 compared to 827 in 1956.

6. Although the total supply of all species of tuna in the United States has increased, United States fishermen are providing a smaller actual and proportionate share of the supply. On a whole-weight basis, imports of all types of tuna products (fresh, frozen, canned, and cooked) contributed 6 percent to the supply of tuna in the United States in 1948; imports supplied 39 percent in 1956 and 46 percent in 1957.

7. Imports of tuna became a significant factor in 1950 when 117,100,000 pounds (whole-fish weight) of canned and frozen tuna were shipped to the United States by foreign producers. By 1957, an estimated 259,600,000 pounds were imported. During the early years of this period, canned tuna predominated in the imports. Imports of frozen raw albacore, however, soon increased rapidly to 63,200,000 pounds in 1953; thereafter, except for 1956, they were at or above this level. In 1954, imports of other raw tuna (almost entirely frozen yellowfin and skipjack) began to surpass those of frozen albacore. During 1955–57, imports of other raw tuna were between 80 million and 87 million pounds annually. Besides the canned and raw tuna, frozen cooked loins and discs have become important in the tuna import situation. These products first entered the United States in 1951; by 1957 imports of loins and discs were about 21,700,000 pounds on a whole-fish basis.

8. About 85 percent of imports of frozen raw tuna have been received from Japan, where recent expansion in the tuna fisheries has been mainly directed toward producing larger quantities of such exportable species as yellowfin tuna. Most of the remaining 15 percent has been from Peru; imports from Peru, however, have been largely transshipments of catches made by United States-flag vessels.

9. Increases in the United States consumption of tuna have not kept pace with the increases in the total supply of raw tuna. Surplus situations have resulted in lower prices for raw tuna with consequent lowering of returns to domestic fishermen.

Adverse trends, such as declining landings and lower prices for domestic tuna, have been intensified by the general inflation in the domestic economy; this inflation has increased the costs of operation for United States tuna producers. In an effort to reduce costs and operate competitively, domestic tuna fishermen have, aside from accepting lower prices, attempted to introduce shipping and marketing economies through transshipment of catches and through auction sales. Although helpful, these have not been sufficient to overcome the downward trend in production and exvessel prices.

In the foreign tuna fisheries with which our fishermen must compete, lower vessel construction costs, long-term loans at low rates of interest, and subsidies by the local government have facilitated the construction, rebuilding, and insuring of vessels. The Japanese high-seas tuna fleet has nearly doubled its carrying capacity since 1951. On the other hand, vessel construction in the California yellowfin and skipjack fishery has stagnated, and only 9 new large vessels (in a bait-boat fleet of 146 vessels) have been built since 1951. Most of the present bait-boat fleet is becoming obsolescent; the vessels now average about 13 years in age. Vessel owners have little or no incentive either to replace old or lost vessels with new ones, or to make additions to the fleet. Moreover, investment money to build new vessels is lacking because of the recent poor financial experience of vessel operators.

The present import duty on canned tuna in oil is 35 percent ad valorem. On canned tuna in brine the duty is 12½ percent on quantities up to 20 percent of the previous year's pack; on quantities above this amount the rate is 25 percent. On frozen, cooked tuna loins and discs the duty is 1 cent per pound, if in bulk or immediate containers weighing with their contents over 15 pounds, and 12½ percent ad valorem, if in containers under 15 pounds each. Fresh or frozen raw tuna is free of duty. The two products, canned tuna in brina and canned tuna in oil are essentially identical except that oil is added to one and salt brine to the other. Canned tuna in brine can be packed for about 75 cents per case less. Frozen cooked tuna, which can readily be packed as canned tuna by the addition of oil and the sealing and processing of the can, can be imported at a rate equivalent to about 3.3 percent ad valorem, compared with the 35 percent rate for canned tuna in oil.

The tariff rates on the different tuna products have had an effect on the pattern of imports since 1950. Imports of canned tuna in oil were heaviest during 1950 when the Japanese made special effort to ship canned tuna in oil to the United States prior to an announced increase in duty. In January 1951, the duty was scheduled to revert to 45 percent from 22½ percent as a result of the abrogation of the trade agreement with Mexico which had reduced the rate in 1943.

Upon the imposition of the 45 percent duty, imports of canned tuna in oil declined. The Japanese shifted their exports to a new product—canned tuna in brine—after it was found that the brine pack was dutiable at 12½ percent as the result of a United States tariff concession given to Iceland in 1943. In 1952, it was also found that cooked tuna products would be dutiable at 1 cent per pound. Since 1958, imports of cooked tuna products have increased sharply.

The types and quantities of tuna exported by the Japanese have been influenced by the differences in tariff rates Since April 1952, the Japanese Government has maintained controls on the quantity and price of most tuna destined for the United States. In recent years the Japanese have practically prohibited shipments of canned tuna in oil. Their increasing supply of tuna has been exported mainly frozen or as canned tuna in brine or as cooked loins and discs at considerable tariff advantages.

Mr. Speaker, four Congressmen from the west coast—Mr. WILSON, Mr. KING, Mr. TOLLEFSON, and I—have introduced identical bills to correct these inequities in law that are destroying this valuable industry. These bills are now pending before the Committee on Ways and Means and we are hopeful of getting them reported out of committee favorably and soon. We hope that this legislation will receive the approval of the House so that it can be enacted into law before this session of the Congress is concluded.

Defense Interest in Transportation Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Mr. P. M. Shoemaker, president, the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co., before the annual meeting of the Baltimore chapter of the National Defense Transportation Association, Sheraton Belvedere Hotel, Baltimore, May 16, 1958:

In no way could I be more remiss than by failing to pay tribute to the broadened scope of activity and responsibility which the National Defense Transportation Asso-

ciation has been assuming at national, State, and local levels. Great problems of transportation policy exist. As the broad objectives of NDTA are observed, we have a growing and informed group of able men dedicated to an understanding of transportation in all of its aspects, and to the assurance that commercial transportation is adequate for national defense.

National transportation policy, as defined by the Congress, clearly emphasizes the importance of preserving and encouraging all forms of transportation for the social and industrial welfare of the country and for the national defense. This is a sound philosophy, for if our transportation machine is adequate for our society and industry; if it is healthy; if it is growing in competence and capacity with the growth of the country, then there is achieved simultaneously a general adequacy for defense.

That this is so was proven in World War I, World War II, and, to a lesser extent, in the Korean war. I say to a lesser extent only because we found some of the dangers of trying to have two commercial-type transportation systems in operation and competing with each other, one military and one civilian. Particularly in the field of air transportation this is a competition which has continued to grow. I decry it as being contrary to the public interest from the standpoint of hundreds of millions of dollars of expense; from the standpoint of duplication; from the standpoint of our necessary dependence, in wartime, upon commercial transportation personnel as well as facilities and equipment.

We all know that adequacy of transportation is fundamental to the successful waging of war. It is thus basic to national defense. I would not be misunderstood in feeling that a reasonable nucleus of commercial-type transportation is not a desirable arm of the Armed Forces. I do say that the building up of the Military Air Transport Service into the largest airline in the world, and competing to the extent it does with American flag, publicly supported airlines, represents a questionable balance in military judgment which goes beyond the walls of the Pentagon.

I do not desire to be considered as merely throwing a brickbat at MATS, as such. The point is that the policies involving MATS' operations carry through into the broad principles of such general support transportation as the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps manufacture for themselves in all kinds of transportation, including trucks, buses, planes, ships, pipelines, and railroad cars. Military support of, or excessive competition with, private commercial-type transportation has tremendous impact upon our transportation economy and capacity.

In fiscal 1958, the estimated expenditure by the Department of Defense for the transportation of persons and goods was estimated, in the budget, to be $2,263,000,000, or almost 6 percent of our total expected military outlay. Involved, as you all know so well, in the spending of such money is the handling of persons and goods in accordance with varying degrees of priority and movement on a worldwide basis. The transportation of goods includes most types of material in commercial movement, but additionally includes those of a strictly military characteristic together making up the more than 3,300,000 items of supply in the military pipeline. It includes movement between normal commercial centers. It includes movement between points remote from the domestic channels of national and international commerce.

I would reemphasize to you that there is available to the commerce and industry of this country, and to our military establishment, commercial transportation of high quality. If we exercise wisdom in public policy to protect the economic health or the private transportation enterprises involved, be they water, air, highway, or railroad, there is automatically available to the military the kind of transportation upon which it is dependent in peacetime and in war.

It becomes self-evident, then, at the Washington scene, that Department of Defense policy with respect to transportation, and the adequacy of Department of Defense traffic management in its broader concept, are both of great importance in their effect upon domestic and international commercial transportation of all kinds. It is presently far from clear what transportation policy actually motivates basic decisions within the Department of Defense, and this organization, the National Defense Transportation Association, can achieve a great public service by making such a clarification one of its objectives.

Great public controversy exists today over the changes in law recommended by the President with respect to the organization of the Department of Defense. I strongly support the basic thinking behind his recommendations because, in this day and age, there must be no question of unified military command. I am very disturbed at some of the statements which have been made in the testimony before the Vinson committee and the tenor of some of the questions which have been asked, which indicate an absence of congressional realization of how seriously the phraseology, "separately administered," with respect to the services, and as established in the 1949 amendments to the National Security Act, have impaired the ability of the Secretary of Defense to really achieve policy control and really place into effect related coordinations, if not unifications, of great importance to the smooth and economical operation of our military machine.

And I am thinking, among other things, of transportation and transportation control. The single managership in the Army over traffic management is confined to the continental United States and it can exercise no control over the utilization of commercial-type military transportation lodged with and protected by the Air Force, nor commercial-type sea transportation lodged with and protected by the Navy under MSTS.

Our defense posture with respect to transportation raises the basic question as to whether it has been segregated too much from the broad interest in transportation going across all departmental lines of our Federal Government. Adequacy, in fact the correctness of the Federal Government's policy, or lack of policy; interference, or lack of interference; support, or lack of support, in various aspects of transportation has become one of the challenging questions of today. I believe that our finding the right answer to this question would have a great impact upon our defense planning and defense capability.

And so, going to the broader picture of evaluating the proper and necessary place of Government, I see no alternative to the creation of a Secretary for Transportation, as a Cabinet officer of the President. I believe that the creation of a Transportation Department, with responsibility for the promotional aspects of all forms of transportation in the public interest and in the defense interest, is a necessary evolution of Government for the national welfare.

I believe the regulatory agencies should retain their independence and not be under the control jurisdiction of such a department. I believe that, to the extent the Federal Government, except the military, is involved in operational aspects of transportation such as the Panama Canal, the Alaska Railroad, the Panama Steamship Line, and river and harbor work, including that now under the Corps of Engineers, should be a part of the jurisdiction and responsibility of such a department.

I believe that the buying of commercial transportation by the Federal Government should not be in the Transportation Department but should be lodged with the military on the one side and with GSA for all civilian agencies on the other.

I would not have you think that this is a new thought. I deliberately used the word "evolution". Clearly the time has come when the transportation industry on the one hand and the people of business on the other deserve to have our common interests in the hands of a stronger and more centralized type of operation than presently exists. Transportation interests are now scattered through more than forty governmental departments. Any objective analysis must lead to the conclusion that the presently uncoordinated overlapping, and even confused approach, of the Federal Government is a combination of historical accident, fixed bureaucratic interest and the failure of our people as a whole to recognize the importance and significance of transportation as an entity in our national existence, and as a visual function of national growth.

I said this was not a new subject. It has disturbed students of government and students of transportation for a long period of time. Going back at least to 1932 there is a record of public concern over the relationship of the Federal Government to transportation as a whole.

In 1933, the Calvin Cooldige-Bernard Baruch report recommended that the Interstate Commerce Commission be "reorganized with appropriate separate departments, with a chief at the head of each, for its legislative, executive and judicial functions." Alfred E. Smith made a supplemental statement favoring the abolition of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the creation of a bureau or department of transportation.

It was in 1934 that Joseph B. Eastman, who, historically, is recorded as one of the greatest Commissioners ever to serve on the Interstate Commerce Commission, recommended that a single member of the Interstate Commerce Commission be designated by the President as Coordinator of Transportation, and that his orders and regulations be subject to ICC review.

In 1937 the Brookings Institution prepared for Senator HARRY F. BYRD'S committee a report of governmental reorganization in which was recommended the establishment of a Division or Department of Transportation with Cabinet representation.

In 1938, a presidential committee, known as the Committee of Three, recommended, as an independent agency, a Federal transportation authority. Later in the same year another presidential committee, known as the Committee of Six, recommended another independent agency, namely a transportation board.

In 1942, the National Resources Planning Board, at the request of the President, published a report on Transportation and National Policy. The report was prepared under the direction of Owen D. Young, as Chairman of an Advisory Committee for the Transportation Study, which was composed of heads of the various Federal transportation agencies. This report recommended a revived Office of Federal Coordinator or a Transport Authority, but clearly pointed out preference for a Department of Transportation with Cabinet rank. It further emphasized that the quasi-judicial functions of regulating rates and discriminations should be left in independent hands.

In 1944, the Board of Investigation and Research, a three-member Board appointed in compliance with the Transportation Act of 1940, recommended three new permanent Federal agencies:

1. A Federal Transportation Authority.
2. A National Transportation Advisory Council.
3. An Office of Public Transportation Council in the Department of Justice.

In 1947, a presidential Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine concluded that the Maritime Commission, established under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, should be reorganized, and recommended that a Maritime Administrator be placed in charge of the executive and operative functions, and that a Maritime Board be appointed for the regulatory functions.

Again in 1947, the President's Air Policy Commission recommended that the Secretary of Commerce retain direction of the Government's executive functions relating to civil aviation but that the Department of Commerce perform only the housekeeping functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Air Safety Board. This Commission, in addtion, foresaw the need for a Department of Transportation to coordinate the development of all forms of transportation.

The immediate recommendations of both the Merchant Marine and Air Policy Commission reports were placed into effect.

In 1949 the First Hoover Commission was critical of the existing Federal transportation organization, and among other things made these specific points:

1. Transportation activities are scattered over many separate agencies, with consequent waste and overlapping.
2. There is a lack of coordination of policies in the transportation field.
3. The scattering of functions makes intelligent budgeting difficult, and policies or programs cannot be considered for transportation as a whole.
4. Research activities are carried on in narrow segments of certain areas of transportation, and these segments are not coordinated. In some areas, they overlap; in others, they are deficient.
5. The amount of subsidies to carriers included in mail contracts is not clear under the present system of appropriations and accounting.
6. Merchant marine activities are directed by a full-time board, whereas good administration requires a single executive.
7. Safety requirements are too often administered by regulatory groups, rather than by executive agencies.
8. Transportation planning for national defense is inadequately centralized.

The first Hoover Commission went on to point out that a major weakness in Federal transportation policy was its failure to recognize that the primary objective must be to assure the Nation the best possible transportation system for the movement of persons and goods, and that there has been a failure to think and act in terms of total transportation requirements. The Hoover Commission recommended the establishment of enlarged transport service within the Department of Commerce.

Also in 1949, the Brookings Institution published its study of national transportation policy. It disagreed with the Hoover Commission's recommendation and favored a Department of Transportation, headed by a Cabinet member.

In 1955, the transportation report of the second Hoover Commission did not go into the question of a Department of Transportation, but did recommend that traffic management within the Government be confined to General Services Administration for the nonmilitary agencies and be centralized in the Department of Defense for the military agencies.

We are now approaching the middle of 1958. There continues to be a situation under which the Federal Government's direct and indirect interest in transportation is scattered among more than 40 departments, agencies, commissions, bureaus and committees of the Federal establishment. There continues to be a segmentized, piecemeal, discriminatory, overlapping approach. An incomplete analysis of the 1958 budget discloses more than $3 billion of Government expense in the transportation field, outside of some $2.5 billion in the military budgets for either the purchase of, or the manufacture of, transportation.

Clearly, we are talking about a major function of our economy. Clearly, we are talking about an activity vitally important to the future of the American people. This uncoordinated and diffused handling must, in the interest of commonsense and economy if for no other reason, be stopped.

It is my belief that we are talking about an activity which is within the scope of the executive branch of the Government; that it should be an executive function. Therefore, I cannot accept the desirability, as recommended in some previous studies, of transportation being centralized in an independent office or a congressional agency or under a transportation czar or continued as a side function in the Department of Commerce. As a department of the executive branch, the Transportation Department would be subject to all of the checks and balances of the Congress and others. It would offer a vehicle for real coordination with the Department of Defense in the field of transportation as a whole.

I would make no attempt to estimate the economy from the establishment of a Department of Transportation, but I am sure it would be substantial.

I can think of no greater immediate public service for the National Defense Transportation Association than for it to consider this recommendation for a Department of Transportation with great seriousness. It is not an easy subject to understand. Those of us who spend our lives in daily work in the transportation field have repeatedly made this mistake of assuming that our friends in business, in the professions, on the farms, and in government understand what transportation has meant to our past history, what it means to the economic realities of today, and what it means to our future.

I am strongly convinced that the security of our country would not be enhanced by transportation being socialized by Government operation and ownership of the railroads, the truck lines, water and air transportation. One of our greatest strengths is to keep each form of transportation healthy; to keep it operating competitively; to keep it free from monopoly and to have its own future dictated by its service contribution to the public, as developed under a policy of equal and impartial treatment in governmental relationships.

I emphasize the importance of this to our national security, and it is particularly from this standpoint that NDTA has an opportunity, and a challenge, to apply to this subject that judgment and action which is consistent with its growing stature of recent years.

I commend it to you.

The Current Economic Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, one of the fine and alert organizations in the First Congressional District of Ohio is the Cincinnati Life Underwriters Association. Its board of directors has given serious consideration to some of the current economic problems with which we are wrestling here in the Congress and not always too successfully.

On May 5, at one of its meetings, the following resolution was adopted and forwarded to me:

Be it hereby resolved:

1. That inflation is the greatest internal danger this Nation faces, as evidenced by the rise in the cost of living during a period of recession;
2. That deficit financing contributes in large measure to inflation and the Government estimates the deficit for fiscal 1958 will be $3 billion, fiscal 1959 will be $5 billion or more;
3. That the Congress and executive branch must be held responsible for the manner in which they are increasing expenditures, particularly in years to come. The Congress must shoulder the major share of the blame.
4. That the only sound way to fight the recession is to reduce Government expenditures enough to allow for reduction of the national debt each year and a permanent income-tax cut. Such action would inspire confidence in the people.
5. That the tax cut should recognize the principle that each man is equal under the law and should provide for a gradual reduction of the discriminatory top-bracket rates. We believe this would have an immediate stimulating effect on the economy.

Austria Slashes Taxes and Its Income Zooms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting herewith, that all may read, a significant article from the Chicago Daily News of May 7, 1958. As the heading of the article so aptly suggests, the facts contained therein may indeed hold some lesson for us.

AUSTRIA SLASHES TAXES AND ITS INCOME ZOOMS—THREE CUTS IN 4 YEARS HELP BUSINESS PROSPER

(By Sylvia Porter)

Austria has just put into effect her third tax reduction in 4 years.

After each of the previous two tax cuts the Austrian government's income from taxes zoomed—and this is the way the trend is going again.

So stimulating to business have been the soundly conceived and timed tax reductions that her treasury has been able to collect more money via low tax rates than via the high ones.

Of all the nations in the Western world, Austria—which regained full political independence only about 3 years ago—is now the most prosperous.

But the tale is particularly pertinent to us right now—as the debate in our land over the wisdom of a tax cut to stimulate our own economy intensifies by the day.

Those arguing against tax reductions now are doing so because they honestly believe that any significant tax slash would take so much revenue away from the Government

that our already ballooning budget deficit would be swelled to astronomical proportions.

FEAR A BALLOONING BUDGET

But must it turn out this way? Our own experience after recent tax cuts says it wouldn't.

And Australia's record is dazzling refutation of the theory—which is the reason I've been digging for details.

In 1954 when Austria put through the first of her series of across-the-board tax cuts—giving both individuals and corporations relief—her total tax take was $729 million.

In 1955 the tax take was up to $791 million.

That year she put through the second broad tax reduction.

In 1957 the tax take was up to $996 million.

FAVORS LOWER INCOME GROUP

Now, in 1958, the third reduction is in effect. While this year's reduction favors middle and lower income taxpayers and particularly aids working couples, it also includes major relief for corporations and exempts income from stock dividends up to $144.

The forecast is for continuing business boom. Last year production in Austria rose to an impressive 6 percent while prices and wages held stable.

The estimate by the Institute of Economic Research is that production will climb another 6 percent in the first half of 1958.

Admittedly, our Marshall plan aid was of crucial importance.

Admittedly, Austria's economy cannot be compared with our vast, complex economic machine.

Nevertheless, we can learn plenty from Austria's experience—and the least our policymakers should be doing is to be studying it intently.

Special Congressional Committee on Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee held hearings this morning on the bill reported out of the newly created Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration, of which Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK is chairman. This bill was reported out favorably by a unanimous vote of the Committee on Rules.

The following editorial by Mr. H. B. Snyder, editor-publisher of the Gary Post-Tribune, Gary, Ind., sets out some pertinent facts with reference to this legislation:

CIVILIAN SPACE AGENCY

Congress appears headed toward creating a space agency in the form requested by President Eisenhower—one in which the civilian scientists will have the predominant role.

The bill sent to the floor of the House by the special committee headed by Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, with Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Republican, of Massachusetts, as its vice chairman, is an excellent example of bipartisan action on a matter in which politics should play no part.

The bill provides for a new National Aeronautics and Outer Space Agency which will utilize the existing National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics as its nucleus. Its Administrator would be a civilian.

The agency would be given control over all research and development projects in space exploration except those primarily connected with national defense or control of atomic energy. It would have its own facilities, build its own vehicles for travel in outer space. It will get an excellent start in life because of the work already done by the NACA and by the laboratories and other facilities it has built up.

The key of the measure is its provision for civilian control. Some of the military leaders have objected, but the defense phase appears adequately cared for in the bill. Any disputes over control of a particular activity can be referred to the White House for a final determination, and Congress will monitor the agency through a special joint committee such as the one that works with the Atomic Energy Commission.

But the emphasis should be, as the President proposed and as the House committee has approved, on letting civilian scientists handle the research and development work. In the first place, we should still hope that an agreement can be reached for international rule in outer space, and should do nothing now to discourage that possibility.

Furthermore, military control would mean research primarily for military purposes. The scientists should not work under fetters. Best results are not obtained that way, either for military ends or for the broader purposes of expanding man's knowledge of the universe in which he lives. In fact, we might do harm to our military position by unduly restricting research to purely military projects.

The bill is only started on its course through Congress, it is true. But the endorsement it has received from the select committee headed by MCCORMACK and MARTIN should go far toward winning it favorable approval in both House and Senate. Its enactment would put America truly on its way to the stars.

Socialized Medicine?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to set forth for the benefit of the Members a resolution adopted by the board of trustees of the Jamaica Hospital, New York City, expressing their views with regard to certain provisions in H. R. 9467:

At a meeting of the board of trustees held November 25, 1957, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved*, that the board of trustees of the Jamaica Hospital, of Jamaica, New York City, a voluntary hospital now supported by voluntary gifts and the proceeds of voluntary medical insurance, are unalterably opposed to the so-called old-age and survivors program of the Social Security Act, H. R. 9467, upon the ground that such an act is an intended initial step toward complete socialization in the United States of America of medicine in all forms—a system which has proved in England to be bad and which here, if enacted, would serve mainly to further intrench a new class of bureaucrats and deprive the individual American citizen, through taxes of more of his earnings and subject him to myriad rules and regulations with resultant harassment and deprivation of private rights; further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the American Medical Association with full authority to use the same in any manner it deems beneficial; and further

Resolved, That a copy hereof be forwarded to the United States Senators and Congressmen from the State of New York."

This resolution was adopted in connection with our approval of a letter from Dr. David B. Allman, president of the American Medical Association, under date of November 20, 1957.

Very truly yours,

THE JAMAICA HOSPITAL,
F. C. LEUPOLD, *Administrator*.

Heavy Electrical Equipment: A Key Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. W. G. Scholl, executive vice president, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., made an interesting and important address dealing in part with certain problems created by our Government's purchase of heavy electrical equipment from foreign manufacturers. The most significant portions of that address were as follows:

The electrical equipment industry has made a tremendous contribution by its development of better and more efficient generating, transmission, and distributing apparatus, as well as the many products it products for homes and industry, to say nothing of its contributions to national defense.

In 1956 this great industry employed more than 870,000 people. Wages and salaries for these people totaled just under $10 billion. Total assets of this industry, at the end of 1956, were well over $12 billion. It paid over $800 million in Federal income taxes, not to mention the hundreds of thousands of dollars paid for other forms of taxes, such as State income taxes, property taxes, etc. To me it seems easy to see the tremendous impact the electrical equipment industry has had on the total economy of our country. The abundant use of power has resulted in the highest standard of living for our people that has ever been known in the history of any country.

But it is confronted with a problem today that could have an important effect upon its future growth and stability. One which it alone can do very little about. It is so important that I think I should take just a few moments to talk about it with you.

It is this matter of the purchases of large quantities of heavy electrical apparatus abroad by our own Government. Please don't misunderstand me—I am not nationalistic in my views on foreign trade, and neither am I against foreign aid. Those two points don't enter into the matter as I see it.

CUSTOM BUILT FOR SPECIFIC NEED

Let me picture the situation for you. Heavy electrical apparatus in the generating and transmission fields is designed in every case for a specific job. It has a tremendous amount of engineering time in it and a very large number of man-hours. Be-

cause of this fact, this type of equipment cannot be mass-produced and probably never will be. Further, there is a definite limitation on the use of anything but very large general-purpose tools, making it difficult and sometimes impossible to tool man-hours out. In other words, this particular type of equipment is custom-designed and custom-built to fit specific requirements.

That causes us a problem in worldwide competition. It takes just as many man-hours to engineer and produce a hydraulic turbine, a generator, or a large transformer in Milwaukee, Wisc., as it does in England. At the same time, the labor rates for both engineers and production people are 3 to 4 times as high in Milwaukee as they are in England. Including the fringes, we pay about $3 an hour for skilled production labor in Milwaukee as against approximately 75 cents an hour for the same type of labor employed in the Midlands of England.

You can quickly compute what that does to the costs of an item in which the man-hours are equal. If material costs about the same in both places, which it does, and if machine tool time cost isn't much different, and it isn't—the man-hour costs would wreck you. That is exactly what is happening to the heavy electrical industry in its effort to compete with foreign maufacturers in markets outside North America. We just can't compete, because our costs are so high that we price ourselves right out of the market. As a result, practically no heavy electrical generating apparatus or transmission equipment is being exported by American manufacturers.

But that isn't what I am disturbed about. I don't know what we are going to do about it and I am not talking about subsidizing American manufacturers so that we can compete with countries with lower labor rates. I like this country and I wouldn't change it, so I wouldn't want to reduce our labor rates. In fact, our whole country is so geared to this high-level economy that we can't think of changing our labor rates or think about dropping our standard of living. This we must live with.

OUR STANDARD OF LIVING—PRODUCT OF ELECTRIC POWER

Now, incidentally, this standard of living which we have here in our country, in my mind, is a direct product of the use of great quantities of power. By using electrical power and lots of tooling, we have contributed toward this high-level economy which we enjoy in this country.

But there is one phase of this matter about which I am incensed, and that is the recent habit of various governmental divisions going into the world market and purchasing heavy electrical apparatus, inviting foreign bidders to come in and quote a low price and walk off with the business. Most of the money which comes from these Government institutions is wrung out of American taxpayers, both corporate and individual, in the form of taxes. The reason our Government can set tax rates so high is due to the high-level economy which we have developed in this country. And a lot of that goes back to our generous use of power and the employment of large quantities of capital and labor at high wage rates. We cannot separate the Government's ability to tax at these rates from the type of economy which we support.

At the same time, sections of our Government take these tax dollars wrung from individual and corporate taxpayers in a high-level $3-an-hour economy and spend them in another economy where wages paid for the same kind of work are 75 cents an hour. Under these conditions we do not believe that these governmental institutions are doing us any particular favor in even asking us to bid. We know before we start that we won't get the business.

GOVERNMENT SHOULD BUY FROM ITS OWN TAXPAYERS

Now my point is that it is absolutely immoral for any section of our Government to wring money out of its citizens and spend it in an area abroad whose ability to compete is based purely on low wage rates and what to us is a substandard standard of living.

Again, I repeat, I am not a protectionist, but I am firm on two points, one of them being that our own Government should not engage in this kind of double standard of operation, and further that it is particularly reprehensible in the electrical area, since such a great portion of our high standard of living can be directly credited to our great use of electrical power.

ONE EXAMPLE: 600,000 AMERICAN MAN-HOURS LOST

I could give you a few statistics on man-hours involved, just as illustrations. For instance, one hydraulic turbine order in 1956 represented the transfer of 600,000 man-hours of work from the $3-an-hour economy in which the taxes were raised to the 75-cent-an-hour economy in which the money was spent. That was a direct loss in the turbine shops—but in addition, it is estimated that about 250,000 other American man-hours were transferred from the steel mills, forge shops, etc., to those in the other country.

Another example—one generator of the type installed at McNary Dam needs 500,000 man-hours of labor directly and indirectly in whichever country gets the job.

Now there are of course other arguments against this practice, one of them is the matter of national defense. In view of the steady requirement for electric power, and particularly in times of international stress, I think you would agree that it is an understatement when I say that it would be unhandy to have one of these large machines fail and have to depend on an outside manufacturer to fix it. Incidentally, I understand Great Britain handles that by just insisting that all of the purchases of power and transmission equipment for their central electric authority be made from domestic suppliers, and says very simply that "it would be unwise for the electricity supply industry (of England and Wales) to be dependent upon foreign manufacturers for spares and maintenance."

This misguided effort of governmental agencies to take tax money out of the highest market and spend it in the lowest market has been going on for some time. For a little while, certain applications of the Buy America Act handicapped it, and that was good as far as it went. But this doesn't seem to have been operating lately, and again, I don't think I know what can be done about it. I certainly wouldn't want to see it tangled up with our reciprocal trade matters, for it doesn't belong there. It belongs in a niche by itself and is connected with our own Government's responsibility to play fair by spending the money it collects in the same kind of an economy from which it collects it. My reason for talking about this problem here is that you are the kind of folks who can explain this problem to others if you agree with my thinking, and I believe you would be doing our industry and your country a favor in so doing.

ORDER OF THE DAY: GOOD JUDGMENT

In conclusion, let me say that with the exception of the problem just mentioned in connection with the electrical equipment industry, I can't feel anything but optimistic about the long-term possibilities for business, and for the future of this great country of ours in which we live.

I feel confident that the present situation in our economy and business is only temporary, and that if we will all keep our feet on the ground (as incidentally I think our President has been doing during this period), and practice good business judgment in the conduct of our business as we ought to, anyway, that in the not too distant future we will see both business and employment rising to new and even greater heights.

Let me repeat—I don't think things like this just happen. We have to make them happen. The very thing that caused commerce and industry to pause and take a look when they found we needed some adjustment in inventories is the very same factor that will start our economy rising again

---

The States Act To Conserve Their Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, many State governments are giving increased attention these days to the conservation of historical resources such as letters, diaries, early newspaper files, archives of government, both State and local, and historic sites and buildings.

Original historical resources, once lost or destroyed, can never be fully recovered. Historic buildings can be restored, but the accuracy of such restoration is dependent upon documentary historical evidence and the authenticity of the restoration is sometimes open to question.

The growth of State activity in the field of historical conservation is due in part to the growing recognition that the roots of American history are in the soil of the States and in the local communities. We are coming to realize that the American heritage is best understood when it is examined at State and local levels.

S. K. Stevens, executive director of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, said recently that—

Increased State attention to the problem may also be said to be a part of a revolt against national centralization. Half a century ago Josiah Royce in his The Philosophy of Loyalty wrote: "We need * * * in this country a new and wiser provincialism * * * which makes people want to idealize, to adorn, to ennoble, to educate their own province." He went on to say, "Further centralization of power in National Government, without a constantly enriched and diversified provincial consciousness, can only increase the estrangement of our national spirit from its own life."

Another important reason for increased interest on the part of the States of their heritage is that it is proving to be good business. A recent survey by Redbook magazine showed that more than 90 percent of those queried indicated that their future vacation trips would be limited to the United States. Every person in charge of State historical shrines, as distinguished from those administered by the National Park Service, reports that visits to these places are

increasing by leaps and bounds, just as they are at the federally administered historical parks, buildings, and monuments.

New Jersey has lost numerous landmarks and historic sites to the march of progress in the form of rubber tires, gasoline fumes and highways. In addition New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Florida, Louisiana, and Virginia are States where places of historic interest are presently threatened by new-highway programs. This situation led the Camden (N. J.) Courier-Post to say editorially on February 11, 1958, that—

Priceless bits of the American heritage will be chipped away unless public opinion is alerted and expresses itself in demands that State legislatures, as well as Congress, pass laws to protect the Nation's less tangible values from burial under our ever-burgeoning strips of asphalt and concrete.

This same newspaper reported that—

The State of Pennsylvania is planning to run a modern-express highway down New Hope's narrow, tree-shaded Main Street. The project threatens destruction of the renowned Bucks County Playhouse, which fronts on Main Street. Residents are up in arms, petitions are circulating, and the State in the end may have to divert the highway. Never before has highway planning threatened historic and cultural sites in America as it does today. New Hope's case is only one of many.

I include here an article from the magazine State Government, by S. K. Stevens, and an editorial from the Camden (N. J.) Courier-Post:

[From State Government of April 1958]

THE STATES ACT TO CONSERVE THEIR HERITAGE

(By S. K. Stevens)

State action in the field of conservation of natural resources, including streams, forests, game, and the land itself, has become a common feature of governmental policy in the last 50 years. It is only within the last decade or so that very much attention has been directed toward conservation of historical resources. These include letters, diaries, and records, early newspaper files, archives of governments, both State and local, object materials such as tools, utensils, and implements used by former generations, and historic sites and buildings which were the places with which notable persons had an association or where great events took place.

The loss or destruction of such materials can be more permanent than the depletion of natural resources. The latter can be replaced. Forests can be replanted, streams purified and cleared, game supplies restocked, and land improved. Original historical resources, once lost or destroyed, can never be fully recovered. Historic buildings, it is true, can be restored, but the accuracy of such restorations is almost entirely dependent upon documentary historical evidence. Even the adequate marking of historic sites and buildings must rest upon basic source materials for authentication.

Accurate and comparative figures are not available, but it is a considered judgment that 50 years ago no State spent more than a few thousand dollars which could be considered as devoted to conserving or restoring any of its historical resources. Pennsylvania, with its historical riches, did not create an official State historical commission until 1913. The principal early pattern of activity at the State level was that of the State Historical Society, so termed because it was chartered by the State and utilized the name of a State as the prefix to the words "historical society." New York, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Pennsylvania were leaders in establishing such societies early in the 19th century.

Actually, these societies were largely semiprivate institutions. As Americans moved westward, they took with them the idea of the State historical society. But there developed one very important difference. While the eastern societies basically were both privately supported and controlled, many Western States subscribed to the idea that the State government should have more responsibility. In return for aid to the society in preserving State historical records, the State itself was given representation on the governing board of the State historical society. State funds were appropriated in small sums to aid in this work. In such typical Midwestern States as Ohio and Wisconsin, the State Historical Society of Wisconsin and the Ohio Historical Society today receive an increased portion of their financial support from the State, and the State is represented on the board of trustees in each case, although the societies retain the idea of individual memberships and operate essentially as semiprivate associations.

PATTERNS OF ORGANIZATION

Several States now combine the privately supported and directed society with a State department of history or historical commission which is an official unit in the State's governmental organization.

The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission is the official State historical agency. It is concerned with research and publications; marking historic sites; preserving, administering, and interpreting historic buildings and sites placed under it by act of the general assembly; operating the State museum and the Pennsylvania Farm Museum; caring for the State's public and historically important records, and carrying on a general program of informational and publication services in the field of Pennsylvania history. At Philadelphia, the Historical Society of Pennsylvania sits serenely as one of the Nation's oldest privately endowed and managed State historical societies, with one of the largest and finest historical manuscript collections in America.

New York has the even older New York Historical Society, in New York City, with marvelous manuscript and other collections, and the New York State Historical Association, based at Cooperstown, has its nationally famous Farmer's Museum. Both are private rather than public institutions. In Albany, in the department of education a State division of archives and history administers State historical markers, sites, and museums, preserves State and local records, and promotes a program of statewide historical activity.

Michigan has both a privately functioning Michigan Historical Society and a Michigan Historical Commission—the latter the official State agency, with archival, research, publication, historical marking, and related functions under its official direction, and using State funds. Other examples could be cited. Obviously there is today no fixed pattern of State-supported historical work in terms of the way this function is organized.

STATE ATTENTION RISES

The more important point, however, is the fact that, whatever the pattern of organization may be, there is a noticeable increase in State attention to conservation of historical resources. More money is being spent out of State budgets to support this work. On the other hand, no taxpayer need yet be frightened at the size of the State historical agency budget in any State; it remains a mere drop in the bucket. Pennsylvania is a fair sample of the present trend. The biennial budget of the Pennsylvania Historical Commission in its early years averaged a few thousand dollars; today it has climbed over the million mark. Wisconsin, New York, and Ohio are States with comparable budgets for this purpose.

Why are States turning more attention to State history, and spending more money in this area despite mounting pressures on total State budgets? One reason certainly is that Americans today are searching as never before for an understanding of their historical tradition. The search has been intensified by world events of the last few years and a realization that the American tradition needs to be revitalized more than once a year on the Fourth of July. As Americans reach out for this understanding of their heritage, there is a growing realization that it rests upon knowledge of the Nation's history. A quick look at the dates when a majority of the national historic sites and monuments administered by the National Park Service were taken under the wing of the Federal Government will indicate that a majority were acquired less than 30 years ago.

THE ROOTS OF HISTORY

In part, at least, the growth of State activity in historical conservation may be attributed also to a growing recognition that the roots of American history are in the soil of the States and the communities within the States. There is indeed an increased realization that the American heritage is best understood when it is examined at State and local levels, where it is closer to the life and the experience of people, than is possible at a national level. State shrines and State history implement basic appreciation and understanding of the American past.

Increased State attention to the problem may also be said to be a part of a revolt against national centralization. Half a century ago Josiah Royce in his The Philosophy of Loyalty wrote: "We need * * * in this country a new and wiser provincialism * * * which makes people want to idealize, to adorn, to ennoble, to educate their own province." He went on to say, "Further centralization of power in national government, without a constantly enriched and diversified provincial consciousness, can only increase the estrangement of our national spirit from its own life."

The essence of this thought is that achieving a philosophy of loyalty to an abstract and general thing we know and think of as America is not enough. Indeed, it is the most difficult of all loyalties to cultivate in a land so broad and so diversified as ours. People tend more readily to understand and to idealize and venerate those things which are close to them than those which are remote. It is my considered opinion, based on 20 years of association with historical activity at the State level, not only in Pennsylvania but throughout the country, that the growing attention to conserving and emphasizing State and local history on the part of our State governments is in large measure a response to a realization that it is important as the very foundation for preserving our national heritage.

ATTRACTING TOURISTS

Yet another important reason for cultivating the historical heritage of the States is that it is proving to be good business to do so. A recent survey by Redbook magazine presents further striking evidence of the interest of Americans in America. More than 90 percent of those queried indicated that their future vacation trips would be limited to the United States. Granted that much of this travel is purely recreational, who can deny that in its course increasing hundreds of thousands are being brought into contact with more than recreational benefits? The very scenery of America is an inspiring panorama which cannot help but create a new spirit of appreciation of the greatness of the Nation. The American landscape is truly a vital part of the American heritage. Every person in charge of

State historical shrines, as distinguished from those administered by the National Park Service, will testify that visits to these places are increasing by leaps and bounds, just as they are at the federally administered historical parks, buildings, and monuments.

Recognition that there "is gold in them thar hills" in tourist travel is leading many States to take a new look at their history. Virginia went all out last year in celebrating the Jamestown tercentenary and with resulting economic benefits. Every tourist who can be attracted by a State's historical shrines into spending a few days in that State will spend on an average of $12 to $15 a day for food, lodging, gasoline, and odds and ends. National Park Service statistics show that national historical monuments, for the first time, are competing with and even running ahead of scenic areas in the percentage of increase in tourist visitation. Like figures are not available at the State level, but it is reasonable to believe that they represent a comparable trend.

To conclude and summarize, conservation of the history of our States is an increasingly important concern of State government. It is, and should be a concern, in terms of its very real place in the pattern of a rising consciousness of the need to translate the American heritage into terms which will lead Americans to become educated in the historical tradition of their own particular States. Provincialism is no longer a "dirty word" to those concerned with developing a truly national spirit. It is rather, perhaps, the indispensable means to that end. At the same time, with increasing thousands of Americans milling about—searching out the physical evidences of their past as preserved in museums and historical monuments and buildings, or as pointed out by increasing thousands of State historical markers alongside the highways, or as recorded by the landscape itself—there is a very practical aspect to increasing State budgets of the agencies entrusted with historical tasks. In most States conservation of our State historical heritage is at once a contribution to better citizenship and a sound business practice.

[From the Camden (N. J.) Courier-Post of February 11, 1958]

HIGHWAYS AND HISTORICAL SITES

New Hope, Pa., is a famous artists' colony. To call it quaint might be insulting, but it is a beautiful old town that retains the charm of a bygone American era. That is why artists originally congregated there.

Now the State of Pennsylvania is planning to run a modern express highway down New Hope's narrow, tree-shaded Main Street. The project threatens destruction of the renowned Bucks County Playhouse, which fronts on Main Street. Residents are up in arms, petitions are circulating, and the State in the end may have to divert the highway.

Never before has highway planning threatened histbric and cultural sites in America as it does today. New Hope's case is only one of many.

Elfreth's Alley, the famous little enclave of colonial Philadelphia near Benjamin Franklin Bridge, is threatened in whole or in part by a new highway planned along the Philadelphia waterfront. Like New Hope, it will not be so desecrated without a terrific fight by its many friends.

New Jersey has already lost numerous landmarks and historic sites to the march of progress in the form of rubber tires and gasoline fumes. A major threat is posed at the moment to the old Ford mansion in Morristown National Historical Park. This mansion, dating back to pre-Revolutionary days, was Washington's headquarters in the winter of 1779–80. Actual physical destruction of the building is not planned. But a realinement of Route 202 worked out by the State highway department under the new Federal highway program would bring heavy through traffic within less than 100 yards of the mansion. Part of the protective park land would be bitten off.

Perhaps the Ford mansion is luckier than many of its counterparts. Not only the Morristown Planning Board but the National Trust for Historical Preservation and the National Park Service itself are battling the projected encroachment. The highway department in the end probably will have to give in and build along a different line. Other routes are said to be perfectly feasible for the new road, as they are in virtually all similar cases.

Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, has introduced legislation in Congress to protect federally controlled areas like Morristown National Park from despoliation by highway construction. Similar legislation has been introduced in the Senate. It seems to have a fair chance of enactment, but it will apply only to historic sites under Federal control—a small minority.

In addition to New Jersey, New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Florida, Louisiana, and Virginia are States where places of historic interest are presently threatened by new highway programs, a conservation writer reports.

Priceless bits of the American heritage will be chipped away unless public opinion is alerted and expresses itself in demands that State legislatures, as well as Congress, pass laws to protect the Nation's less tangible values from burial under our ever-burgeoning strips of asphalt and concrete.

Slovak World War II Martyrs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John C. Sciranka, editor of American Friends of Slovak Freedom, has forwarded the following article to me, which reveals the records of two outstanding Slovak heroes and patriots of World War II, namely, Capt. Thomas Scecina, Army chaplain from Indianapolis, Ind., and Alaman Lucien Bily, professor at De Salle College, Manila, Philippine Islands.

Mr. Sciranka, very fittingly, over 13 years ago recommended that two scholarships be established in memory of these two outstanding heroes and patriots. This article will give further details:

TWO FORGOTTEN AMERICAN MARTYRS OF WORLD WAR II

(By John C. Sciranka)

When His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York, honored the illustrious Gen. Douglas MacArthur, announcing that in observance of the famous military leader's 78th birthday, he established a $50,000 scholarship for four Filipino students to be known as "Memorial to 'Saviour and Liberator'," the writer was reminded of two American Slovak World War II martyrs who may be termed as "forgotten" heroes.

We mention them today because they fit in with the life and sacrifices of General MacArthur, in whose honor the famous Cardinal established the four scholarships as a monument in the hearts of the Philippine people, who look upon the famous American war leader as their saviour and liberator.

Cardinal Spellman noted that "there is no monument to Douglas MacArthur in the Philippines and, as far as I know, there is no monument to him in the world."

His Eminence, according to the story of Bill Linge, felt the scholarship will help cement relationship between the United States and the Philippines where, he pointed out, "twice the precious blood of American youth has been shed in the cause of liberation."

The writer recommended in October 1945 that two scholarships be established, one in memory of Capt. Thomas Scecina, chaplain in World War II from Indianapolis, Ind., in the Catholic University, Washington, D. C., and the other one in memory of the Venerable Brother Alaman Lucien Bily, professor at De Salle College, Manila, Philippine Islands.

Capt. Thomas Scecina was a United States Army chaplain, who died a martyr's and hero's death on October 24, 1944, on the Japanese ship with other American soldiers, captured by the Japanese. The ship was torpedoed in the South China Sea. The chaplain priest died giving last rites to his American captured soldiers.

In September, 1945, Father John Blazic, pastor of St. Mary's Parish of Uniontown, Pa., gave the following facts on the life of this forgotten martyr and hero.

The late Captain Scecina was born in Clinton, Ind., of Slovak parents. His maternal uncle lives in Uniontown, Pa., and his cousins live in the section of Brownfield, near Uniontown, Pa. Before World War II Captain Scecina spent his vacation on several occasions with his relatives near Uniontown, Pa. At that time he was taking up postgraduate course at the Catholic University in Washington, D. C. Father Blazic noted, that during one of his vacations Captain Scecina represented him as acting pastor of the Uniontown, Pa., parish. The hero's mother lives in Robstown, Tex., where her other son is also a priest of the Corpus Christi diocese. The mother is an ardent reader of Slovak and Slavonic newspapers.

The heroic Captain Scecina was a priest of the Indianapolis, Ind., archdiocese.

At the time of his martyred and heroic death the writer called upon the Slovak people to establish a scholarship in his memory at the Catholic University. No doubt, that the postwar problems made us forget that duty toward one of the first American Slovak priests and Army chaplain, who paid the supreme sacrifice during World War II under the leadership of now honored "Saviour and Liberator" of the Philippines, who was remembered and honored by His Eminence Cardinal Spellman. Perhaps this noble gesture of the famous New York Archbishop will inspire us to remember the forgotten Father Thomas Scecina.

And at the same time in 1945 the writer has also recorded the martyrdom and heroic death of the Venerable Brother Alaman Lucien Bily, who was the professor of De Salle College in Manila.

Brother Alaman Lucien, as he was popularly known, was born in the town of Dolna Krupa, County of Bratislava, Slovakia. He was a great scholar and mastered fluently eight languages. When the city of Manila fell into the hands of the Japanese, Brother Alaman Lucien and 15 other religious brothers were tortured and died martyrs deaths. His nearest kin were Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Stracar, parishioners of the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Stephen J. Krasula of St. John Nepomucene Parish of New York City, who were notified of the death of this modern martyr.

Now and on many occasions before, when his Eminence Cardinal Spellman showed us by vivid examples how to honor our heroes, may we be inspired to remember Capt. Thomas Scecina and Brother Alaman Lucien Bily.

Farm Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, in the May issue of the Missouri Farmer, a magazine published by the Missouri Farmers Association at Columbia, Mo., there appears an article on page 6 written by the president of MFA, Mr. Fred V. Heinkel.

Mr. Heinkel, like myself, has been working with and for Missouri farmers for more than a quarter of a century. From his many years of practical experience, he has learned to know farmers and farm problems as few men know them today. I am proud to include his article with my remarks, and I hope my colleagues will take time to read the article because, as Mr. Heinkel reminds us, general depressions have always been farm led and farm fed.

Recently one of my colleagues asked me this question: "Do you believe the Federal Government can afford to support farm prices?" I answered his question by replying, "The Federal Government cannot afford not to support farm prices."

Let us consider the record and see if facts back up this contention. In 1933 the American farmers paid $5 million in income taxes on their 1932 incomes, but in 1953 their Federal income taxes had swelled to $1,365 million for the 1952 tax year. From 1932 to 1952, farmers alone paid a total in Federal income taxes of $9,825 million, but it should be remembered that in the first year of that period, they paid only $5 million. The primary reason for such a low tax payment in 1932 was because at that time they had little income on which to pay taxes. If farm incomes had remained as low as they were in 1932, farmers would have continued to pay only $5 million in tax per year, and would have paid into the Treasury only $100 million during that entire 20-year period. Instead, however, price supports and other farm programs began to raise the agricultural income of farmers and they were thus enabled to pay more and more money into the tax fund each year. Price support programs during that 20-year period cost the Federal Government $1,200 million in CCC losses. Subtracting these losses from the total 20-year farm tax of $9,825 million leaves a balance of $8,625 million in additional taxes. Now, if we subtract the $100 million that farmers would have paid had their incomes remained as low during that entire period as it was in 1932, we still have a balance of $8,525 million.

No one would argue that all that increase paid into the Federal Treasury by farm income taxes was the result of price supports alone, but anyone familiar with the situation will readily admit that without the farm programs, including price supports, agriculture would have remained in an impoverished condition and a fair estimate would undoubtedly be that at least 50 percent of the increase in taxes paid by the farmers was due to the raise in farm incomes brought about by supported farm prices.

These price-support programs raised farm prices to 100 percent of parity in the first 8 of those 20 years from 1932 to 1952, and held them above 100 percent of parity for 11 consecutive years—1953 being the first year since 1941 in which farm prices averaged less than 100 percent of parity. It should be remembered that parity means equality of purchasing power and nothing else.

From these figures it is evident that the price-support program for agricultural products brought into the United States Treasury $4,626 million that would never have been paid had farm prices not been supported. In other words the Treasury invested $1,200 million in agricultural price supports over a 20-year period and gained $4,262 million in net return after all possible expenses had been deducted. In even simpler figures, for every $12 invested in price supports a net profit of not less than $42.62 was realized, and this does not take into consideration the increased taxes that were generated in other industries by the restoration of the purchasing power of the American farmers.

Secretary Benson reports that farm prices averaged 87 percent of parity in April 1958. He obtained that figure by averaging in apples at 101 percent, grapefruit at 135 percent, oranges at 156 percent, and limes at 365 percent of parity. Here are the April figures for Missouri products taken from Mr. Benson's report in which he quotes the 87-percent figure:

	Percent
Wheat	83
Corn	64
Soybeans	70
Grain sorghum	67
Milk	70
Butterfat	66
Beef cattle	99
Hogs	92
Eggs	68
Chickens	56

Average for principal Missouri farm products 73.5 percent of parity, or 13.5 percent less than Mr. Benson's. Figures do not lie but—

Another false statement heard quite often is "supporting farm prices robs the consumer." The answer to this statement is that at no time in the past 50 years, war or peace, has the cost of living been as high as it is today. Ask yourself if there has ever been a time in your entire memory when a $10 bill paid for as few groceries as it does today. Low farm prices do not mean cheap food for the consumer.

In 1955, I told my colleagues on the floor and have reiterated it since, that the depression then building up on the farms would not stay there; that it would lead to business stagnation, unemployment, generate heavy Federal expenditures that would be made in an attempt to care for the jobless, that it would drive farm people to the cities to seek nonexistent employment and that unless conditions affecting farm prices were reversed, these conditions would in time advance to the point where they would adversely affect the Federal Treasury.

All these things have now happened and neither the President nor the Secretary of Agriculture show any inclination to even permit Congress to remove the basic cause. The under-payment to American farmers for their services in producing more than 60 percent of all the new wealth generated in this country each year is the primary cause of the present recession.

That the affects of this agricultural depression has finally reached the Treasury is abundantly proven by an article appearing in the Washington Evening Star for May 21, 1958 in a statement reported to have been made by Budget Director Morris Stans, in which he said "I expect the deficit for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, to reach $3 billion." The Star further reports Mr. Stans as saying that the deficit for fiscal 1959, which begins July 1, this year, will probably reach $10 billion if no legislation for the reduction of taxes is enacted, and an even greater deficit in case of any tax reductions.

The American farmers have been underpaid $6 billion per year for the past 5 years. Had the farmer received this money over that period, every dollar of it would have generated $8 in national product. The basis for this statement is the fact that every dollar paid the farmers did generate $8 of national product. If the American farmer had received 100 percent of parity during the past 5 years, almost 2 million farmers who are now in the cities would still be on the farm, we would have no unemployment, we would have no recession, and the Federal Treasury would not have gone in the red.

Again I say that the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Congress of the United States, as well as industry, labor, and the entire national economy cannot afford to permit the liquidation of the family-type American farmer.

The article from the Missouri Farmer, May issue, follows:

THE PRESIDENT SPEAKS—DEALS FARMERS A LOW BLOW

(By Fred V. Heinkel)

"What the farm economy needs is a thaw rather than a freeze," and with this rebuke to Congress for its attempt to hold-the-line on sagging farm incomes, the President of the United States vetoed the farm bill.

The bill, which passed by a 50–43 vote in the Senate and a 210–172 majority in the House, would have required that support prices and acreage allotments of most basic crops and milk and butterfat be held at 1957 levels in order to prevent further decreases in farm income and allow Congress time to consider new approaches to farm legislation.

But Eisenhower pointed out that twice in the past 2 years the Congress had sent him a farm bill which he could not approve, and suggested that if they were after a solution to agriculture's problems, they adopt the farm program which he had previously sent them. Among other things his program calls for legislation to permit price supports to fall to 60 percent of partiy.

Congress is in no mood to sacrifice farmers in such manner, and leaders there are going ahead on an all-out campaign to override the veto. Maybe by the time you read this, the Senate will have taken favorable action. I hope so. However, it will

be difficult to get the required two-thirds majority—especially in view of the unyielding opposition of the Secretary of Agriculture toward any move which would halt his plans for doing away with Government price support programs.

I am sure you will be interested to know that your MFA vigorously supported passage of this bill, and wired the President urging that he sign the measure. Our message to him reminded that already millions of people have been forced off farms, and that any further reduction in prices could only speed up this movement. "General depressions are farm led and farm fed," we pointed out, "and the present economic slump can find its deepest roots in the perilous situation facing our agricultural communities."

In his comments about the bill, Benson made the remark that it was only a political move on the part of Congress, and stated that, "the farm organizations were not given a chance to be heard." Nothing could be further from the truth. While no formal hearings were held, all expressed their opinion on the bill. The Grange worked for its passage and also asked the President to sign it. The Farmers Union, the National Milk Producers Federation, the Conference of Commodity Organizations—all were active in working for this measure. The American Farm Bureau alone declined to support the bill.

Early this year, I spent a week in Washington on behalf of Missouri farmers, conferring with the Missouri delegation and other farm Congressmen. Your MFA is given credit there for helping to draft the recommendations which later were incorporated into this bill.

The implication that farmers through their organizations did not have a chance to be heard is but one of a number of misleading statements which have come from the Secretary of Agriculture. His earlier announced cut in dairy supports was purposely heralded by him as a means of lowering the price of dairy products to consumers. It received a big play in the city press. The facts are that prices of milk and other farm commodities have been steadily declining since Benson's appointment. Yet food prices have continued to increase. Last year, total receipts for all farm products were actually $2.6 billion less than in 1952, though total production was up some 6 percent.

Did consumers get this food for less? They did not. The Bureau of Labor reports that food prices are now at an all-time high.

It is beyond the realm of reason as to how an official—whose duty it is to administer the agricultural programs of Government to the best interests of farmers and the Nation—can continue to spread propaganda which sets consumers against farmer, and city Congressman against farm Congressman.

The Secretary has made quite an issue over the fact that he is required by law to lower supports when supplies are adequate. But it's plain that this is a hollow excuse. He has filled bins and barges to overflowing but has been reluctant to open his storehouse to provide supplies for school lunches and needy persons. And when Congress passes legislation to give him legal authority to maintain price supports, he denounces both the bill and the intentions of those who offer it.

Favor is mounting for future farm program development that would place control of such programs in the hands of elected farmer boards, rather than a Cabinet officer. It had been hoped that legislative action to halt the decline of farm prices would allow time to properly study improved approaches to farm problems. USDA estimates that last year almost 2 million persons left the farm. I wonder how many of them are now in the ranks of the unemployed.

Farmers continue to suffer from lowered take-home pay, also. USDA estimates the average return to farmers for their labor and management last year was 69 cents per hour—the lowest in 12 years except for 1955 when it dipped to 67 cents.

MILTON YOUNG, Republican Senator from North Dakota, recently summed up the problem when, after reminding that the number of unemployed is the highest in 16 years, he warned, "Our national economic situation could become far more serious than it is now—that is, if we do not correct the basic reasons for its cause." As every depression in the past has started with depressed farm prices, the Senator recalled, it doesn't make sense for this administration to purposely plan lower farm prices. "What we need is increased purchasing power—not less," he said.

Construction of Superliner Passenger Vessels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 22, 1958, I introduced H. R. 12644, to amend title 5 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide an additional defense allowance to aid in the construction of superliner passenger vessels.

As I stated during the recent debate on H. R. 11451, although I supported the passage of that bill, it had been my hope that we would be able to offer an amendment to the Merchant Marine Act to provide for the construction of these highly desirable and special purpose vessels. Since I anticipate that there will be a future requirement for building other vessels of this type, I have introduced this new bill which is a general modification of the law so as to provide additional government participation in the construction of these very large vessels, so urgently required for national defense. This approach will not be an "opening of Pandora's box" since there is no likelihood that there will be commercial requirements for vessels of this character in excess of a total of 8, namely, 2 to be operated on the North Atlantic run, providing a weekly service, 3 on the New York-Mediterranean run, also providing a weekly service, and 3 on the west coast-Orient run, providing a biweekly service. At the present time and in the foreseeable future, vessels designed for in excess of 1,000 passengers could not be operated commercially under the United States flag on any other presently established trade routes. Nevertheless, in order to avoid the necessity of the Congress considering what is in effect private legislation on the occasion of a commercial operator indicating his willingness to operate such a vessel, it seemed desirable to me to amend the law as the framers of the original 1936 act anticipated might be necessary.

I have knowledge that American Export Lines at this time is interested in building such a vessel to run opposite the presently operating *Constitution* and *Independence*, so as to provide a regularly weekly service on that route. The provisions of the bill I have introduced would make the construction of this vessel possible under certain circumstances.

This would also serve to construct, when the time comes, replacements for the *President Cleveland* and *President Wilson* and for the *Independence*, *Constitution*, and the *United States*, at such time as their economically useful life is ended.

It is my firm belief that under the provisions of this bill negotiations between the prospective operator of a new vessel and the Maritime Administration can produce better results both from the Government's point of view and the operator's point of view, than if it is necessary, as we did a few weeks ago, to have the Congress specifically approve a particular financial arrangement.

This bill embodies the philosophy under which the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries reported the bill to construct a replacement for the *America* and a replacement for the *President Hoover*. However, it provides greater flexibility for negotiation and perhaps a greater opportunity for the Defense Department to negotiate on national defense features such as speed, compartmentation, and so forth.

Although I realize it is late in this Congress to attempt to enact a fundamental amendment to one of our basic laws, I have introduced the bill so that all those who may be interested will have an opportunity to study it, and it would be my hope that, if reelected to the 86th Congress, I could initiate action on this bill in the early part of 1959.

The text of H. R. 12644 follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 512. (a) Any citizen of the United States who holds, or who applies for and is granted, a contract for the payment of an operating-differential subsidy under title VI of this act may apply to the Federal Maritime Board for a national defense allowance (hereafter in this section referred to as additional defense allowance) to be paid by the United States as part of the cost of construction of superliner vessels in accordance with this section, in addition to any payment for costs of national defense features under other sections of this title.

"(b) The Federal Maritime Board is authorized to grant an additional defense allowance to aid in the construction of any superliner passenger vessel which the Secretary of Defense certifies to be urgently required for national defense purposes, and which the board determines—

"(1) will have a capacity of at least one thousand passengers;

"(2) is designed to embody the highest practicable standards of safety and design; and

"(3) will be equal to or faster than the speed of the fastest superliner passenger vessel operating, or under construction to be operated, in the service or route for which the vessel is to be constructed.

"(c) Whenever an additional defense allowance is granted under this section, it shall not exceed that amount which the Federal Maritime Board determines will reduce the original cost of the superliner passenger vessel to the applicant to the point where such applicant may reasonably be expected to earn, upon capital necessarily

employed in the business of such vessel, a fair and reasonable average return over the life of such vessel. All determinations made by the Federal Maritime Board to carry out this subsection shall be final and conclusive and no other official nor any court of the United States shall have power or jurisdiction to review any such determination.

"(d) No additional defense allowance granted under this section shall exceed 10 percent of the original contract cost (without regard to any increases in cost occurring after the award of the contract) or constructing the commercial vessel (without regard to national defense features).

"(e) Any contract for an operating-differential subsidy in the operation of a vessel with respect to which an additional defense allowance has been granted under this section shall be subject to the provisions of title VI of this act, except that such contract shall provide that if at the end of any recapture period the net profits of the operation of such vessel for such recapture period, computed without regard to profits or losses on other vessels operated by the contractor, exceed 10 percent per annum on a cumulative basis on the contractor's capital necessarily employed in the operation of such vessel as determined by the Federal Maritime Board, the contractor shall account to the United States for an amount equal to 75 percent of such excess profits, without regard to the amount of operating-differential subsidy paid for such recapture period for operation of such vessel.

America: Reluctant Champion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of considerable worry to many of our people in or out of Congress to find that now that we have proclaimed ourselves leaders of the Western World, and that that leadership has been accepted by the peoples of the West, we seem so loath to play the role we are called upon to play.

The following article by Mr. Constantine Brown, the well-known columnist, appeared in the Washington Star of May 23 and brings out our rather sorry situation.

It seems to me that we suffer from the fact that we are never willing to help the strong on our side, but always spend our time on the weak, who are not our friends and only want our money.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time to remember that, "He who is not with me is against me." We are now playing for keeps, and if we do not know it, our opponents certainly do:

AMERICA: RELUCTANT CHAMPION—HALF-HEARTED "DEFENSE OF TITLE" IN EYES OF WORLD SEEN ADDING TO DIFFICULTIES

(By Constantine Brown)

Experienced American official and unofficial observers returning from travels in many areas of the world agree that our present international difficulties need not be attributed exclusively to communism.

The Soviet plots and intrigues are definitely intended to keep the world in turmoil. But there is something else which contributes to the present confusion: The fact that Uncle Sam appears in the eyes of all foreigners (friends, neutrals, or enemies) as a champion who is called to defend his title, but does it only half-heartedly, as if he had a premonition that he cannot win.

The veteran champ comes out once in a while with a powerful right or left hook which sends his opponent reeling. But these outbursts of strength are getting rarer. The trained observers say that if our leaders and our people would only realize that a real show of strength is best understood, not only by our antagonists but also by our best friends, world conditions would improve rapidly. The cold fact is that despite the national hysteria caused by the Red sputniks or the reported might of the Communist forces, we still have the power and ability to accept the Communists' challenge and defeat them. The price may be high. But no higher than if we continue the present course.

Moreover, it is doubtful, according to those in a position to judge the Soviet power accurately, if the men in Moscow and Peiping would dare issue a deadly challenge in the face of a determined stand by America. The last 12 years have proved that they retreated whenever we flexed our muscles and advanced successfully whenever we hesitated or cowered.

These evaluations are concurred in by a number of Pentagon and State Department policymakers. But they all add in haste: "We cannot do what should be done because the country is apathetic and the politicians who carry so much weight are opposed to any real show of strength. They seem convinced that peace is a commodity which can be purchased in the market and that the world is a general store where the dollar can purchase good will and friendships."

This contention was best illustrated last Wednesday when the once very influential Senate Foreign Relations Committee decided tentatively to restore all cuts on foreign economic aid and suggested a $225 million a year item for India for what appears to be an indefinite period. Similiarly a number of members of that committee expressed themselves favorably for continuing aid to Yugoslavia on the strength of the present squabble between Khrushchev and Tito.

It is apparent that the bulk of our policy and lawmakers cannot break away from the concept that economic aid dispensed indiscriminately can act as an antidote against all poison diffused in the world by international communism.

The Marshall plan completely restored the economies of Germany, France, Britain, the Lowlands, Italy, and Japan after the last war. This is interpreted by our policymakers to mean that the same miracles can be effected everywhere else, including the most backward regions in Africa and Asia. They lose sight of the fact that the countries which have made a miraculous comeback were actually very far advanced industrial countries before the war broke out. They had the know-how, technicians, skilled workers, extremely able engineers and scientists. All they needed for their recovery was the money and machine tools to put their men to work. This was supplied by the United States and was put to such good use that we are faced today with a serious challenge in the world and domestic markets from these nations.

Because the Marshall plan was so effective, the unreasonable conclusion was drawn that the same thing could be applied to undeveloped nations which had never had an industry and lacked everything from know-how to the men to handle the complex tools of modern industrial machinery. In the past the best the men could do was to guard a flock of sheep or goats or beat the harvested crops with a stick to get out the grain.

Because of the example of success in Western Europe and some Asian countries which were industrialized in the past, we are attempting to ram down the throats of people of undeveloped areas a vast program of quick industrialization. We are providing the willing recipients (the newly created independent governments) with hundreds of millions of dollars (as in the case of India and to a lesser extent Laos and Cambodia) and with technicians accustomed to the quick grasp of machinery of the American worker. This seems to be the underlying concept of settling the most confused and threatening situation in the history of the world.

Labor Union Leaders and the Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most amazing bits of congressional testimony from a labor-union leader was presented last week by Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO.

The only interpretation one can place on Mr. Meany's testimony is that he went along wholeheartedly with the Democrats in trying to perpetuate a hoax on the American people when they called the Taft-Hartley Labor Relations Act a slave-labor act.

Mr. Meany, in not speaking out forthrightly prior to this admission, has been guilty of playing politics with the cause of union labor.

Such tactics only result in harming the rank and file of union labor because the well being of the rank and file of union labor should be above partisan political considerations.

The Chicago Tribune, in their editorial of May 26, presented their views on this matter in an editorial, as follows:

MR. MEANY AND OTHER HYPOCRITES

Remember the demands for repeal of the Taft-Harley "slave labor" Act, which were urged so vehemently in the 1952 general election by the Democratic Party, the CIO, and the AFL? Well, all those demands were mere campaign oratory.

We get this from no less an authority than George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, who testified before a Senate subcommittee on labor reform proposals. He frankly admitted that the hollering about the "slave labor" act was political and quoted an unnamed Democratic Senator as saying that keeping the issue hot was more important than any action to repeal the law.

Of course Mr. Meany, his union associates, and the Democratic politicians knew then, just as they concede now, that Taft-Hartley was far from being a tough law. In fact, some abuses that the law sought to correct continue to exist and, as the recent racket committee hearings have shown, union members are still being robbed and exploited by union officials who enjoy powers and privileges like those of ancient royalty.

Mr. Meany conceded to the subcommittee that the union movement is still full of crooks and racketeers, but he insisted that it needs only a little help from Congress to clean house. He was willing to accept legislation requiring financial reports by

both unions and employers. As for laws to regulate union elections, give members the right to vote on strikes, and other measures to protect the workers and the public, Mr. Meany was against all of them. He asked the Senators not to be misled by those who would subvert the legislative process to cheap political ends.

In his view it was all right in 1952 to use the slave-labor slogan for cheap political ends, but now he regards any serious effort to enact labor reform legislation as an undertaking for cheap political ends. He was willing in 1952 to help the Democrats misrepresent the mild Taft-Hartley Act as a harsh, restrictive measure, but now he is unwilling to accept any restrictive legislation in spite of the overwhelming evidence of need for it.

There is a word for Mr. Meany's conduct: hypocrisy. The same word applies to the Senators who praised his testimony. They know we need laws to protect the rights of individual employees and to deal with the effects of the national union trusts, but they are scared to say so. Just as they yammered about "slave labor" in 1952, they will yammer as directed by the union bosses in 1958.

Report From Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, following is my regular report to my constituents in California's 25th Congressional District:

COMMUNIST CLOUDS OVER LATIN AMERICA

There is little doubt that the master strategy of the Kremlin now is directed at our friends in Latin America. The Communist plot was tellingly revealed by the demonstrations and riots that threatened the lives of our Vice President and his wife during their good will tour of South America. This tour has placed in sharp focus the following:

1. We can be proud of Vice President RICHARD NIXON and his wife for the remarkable courage, dignity, calmness, and diplomacy they displayed in the face of agitators who obviously were bent on destroying them.

2. Our policy toward our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere must be given a thorough reappraisal, for there was more to the demonstrations against the Nixons than just Communist agitation; there is economic distress in many of the countries to the south and it is absolutely necessary that our country take this into account on future foreign-aid programs.

3. Communist infiltration of the Western Hemisphere has abandoned the subtle technique and has reached the point of outright aggression against the institutions of personal freedom and liberty.

Again we can be proud of our outstanding constituents in the 25th Congressional District—Vice President and Mrs. Nixon.

RED MENACE STILL HERE

Recently the San Francisco Chronicle attacked me for my stand in support of the action of immigration officials in deporting one William Heikkila, an admitted Communist, to Finland. Some of you may have read about this case in the newspapers. It was claimed that Mr. Heikkila was deported without just cause; was spirited away in the dead of night while a court order was pending; that he had no opportunity to inform his wife or attorney of his arrest and that he could not speak or write the language of Finland, the country to which he was being deported; that he had no relatives there; and that the congressional investigation of the case had only taken 1 hour. My investigation was termed another "red herring" in much the same manner as the Alger Hiss case. All oft hese allegations are false. The plain facts are that Heikkila has lived in the United States for 52 years without even bothering to become a citizen; that he has refused under oath, as late as December 1956, to tell whether he is or is not an agent of the Communist Party; that his arrest was perfectly legal, and that he was allowed to notify his family. As a lawyer, as a Congressman, and as a citizen, I have always believed in due process of law. For 11 years, Mr. Heikkila fought his case through the courts and even though an alien, had every benefit of our judicial system although he was dedicated to the overthrow of our Government. I predict that as a result of the continuing investigation of this case by my committee in the Congress, the evidence will show that Heikkila does not deserve to remain in our country and that the United States Immigration Service was perfectly justified in deporting him to his native Finland.

NUCLEAR TESTS SHOULD CONTINUE

There has been a clamor for the end of testing of nuclear weapons. I would subscribe to the end of such tests 100 percent if the Soviet Union would agree to an ironclad inspection plan. But the leaders of the Kremlin won't agree to inspection despite all the propaganda that has been pouring out of Moscow that Russia has ended such tests.

I have sponsored a resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that such tests should be continued by the free world as long as the Soviet Union refuses to agree to a suitable inspection plan and presents a threat to the security, freedom, and liberty of peoples in the free world.

Moreover, I checked with Adm. Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, on the safeguards being taken to reduce the hazard of radioactive fallout during the current experiments being undertaken at the Eniwetok Proving Ground in the mid-Pacific area.

Admiral Strauss told me: "Protection of health and safety is a primary consideration during the current tests. * * * The test series will advance the development of weapons for defense against aggression whether airborne, missile-borne, or otherwise mounted. * * * Test operations will be conducted in a manner designed to keep as low as possible the public exposure to radiation arising from the detonation of nuclear weapons."

Law for Weapons in Resolving Disputes Between Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent approved by the House, I am including an interesting and informative address delivered by the Honorable Charles S. Rhyne, president of the American Bar Association, before the Bar Association of Kansas on May 9, 1958.

I am sure Members of the House and Senate will be especially interested in reading this well-prepared statement:

Those of us who have chosen law as our life's work certainly do not have to be sold on its importance and its value in our daily lives and as the very foundation of our governmental system of ordered freedom. Yet perhaps because we are so close to our great structure for the administration and preservation of justice, we occasionally tend to forget the magnificent role which law has played throughout our Nation's history and throughout the entire course of civilization as the protector of the inherent and natural rights of man.

On May 1, only just recently, by Presidential proclamation we celebrated Law Day, U. S. A. The sole purpose of this program was to refresh in the minds of our people the extent to which the entire culture which we so proudly call the American way of life is built around the concept of freedom under law. Engaged as we are in the current great battle for the minds of men which seriously threatens the very survival of individual freedom, the need to clearly recognize and realize the potential role of law as a substitute for weapons as the decision mechanism in international disputes stands as a great challenge to the legal profession.

The vigorous activity of the organized bar in promoting Law Day, U. S. A., has been a wonderful experience. The great force unleashed by the concentrated effort of our profession made May 1, 1958, one of the most significant and meaningful nationwide celebrations in our history. For through hundreds of local, State, and national programs, our people have taken a tremendous initial step toward publicizing for all the world to see, the most essential ingredient in our way of life—the rule of law.

Never in all history has any joint effort of the organized bar exceeded that which took place on Law Day, U. S. A. Lawyers, judges, and law teachers joined forces to offer the 28,000 high schools, colleges, civic clubs, and associations, speakers to talk on law and what it has meant and can mean to America. These programs were planned and executed with an enthusiasm unparalleled and unsurpassed in all bar organization history.

Governors and more than 1,000 mayors released proclamations stressing the great significance of Law Day, U. S. A. Senators, Congressmen, and other public officials added endorsements and laudatory comments. More than 100 lay organizations cooperated in making Law Day, U. S. A., the most meaningful day in legal history. Newspaper stories, editorials, coverage in articles in major magazines such as Life and Time, nationwide radio and TV coverage of speakers, and public service "spot" announcements, all combined to insure that maximum public attention focused on the idea and ideals of Law Day, U. S. A. And I firmly believe that the result of this great cooperative activity has been to successfully launch the most important program ever undertaken—the task of selling the rule of law as the only means of securing a lasting peace.

In the outer-space-satellite competition the Communists can make boastful claims. They can do likewise with respect to atom and hydrogen bombs and missiles. But they dare not even suggest individual human freedom.

In putting his finger on human freedom as the ideal we offer to the world, President Eisenhower in his proclamation of Law Day, U. S. A. has flung out as a challenge an achievement of our system of government to which the Communists have no answer. If the Communists meet our President's challenge and offer the people behind the Iron Certain individual human rights and freedoms, that freedom will destroy the basic principles of communism.

When we talked about justice under the rule of law on May 1, its absence behind the Iron Curtain was apparent to all. When we talked about freedom under law, Hungary was forcefully recalled in the minds of men. And when we talked, as we must continue to talk, about peace under law—peace without the bloodbath of war—we made a cogent appeal to the foremost yearnings of all peoples everywhere.

To me the ultimate weapon—the decisive weapon—in the cold war fight for the minds of men is a convincing presentation of what individual freedom under law really offers to mankind. Our country constitutes the greatest example of that freedom and its meaning. But we have never yet used or expressed that concept of human freedom in a clear vision which all men can comprehend. As the cold war grows hotter with the hot weapons stalemate, we must step up our propaganda of truth with individual freedom under law as the ideal we offer for mankinds's salvation. What better way could this be done than to say to the world look at us and what this concept has done and is doing for us? Law Day, U. S. A. has thrown the spotlight of the world upon us and that concept, and the rule of law was and always will be its own "best evidence" of its priceless value.

We have through Law Day, U. S. A. taken the first step on the road to peace. But freedom has never been free, and we have a long way to go before we can reach the great goal of the universal rule of law. However, if civilization is to survive in the space era, law and reason must replace weapons as the ultimate decider of disputes between nations. That is the thesis I am here to present for your consideration.

One must concede that weapons must maintain peace and remain as the ultimate decider until the mechanism for peaceful settlement of disputes between nations under the rule of law is developed and accepted. That such development and acceptance cannot come dramatically and be achieved overnight is also conceded. The use of law to replace weapons in the international arena must go through many growing or formative stages before the idea can function as it should and must. But when the alternative is the destruction of the free world, the costs of success become immaterial.

Let us begin by focusing upon the broad picture of the world in which we live. The miraculous technical and scientific achievements of our day have created unprecedented peril from abroad and growth and change at home. Distance is now almost meaningless as rapid transportation and communications have shrunk nations to neighborhoods. Our era has witnessed such achievements as flight faster than sound, satellites in space, the splitting of the atom, miracle drugs, and other rapid and turbulent changes in the scientific, economic, and social fields almost too numerous to name or to evaluate under prior standards and experience. The whole pattern of our existence is being reshaped at an undreamed of pace.

This in capsule form is the background picture against which I would like to discuss with you a readjustment of our thinking so as to take a new approach to the all-important problem of disarmament and peace to meet the needs of our people in the space era. No one can deny that the No. 1 problem of our day is how to achieve and maintain a lasting peace. Certain it is that this problem has plagued man since the beginning of time. Certain it is also that never before has its solution been so imperative. A generation that has achieved so much heretofore deemed nearly impossible should not be dismayed by these past failures but, in fact, be spurred on by the challenging of our times to achieve this great goal of peace.

We are engaged in an ever-accelerating arms race with Russia, and we must win this race for supremacy in capacity to destroy, on that point, I find no disagreement in Washington or elsewhere. It is recognized that peace in today's world can only be maintained by our winning the arms race and by our keeping on winning it even though this requires billions upon billions of dollars and a great economic drain upon our Nation. No one can or will quarrel with the fact that 64 percent of the proposed new budget goes for national security, in fact, the only quarrel is that the amount may be too small. But a world divided into two mighty armed camps is no pleasant future to envision. The peril from such a situation is obvious. History teaches that every arms race has ended sooner or later in war. We must therefore conclude that war with Russia is as certain as tomorrow's sunrise unless a formula or mechanism can be developed to maintain peace other than through arms. It is such a formula or mechanism which the rule of law offers, with persuasion and reason replacing weapons in the all-important international dispute arena. We cannot be saved from the holocaust of war by science or weapons alone.

As we listen to the roar of current history it is absolutely clear that we must learn to live together or see our civilization go up in the senseless devastation of war. The atomic and hydrogen bombs, the sputniks, Explorers, and Vanguards, and the recent Russian accusations that our Strategic Air Command is threatening her boundaries which we, of course, have hotly denied, have set everyone's nerves on edge. The realization that hot war, regardless of who is right or wrong, may well result in mass extermination has attuned the people of the world to an overwhelming desire for peace which is probably stronger than any such desire in all history. There is a common realization that under present conditions every man, woman, and child will be in the frontline trenches if the holocaust of world war explodes. This most urgent desire to prevent war thus offers a unique and unparalleled opportunity to develop the legal machinery that is essential for peace with the overwhelming support of worldwide public opinion. Never have the people of the world needed or demanded leadership on the issue of peace in a more concerted way. Either we furnish that leadership or someone else will.

Law exists now in some form in all nations. It is a universal term which all peoples understand. Justice and law connote innate fundamentals of fairness embodying the wisdom of the centuries. They are so understood by all peoples. The average person is not learned in the law but the idea of justice under the law is to him very real. We need not so much then to acquaint the people of the world with law but to strengthen and use it in an area where it is little used today. Of all human institutions, law has the best historical claim to satisfy the need for peace and order. Law could offer the long sought common denominator for the creation of a method for the settlement of disputes between nations short of war. I firmly believe that law offers the best growing point toward order in a disordered world and the best path to disarmament and peace.

The most important public service open to our legal profession today is therefore the opportunity to mobilize the prestige and the power, the sanity and the skill, the judgment and the judicial temperament of the lawyers of the world in behalf of the goal of peace under law. We must build upon the experience of the past and the possibilities of the present to insure a peaceful future. To do this we lawyers must evaluate world law and develop new international legal machinery which will maintain essential national sovereignty, yet still provide for peaceful settlement of disputes between nations under the rule of law.

Disarmament conferences have been held down through the centuries, but no agreement resulting from such a conference has ever contained a successful formula to maintain peace. The best evidence of this is the fact that every disarmament conference or agreement has been followed sooner or later by an arms race—then war. My study of the conferences and agreements of the past 100 years reveals that the reason they have failed was an inherent inability to devise a method for so weighing armed might that all participants in such conferences and agreements would always feel that they were treated fairly. In essence this means treated equally.

The formula here presented does not contain this inherent defect, as under it all nations would be on a basis of equality before the law.

Are there reasons why nations should not be on a basis of equality before the law? I think not. There are perhaps some disputes to which present legal principles cannot be applied, but we of the legal profession have always developed new laws to meet the needs of new problems. Our creative capacity should not be paralyzed now by the constant crisis in which we live, but it should be in fact spurred on to ever greater achievements. We must not allow law, legal procedures and legal tribunals to continue to lag behind the needs of the world in this vital field of settlement of disputes between nations.

And so it is that on the vast new frontier of the international community, disputes previously settled by the bloodshed of a war must be settled by tribunals of justice. The International Court of Justice is perhaps the best known but the most unused existing tribunal of justice for the decision of international disputes. It has decided only an average of slightly more than a case per year since its creation in 1945. This situation indicates that as presently operated it may be inadequate and need changes to make it more acceptable, effective, and useful.

The statute creating this Court allows it to sit—in its discretion—all over the world and in chambers of three or more judges. So far it has sat only at The Hague. The inaccessibility of the International Court and lack of knowledge of its jurisdiction, procedure, and precedents are major reasons why it is not used by nations to settle their disputes. This Court should make known its willingness to sit elsewhere than at The Hague. The entire Court, or even a chamber of the Court, should sit rather constantly at United Nations headquarters in New York, for example, so that its advisory jurisdiction would be used more than it is now, and law would move more to the forefront in the deliberations of the United Nations.

Just think of the possibilities for calm and considerate use of law in this Court in such disputes as Suez, border incidents such as that between Spain and Morocco, and similar controversies now fought out in the arena of power politics and backstage diplomacy or by armed might. Public opinion which forced an end to the use of arms in Suez could—if properly and justifiably directed—so crystallize as to require use of this Court, or of other such tribunals, and force reluctant nations to take their disagreements there for decision.

Nations which have been accustomed to settling their disputes by hard bargaining, with little regard for justice or law, will begin to realize that it is to their advantage in the long run to submit their disputes for decision by impartial judges under the rule of law. The idea of the supremacy of intellect over physical violence should ultimately be decisively accepted and put into practice by mankind. Thus on a gradual

basis our goal can become a reality. Let the free nations of the world agree on a plan to snuff out war among themselves before the next step of tackling Russia. Let us offer this plan for settlement of disputes under law in the courts as the free world's path to world peace. And we should show our good faith by positive action such as adopting the Organization of Trade Cooperation. If we are not willing to take the lead, we cannot expect others to follow.

World government, which will not and should not arrive in the foreseeable future is not a part of the picture I paint. Such a government has inherent defects similar to those of disarmament agreements. This idea of peace under law envisions law which can grow out of the enlarged use of law by the world community and does not require any super or other world legislative body.

No plan for peace is worth mentioning unless it takes Russia into account. And Russia could not be expected to favor a plan for peace under law and justice. But this plan can capture the minds of the uncommitted peoples of the world for its sponsors and leave Russia naked of friends. Even Russia does not envision such nakedness as desirable—that is the reason for her constant propaganda effort. To launch this plan—unlike a disarmament agreement—we do not need her, nor do we need to trust her word. She can hurt only herself by her failure to cooperate. Russia's often dishonored signature is worthless on a disarmament or any other agreement, but here only actions would count and all could evaluate those as we go along developing peace under law.

The history of the rise and fall of nations and civilizations is the history of the rise and fall of ideas. Among all the contending ideas which have fought for the minds of men since the dawn of history, the concept of individual human freedom has been outstanding. On this concept, which embodies the natural law, which was the heart and core of Magna Carta, which is the spirit and guiding light of our Bill of Rights, we can build with every confidence that it is a foundation not of sand but of everlasting rock.

An idea can be more powerful than any atom; and an idea whose time has come is too powerful to deny. Our task is to see to it that the time of the rule of law as a decider of international disputes arrives before atomic annihilation overtakes us.

Mankind stands at the crossroads of one of the great dramatic and decisive moments of history. One road can lead to war and annihilation or, what is worse, the slavery of communism. The other road can lead to peace and freedom under law.

As a concrete program I suggest the following as a broad program for action.

1. The State Department, which now has no group or section concentrating solely on law as a replacement for weapons, should create an entirely new section staffed with experts whose sole and exclusive function would be to concentrate on law as a program capable of creating a breakthrough to achieve and maintain peace. This breakthrough is not only possible but absolutely essential. The mere knowledge that our Government is making a serious effort in this regard would revive the hopes of peace-loving peoples throughout the world.

2. Intensified effort to achieve such a breakthrough should be the organized bar's major project and the lawyers in our country should be urged to emphasize individually the importance of international law and of the development of a rule of law in international affairs. They should think about it, talk about it, write about it, and work on the problems themselves on a constant basis, as their ability and circumstances permit. Law Day, U. S. A. is a start in the right direction. It will help to provide the essential foundation of crystallized public opinion in support of the rule of law in the international community. And this program should be expanded to reach the legal profession all over the world and convince it to further the same objectives. By common effort the legal professions of all nations can succeed in establishing and maintaining peace under law.

3. Every institution of legal education in America should make international law a required course, and teach that knowledge of international law is an essential to a successful legal career in the shrunken world in which we now live. We should contact law schools all over the world and urge them to do likewise.

4. All Government agencies should further the use of law to the greatest possible extent in all international contacts and in particular should seek and take every opportunity for progress along the road that leads to the substitution of law for weapons in any and every field of international interest from law to guaranty of world investments to the protection of national boundaries, and to the settlement of all international differences.

5. The United Nations and all other international agencies should be urged to bring law, legal procedures and legal methods to the forefront in all deliberations, and particularly by making more use of the International Court of Justice and its advisory jurisdiction.

6. The lawyers of America should unite in urging removal by the United States of the present reservation which makes inapplicable to our country the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, to the end that we as a nation will accept the jurisdiction of that court in all international disputes in the future.

I sincerely believe that the combined brain power of lawyers can create and achieve as greatly as our scientists in meeting the needs of the world today. From its inception to the present zenith of its power our governmental machinery has been in large part conceived, formulated and operated by lawyers. Now is the time for leadership in a broader and more difficult area. Let us use our talents in taking the broad vision of a formula for peace under law herein presented and making it a reality in the world community. As lawyers we should be proud that our profession is afforded this opportunity to render such a magnificent service to mankind. No greater challenge exists for any profession. No greater public service can be performed.

Voting Restrictions—A Report From the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, last week I published reports on voting restriction in eight Southern States in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These had been part of a recent conference on voting restrictions held in Washington under the auspices of the Southern Conference Educational Fund. The meeting concluded with the following summary of the reports.

Additionally, I include in the RECORD today a special report outlining a registration drive in Baltimore, Md., which resulted in registering 15,000 new voters in 12 months:

SUMMARY OF REPORTS ON VOTING RESTRICTIONS IN SOUTHERN STATES

(By James M. Nabrit, Jr., Esq., Howard University, Washington, D. C., Southern Conference Educational Fund's Conference on Voting Restrictions in Southern States, Washington, D. C., April 27, 1958)

A summary of the reports made to this conference on voting restrictions in Southern States supports the shocking conclusions reached by many able students of the Negro vote and voter in Southern States in previous studies. These are that: (1) Negro voters must run the gauntlet of apathy, ignorance, fear, bodily harm, and racial discrimination in order to register as voters; (2) having registered, they must then face these same obstacles in order to vote; and (3) if they indicate a desire to run for office or pose a threat to entrenched segregationists, they face repeated purges of the registration or voting lists or actual carving up of entire counties in order to nullify any effective participation by them in politics.

These reports indicate the need for three types of action: (1) Political action to enlist national party support of a strong and decisive report by the Civil Rights Commission; (2) a southwide State by State campaign to get Negroes to register; and (3) an educational campaign to instruct Negroes in the value of the vote, the use of the ballot, how to register, how to vote, and that voting is a Federal right.

The Civil Rights Commission which is charged with the duty of investigating and recommending action with respect to these and other impediments to the free and untrammeled exercise of the right of suffrage by the Negro should have an easy job of locating and pinpointing these abuses and violations of the fifteenth amendment. That is, if it ever begins operation the records of the hearing on the civil rights bill in 1956 and 1957 are full of testimony of threats, violence, murder, roving registration and polling places, absent registrars, trick questions asked of Negroes only, repeated purges of voting lists, and economic and political intimidation of Negroes by whites.

The Southern Regional Council in 1956 reported a total of 1,238,038 Negro voters in the South, located by States, as follows: Alabama, 53,366; Arkansas, 69,677; Florida, 148,703; Georgia, 163,389; Louisiana, 161,410; Mississippi, 20,000; North Carolina, 135,000; South Carolina, 99,890; Tennessee, 90,000; Texas, 214,000; and Virginia, 82,603. In 1958, we have probably 200,000 more, with a likelihood of a total increase of 1 million Negro votes in these States between 1956 and 1960 if purges do not offset a large part of this gain. If the Civil Rights Commission does a dynamic and effective job, this increase will certainly occur, and it could, in fact, be doubled. If the Commission is ineffective or weak in its technique, timid in its approach, and apologetic in its report, this increase can actually be less.

Many of the more subtle devices for restricting the Negroes' right to vote are the more difficult to combat. Some of these are literacy tests, knowledge of the names of district and State office holders, use of a blank sheet of paper for registration purposes and requiring the candidate to fill it in correctly from memory, or judging correct qualification for voting by correct use of grammar and punctuation. One of the most biased tests is the oral test where the arbitrary whim of the registrar dictates the questions and answers and where obviously no record of either may be found.

Effective participation in politics requires more than registration and voting, essential as these basic requirements are. But even

these first basic steps seem difficult for large numbers of Negroes to take, although no barriers of law or threats of violence or economic reprisals impede them. As a matter of fact, however, barriers to these elementary steps do flourish to some extent and in varying degrees all over the South. Numerous obstacles to registration combine to prevent both registration and voting. One of the most effective restrictions is the purging of Negro registrants' names from the voting lists. It is true that the law permits an appeal when a registrant's name has been stricken from the rolls, but such appeals are of little avail, because the election at which the registrant intended to vote will have long since passed before an appeal can be heard. Such appeals have no priority over pending cases triable at the next term of court following removal of the registrant's name. The latter fact makes it highly desirable, if not imperative, that a challenge to a citizen's right to remain on the registration rolls should be required to be made in ample time to permit final determination of the issue before the election in which the registrant intended to participate. Such a provision, which is included in one of the proposed Federal civil-rights bills, would nullify one of the most nefarious devices used to deprive citizens of the rights guaranteed by the supreme law of the land. A lack of understanding of political processes and the dominant influence of factors outside the South are potent forces which also must be taken into account in any analyses of the future of the Negro voter in the South.

We know that all over America voting participation is lowest in the low-income, low-education groups in our population, black as well as white. Further we know that apart from restrictions on voting because of race or color we should expect a lower level of participation by Negroes in the black-belt counties of the South. That is exactly what we do find. There are few sections in America where the income and education received are as low as they are for Negroes in the black belt. Here is where the Negro population is thickest, where in many counties he outnumbers the whites from 2 to 1 to as high as 7 to 1. Here too, is where in county after county, there is no Negro registrant or only a handful of teachers and professional Negroes on the voting list. The number averages out at about 30 Negroes registered for 1,000 Negroes of voting age. This, one recalls, is the rural section of the South, the center of active, emotional opposition to the Negro.

Finally, it should be borne in mind that despite all of these restrictions and dangers, Negroes have continued to seek registration. But if the whites of voting age register 50 percent of this potential and Negroes only 24 percent of their voting potential or less, the power of the Negro vote will not be materially increased.

One should not overlook the fact that the potential white voter in the South, or even in the North, has a low registration record, while the registered voter has an even worse voting record. A 20-, 30-, or 40-percent turnout of voters is an amazing event. Negroes do not have sole claim to apathy in this area. Under our system political parties and trade unions make registration and voting their business. The future of the Negro voter in the South is intertwined in their growth and development.

The future of the Negro voter in the South may very well be in the hands of voters completely outside that region and subject to forces and factors far removed from him. This may be the case, not because of his apathy, lack of organization or leadership, nor because of the resistance to his participation in politics by white southerners, but because his future is bound up inextricably in the future of political parties in America, in their program and policies, in the effect of Negro voters in the North and West upon political parties, and partly depends upon the pressure of outside or world problems upon American political and governmental policies and actions.

The Negro, as a member of the working class, will normally give his allegiance to institutions which have as one of their major policies the welfare of workers. As these institutions develop and change the Negro voter will tend to switch his affiliation as he identifies their economic philosophy and its relationship to him. Further, the Negro voters in the North and West wield definite influence on the platforms and policies of both major political parties, which in turn may have some effect on the Negro voter in the South. The present civil rights bill was foreshadowed in both party platforms in 1956, for instance. In addition, integration in the armed services and the efforts of the President's Committee on Government Contracts to insure equal job opportunities for Negroes, set patterns of public behavior which in turn condition the thoughts and actions of all sections of the country. Furthermore, as the leader of the free world, the United States wants to win the confidence and support of all of the uncommitted millions of colored people in Asia, Africa and the islands of the sea. Thus, it becomes necessary for America to dispatch the Vice President to these areas as a good will ambassador; to invite their rulers here for the purposes of developing and keeping their good will; and to demonstrate at home that racial hatred and prejudice are not a policy of the Government. These high level policy considerations of the Federal Government are powerful instrumentalities in the field of Negro suffrage.

To the extent that this future can be decided within the South one cannot be too optimistic as to what it portends. Persons or symbols seem essential for rallying masses of Negroes for political activity. I mean political leaders, office holders or party functionaries. Politics require organizations and money, patronage and self-interest motivation. Within the southern framework many of these essentials seem to be missing. These observations do not ignore or discount the election of Negroes to public office in the South in recent years, nor the increased registration and voting of Negroes since the white primaries were abolished by the Supreme Court. These are encouraging signs but in my opinion are of little real significance, except for purposes of indicating possibilities or for creating a political esprit de corps.

A more pressing demand is the immediate need for the registration of an increasingly larger number of Negroes so as to furnish a reservoir out of which actual voters may come. The very existence of a vast number of registered Negroes may have an astonishing result. True, whites may become alarmed and register in larger numbers than usual, but, as is more likely the case, they may very well remain indifferent. In either event the growing Negro registration will function as a strong inducement to white politicians to seek the Negro vote. This latent threat of a heavy potential vote is the key to the national concern over the Negro vote. Politically, it is considered inherently dangerous to ignore it even at present.

The Negro must be aroused until he seeks registration by the tens of thousands. It is much easier to deny registration to 1 or 10 than it is to 100 or 1,000.

In conclusion, a summary of these reports reflects numerous, subtle and ingenious restrictions which operate to curtail the effectiveness of the Negroes' right to vote. A strong campaign to increase the registration of Negroes is a paramount necessity. Let us get it going.

The Register and Vote Campaign in Baltimore

(By Dr. John L. Tilley, pastor of New Metropolitan Baptist Church and chairman of the campaign)

The Citizens Committee on Civil Rights legislation is conducting a register and vote campaign in Baltimore which has resulted in the addition of more than 15,000 voters to the rolls in 12 months.

This drive was set off by refusal of the Baltimore City Council and the Maryland State Legislature to pass civil rights legislation presented to them. It was spurred by statements that councilmen and legislators considered the Negro vote of no significance or consequence. (The Afro-American reported that fewer than 80,000 of the 180,000 Negro adults were registered.)

A resolution was presented to city council to disapprove of discrimination by hotels in Baltimore and ask them to relax discriminatory practices, but the measure was beaten by a sizable margin. Opponents of all civil rights legislation are reported to have stated with contempt that the Negro's vote was inconsequential.

Several civil-rights bills drafted by the Citizens Committee on Civil Rights Legislation were presented in the legislature but were defeated. Senator Della from the sixth district even presented a bill to make it unlawful to present a civil rights bill to the legislature. This despite the fact that Senator Della is from a district predominantly colored, which has 1 housing project with 15,000 Negroes and only a few white persons. It is reported that he told some Negroes who approached him that the Negro vote was of no significance to him.

The citizens committee, of which the Reverend Marcus G. Wood is chairman, decided that the only effective answer to these insults to the dignity of Negro citizens was to get all eligible Negroes to register; to educate them in the proper use of the ballot, and to urge them to vote for persons and measures which would promote full civil rights.

The committee was aware that petitions, telegrams, and letters have but little weight with members of legislative bodies if they are not from people registered to vote.

The committee also concluded that in neither the Democratic nor the Republican Party is there hope for freedom of all people, but in a nonpartisan civil-rights movement made up of all liberty-loving people, whether Democrats, Republicans, or Independents, white or colored. The committee saw an urgent need for an intensive person-to-person campaign to inform, arouse, and direct people to register and vote.

It decided that a non-partisan register and vote campaign could be carried out most successfully through the churches with the pastors providing the leadership. There are churches in practically every community; the membership meets regularly; churches cross all lines in society; they are committed to the ideal of serving and meeting the basic needs of people; churches have the resources and techniques for moving people to service.

We worked out a detailed program for carrying our campaign to the precincts and blocks. The pastors of the churches headed up certain wards and precincts. The heart of the drive is house-to-house canvassing for the purpose of urging people who had not registered to do so at once, to get the names and addresses of those not registered, and to get registered persons who had moved to report their changes of address. We have written up and mimeographed the detailed plan, and copies of it are available for the asking, so I will not go into that here in the limited time available.

We have also worked out a number of forms which proved valuable. These facili-

tated the collection and organization of information which will be useful in subsequent register and vote programs and in pushing for civil rights legislation.

The citizens committee recognizes that getting people registered to vote is only one phase of a most vital program. Motivating people to use the ballot and to use it for the best interest of the local and larger community rather than for narrow, selfish interests is a matter of major importance.

By the time of the next election, the Citizens Committee on Civil Rights Legislation plans to list the legislation that we wish to have passed in the city of Baltimore and the State of Maryland. We will interview the candidates to determine their stand on the civil rights legislation that we will want passed. We will consider the record and commitments of each candidate for office and will determine which ones we can conscientiously endorse and those we cannot endorse. We will then communicate our findings to the people through two media:

1. We will send out letters to the citizens who are already registered and those who register during the campaign. We will have their names in our files from the block canvassers' data sheets.

2. We will inform the pastors, and leaders of other cooperating organizations, who will be asked to mobilize the block workers who canvassed the people to get them to vote; and to get them to go back to the people with written materials and inform them of the issues and the position of the candidates concerning them.

This should get some friends of true democracy elected to office and keep some enemies out. This will be an important step toward true democracy.

Letter From Dr. Harry M. Hoxsey, of the Hoxsey Cancer Clinic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter which I believe should be called to the attention of the Members. Inasmuch as cancer is one of the most vicious killers of human beings known to science, it seems to me that anyone offering the possibility of a cure or the alleviation of this deadly disease should be given a chance to help the sufferers who come to him, and that as an American citizen he should not be subjected to persecution by those who may not agree with him or support his methods. I believe this to be particularly true inasmuch as I have in my files many letters from people who claim to have been completely cured by Dr. Hoxsey's treatment.

The letter follows:

HOXSEY CANCER CLINIC,
Dallas, Tex., January 31, 1957.

Mr. JOHN L. HARVEY,
United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Pure Food and Drug Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HARVEY: According to your latest press release concerning me and the Hoxsey treatment, it is the intention of the Food and Drug Administration to post warnings against this treatment in all 46,000 post offices within the United States. It is the apparent objective of your department to give the general public the impression that I am, in the eyes of the Government, a criminal, since most of the posters in the post offices are of wanted criminals. I have been advised that, when you do this, you will be violating my constitutional rights, and I intend to take action against this un-American persecution.

In these warnings against the Hoxsey treatment for cancer, the FDA has asserted that it has conducted a thorough investigation of the Hoxsey treatment, and that not a single cure was affected. If this be true the FDA, without ignoring me (I am an American citizen, and yours is a department supposedly a servant of the American people—not yet its master) or without sidestepping the issue, or without lying about it, can and certainly ought to furnish me with (1) a list of the patients investigated; (2) information on where this alleged investigation was held; (3) by whom it was conducted; and also all other pertinent information relative to this alleged investigation.

In previous press releases, the FDA stated that a Dr. J. R. Heller of the National Cancer Institute, which, by the way, is dependent upon the people's tax money for its support, conducted an investigation of 77 case histories which were furnished him by the Hoxsey Cancer Clinic. I challenge you to send me copies of all data relative to this investigation. If I do not receive copies, I shall rightly assume that no such investigation was ever made, and that the FDA again has released lies about me and my treatment of cancer.

It is now known that Dr. Heller never undertook the investigation at all. He referred this task to a Dr. Gilcin Meadors. During a court trial in Dallas, Tex., Dr. Meadors testified under oath that he did not write a single letter, in an attempt to investigate the 77 case histories of the patients in question. As a result, when he sat on the witness stand, in the Pittsburgh trial, and this testimony came to light, presiding Judge John L. Miller refused to allow him to testify further, on the grounds that he had not conducted an investigation. In further questioning, it came out that all he had done was give the case histories a very casual "perusal" and formed a personal opinion that the case histories did not meet his criteria.

Also, Dr. David Karnofsky, to whom I had turned over a group of cured patients' histories, was called to Pittsburgh to testify for the Government. Judge Miller denied his testimony on the same grounds; that is, that he had not made a thorough investigation of the patients, their pathological reports, and the hospital records.

Mr. Harvey, whenever you notify 165 million American people that the Food and Drug Administration has made a thorough investigation of the Hoxsey Cancer Clinic (where we have currently over 10,000 patients under treatment and observation) somebody is perpetuating a grand lie on the public. The American Medical Association, Food and Drug Administration, National Cancer Institute, Sloan-Kettering Foundation, American Cancer Society, Damon Runyan Fund, Dallas Medical Society, and the Texas State Medical Board all have been repeatedly invited (even urged) to come here and make an unbiased investigation of my clinic. None have ever come. And, Mr. Harvey, you know this well.

Here, again, I want to extend such an invitation. If you will come, or cause to be sent, delegates from your Administration, I and my entire staff will cooperate fully, in every way possible, so that you and the FDA will, once and for always, know the truth: Whether my clinic really cures cancer sufferers. I am willing to stand on the finding of this delegation—good or bad. Then, and only then, in this free and democratic Republic of ours, should a Government agency conduct a national denunciation against me and my cancer treatment.

Mr. Harvey, since I assume that, as a servant of my Government, you do want to be fair and conduct your office after an honorable pattern, I offer the free run of my clinic and facilities and my staff, and offer to open all my files and records for and to a delegation of your choosing. I suggest you send the following: Five M. D.'s (not on Government payrolls, and not members of the American Medical Association), 5 scientists from Government hospitals and research foundations, 5 members of the United States Senate or Congress. If I fail to prove to this group of scientists, doctors, and experts that you would send here, that I have not cured—after radium, X-ray, and surgery have failed to cure—the deadliest types of cancer, then I will no longer protest to your advertising that my treatment is worthless. Moreover, if I fail to prove to this group of experts that the Hoxsey method of treating cancer has cured numerous pathologically proven, metastatic cases of the deadliest types of cancer, I will voluntarily lock my door. But, until then, I want you to know that I know that you know that you are persecuting me, by continuing your campaign against me.

I fully realize how easy it is for you to sit in your Washington Ivory Tower and condemn me. Have you not examined the testimonies of the pathologically proven cured patients I put on the witness stand in the Pittsburgh trial? Or, have you examined it and fear to come here and make a firsthand examination of my clinic and my cancer treatment? The FDA has admitted that "it may be a long time before we can close the Hoxsey Clinic." I want you to know, Mr. Harvey, that as long as there is a drop of blood in my veins, or a breath of air in my body, I shall fight for the right of cancer sufferers throughout the world to elect a treatment for themselves, of their own choice.

The louder the voices against me, and the more hostile my enemies become, the more cancer sufferers come to my clinic. They come because my treatment has been proven successful. They come because they talk with the dead restored to life who have received the Hoxsey treatment. They come because they see the living proof results of my clinic. I stand ready at all times to substantiate this living proof.

Enormous funds are constantly being solicited through press, radio, TV, movies, and other mediums to be used in chemotherapy research for the treatment of cancer. Don't you think that representatives of some of these research foundations should come to Dallas and make an investigation of the largest clinic in the world using the chemotherapy treatment, and getting results?

For the convenience of the Government, and in order to get an investigation underway without delay, I would be willing to pay the expenses of this entire project. So, in the name of suffering humanity, and millions now doomed to die of the dread disease, come and make this investigation.

Again, let me repeat: If you should find that I am not curing both internal and external cancer cases, the Government will not have to put me out of business. I would want to be out of business.

I trust this letter will bring an immediate reply as to when I may expect your investigating delegation.

Until then, I am

Most sincerely,

HOXSEY CANCER CLINIC,
HARRY M. HOXSEY, N. D.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my weekly newsletter to constituents for May 24, 1958.

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

The Department of Commerce and related agencies appropriation bill involved expenditures totaling $917 million, $199 million above last year's expenditures, yet $65 million below this year's budget request (the double play—we spend more but we are still for economy). Congressmen pass legislation at the people's request offering more Federal services, then criticize the Commerce Department for adding 6,056 new permanent positions in this bill. Government is still growing. Primary interest in this bill is the money for the Civil Aeronautics Administratiton (CAA) for increased airways safety, and recognition of the need for immediate coordination of all aircraft flight—civilian and military—under one authority. Military aircraft cannot be permitted free range.

The joint postal pay and postal rate increase bill, both overdue, in the form of the Senate-House conference report passed unanimously, but with misgivings. The parliamentary procedure made acceptance of the conference report almost mandatory, the culminatiton of the long struggle of postal union pressure and political infighting for advantage. Questionable features which some Members disapproved were: (1) The retroactive-to-January pay increase, costing $97 million (total yearly increase is $265 million); (2) the failure to raise all postal rates immediately, instead setting 1959 and 1960 increase dates for certain classes of mail. Rate increases effective August 1 are first class to 4 cents, postal cards to 3 cents, and airmail letter to 7 cents, airmail card to 5 cents. Other rates, second, third, fourth, and miscellaneous (including "junk mail") also go up. Other conclusions: (1) There should have been no discrimination between pay levels (levels 1 through 6 get 7½ percent permanent and 3-year temporary 2½ percent boost, while level 7 gets only 7½ percent plus 1½ percent); (2) postal pay and postal rate bills should not have been joined together; (3) other Government workers will now request raises; (4) postal matters are the most "political," "pressure-group lobbied" that Congress considers.

The Trade Agreements Extension Act (reciprocal trade) is approaching its day in Congress. Trade affects all citizens. It isn't a matter of being for or against trade. It's not that simple. It's what kind of trade bill—and whether Congress has abandoned its constitutional control. Questions to answer: (1) How "reciprocal" is the bill (some nations don't cooperate, keep high tariffs)? (2) Are Tariff Commission's recommendations getting sufficient administration attention? (3) Is the President, acting on the State Department's advice, making diplomatic rather than economic decisions, and, if so, how much and what industries are being affected? (President makes executive agreements with other nations, having force and effect of treaties.) (4) Are the peril-point and escape-clause provisions sufficiently protective of United States industry? For example, heavy foreign importation of oil jeopardizes domestic oil production and defense readiness. I have joined in the effort to safeguard the oil industry, not unaware that Government regulation is a continuing danger. There are other industries, too, such as cotton, that need consideration.

The Alaska statehood bill has occasioned an unusual rule under which debate is conducted—1 hour per Member (435 hours would keep us here until Christmas). Fortunately, all will be said without every Member taking part. Alaskan statehood ran squarely into some tough opposition. (1) The number of people involved is small, 161,000, of which 141,000 are adults (less than the capacities of many college football stadiums); (2) 2 Senators and 1 Representative for 28,767 voters (1956 figure) is disproportionate and excessive; (3) Alaska's unsound economy—business income $160 million, Federal aid $122 million plus $350 million military construction (1958 figures)—demonstrates that statehood would be prohibitively expensive at this time; (4) a citizens' poll by 5 Alaskan newspapers on the question, "Do you favor immediate statehood?" produced answers 2 to 1 against; (5) the noncontiguity location would set a questionable precedent—that of the first State separated from the mainland by a foreign nation or international waters.

Briefs: (1) Important defense reorganization bill may be amended making it acceptable to most, the major change being to keep control in Congress; (2) the Trinity survey by the United States Corps of Engineers is necessary and proper as prelude to later decisions whatever they may be; (3) the CAB is considering south central route matters of interest to Dallas. The danger is reduction of airline service, as the examiner initially has recommended; (4) a fair-trade bill allegedly to protect competition poses a real dilemma—to permit manufacturers to set prices on trademarked products, thus eliminating cutthroat competition but cause higher prices to consumers.

Deterrent NORAD

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to an editorial from the Washington Star on the North American Air Defense Command. I am happy to have this important installation located in Colorado Springs in my district.

I want to take this opportunity to commend General Partridge, commanding general of this service, for the outstanding job he is doing. Air Marshal C. Roy Slemon, of Canada, is also located in Colorado Springs and is making a most valuable contribution to this operation.

The editorial follows:

DETERRENT NORAD

The new 10-year Canadian-American agreement on joint air defense is well designed to safeguard North America against the threat implicit in advanced nuclear weapons, supersonic bombers and ballistic missiles. To that end, it significantly improves upon and supplants the cooperative arrangements that have heretofore existed between our two countries.

As explained in the notes formally effectuating the new pact, the supplanted arrangements consisted of coordinated but separate Canadian and American plans that failed to provide authoritative control over the defensive action that would be needed in the event of attack. Although adequate enough when first drawn up, these plans have been outdated by progress in military science and technology. Accordingly, to strengthen their own security and the security of NATO as a whole, our two countries now have in operation, and have had for some time, a North American Air Defense Command (NORAD) whose main feature is that is is more tightly integrated than the former setup.

This means that NORAD, which is directed from headquarters at Colorado Springs, Colo., is capable of markedly swifter defensive action than that provided by the old arrangements. Its top commander is Gen. Earl E. Partridge of the United States Air Force, and its deputy commander is Air Marshal C. Roy Slemon, of Canada. Between them, subject to the chiefs of staff of both countries, these two men run the show, with General Partridge exercising operational control over the American-Canadian forces assigned to him—control of a sort calculated to promote the fastest possible response to a threatened or actual attack on North America.

Of course, in the age of supersonic bombers, not to mention ballistic missiles, there is precious little time to counter an attack. Even so, defensive arrangements like NORAD, if vigorously sustained on an alert around-the-clock basis, can make good use of that time. Indeed, in that sense, its existence can serve as a powerful deterrent to the potential aggressor.

Crackdown on Smut Peddlers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the House last week approved a bill, H. R. 6239, intended to help curb the vast traffic in distribution of obscene and crime-inciting matter. In connection with House consideration of the bill, I included as part of my remarks the testimony on this bill which I submitted last January to the Judiciary Subcommittee which held hearings on this legislation.

In my statement before the subcommittee, I cited the difficulty from a legal standpoint of legislating effectively in an area which touches so closely on the first amendment to the Constitution, stating:

The Constitution is our great bulwark. The first amendment is a great guaranty of our freedoms. We respect it. We are conscious of the practices which the first amendment was intended to prevent.

This amendment to the Constitution was written to serve the noblest aspirations of our people. It was written to protect the free exchange of thought—of literature—of the ideas which make democracy work and prosper and flourish.

It was not written into the Constitution in order to protect panderers to the depraved, or to protect the pusher of obscene printed or visual matter, as despicable a person as the pusher of narcotics. Those who deal in obscene material are among our worst offenders against the moral bases of our society.

GLOBE-DEMOCRAT CALLS FOR CURBS ON OBSCENITY

Mr. Speaker, the views I expressed in my statement last January are similar in many respects to an editorial appearing recently in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on this problem of curbing the flow of obscene material, which it identified as a big business, and a national disgrace, declaring "it has no right to hide behind the Constitution."

Quoting the Supreme Court, the Globe-Democrat added:

Obscenity is not within the area of constitutionally protected speech or press.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I submit for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD the full text of the editorial referred to from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Crackdown on Smut Peddlers, as follows:

CRACKDOWN ON SMUT PEDDLERS

America's pornography peddlers make the Parisian hawker of offcenter post cards look like a piker. Smut peddling is no clandestine, penny-ante trade in the United States. It is big business.

The traffic in pornograph is a $500 million a year racket, the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee estimates.

This flood of smut is making a mark on our generation. As FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover says, there is a "growing conviction among law officers that the flood of pornography that has ben circulating among our young people for the past 10 years is a major factor in today's rapidly rising rate of sex crime."

Many Americans haven't the faintest idea of how big and how bad the smut pedding is in this country. They often assume that it is a simple matter for the Post Office Department to dry up this flood of obsecenity by barring it from the mails.

But many smut peddlers, publishers, or distributors, get around this by shunning the mails. They can ship their stuff, for example, by truck.

In addition, the Post Office Department's power to keep the lewd and lascivious out of the mail is less effective than many realize.

Postal authorities have two ways to proceed against the offender. They can try to deny him use of the mails. But this can wind up in the courts, or involve lengthy hearings and appeals. Or they can try to prosecute the offender.

But 5 years ago, Federal courts up to the 10th circuit court of appeals, held that the violator must be prosecuted in the district where the smut is mailed, not where it is delivered.

Smart smut peddlers now base their operations largely in Los Angeles and New York City. Experience has shown them that courts and juries there are lenient with them. In short, they are free to shop around and settle in a district where the judges or jurors are broadminded about their sleazy kind of business.

This year, Congress is going to try to plug some of these loopholes. It is expected to pass a bill that would permit the Justice Department to file suit wherever the obscene matter is delivered—instead of just at the point where it is mailed.

Whether this law will stand up in the courts is debatable.

The Post Office is also making extra efforts to keep obscene publications out of the mail. Postmaster General Summerfield has set up a new judicial office charged with speeding up proceedings against persons using the mails to defraud or debauch.

Smut peddling is a national disgrace, as a House committee declared not so long ago. It has no right to hide behind the Constitution: "Obscenity is not within the area of constitutionally protected speech or press," the Supreme Court said last year.

It must be stopped by whatever constitutional means are available.

Nixon's Triumph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News from Friday, May 16, 1958, entitled "NIXON'S Triumph."

Pat and DICK NIXON have again proven themselves worthy representatives of this Nation. Their goodwill tour was a United States triumph, not just a Nixon triumph. As Vice President he has a very real obligation that transcends future expectancies, and as Vice President he was representing the people of this Nation officially on the tour. The courage and dignity of the Nixons reflected great credit on the United States and branded them indelibly in the minds of many as the good Americans that they are.

The El Independiente of Bogota, Colombia editorial was typical of the foreign appraisal when it said:

Mr. NIXON is a man of great human qualities who conducts himself with dignity under difficult conditions because he has learned in the school of life how to overcome obstacles.

True, there are lessons to be learned from this trip, mindful of the Communist rabble-rousers efforts, representative of only a handful of the people. Beyond our recognizing the unceasing efforts of Communists to penetrate our hemisphere is the recognizable fact that we must, all of us, bend every effort toward good salesmanship, the accurate representation of what the United States stands for, of our basic beliefs, of capitalism over communism.

The efforts of the Nixons, representative of our United States citizens, must be but one of our continued efforts to establish the person-to-person contact between the citizens of this Nation and our many foreign friends—not the least those of the South American countries. Nixon's triumph was America's triumph, but must be followed by many others, until we completely vanquish the Communists' ideology.

NIXON'S TRIUMPH

Vice President and Mrs. Nixon amply deserved the outpouring, bipartisan welcome which greeted them Thursday on their return to Washington.

Their reception at the airport and triumphal drive through the streets of the Capital constituted a truly national ovation. It was warmly extended to two spunky Americans who had carried out a most difficult and trying mission with distinction to themselves and their country.

Keep in mind that much of the trouble encountered was not unexpected. Their South American journey was no routine goodwill junket. The Nixons well knew before they left that they would not have fair sailing all along the way. It was patent that relations with more than one country on the southern continent had deteriorated. The real purpose of the trip, in fact, was to clear up as much of the misunderstanding as might be possible.

To the everlasting credit of DICK NIXON and his brave wife, be it said that from the start the Vice President was determined to go beyond the police security safeguards ordinarily provided for foreign visitors. At admitted risk to his person he sought firsthand contacts with students and other elements bent on staging anti-American demonstrations.

This courageous facing of antidemocratic groups for man-to-man discussions of differences was DICK NIXON'S supreme compliment to these neighbors to the south.

Uruguay, as might have been expected of this advanced little democracy, met the test of that compliment with flying colors. Peru flunked it disgracefully. The complicity of the Prado government itself is open to suspicion.

Only in Venezuela was the Vice President's visit on the somewhat foolhardy side. Barely emerging from revolution, this backward land, for all of its false-front glitter of oil riches, has no effective law-enforcement bodies. The visit there might well have been passed up entirely. But there, in the worst ordeal of all, the Nixons comported themselves as the great Americans they both are.

Comments of O. R. Strackbein on Statement of Secretary Dulles Before the Ways and Means Committee, February 4, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as we expect to take up on the floor of the House within the next day or two legislation to extend and modify the so-called reciprocal trade legislation, I think it would be helpful for the membership to read a letter written to Hon. Wilbur D. Mills, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee on March 7, 1958 by Mr. O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture and Labor on Import-Export Policy.

This letter analyzes and comments upon the statement of Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, before the Ways and Means Committee on February 4, 1958.

I have read this letter with a great deal of interest and under unanimous consent granted by the House, I attach Mr. Strackbein's statement hereto as a part of these remarks as follows:

THE NATIONWIDE COMMITTEE OF INDUSTRY, AGRICULTURE, AND LABOR ON IMPORT-EXPORT POLICY,
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1958.

Mr. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, House Committee on Ways and Means, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MILLS: On February 24, 1958, the Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles,

appeared before your committee and presented a prepared statement for the record.

I would like to offer an analysis of, and comments on, some of the leading points set forth by Mr. Dulles and hope that this may be included in the record. Ordinarily I would make no request of this kind but I believe that because of the far-reaching implications of some of Mr. Dulles' observations and judgments and their vital bearing on the merits of the legislation that is before your committee in the form of H. R. 10368, you and members of your committee no less than those who look to the hearings record for information and guidance will be interested in an analysis of his statement from the point of view of one who disagrees with his position.

The Secretary of State's paper is divided into seven parts and this reply will be addressed in sequence to these parts.

I

In part I Mr. Dulles refers to what he calls the two main aspects of the President's proposal to extend and strengthen the Trade Agreements Act.

The second aspect was selected by Mr. Dulles himself for your attention. As set forth by him this aspect of the President's proposal is the part designed to help make the United States secure against external danger.

The Secretary of State should be lauded for his frankness. It is clear from his statement that the Trade Agreements Act is to be wrenched from its original intent and converted into an instrumentality of the diplomacy of this country. That it has in fact been used in this manner for a number of years has been asserted numerous times by those who have questioned the unauthorized direction taken by the program, but never before has the State Department so clearly pleaded guilty to the charge.

The question thus presented by Mr. Dulles is really twofold. One is whether the danger to the United States on the political side is so great and imminent that it should be raised to an overriding discipline, superseding our Constitution and such considerations of the domestic economy as might be held to upset international diplomatic maneuvers and negotiations. The other is whether international trade as an instrumentality of diplomacy is in fact a suitable or useful or manageable tool that can be used successfully to further the security of this country against external danger.

The first part of the question is a most serious one. If we keep in mind that there was a time less than 200 years ago when the American colonists were willing to risk death and privation and did indeed experience both, for the sake of setting up a constitutional system of government on this continent, we must naturally wonder why today we should throw the principles of that constitution overboard as a means of courting safety.

Presumably danger may be so great at times that we must temporarily forego the benefit of principles for the establishment of which others died; but when there may be a clear doubt about the nature of the danger and when there is in any case no compelling reason for believing that the action proposed to avert the danger would be more fruitful than other proposals, then surely there can be no justification for jumping to a totalitarian conclusion about what should be done.

It has become a habit in high places to shoot from the hip with superlatives, to say, for example, that a course of action not conforming to the official proposal, would be totally disastrous. The meaning of words is thus vitiated and testimony that deals in such superlatives loses its weight. If it is necessary to invoke totalitarian principles in order to gain the acceptance of testimony it may be suspected that the testimony lacks the force to recommend itself.

The other part of the question, i. e., conceding the danger, whether the trade agreement program is a suitable instrumentality for warding it off, should also be closely examined. This phase of the question leads us into parts II, III, and IV of Mr. Dulles' statement.

The Secretary's statement says that the trade agreements legislation of the United States has become "symbolic of economic cooperation as a substitute of economic warfare." Then, going back to the depression of 1929, the statement refers to the trade barriers that were erected as a means of reviving the economies of various countries and the decline in world trade that ensued. Since World War II "the trend has happily been in the other direction, at least so far as the free world is concerned," the statement continues.

The latter statement will come as news to many people who are under the impression that international trade became more closely hedged by quotas, exchange controls, embargoes and import licensing systems after World War II than ever before. The Secretary evidently paints with very broad strokes of the brush. Very recent years have indeed witnessed some relaxation; but the trade of most countries continues under close surveillance of their governments; and there is visible little or no hesitation to restore restrictions that have been taken off if this is regarded as necessary.

The United Kingdom still has the token import plan which greatly restricts imports of a long list of goods from this country. For this there may be good reasons. The point is that GATT or no GATT other countries shuttle between liberalization and restriction of trade very much to suit themselves.

Mr. Dulles points to the need of liberalizing trade more and more because of the "physical danger that we face."

Evidently 24 years of the trade agreements program did not prevent us from drifting into such physical danger. Why then should we try more of the same medicine? Evidently as a preventive it was not effective; and just as surely it has not acted as a cure. Whence the notion then that the record supports a further 5-year extension of the program?

"For the first time in history," the statement continues, "the United States is subject to major devastation from weapons launched from foreign soil."

Can Mr. Dulles really believe that the existence or continuation of the trade agreements program bears any ascertainable relevance to the fact that Russia has risen to a position of challenging this country physically? If there is any relevancy the more obvious conclusion, according to ordinary logic, would be that the program did nothing to prevent the unwelcome development if it did not indeed enhance it.

He does indeed claim that "the danger is met, and our peace is preserved, by one fact and one fact alone—that is that the free world is not disunited, but works together and provides dispersed power to retaliate against armed aggression."

In saying this he makes two assumptions. One is that such unity as there is does not come from military considerations but from the trade agreements program. The other is that the trade agreements program will be the magnet that will keep the free world together.

Both are very strained assumptions and can be sustained at best and then only flimsily by exaggerating vastly the proposals of the so-called protectionists. Thus Mr. Dulles says "If other world nations think that the United States market will be increasingly closed to them, that will immeasurably help the Soviet Communist bloc to prosecute their plan of economic encirclement and ultimate strangulation of the United States." In other words, the "free" world will lose its unity and Russia will pounce on us.

There is no proposal before the Ways and Means Committee or before Congress that would come anywhere near closing our market to imports. There are, indeed, proposals that would keep imports from running wild as they have in some sectors since the war and with their low-wage advantages driving our own producers, with their vaunted higher productivity armor, like chaff before the wind. Principally these are proposals to keep imports within bounds and to housebreak them competitively so that it will be possible to live with them.

Again, Mr. Dulles in part IV says that "some elements of the United States industry seek to improve their competitive position by implying that any competition from abroad, merely because it is 'foreign,' should on that account be debarred."

It would be very helpful if Mr. Dulles supported this bald assertion with substantiating citations. Without bothering to do so, he swings stoutly at this ugly strawman that he has thus set up and brings him down flat with this: "The United States cannot accept that viewpoint without endangering our whole Nation." This is in part V of his statement.

Naturally we are moved to shout "Bravo." The trade-agreements policy scores again as it has scored so many times against the villains made of straw.

But then Mr. Dulles softens. This is a pity because it robs him of his victory. He says, "There is, of course, a wide range of cases where foreign competition should be restrained, and is restrained by protective action."

This admission brings him within the range of reality; but in the process he lost his lance.

His admission that there is a wide range of cases where foreign competition should be restrained ranges him alongside the proposals of the so-called protectionists. That is all that they have claimed. They do not propose a general increase in tariff rates nor the general imposition of import quotas. They seek redress against injury only when this can be proved to the satisfaction of the Tariff Commission in public hearings where all sides are heard, in individual cases; and they advocate quotas only where the tariff alone is unequal to the situation because of the operation of the most-favored-nation clause.

Why is Mr. Dulles not satisfied with this? He, as spokesman for the State Department and accepting the long-time position of that Department, does not believe that the regulation of our foreign commerce can be left to the Congress, where it was placed by the Constitution.

And why does this attitude come so naturally to the State Department? Evidently it is not so much a matter of principle as it is a matter of who exercises power. That it is not a point of principle is readily deduced from the Secretary's and the State Department's view of restraining imports so long as it is done by that Department in consort with the Department of Commerce or other executive agencies and not by Congress.

Thus he cites with approbation the voluntary restriction of oil imports, "including those from Venezuela and Canada." These restrictions, such as they are, are in the form of quotas. Obviously quotas are respectable if they are under the control of the executive but unspeakably wicked if they are imposed as a matter of law under procedures spelled out by Congress and controlled by Congress.

Again he points approvingly (part VI) to the restrictions imposed by Japan on her exports of "textiles, flatware, and other goods sold to the United States." Once

more these "voluntary," self-imposed restrictions find no echo in the well-stocked arsenal of ill-will against quotas in the State Department.

Obviously it is all right to impose trade barriers so long as it is done by the State Department or some other arm of the executive. Evidently sin becomes saintly if it is committed in the right quarters.

In other words, what concerns the State Department is not the restriction of trade as such but who does it, even if the law and its orderly application must be set aside; and even if our system of government must be subverted in the process. Such a view is a natural product of the assumption that diplomacy must be the arbiter of our lives. All else must then be subordinated to the considerations of foreign relations, including the Congress.

VI AND VII

Here Mr. Dulles turns to all points of the compass, north, south, east, and west.

He cites Canada and her "unfavorable" balance of trade with us in 1957 and by deploring such a condition swallows the mercantilistic philosophy that his Department abhors so busily. In 1957, a year during which Canada made tremendous capital outlays for pipe lines, iron-ore development, and other enterprises that drew heavily upon United States sources of supply, that country imported $3.9 billion from this country but sold us only $2.9 billion. Already toward the end of 1957 this "unfavorable" balance began to move toward a balance, as should have been expected as these developmental enterprises neared completion. Imports from this country dropped $160 million in the second half of the year. That the "unfavorable" balance was no great strain on Canada in the first instance was reflected in the sound exchange position of the Canadian dollar.

What Mr. Dulles did not mention is notable. He said nothing about the Canadian grievance against our liberal trade-minded wheat producers and flour millers who hold tenaciously to a virtual embargo against the importation of Canadian wheat and wheat flour while ranging themselves staunchly on the side of the freer-trade advocates in this country.

Also, Mr. Dulles failed to note that the duty on American goods going into Canada averages a good 2½ times our average duty on imports from Canada.

Southward he points to Venezuela and points out that in 1957 we shipped $1 billion of exports to that country while we bought only $900 million. He observes that if the Government of Venezuela consider that we intend to put up serious barriers to imports from Venezuela the consequences will not be in the interest of our national security. Yet he admits that we have a Government-sponsored voluntary restriction which limits oil imports including those from Venezuela and Canada. In other words, the restrictions are sanctified by the fact that they were sponsored, not merely by our Government, but by the executive branch thereof. Had they been put on by Congress or an agency of Congress under due process of law, the same restrictions would have to go to the foot of the line and stand as a monument to the crumbling of our national security.

Now eastward he points to the United Kingdom, a country that he correctly describes as living by participation in world trade. In 1957 the United Kingdom bought $1.1 billion from us but we imported only $775 million from there. This left a balance of over $300 million against England.

One of the principal troubles is that Britain competes in our market principally with finished products that not only we also manufacture, but that are also manufactured and shipped to us by England's competitors, such as West Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, and, not least, Japan. The most-favored-nation clause prevents our granting lower duties to British imports as could be done in many cases because of their relatively higher prices. Should we lower the rate on imports from the United Kingdom, the same lower rates would be applied unconditionally under the most-favored-nation clause to imports from all her competitors. This would only widen their price advantage in this market over imports from England, and would not help her.

So, the capping statement of Mr. Dulles is mere hollowness and rhetoric when he says: "If the United States were to adopt policies that would set in motion a series of world-wide trade restrictions and high tariff policies, the effect upon the United Kingdom would be grievous."

Possibly. However, there is no proposal before Congress that suggests what Mr. Dulles professes to fear. Moreover, Britain did her best in a world of high tariffs before World I. Lower-wage competition in combination with the most-favored-nation clause (the principle of nondiscrimination) later undermined her position.

Turning westward Mr. Dulles comes upon Japan. He points at her unfavorable trade balance with us. In 1957 she bought $1,250,000,000 from us but we took only $600,000,000 or half as much from her.

Unquestionably we have a responsibility here so long as we insist that Japan must not trade with Red China and North Korea.

However, recognition of the responsibility does not solve the problem. Of all the routes to take in our relations with Japan GATT is probably the poorest. We should not have sponsored Japanese membership in GATT but should have entered into a bilateral agreement with her. Fourteen of the other leading nations of GATT have in any case refused to extend most-favored-nation clause treatment to her, although we have done so. Our support of Japanese entry into GATT was a case of a bankruptcy of ideas and of following what appeared to be the obvious and easiest channel.

We should have made a study of our trade with Japan and of the capacity of our industries to absorb competion from Japan in our market. We should then have devised import quotas which would have kept the imports within limits but which would have set aside a reasonable share of the market to be supplied by Japan. This would have made it possible to live with the imports.

As it is we are being driven of necessity to the use of import quotas on a global basis because imports from Japan not only confront our own industries with a problem in our market but also exporters from Europe and especially the United Kingdom.

In the end Mr. Dulles again invokes danger as the impelling consideration in support of H. R. 10368.

What is his suggestion worth? The trade agreements extension for another 5 years would presumably provide us the necessary shield.

Now let us suppose that the Russian economic threat against which Mr. Dulles so properly warns us should materialize. The next question is how GATT, which is the offspring of our trade agreements program but which in turn houses the program, is fitted for economic warfare. Let us remember that at the outset Mr. Dulles said that since 1934 we had moved toward economic cooperation as a substitute for economic warfare. Now apparently we are to use the same instrumentality of international cooperation, that is, GATT, for purposes of economic warfare.

Obviously what is meant here is the use of foreign trade by our Government for international political purposes—in a new direction, namely, to block Russia.

Implicit in this undertaking is an end to private international commerce; for nothing is less suited to economic warfare than private trade conducted for profit. What we are really witnessing here is the effort of the State Department in the guise of freer-trade to gain complete dominion over the flow of commerce.

This effort continues to reflect the same philosophy that produced both the ill-starred ITO (International Trade Organization) signed in 1948 but rejected by Congress in 1950, and the still waiting OTC (Organization for Trade Cooperation) which is still in the eggshell on which Congress has been sitting for 3 years. The Russian economic and military threats are merely handy arguments to be pressed into service in the attempt to denude Congress of its authority over foreign commerce.

Obviously, if it becomes necessary to meet the Russian trade challenge by extraordinary means we must quickly forget the most-favored-nation clause in order to gain greater maneuverability. Also we must set aside earmarked products, raw materials, and farm surpluses for shipment where they will do the most good, and not according to profit consideration nor through established distribution channels. Commercial consideration must be brushed aside.

Such a course would upset the normal trade channels to an incalculable degree and would undoubtedly interfere with our trade relations with GATT countries. Instead of being of help to us GATT would no doubt challenge our violations and throw into doubt the value of our economic efforts against Russia.

All that Mr. Dulles really accomplished in his statement was to press into the service of the State Department the latest international developments for help toward gaining the long-standing objective of the Department, but which it has so far not quite succeeded in assuring—and that is, making of international relations a totalitarian discipline to which Congress and our Constitution must bow if any of us are to remain free or even alive and establishing the executive branch of the Government and the State Department in particular as the supreme arbiter.

Sincerely yours,

O. R. STRACKBEIN, *Chairman.*

Has HEW Overstepped Its Authority?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, it seems to me, has stepped out with unauthorized assurance in its article condemning the Hoxsey cancer treatment because of two court decisions. Here is their latest barrage:

PUBLIC BEWARE: WARNING AGAINST THE HOXSEY CANCER TREATMENT

Sufferers from cancer, their families, physicians, and all concerned with the care of cancer patients are hereby advised and warned that the Hoxsey treatment for internal cancer has been found worthless by two Federal courts.

The Hoxsey treatment costs $400, plus $60 in additional fees—expenditures which will yield nothing of value in the care of cancer. It consists essentially of simple drugs which are worthless for treating cancer.

The Food and Drug Administration conducted a thorough investigation of the Hox-

sey treatment and the cases were claimed to be cured. Not a single verified cure of internal cancer by this treatment has been found.

Those afflicted with cancer are warned not to be mislead by the false promise that the Hoxsey cancer treatment will cure or alleviate their condition. Cancer can be cured only through surgery or radiation. Death from cancer is inevitable when cancer patients fail to obtain proper medical treatment because of the lure of a painless cure "without the use of surgery, X-ray or radium" acclaimed by Hoxsey.

Anyone planning to try this treatment should get the facts about it.

For further information write to United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Food and Drug Administration, Washington, D. C.

There is no definite cure for cancer and especially internal cancer, that has yet been devised. No cure is in existence today, and anybody who says that any particular system is hocus-pocus is speaking from authority that does not exist.

I spoke to one of the leading cancer experts in the United States this last winter, and I asked him about the Hoxsey cure and he told me he was very guarded in what he said about any cure. As long as he did not have one of his own that could be relied upon, it would ill become any physician to say that there are only two ways to cure it, one by surgery and the other by radiation. Unless the development of cancer can be treated at an early stage, operations have been proven to be useless; and radiation treatment, according to testimony of many doctors themselves, in advanced stages merely spreads the cancer and does not cure it. Unless people know what they are talking about they should not condemn any treatment. I do not know whether the Hoxsey treatment is good or bad, but I do say that for doctors to condemn it when they can offer nothing better is stepping out on a limb in the eyes of the public.

As Tyndall says:

The greatest discoveries of science have been made when man has left the region of the seen and known and followed the imagination by new paths to regions before unknown.

I sent my daughter-in-law to Hoxsey's institution this last February suffering from cancer of the liver and they at once said that they believed the cancer had made too much headway for them to cure, but they would try. They did at least offer hope when every other source pronounced the cancer incurable. She passed away within 60 days, and while Hoxsey did not cure her or did not say that he could, he certainly did not injure her, while the radiation treatment, according to best authorities, spread the cancer and did not cure it.

Hundreds of affidavits have been filed in court, which the court took no notice of, by people stating that they were cured by the Hoxsey treatment, and who knows at this hour whether in many instances they cannot cure cancer? In one case the court did not rule on the admissibility of these affidavits without first calling up the department of health and then the next day rejected the affidavits.

Who knows but what a final act of success in finding a cure for internal cancer will not be made by someone not within the medical fraternity? The bulletin put out by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is premature.

Still Fighting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1958

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent letter appearing in the letters to the editor column of the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune presents a fine statement of why the high dam at Hells Canyon still remains the outstanding symbol of sound river development.

I congratulate Mr. Lynn Tuttle, chairman of the Idaho-Oregon-Washington Hells Canyon Association, for his forthright statement, and I commend it to my colleagues.

The statement follows:

STILL FIGHTING

To the TRIBUNE:

In development of water resources and hydro power, Russia is forging ahead much more rapidly than the United States. In 1956, 5 percent of her national investments, equivalent to $2.1 billion went for hydroelectric purposes. This much money would go a long way toward building all of the prospective storage and hydro plants of the Northwest. But due to the influence of private power companies and their political bedfellows, it is hard to get funds for any project they cannot control.

Due to our intensely commercialized profit system, public benefits are submerged in the interests of pampered special privilege. These monopolistic groups are pulling all the strings possible to hamper and hamstring any and all cooperative or public effort, especially that of rivers for navigation and power. Disregarding the needs of the public or of the country, they seek full control over water resources and also over the general economy.

Thus, the fight for the full potential of Hells Canyon has been long and hard. It is not yet over. The power companies and their satellites, a few of whom still sit in governor's chairs and the Halls of Congress, have pulled all strings to get this most valuable strip of river for their own wasteful, cream-skimming semidevelopment. But more and more people are seeing the light. The need for full economic usage of water is becoming increasingly apparent. Hells Canyon Dam will eventually be built.

According to President Eisenhower, "we spend $5 billion a year on military weapons research, learning how to kill the mostest the quickest. But in the process of becoming the world's most militaristic power and forcing reluctant nations to rearm, we are neglecting our most vital and essential potentials of strength; our renewable-energy and water resources.

Mr. Dulles outlined the whole program of the administration, both at home and abroad, when he said almost these words, "We are not interested in other people; all we want to do is to protect American interests." Abroad we are protecting the big oil companies and a variety of unscrupulous dictators. These include Chiang Kai-shek, and Batista. At home, the administration is "private power or nothing." Such is the power politics of money and force.

Hydropower and storage are most important for both our economy and our security. Hells Canyon and Nez Perce Dams offer perhaps the greatest feasibility and the most economic benefits of any location in the Northwest.

Hells Canyon has become the symbol, if not the fact, of wise river usage. The substitute dams have become the symbol of waste. We continue to fight.

LYNN TUTTLE,
Chairman, Idaho-Oregon-Washington Hells Canyon Association.
CLARKSTON.

Minnesota Federation of Women's Clubs Favors the Corn Tassel for Our National Floral Emblem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I have received a resolution in favor of the corn tassel as our national floral emblem, from the Minnesota Federation of Women's Clubs. This federation consists of 400 clubs in 78 counties in Minnesota with over 10,000 members. I think the covering letter is itself full of fine arguments in favor of this legislative action. Under unanimous consent I include the letter and resolution as follows:

MINNESOTA FEDERATION OF
WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC.,
Minneapolis, Minn., May 23, 1958.

The Honorable COYA KNUTSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN KNUTSON: I am pleased to tell you that the voice of the Minnesota Federation of Women's Clubs joins that of the Minnesota Legislature and that of many individuals in our State who are interested in seeing the corn tassel become the national floral emblem. I am enclosing herewith a copy of the resolution as passed without dissent by the Minnesota Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled in Minneapolis May 15, 1958.

As you know the Minnesota federation consists of 400 clubs in 78 counties in Minnesota with over 10,000 members. The women have become genuinely interested in making the corn tassel our national emblem because, in addition to the historical, economic, agricultural, social and reverential importance of corn, there is a worldwide significance. A nation that adopts a humble symbol such as corn will certainly win friends internationally over one that might adopt a symbol synonymous with luxury.

Although there are other measures pending that are very much more important, would it not be a comparatively simple matter to complete this little bit of minor legislation now? We are willing to help in any way we can. Please tell us how.

May we count on you and our Minnesota delegation taking the lead in getting this done? Corn is the leading agricultural product of our State. The corn tassel crusade has been waged almost single-handed by a Minnesota citizen. Let's complete the job by having the congressional delegation from Minnesota take the lead in naming the corn tassel the national emblem.

We humbly solicit your consideration and support.

Sincerely,

Mrs. KERMIT V. HAUGAN.

THE CORN TASSEL AS THE NATIONAL FLORAL EMBLEM

The following resolution was adopted by the delegate body of the Minnesota Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled May 15, 1958, in Minneapolis:

"Whereas most nations have a floral emblem to be recognized as their national symbol, while our country has made no such choice; and

"Whereas corn is native to our United States, is characteristic of our land, is grown in every State, was cultivated originally by the Indians here, continued by the farmers to become the most widely cultivated food crop of the world; and

"Whereas corn kept alive our Pilgrims through perilous winters and was sent by them to England to pay for their *Mayflower* crossing; and

"Whereas the corn tassel has a glory all its own, blooming through many weeks, then to live again in seed which became the first export from our present United States: Therefore

"*We hereby resolve*, That in gratitude we should honor corn, the genesis of our history, our agriculture, our economy, by adopting for our national flower, the corn tassel."

New Orleans, a Town Both Gentle and Violent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1958

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, New Orleans, it is agreed, is one of the world's largest cities with a distinctive flavor and in deed a city of character.

Anybody who visits New Orleans never forgets it.

Recently the New York Herald Tribune asked a number of editors from around the country to write guest articles about the special qualities of their cities. The series of articles was to be called Our Town.

Among the prominent and competent editors invited to contribute to the series was George Chaplin, the editor of the New Orleans Item.

Following is Mr. Chaplin's vivid and living article on New Orleans:

A TOWN BOTH GENTLE AND VIOLENT

This is a magic town, caressed and nourished by the river, a town that loves its jazz and its Mardi Gras, its food and its wine—but lives by water.

The Mississippi, impatient for its freedom in gulf deepwater 100 miles downstream, rolls enough gallonage past the foot of Canal Street each day to slake the entire Nation's thirst.

Water brings ships (4,300 in foreign trade alone last year) and lures petrochemical plants. It is a blessing, but a bother, too, for this sprawling metropolis rests on a below-sea-level sponge and every raindrop must be pumped out through a canal network big enough for Holland.

Water and heat make this a town of outdoor living, a town that plants and gardens the year around. There is redolence in the air and semitropical lushness—palms, magnolias, banana trees, flowering oleanders, great live oaks, azaleas and camellias, and the ripple of fountains.

This is a town of iron-laced balconies and patios, of old brick garden walls, of stately columns—and a town, too, with the squalor and evil of slums and the dingy, headbusting joints along the waterfront.

This is a town both gentle and violent, that enjoys its art and its mayhem. It was once the wickedest town in the world. The local correspondents of the New York Tribune reported in 1855 that "murders here are an everday occurrence." And earlier Andrew Jackson's wife, Rachel, wrote back home during a visit here: "Great Babylon is come up before me. Oh, the wickedness, the idolatry of this place. Oh, farewell. Pray for your sister in a heathen land."

Life is safer nowadays, but still pleasantly turbulent. New Orleans, someone has said, is like a slightly tarnished female who on Sunday morning can't make up her mind whether to take another drink or go to early worship.

Whatever her decision it will be to music—for this is a town that is sustained by its sweet sounds, from Ferdinand (Jelly Roll) Morton's to W. A. Mozart's, with an understandable partiality for the farmer.

Symphony, opera, chamber groups—they're all popular here, although underfed as everywhere—but the hometown music is the jazz that burst out of Storyville, the red-light district dead these 40 years.

Louis Armstrong, Buddy Bolden, Bunk Johnson, Kid Ory, Manuel Perez—they and many other greats served their time in the tenderloin. Alphonse Picou remembered: "Those were happy days, man, happy days." And Jelly Roll once recalled: "New Orleans was the stomping grounds for all the great pianists. * * * The sporting houses needed professors."

In 1917, when wartime Secretary Josephus Daniels decreed Storyville must go, the city's chief executive rushed to Washington to protest and one of the housekeepers sought an injunction. But both mayor and madam lost, and Storyville's 38 blocks went.

Satchmo Armstrong, 15 at the time, remembers "it was a sad, sad situation." There were still the riverboats and the minstrel shows and the roadhouses, but jazz headed 'way up yonder from New Orleans.

Today the Basin Street of Storyville is the site of a low-cost housing project, but a few squares away in the French Quarter, on Bourbon Street, they're still beating out the hot licks. Now and then somebody suggests putting up a statue to jazz, but the idea never gets far—perhaps because monuments are really for the dead.

Parades and street bands get the right-of-way here, and there are still Negro funerals where the musicians march. "He rambled all around * * * till the butcher cut him down." Lizzie Miles insists that when her time comes the hearse must pass down Bourbon Street—even it it's only for a block—because it's the street that gave her a start and a comeback.

And Thomas Griffin, Item columnist, confides that one society matron has it in her will that when she's lowered into the grave a jazz band must play "When the Saints Come Marching In."

This is a town that likes its freedom; a town that goes carnival-crazy on Shrove Tuesday and rushes penitently to church on Ash Wednesday; a town that likes to gamble and does when it can get away with it; (General Beauregard once drew $30,000 a year for supervising a post-Civil War lottery here); a town that prefers jaywalking to the new "walk" and "don't walk" signs; a town whose streets are an invitation to freewheeling enterprise (with those white lanes obviously painted only for visitors).

This is a town that drinks its coffee hot and black, and flavored more often than not with the roasted root of the blue-flowered chicory plant.

It is estimated that 72 to 74 percent of the coffee drunk locally is chicory-blended and that 65 percent of the chicory consumed nationally is processed and distributed from here. This chicory comes mostly from France, Holland, Belgium, and Yugoslavia, occasionally from Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Rumania. There was a time when restaurants served only chicory, but tourist demands have brought about concessions and you can get it pure if you wish.

There is no compromise, however, in the preparation of the oysters, the shrimp, the crawfish bisque, the trout, the pompano, Mark Twain called the fish here "as delicious as the less criminal forms of sin." Former Mayor Maestri spent a whole day hosting the late President Roosevelt and reportedly made conversation only once. He asked FDR: "Mr. President, how ya like dem ersters?"

This is a town where a lot of people speak Brooklynese without having been north of Lake Pontchartrain; where kids don't have birthdays but "make" them—"he just made 16;" a town where the faithful run classified ads to show their gratitude—"Thanks to St. Frances Xavier Cabrini, Mother of Perpetual Help, and Our Lady of Fatima."

The story is told that when an adjoining parish, St. Bernard, cast fraudulent votes in a major election, this ad appeared in the local press: "Thanks to St. Bernard for favors granted."

This is a town that paints and sculpts and turns out more aluminum than the entire Nation did before World War II; a town where streetcars still clang down Canal St. while city council is talking monorail; a town where a sternwheeler paddles under the just-opened $65 million bridge connecting east and west banks of the river with the country's longest cantilever span.

This is a town named after a carouser (the Duke of Orleans), a town with history and mystery and not a little music in its street names. Burgundy, Chartres, Dumaine, Toulouse, Melpomene, Terpsichore, Euphrosine, Felicity and Virtue. And where did Tchoupitoulas come from?

This is the town that was the original Dixie. A bank here issued a 10-dollar note printed in English and French (in which 10 is dix) and the rivermen loosely pluralized it. "Let's go to New Orleans and get those dixies." The name didn't go regional until the song was written in '59.

This is a town that is now building on the original site a duplicate, at least externally, of its famed old St. Louis Hotel, in the ruins of which Galsworthy found a white horse wandering and wrote a piece about it.

This is a town for lively news. Typical examples during April:

Gamblers were robbed of $50,000 in cash in a club in next-door Jefferson Parish, but the sheriff wasn't interested: "We never investigate unless there's a complaint."

The director of the Vieux Carre Commission, guardian of architectural integrity in the French Quarter, climbed over a back fence to photograph some oversized window panes, which appeared to be in violation of the code, instead reportedly got a picture of the pretty but irate housewife who'd rushed out in her underwear. Said she: "I was born and reared in the French Quarter. But if this is what it's coming to, I'll leave."

Diamond Jim Moran (really James Brocato turned Irish), restaurateur and delightful rogue, who often said, "When I go, pal, I wanna go fast," went just that way, of a coronary. With him went his ermine tie, his bediamoned appurtenances including sparkling toupee, spectacles, bridgework, shoes, and zipper, and a penchant for serving Dutch beer in an ice bucket and putting small

diamond rings in pals' meatballs. When Senator KEFAUVER grilled him here some years ago about his slot-machine days with Costello and Kastel, Jimmy answered candidly, then in effect said, "Say, pal, how about comin' duck-huntin' with me?" "Sometime," indicated the Senator.

Yes, this is a delightfully different town, a fun town, but behind the fun is a solid and aggressive community which really works harder than it plays; which supports its charities and capital fund drives; fills its churches and synagogues more often than most places; boasts two top medical schools with major research achievements; is a great retailing, industrial, and oil center; and a gateway between Latin America and the midcontinent.

Like other cities it has its tensions, racial and other; its bigness and its pettiness, its headaches and its challenges. Where to get money for schools, for the needs of suburbia, for the battle on traffic congestion and downtown blight?

This is a town that mixes the Latin with the South; a town in transition that has taken in stride, plague, yellowjack, and hurricanes. It faces the future with hope and skill—and another cup of coffee.

Lyle Saxon called it marvelous. It was and it is.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.